

16.31 hrs.

**DISCUSSION RE. CHINESE INVA-
SION OF VIETNAM AND THE
CONSEQUENT THREAT TO THE
FREEDOM OF NATIONS IN ASIA—
Contd.**

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Now we go to the further discussion on Chinese invasion of Vietnam.

Mr. Govindan Nair.

SHRI M. N. GOVINDAN NAIR (Trivandrum): I rise to join in the condemnation of the Chinese over the naked aggression they committed on the Vietnamese soil and also to express solidarity with the people of Vietnam.

I also join to demand the withdrawal of the Chinese army from the Vietnamese territory.

Sir, on the 17th February at 6.30 p.m. this attack started. All over the world the news was flashed and the whole world was agitated over it. But there were two persons—one our Foreign Minister who was in China at that time and the other, our AIR, completely blind to these developments. Of course, I could understand, I saw his photo before the Buddhist temple. He might have been meditating without knowing what was happening around him. But what happened to AIR? Are we to understand, we should know about these developments from BBC or the Voice of America? We have a network of AIR stations all over the country. I demand an answer from the Government why they blacked out this news.

I am very much angered not because the Chinese behaved in a discourteous manner by not informing our Foreign Minister while he was their honoured guest about the aggression, but about the criminal negligence of our foreign Ministry. I ask what our Foreign Ministry was doing. We have an army of

diplomats, we are spending crores of rupees for maintaining them. In what an awkward position was our Foreign Minister put before the whole world? You have diplomatic relations with China. You have an Ambassador there, you have enough staff there. Don't they go through the newspapers? And this morning the Foreign Minister had to admit that he got the information from the phone call of some newspaperman who got the information from this country. Yesterday somebody was asking whether we should withdraw our Ambassador because of the Vietnamese war. I am asking the Foreign Minister, why are you maintaining an Ambassador and his staff there if they cannot give this simple information to you? I want an answer from the Foreign Minister. Now, Sir, it is a matter of disgrace to our Foreign Affairs Ministry that they were ignorant of what was happening all round?

Yesterday somebody said not somebody but our hon. Shri Raj Narain pointed that out—that he had advised him not to go because things are developing in a different way. Whether he followed the advice or not, that is not the point. The point is: I want to know whether our Foreign Ministry is following the developments that are taking place all a round the world and in that region? It shows the complete ignorance of developments that were taking place in the rest of the world. A few minutes earlier somebody pointed out about the letter written by our Prime Minister to Shri Bakhtiar.

SHRIMATI PARVATHI KRISHNAN (Coimbatore): Now, he is no longer there.

SHRI M. N. GOVINDAN NAIR: In what a ridiculous position we are? Is not the Foreign Ministry responsible for this? I ask you whether you accept this or not. What is this Ministry for I do not know. If they are not informing the Minister about the developments? Anybody with a little intelligence should know what the fate of Bakhtiar Ministry is. Everybody in the world knew this excepting our Foreign Office. (Interruptions). Our Prime

[Shri M. N. Govindan Nair]

Minister writes a letter congratulating him greeting him but before that letter reaches Iran—Teheran—that gentleman is out.

SHRIMATI PARVATHI KRISHNAN: That gentleman is not here.

SHRI M. N. GOVINDAN NAIR: You always blame the Minister. I do not blame him because the minister, it seems, is a victim in the hands of the officers and information is supplied by them.

THE MINISTER OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS (SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE): Are you speaking from your experience?

SHRI M. N. GOVINDAN NAIR: I am talking from my experience. That is why I say you cannot dispute my statement. Now take this attack on Vietnam. It is not known to the world what was brewing there? If our Foreign Affairs Ministry and the Ministers did not know the developments, they are not fit to hold their posts. I ask: was it not in all the newspapers? Forget about that newspaper. A Parliamentary Delegation headed by the General Secretary of the Janata Party,—his boson friend—Shri Madhu Limaye with the Members from all the parties made an on the spot study in Vietnam; they knew what was happening in the Kampuchea—the struggle against the Vietnamese. They must have had all this information. It was a very pitiable sight to see the two mighty nations of the world, America and China, taking the coffin of Pol Pot regime to the United Nations to seek their help to revive it. Now, I was surprised to hear this morning from our Foreign Minister about Kampuchea that things have not settled down there. Even after the attack on Vietnamese he was not sure that the Chinese had committed the aggression. Even today he will not commit the word 'aggression'. In our part of the country, I hope the lady member and the lady Minister will excuse me to say that, women will not call

their husbands by name. (Interruptions). What do you know Mr. Vajpayee? Mr. Vajpayee is a bachelor. How can he intervene in this matter. Therefore, in the same way even when Chinese Army has gone 30 kms inside Vietnamese territory and there is a wholesale attack with tanks and everything yet to say that Chinese have committed aggression there is some reservation on the part of our Government. Why! So also there is some reservation on the part of 'X' to recognise Kampuchea. Was there in the 20th century a more barbarous government than this Pol Pot government? Even their representative who went to U.N. is now in the hospital due to nervous breakdown. The people of Kampuchea threw him out and they formed a new government. It is the responsibility of this government to recognise it. What stands in the way? I do not know.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Please conclude now. There are still many members who are to participate in the debate.

SHRI M. N. GOVINDAN NAIR: Sir, I come to the main point. The main point is that it is not a question as to whether the Vietnamese will be able to resist or not. A nation of 900 million strong is fighting a nation of 50 million. But that is not the whole thing. There is a big contingent of Chinese in Burma, Singapore, Malaysia, Indonesia and everywhere. The other day the Prime Minister of Malaysia came and complained to you openly that the Chinese government is unresponsive to the request not to incite the Chinese on their soil against the existing regime. Now what is the situation that has emerged? After the visit of the Chinese Vice Premier to USA Mr. Carter has entrusted the responsibility of keeping peace and order in the East with the Chinese. The way they are trying to keep peace is shown by their action in Vietnam. Every other State

in South East Asia is terribly afraid about their security and here is a country, India, which is one of the major nations in this region, are we taking a line of giving some sense of security to these nations?

