

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : The question is :

"That this House agrees with the Thirtieth Report of the Committee on Private Members' Bills and Resolutions presented to the House on the 30th April, 1968".

The motion was adopted

16 04 hrs.

RÉSOLUTION RE: DIPLOMATIC RECOGNITION OF GERMAN DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC—Contd.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : Now, we are taking up the discussion of the resolution moved by Shri H. N. Mukerjee on the 19th April. Two hours were allotted and he has taken just one minute.

SHRI BAKAR ALI MIRZA (Secunderabad) : Sir, before the hon. Member begins his speech, may I make a submission? This is a question of major policy, and the decision cannot be taken by the Minister of State without the approval or sanction of the Prime Minister and Minister of External Affairs. Do you think that any useful purpose will be served, because, even if he has come with an open mind on this issue, he cannot express in this House any change in policy. So, we may take it up some other time—

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : Shri Bhagat, the Minister of State, is here and we must presume—and of course—he knows the Government's mind on the issue.

SHRI INDER J. MALHOTRA (Jammu) : Mr. Bhagat may be here. But what Shri Mirza has pointed out is such an important issue that if the Prime Minister could be here that would have really helped us.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : That would have been far better but, at the present juncture, Mr. Bhagat is here.

SHRI H. N. MUKERJEE (Calcutta North East) : Sir, on this point, perhaps you do not know, the Prime Minister wrote to me that she had informed the

Speaker and she wrote to me to inform me that she had to go to Bhutan and Sikkim, otherwise she would have been here. She had the courtesy to do that which is why I mention it to you.

Last time, I read out my resolution, which is to the effect that this House is of opinion that the Government of India should accord immediately full diplomatic recognition to