What is the method and how it is to be done, I am not going into it because I have no time. But do you not consider it our responsibility to see that peace is maintained in this region, to see that no other nation is attacked like this, as they have done in Vietnam? Is it not our responsibility to see that as a nation existing in this region, peace is maintained in this region? The Japanese, the Chinese and the Americans have now joined together. What are the Americans doing now? What they have failed to do is being got done through the Chinese. That is what is happening. Now, the Chinese are acting as the policemen of the East. There was a Policeman in the middle East and that was the Shah of Iran. He was behaving like a Policeman. It has been generally accepted and it is not my coinage. You all know what happened to him. I find that the biggest tragedy of this century is a big nation like China, after fighting against the imperialists and establishing a Socialist Government, is breaking away from the socialist world and becoming a handmaid of imperialism. It is the biggest tragedy of this century and all of us will have to pay for it. But when I speak on China, my thoughts go back to these days, those heroic days, when the Chinese fought against the imperialism of both Japan and America. Millions of people in China laid down their lives to save their country from imperialists. All of them in their grave must be revolting against what is happening today in China. I am quite sure many of the Generals who led that heroic battle will be hanging down their head in shame. I am quite sure the People's Liberation Army which fought against the imperialism will not for long be loyal to this Government which is now ruling China. Iran is a lesson to all Policeman. I

believe in the people, I believe in human values and I am sure it may not be tomorrow, it may not be day after, but the time is not far off when the people in China will rise against the present regime which is behaving like a stooge of American Imperialism and I believe that the peace-loving people of the world will unite in condemning and containing these new aggressors who have come into the field.

श्री. श्री. श्री. नन्दल (गधेपुरा) : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं चीन द्वारा वियतनाम पर किये गये हमले की खबर शब्दों में निम्न करता हूँ। उपाध्यक्ष महोदय चीन को हम अच्छी तरह से जानते हैं। चीन ने जो कारनामा अब वियतनाम के साथ किया है, वह हमें 1962-63 के दिनों की याद दिलाता है जबकि उसने दोबोरे से, सर्वात्मक तरीके से हम पर आक्रमण किया था। उस के पहले जैसी बातें कर के हम से दोस्ती का झाँक चीन में बढ़ाया था और हमारे प्रधान मंत्री श्री बजाहरनाथ नेहरू को अपने बुंगल में लिया था उसको हम भलीभाँति जानते हैं। तिब्बत पर उनकी आक्रमण करने के लिये छेड़ दिया था। तिब्बत एक आबाद मुल्क हम जानते हैं और चीन को उस पर बनवानी करने के लिये छेड़ना उस वक्त हमारी भूल थी और वह भूल चीन की दोस्ती में फँस कर हमारे उस वक्त के प्रधान मंत्री ने की थी। कुछ के साथ कहना पड़ता है कि हमारे अब के विदेश मंत्री श्री बाबेयी की जो उस वक्त चीन के खिलाफ प्राण उगलते थे वह भी चीन के बुंगल में फँस गये। उनका चीन जाना किसी भी हालत में मैं जायज नहीं समझता। चीन ने हमारी 50,000 वर्ग मील जमीन छपी की अपने कब्जे में की हुई है। उसको हमारे वहाँ भ्राना चाहिये था। हमारे विदेश मंत्री वहाँ जायें यह सर्वथाक बात है। और जाने के बाद जो इनके साथ सलूक हुआ वह बुर समझते होंगे। इनके वहाँ रहते हुए ही चीन ने वियतनाम पर आक्रमण किया जिसने दुनिया में इनकी पोजीशन को बहुत हल्का बनाया, और जो इनका स्थान विदेश मंत्री की हैसियत से दो बर्से ले था वह बहुत हल्का पड़ गया चीन जाने के बाद जब इनके वहाँ रहते हुए चीन वालों ने वियतनाम पर हमला किया। और यह बात और भी पैचीया हो जाती है जब कम्युनिज्म की इन्होंने बली तक मान्यता नहीं दी। लेकिन जहाँ तक ईरान का स्थान है उसको सबसे पहले मान्यता दे दी। उसी तरह बलिहार को मान्यता दे दी थी। इन सब बातों से समझ होता है कि हमारी विदेश नीति से कुछ नकबनी बानी है। चीन के साथ हमारा सीधा सम्पर्क यह होना चाहिये कि पहले हमारी भूमि को सपष्ट कर दें। बारबार इस समय वे हमारे रक्षा मंत्री कहते हैं कि हमारी पूरी सैना ही और अब अब बुकमना होना तो हम बचना में। लेकिन आज 17 साल के बाद

[श्री श्री श्री गणेश]

की 50,000 जर्न चीन भूमि चीन से आने की थी इसी विजयत नहीं हुई है, और उनके उनके वहाँ हाथिरी देने के लिये जा रहे हैं। उनको चाहिए कि वह उनके अपनी जमीन जाने, और नहीं देने से अगर वास्तव में सब को मिसवीज नहीं किया जाता है और हमारे पास ताकत है तो हमें चीन पर उस जमीन के लिये बार डिक्लेयर करनी चाहिए। और वास्तव में जब चीन बुनिया में एक कंट्रोवर्शियल देखा जाता हुआ है और बहुत से देशों के साथ उसका सम्बन्ध ऐसा ही रहा है। तो चीन के साथ दोस्ती करने के बजाय हमें साफ कहना चाहिये कि हमारी जमीन दे दो नहीं तो हम तुम्हारे दोस्त नहीं हैं। लेकिन हमारे विदेश मंत्री माननीय बाजपेयी जी उन्हें उनके यहाँ गये। और इनको कहा कहा भेष किया पता भी नहीं बना, और इनको पता भी नहीं लगने दिया कि चीन की कायबाही विवतनाम पर क्या हो रही है। और बहुत बेशाक हो कर तेरे कूबे से, हम निकले, यही इनकी हालत हुई।

जब या बाजपेयी चीन जा रहे थे, तो शायद लोगों का अन्दाजा था कि वह जरूर हमारी पचास हजार जन-चीन भूमि को वापस लेने में सफल हो जायेंगे, इस लिए वे चुप रहे। लेकिन जब मासूम हुआ है कि और सब बातें हुईं, लेकिन बाइर के बारे में कोई बात चीन ने इनसे नहीं की। यह एक अमानक बात है। अहाँ तक हम जानते हैं, चीन ने यही कहा कि काटोबवाल इत्युक्त को छोड़ दीजिए, दूसरी बातों पर मेल कीजिए। दूसरी बातों के बारे में क्या मेल करना है? अगर अभी तक मेल नहीं था, तो हमारा क्या मुकाम हो रहा था?

हमें 1962 को तथा बाद रचना चाहिए— उसको कभी भूलना नहीं चाहिए। हम उस वक्त बेफिक्र थे। हमने वहाँ सेना नहीं रखी थी। हमारी कोई तैयारी नहीं थी। उस वक्त "हिन्दी चीनी भाई भाई" का नारा लगाया जा रहा था। हमने तिब्बत को भी छोड़ दिया। लेकिन चीन ने किच तर्ह हिन्दुस्तान को इधुमिलिएट किया। डेड बाडीज भी इन इस्लामेंडस वापस की जाती थीं। हो सकता है कि विवतनाम से भी चीन वापस बना जाये, लेकिन उसका इरादा है विवतनाम है को इधुमिलिएट करने का।

मैं यह भी समझता हूँ कि अगर चीन एशिया में किसी से डर सकता है, तो वेकेंड मार्केट में, इंडिया, से डर सकता है। अब हमारी तैयारी है, इस लिए उसको डर होता। लेकिन अब यह हमारी जमीन को रके हुए है और फिर भी हमारे फारेन मिनिस्टर इनको वहाँ हाथिरी देने के लिए जाते हैं, तो उसका डर बात हो जाता है। यह समझ जाता है कि हम कितने पापी हैं। उसको और किच का डर है? उसी विवतनाम के साथ जो दुष्कर्म किया है, यह इच्छा उठाएक है।

मैं समझता हूँ कि फारेन मिनिस्टर का वहाँ जाना किसी भी तर्ह से अच्छा नहीं था। कम्युनिवा को अभी तक रेकग्नीशन नहीं किया गया है। हमारे फारेन मिनिस्टर का वहाँ जाना, और वही बीच चीन का विवतनाम पर टैक करण, मैं समझता हूँ कि इस तर्ह बुनिया के लाने हमारी पोजीशन को बहुत कुछ रिबिजुलस बना दिवा गया है, और मैं इससे बहुत दुःखी हूँ।

कुछ माननीय मित्रों ने हमारी प्रियेवनेस के बारे में कहा है। हम कहते हैं कि एटमिक हथियार नहीं बनयेंगे। जब चीन बीता वेत हमारी सीमा पर है, तो उसके हमें बराबर खतरा है। मैं वही भी चाहूँगा कि ऐसे दुश्मन के रहते हुए हमें बुरी तर्ह से प्रियेवनेस रखनी चाहिए, और अगर जरूरत हो, तो अपने डिफेंस के लिए एटम कम बना कर रखाना भी बेजा नहीं है।

मेरे विमान में कभी कभी एक और बात धाती है। हो सकता है कि मानवीय तत्वों को वह न बचे। अगर हमारी मजमेंट के लोग हमारे फारेन एफेयस मिनिस्टर, यह समझते हैं कि चीन को हमारी भूमि वापस करनी ही चाहिए, तो उनको चीन जाना नहीं चाहिए था। उनको अपनी भूमि वापस करने की जिमांज करनी चाहिए थी। अगर इसके लिये सड़ाई करने की नीजत भी चाये, तो वह भी करनी चाहिए थी। और अगर और कुछ न हो सके, तो गांधी जी के बताये हुए नान-वायनेस के तरीके से हम को लार्बो बालन्डीयर्ब को मेकमोहन लाइन पर भेजना चाहिये गांधी जी ने कहा था कि नान-वायनेस इज बेटर देन बालेंस, बट वायनेस इज बेटर देन कबाइस। नान वायनेस कमजोरों का हथियार नहीं है, तर्कवालों का हथियार है। हमें इस बारे में कुछ करना ही चाहिये था, बजाय ये इसके कि हम चीन के दरबार में हाथिरी हों, और उसने नाजायज तरीके से हमारी जो भूमि रखी है, उसकी बात भी न करें।

विवतनाम पर चीन का जो एटेक हुआ है, मैं जोरदार तर्हों में उसकी निन्दा करता हूँ, मैं शर्मा करता हूँ कि भविष्य में हमारे संतरीयण चीन के साथ चीन करते हुए बरा बुद्धिमानी से काम लेंगे। विदेश मंत्री की वेदियाटिष्, वेधभक्ति, की स्वेस्वन नहीं करता हूँ। लेकिन इस बार केन की विजडन तो जरूर स्वेस्वनेबल ही गई है। उसकी बुद्धिमता पर अब मुझे शक ही क्या है। मैं कनिक्लेस्ट हूँ कि उन का यह काम अच्छा नहीं हुआ है।

17 hrs.

Mr. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Shri Salyanarayan Rao. I request him to take only five minutes, unfortunately there can be only one speaker from your party. I am going to call the hon. Minister at 5.30 and there are so many other speakers.

SHRI M. SATYANARAYAN RAO (Karimnagar): While sharing the sentiments which the hon. Members had expressed yesterday and today in condemning the aggression committed by China against Vietnam, I would request the External Affairs Minister Shri Vajpayee to join in this condemnation. Just now my hon. friend Shri B. P. Mandal pointed out that when he was the opposition leader in 1962, he was the first person to condemn Chinese aggression against India. The same situation is there in Viet Nam now. Why he does not condemn it, I do not understand. I think he is undergoing some imprisonment; he is not a free man to speak. Left to himself he may say, like our Prime Minister who always says, while speaking about Sikkim or some other problem, it is his personal opinion. So he can also express his personal opinion; there is that excuse. So he must rise to the occasion. Is it a fact that before going to China he was advised by the experts in the External Affairs Ministry that it was not the opportune time for him to go there and they also gave him the ground for their conclusion? This has been commented upon editorially by papers. It seems that advice was rejected by Foreign Secretary Jagat Mehta saying: I know more, you need not advise. This is the impression in this country; it is for the hon. Minister to say whether it is a fact or not.

When the External Affairs Minister was in China, on the last day of his visit, China committed aggression against Viet Nam. Unfortunately he was not aware of that fact. He was very near that border; he was visiting the southern part of China at that time. But he was not told by the Ministry or our ambassador; he came to know from some newspaper correspondent who came to know of it from Delhi that China had committed aggression. He cut short his visit. I am happy about it but it is not sufficient. The Chinese chose their time deliberately to attack Vietnam when he was

there. He may say, my visit was decided in October. I will only remind him that when he wanted to go to China in October, it was not political illness, it was God's warning; that is why he made him sick and told him: do not go to China, if you go there you are not safe there. In spite of that warning, not only from the ministry but also from God, he went there. There is a big conspiracy between United States and China. Recently the Chinese Vice Premier went to USA and had talks with President Carter; after discussions with him he came back to China and then they wanted to involve our country and so when our Foreign Minister was visiting China, they wanted to give an impression to the world that not only the United States, Japan and other countries but also India is supporting China. It is a proof. They wanted a proof. They did not know at that time that he will be bold enough to cut short his visit and come back soon and the condemnation Resolution will be moved here and all parties will condemn it. They did not know that. This is the conspiracy and I am happy that this Government did not come in the trap. I expect the same thing from the External Affairs Minister, Mr. Vajpayee.

I know that he went to China under the threat of Dr. Subramaniam Swamy. Dr. Subramaniam Swamy is a great critic of Shri Vajpayee. He always says—because of Mr. Vajpayee we are a failure and we are not cultivating friendship with China. With the consultation of the Prime Minister he went to China; just as an Ambassador. This was the first time in this history of India that a person who had nothing to do with the Government and was not holding any position in Government was sent to China. In what position he was sent? He forced Shri Vajpayee to follow suit also. That is why he had to go and he is waiting if Shri Vajpayee is dropped from the Cabinet he will be able to fill the vacuum. I know Dr. Subramaniam Swamy has disappeared since this debate took place.

[Shri M. Satyanarayan Rao]

Again I would like to emphasise the point, to say that we have asked China to withdraw her forces, that will not be sufficient. Just now Shri M. N. Govindan Nair and Shri B. P. Mandal said that these so-called countries—Indonesia, Burma, Philippine, Singapore, Malaysia, Nepal, Ceylon, Burma—are afraid of China. All these countries are small countries. They are not in a position to say anything or condemn aggression because they know that they may be attacked. U.S.A. will joint China and there is nobody to provide protection or security to them. It is high time for us to say that we are all united. If anything happens in South East Asian countries our country will come to their rescue. You start negotiations with other countries and see that this aggression is vacated immediately.

In 1962 China committed aggression against us without any provocation, without any justification. The simple reason was that in the comity of Nations we were having great respect. At that time Pandit Jawahar Lal Nehru was universally accepted Asian leader. The Chinese did not want that. They wanted to establish their own edgism. This thing was coming in their way. That is why they wanted to teach us a lesson.

They started this thing in 1962 and they are continuing that. They wanted to prove it by committing aggression on Vietnam. Do not think that this will be confined to Vietnam only.

History will know what is in the mind of China? Whenever any country becomes strong, China will attack it. It knows no principle, no morality, no reason, etc.

We also tried our level best at that time to see that China is admitted to U.N.O. We have fought for it and at that time we earned enmity of European and other Western countries.

China has become a great imperialist country. It used to condemn imperialists, colonialists and expansionists and the same country is hobnobbing with those countries. Why is U.S.A. interested? U.S.A. failed in curbing Vietnam. They wanted to take revenge against Vietnam. That is why they found freindship with China and indirectly they are encouraging this. Now they are also very much interested to see that Vietnam is defeated by China. This is the thing.

You say that you want to have friendship with the U.S.A. But be careful. But you should be careful about us on anything, whether it is Pakistan, Goa or on any issue. It always wanted to twist our arms. Now also it is doing the same thing. Although you extended your friendship and cooperation to U.S.A., it is supplying sophisticated arms to Pakistan. China also is doing like that. So, keeping in view all these things, it is better you change your policy fundamentally.

PROF. SAMAR GUHA (Contai): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, very regrettably the most irrelevant issue like the visit of the Foreign Minister to China, which should have been considered on other occasions, have been brought into this debate. Perhaps most unwittingly many members have forgotten that by what they are saying they are trying to play into the hands of very big power that was persistently and consistently trying to see that the *detente* between India and China is not re-established because of certain international political relation that have developed in recent decades. I would therefore request now that—already the members have expressed their views—let us concentrate on the issue of the conformation or conflict that is going on in the border between China and Vietnam. As a free, independent and dignified nation what we should do on such an occasion when a big power attacks a smaller neighbour, the President of India the Prime Minister of India have exactly expressed their views denouncing the aggress-

live action of China. Our Foreign Minister by very promptly curtailing his scheduled visit and that has also in a diplomatic way and very promptly expressed the views of India and the concern of India regarding the Chinese attempt to over power or terrify Vietnam. The sympathy of the Indian people and of this House have been ramply expressed in favour of Vietnam. There is another reason for this. The great people of Vietnam, who fought for 25 years one big giant—U.S.A.—have shown how even a small nation, with the spirit and determination to defend their freedom, could accept the challenge of a big power like the U.S.A. That is another reason why we have our sympathy and our respect for Vietnam.

But the issue in this conflict between China and Vietnam is not so simple that it is a conflict between one country and another or aggression by one country against another. Therefore, I would request the Foreign Minister and the Government that they should not indulge in any kind of over-act or making over expression in this very delicate situation. Why I use the word 'dictate' is,—because there is dangerous potentiality of escalation of this limited conflict between China and Vietnam into an international conflagration which may consume not only the South-East Asian countries but millions of people of the world. Therefore, in making our observation on such a delicate situation, a potentially very dangerous situation, we should be very careful. But seeing the way our friends are expressing their views in a lighter and hilarious mood, I do not understand that they have sympathy for Vietnam and have a deeper understanding of the problem and the seriousness of the issue that is involved. I ask one question to those people who are talking aloud and saying why India is not taking a very bold step in this matter, saying—why India is not coming forward and taking all kinds of initiative in sending the army to Vietnam or open a second line against China in the Himalayan range—some of them would have been very happy

if it so happened I would ask one question to them: Today is the sixth day of fighting. What about Russia? What about USA? Russia has sent a few reconnaissance planes and perhaps two warships are on the way to Vietnam. But why have they not done the international diplomatic thing? Why Russia which is one of the members of the big powers, is not taking initiative in convening the meeting of the Security Council, let alone the question of General Assembly? Why USA which is also taking a lot about it has not taken any initiative whatsoever in convening the meeting of the Security Council. We have to understand the problems. We have to understand the implications of it. We have to understand the politics behind it. As I said, there is a dangerous potential of escalation of this conflict into an international conflagration. That is one aspect. For this reason the big powers are cautious.

There is another aspect. That is the new trend of international politics. Apparently it is a fight between China and Vietnam but in reality it is a fight between two big communist countries China and Russia by proxy. A new politics has developed. Earlier we used to hear the word 'capitalist contradiction' and it was the theory that out of capitalist contradiction, all international conflicts developed. What do we see after the Second World War? When so many communist countries emerged, developed, what do we find? We find a new phenomenon in the world, the phenomenon of communist contradiction. This communist contradiction started with the polemics between Yugoslavia and China first. And then what do we see? When the Russian Army invaded other communist country like Hungary and Czechoslovakia, what was the phenomenon? The communist super power wanted to keep them under its thumb. Although they were communist countries, it crushed them because they did not follow the dictates from Moscow. Now what do we see here? We did not expect that Vietnam—although I have full sympathy for them—would

[Prof. Samar Guha]

after its coming out of such a big war, a continuously war would unilaterally send its Army against another communist country. Right or wrong there is an assumption that it was a real communist country and this communist country was suppressing the people. In every communist country how the people are being suppressed, we know it. How the Vietnamese Army entered into Kampuchea? We did not take notice of that. We did not raise a voice at the proper time. We did not say a word that Russia should not enter into the region of South-East Asia in the interest of peace and security there. When the Russian arms Russian policy, Russian diplomacy were trying to create a sense of in security, instability apprehension in South-East Asia, we did not utter a single word. Therefore, I say that when it is a communist contradiction in an ugly form between China and Vietnam, in reality it is a communist contradiction between two big powers—China and Russia. Therefore, in getting into the fury of it, we must be careful. We must carefully analyse what is the implication of this conflict. By giving this note of warning I would say, do not make a very bold face and try to make over-zealous and over heroic statements on the floor of this House. Let us understand what we can do. Let us realise in the perspective of real politik what really we can contribute to this problem, I would use the word, ugly problem, unfortunate problem of Chinese Army entering into the territory of Vietnam. I would, therefore, suggest a few concrete steps.

If our Government really want to adopt a policy of real politik, instead of India initiating any move for convening the Security Council, they should try by all means to see first that this limited conflagration does not escalate into an international conflict. This is the first thing that India should get done. Secondly, we have to see that Russia and USA jointly take the responsibility, and initiative for convening the Security

Council. I repeat that we should see that Russia and USA are induced to jointly sponsor and initiate the convening of the Security Council. Thirdly, we should make every effort to see that immediate cease-fire is effected there. Fourthly, we have to see that the conflict does not escalate further. We have to see that an over-all solution of the problem as it obtains today in South East Asia is taken into consideration. The Chinese involvement in Vietnam, the Chinese involvement in occupying some of the Vietnamese islands, the question of the Chinese nationals in Vietnam the question of Vietnamese interference in Kampuchea, the Russian attempt to build up a power base in South East and thereby creating apprehension in the minds of both India and China and also indirectly trying to jeopardise the stability, the sense of security, peace and understanding in South-East Asia where Russia is trying to interfere, all these questions should be resolved, possibly through the UN forum, or otherwise also if possible.

Therefore, I would say in conclusion that our Government and our people should act in a dignified spirit of a country which is already independent for 30 years, with a sense of real politik, with a look to safeguard our interest of the freedom and dignity of the other nations as well.

SHRI J. RAMESHWARA RAO (Mahboobnagar): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, the statement made yesterday by our Foreign Minister has, I am afraid, been overtaken by events. Sir, the Foreign Minister will excuse me if I were to say that this statement had better not been made at all. In fact, his visit to China was also overtaken by events. History, in a sense, has passed him by.

We must understand at this point, or rather we should try to recall, what we mean by non-alignment. By non-alignment we mean that we do not have any pre-conceived, prejudged attitudes, that we are not aligned to any of the big powers that we decide our policy on each issue on

merits and the basic principles we stand by. When naked, brutal and massive aggression has taken place, we are not non-aligned, but we are aligned with that country, and the people of that country, against whom there has been massive and brutal aggression.

It is with great concern and anguish that I refer to the invasion of Vietnam by China. The President's comment that the Chinese forces should be withdrawn is certainly most welcome. It is good as far as it goes; but it is not adequate. We should understand the perspective in which the Chinese forces moved into Vietnam. It reminds me of our own experience in 1962. It is very similar. It is most unfortunate that this aggression took place when our Foreign Minister was in China, exploring the possibility of normalising our relations. The Foreign Minister may feel it is not an insult to him or to this country, but our Chinese friends did not have even the common courtesy, the common decency of informing him of what was taking place even after Peking Radio had announced this news of the Chinese army moving into Vietnam. Our Foreign Minister had to learn of this from an Indian correspondent who heard it. I am told, on the long distance telephone from India.

The Chinese action in Vietnam while our Foreign Minister was there to explore possibilities of normalising relations of finding a way to settle outstanding issues, itself shows that they are not interested in normalising relations. They want to tell us and they want to tell all the neighbouring countries that they would like to settle all matters only by the use of force. This is no new attitude of the Government of China. It is the ancient attitude of the Middle Kingdom. Every one outside the Middle Kingdom is a barbarian and has to be disciplined and civilised. Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, I wonder sometimes whether it is not better to be human and barbarian rather than civilised, conceited and self-centred. The people of Vietnam after a long strug-

gle have achieved independence, have achieved freedom, have achieved liberation and they have embarked, on peaceful economic reconstruction. The Chinese don't want Vietnam's economic reconstruction. They want by this action to prevent Vietnam's social and economic reconstruction. They want Vietnam to remain backward and become a Chinese vassal State.

17.27 hrs.

[MR. SPEAKER in the Chair]

My friend, Prof. Samar Guha, talked about new Communist politics and contradictions. As far as the Vietnam-Chinese relationship is concerned, I see no communism or communist contradictions. The history of this area shows that this has been a conflict inherent in this area. For 2000 years the Chinese always wanted to expand southward, have always wanted to incorporate the areas of Vietnam, Laos and Cambodia into the Chinese State. They wanted to incorporate the other States of South-East Asia in their empire and the only power that has through history resisted this and resisted them successfully over these decades and centuries has been Vietnam and what is happening now is a repetition of these historical events. There is nothing new in this, and there is nothing specially communist about it.

In the moment of Vietnam's agony and trial it is very easy to pass resolutions expressing our sympathy, but I do not think, Mr. Deputy-Speaker, that is enough. I feel it is necessary that we stand solidly by the suffering people of Vietnam. I am not saying that we are a major military power to comparable with the military power of China. Certainly not. Nor am I suggesting that we send armed forces to Vietnam, but certainly what prevents us, Mr. Foreign Minister, from flying out to Vietnam tomorrow or the day after a medical mission to show to the people of Vietnam that we stand by them and help them with

[Shri J. Rameshwar Rao]

our doctors and nurses to treat the wounded of the heroic Vietnamese armed forces who are fighting for the freedom of their country against massive foreign invasion? There can and should be no difficulty about this.

Vietnam has a treaty of peace, friendship and mutual assistance with the Soviet Union. I have no doubt that the USSR will assist Vietnam. We also have a Treaty of peace, friendship and mutual assistance with the Soviet Union. We should consult with the USSR and also take counsel with other friendly countries on what is happening in Vietnam, and find out what these Governments are thinking, what the other countries are thinking and decide what should be done to stop this conflict. We would like to hear from the Foreign Minister if any attempt had been made in this direction or if he feels the time is not ripe to disclose what action he has taken or is proposing to take, we shall not press him for an answer, but we shall expect that he will take necessary steps in this regard.

There is one thing I would like to say before I conclude.

Yesterday my friend and colleague Shri R. Venkataraman asked the Foreign Minister if he could find out through his diplomatic and other sources whether the United States Government had any prior information about Chinese aggression on Vietnam. I hope my friend, Mr. Venkataraman will forgive me when I say that it is a rather naive question indeed. Mr. Deng Hsiao-Ping the Vice premier of China, was in Washington only a few weeks ago. Are we to believe that he had not discussed this matter with President Carter? Are we to believe that this question had not been cleared with the State Department and the Pentagon? Are we to believe that the Chinese moved into Vietnam without some kind of prior assurance from the United States that there would be no

intervention by them or that they would try and prevent any intervention by the USSR. This is indeed a dangerous game, and those of us who feel friendly towards the United States should caution them not to play this dangerous game because war games have an uncanny way of boomeranging. I hope adequate note will be taken by our friends of this caution. But I must support him, Venkataraman's suggestion that we move the little Assembly at the United Nations.

As I conclude, I am asking the Foreign Minister to tell us that does he take serious note of what has happened in Vietnam. I am voicing the feelings not only of my party, but I hope, of this House and of the people of this country when I say that our Government has to make it known to the people of Vietnam that we all of us, solidly stand by them in their hour of trial and need.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister.

SHRI K. P. UNNIKRISHNAN (Badagara): He will not require half an hour to reply.

SOME HON. MEMBERS rose—

MR. SPEAKER: No, no. This is not a debate, I will not allow.

SHRI BALWANT SINGH RAMOO-WALIA (Faridkot): A party of six members is given time, but my party is not given time. I request you to kindly give me some time.

MR. SPEAKER: For a discussion under rule 193, we have given 3 1/2 hours.

SHRI BALWANT SINGH RAMOO-WALIA: My party has nine Members.

MR. SPEAKER: This is not a party question.

SHRI K. P. UNNIKRISHNAN: We devoted a whole day to blocking. There have been precedents when dis-

question under rule 193 has gone on and on.

SHRI BALWANT SINGH RAMOO-WALIA: Every party has been given, why not my party?

MR. SPEAKER: I have called the hon. Minister.

THE MINISTER OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS (SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJ-PAYEE): I am grateful to the hon. Members who have participated in this debate. Though the debate was intended to be a short duration discussion, it has turned out to be almost a full-fledged debate.

The subject matter of the debate was the Chinese attack on Vietnam and the threat to the independence of nations belonging to this region. I wish hon. Members who participated in the debate had confined themselves to this subject.

I need hardly emphasize that there is complete unanimity in the House as well as in the country in our desire to express our solidarity with the brave and valiant people of the Republic of Vietnam who are facing a new crisis. We have nothing but admiration and appreciation for the people of Vietnam who fought against imperialism and intervention, who secured their independence and who have now undertaken the task, if I may say so, the Herculean task, of economic reconstruction.

It is a matter of great regret that at this time when Vietnam and its neighbours, Cambodia and Laos, who were ravished, are trying to utilise every ounce of their energies and every resource available to create a better life for their people, they are facing armed conflict. . . .

AN HON. MEMBER: Aggression.

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE: Just now, my hon. friend, Mr. Ramesh-wats Rao, used the word "massive in-cursion".

SHRI K. P. UNNIKRISHNAN: What you are trying to say.

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE: I am not trying to say anything.

SHRI K. P. UNNIKRISHNAN: Is it an aggression or not?

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE: I am not prepared to deal with the matter in the manner in which the hon. Member would like me to deal with.

SHRI K. P. UNNIKRISHNAN: You answer my question. I am not bothered about the manner in which you deal with it. You will face the consequences. That is a different thing. (Interruptions).

SHRI A. C. GEORGE (Mukandapuram): You expressed admiration for the brave people of Vietnam but you have not expressed indignation against the Chinese aggression. (Interruptions)

PROF. SAMAR GUHA: A Foreign Minister has his own language. (Interruptions).

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE: We are raising unnecessary controversies. The People's Republic of China is guilty of committing aggression against the Socialist Republic of Vietnam. But I do not understand the insistence on using a particular word. When we demand that the Chinese forces should withdraw from Vietnam, what does that mean?

The position of the Government is clear and categorical. The world at large has no doubt, no suspicion. But unfortunately, suspicions are being created by some of our friends. They are not helping the cause of Vietnam they are playing politics. As Mr. Venkataraman rightly pointed out, at least on certain issues we should speak with one voice and this is one of those issues. Yesterday my friend—I do not find him here—Mr. Raj Narain talked of the unanimous resolution adopted by both the Houses of parliament to

(Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee.)

1962. He also criticised Nehru but forgot that the Resolution was adopted under the leadership of Pt. Jawaharlal Nehru.

Ever since I assumed office, I have never approached the question of foreign policy in a partisan manner. Even in China, while replying to the banquet speech made by the Foreign Minister Huang Hua, I expressed the distress, the sense of profound sorrow and personal hurt that Pt. Jawaharlal Nehru had felt, clearly and unequivocally. I did not speak on behalf of any party, nor as an individual, I spoke on behalf of this country.

On the question of Vietnam there is no difference of opinion. Only this morning I met the Ambassador of the Republic of Vietnam. He congratulated the Government of India and the people of India for the massive support that we have extended to the people of Vietnam. May I request the Hon. Members to keep this question above party politics? There are many questions on which we are at logger-heads, but not on this question. (*Interruptions*).

No country, however big, no nation however strong, has any business to act like a policeman of the world. (One are the days of punitive expedition, gone are the days of gun-boat diplomacy. Really, I am shocked that those who want to teach a lesson to others forget those very lessons when the time comes for them to act upon those lessons.

Unfortunately, my visit to China has been mixed with the Chinese attack on Vietnam.....

SHRI KANWAR LAL GUPTA (Delhi Sadar): Was it a matter of chance?

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE: There is room for speculation.

SHRI KANWAR LAL GUPTA: What is your opinion?

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE:

Various conjectures have been made. For example, Deng Hsiao Ping had come back from abroad. Norodom Sihanouk had arrived in Peking, the Prime Minister of the Republic of Vietnam Pham Van Dong had gone to Kampuchea; but as soon as I came to know about the massive attack, I informed the Chinese authorities in Peking through their Ambassador who was accompanying me that what had been done was a matter of grave concern for us. And I decided to cut short my visit. This is the civilized way to act, to protest.

I would like the hon. Members to consider my visit to China separately on merits. Now there are differences. Some hon. Members said that I should not have gone at all. Then there were others who said that I should not have gone at this juncture. (*Interruptions*). Having accepted the invitation, and having postponed the visit once, not because of any diplomatic illness—my friend, Mr. Satyanarayan Rao said that, perhaps, God wanted then that I should not go to China....

AN HON. MEMBER: Which God?

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE:

The God in which he believe. I know, you do not believe in God.

Does that mean that this time because I was quite all right, I was hale and hearty, God had wanted me to go to Peking? Let us not drag God into this. (*Interruptions*).

Sir, I decided to visit Peking because there are outstanding problems. I do not want to say things which will not be very palatable to my friends sitting on the opposite....

SHRI K. P. UNNIKRIISHNAN: What is that?

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE:

Some of those things were said by Mr. Mandal. What did we do in the last 18 years to get back our territory? If

I may say so, the entire issue was put in cold storage, and now I have brought it to the fore. I am not saying this in order to boast. If there has to be normalisation of relations, the boundary question must be solved. You go through my speech and all the press reports. Apart from the boundary question, there are other problems also, and we have to talk....

SHRI K. P. UNNIKRISHNAN: That, we shall discuss separately.

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE: Alright. But please do not draw the conclusion that the visit was a complete failure simply because China decided to attack Vietnam....

SHRI K. P. UNNIKRISHNAN: It was a great success! We shall discuss the success later. Let us now talk about Vietnam.

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE: Mr. Venkataraman made a very constructive suggestion. I would like to congratulate him on his speech, though....

AN HON. MEMBER: ...he is in the Opposition.

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE: ...we sit face to face. I used to be there for 20 years. Now I am at the receiving end. I do not mind it. He wanted the government to consider the possibility of convening a meeting of the General Assembly of the United Nations under the aegis for peace provision. That can be done only if the Security Council fails to act. Unfortunately, in this case the Security Council has not yet met. We are not there. We are not a Member of the Security Council. Then there are five members with a negative vote. There was a meeting of the Security Council on Kampuchea. All the non-aligned nations who are currently members of the Security Council had voted for a particular resolution but that was vetoed. That may be repeated. But I would like to assure the

House that we are in consultation with all friendly countries. Within these two days we have had meaningful exchange of views with the Ambassadors of Malaysia, Sri Lanka, Indonesia, Nigeria, Zambia, Kuwait, Yugoslavia, Bangladesh, Thailand and also with the Ambassadors of Japan, Australia, UK and USA. We are constantly in touch with the Ambassador

SHRI DINEN BHATTACHARYA (Serampore): Not of USSR?

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE: Yes, with USSR also. But it will not be possible for me at this stage to indicate....

SHRI DINEN BHATTACHARYA: ...their reaction.

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE: ...whether any initiative can be taken. But we are considering all possibilities.

Sir, the situation has got to be defused. We stand on a precipice. If there is escalation there will be global repercussions. All countries and particularly the great powers have to exercise restraint and put pressure on the People's Republic of China to withdraw from the Vietnamese territory. Sir, an aggressor cannot be allowed to enjoy the fruits of his aggression. If there are any problems....

AN HON. MEMBER: Mr. Unnikrishnan, you get it?

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE: I know there are problems.

The problems should be discussed....

SHRI DINEN BHATTACHARYA: ...bilaterally.

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE: ...bilaterally and in a peaceful manner. They should be solved through negotiations. The use of force must be ruled out and those who want to use force must be condemned universally. May I request the hon. Members that if they have any concrete suggestions to make, they should do so.....

SHRI A. C. GEORGE: There was a specific suggestion about sending a medical mission to Vietnam.

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE: That I have noted. Unfortunately, the Health Minister is not here. We have to ascertain from the other quarters also whether such a Mission is needed and whether it will be of any use.

We seek to normalise relations with all countries. I went to Peking in pursuance of that policy of improving relations with all neighbours. But, I would like to assure the House that normalisation will not be at the cost of established friendships. The dialogue must continue and a proper climate for such a dialogue has to be created. Unfortunately, what happened on the last day of my visit has been a set-back.

SHRI A. BALA PAJANOR: We sympathise with you.

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE: I need your support—not sympathy. That won't do. On another occasion, not while we are discussing the President's address, there will be a debate on the demands relating to my Ministry.

SHRI K. P. UNNIKRISHNAN: The debate will be about your visit?

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE: I do not mind.

SHRI K. P. UNNIKRISHNAN: It was agreed.

MR. SPEAKER: Don't commit me to anything. All agreements will be on record.

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE: I thank the hon. Members.

SHRI P. VENKATASUBBAIAH (Nandyal): On one question I want to seek a clarification.

MR. SPEAKER: No question.

Let us go to the next item.

SHRI P. VENKATASUBBAIAH: It is only a clarification. We were not able to participate.

MR. SPEAKER: No clarification. Now, Dr. Karan Singh.

SHRI P. VENKATASUBBAIAH: I have not been able to participate.

SHRIMATI PARVATHI KRISHNAN (Coimbatore): That question has not been answered.

MR. SPEAKER: Like that many questions will remain unanswered. Now, Dr. Karan Singh.

17.57 hrs.

DISCUSSION RE. SITUATION IN JAMMU AND KASHMIR

DR. KARAN SINGH (Udhampur): Mr. Speaker, Sir, I rise in deep anguish and distress to place before this honourable House the situation that is prevailing in the northern most State of the Union.

Sir, at the very outset, I would like to clarify the viewpoint through which I will present the problem. Certainly I come from Jammu; I am elected from there. I am a Dogra and I am proud of my heritage. Also I have deep links with the entire State of Jammu and Kashmir which my ancestors founded and of which I was the head for 18 full years including Kashmir and Ladakh, and their welfare is equally dear to me as that of Jammu. But, above all Sir, I stand here as an Indian who seeks to safeguard the national interest at all costs; what ever problem any region may have, any State may have, the national interest has got to be foremost and it is in that context that I will place before you and the hon. Member the unfortunate situation that has developed in Jammu and Kashmir, and appeal to you for your support at this difficult juncture.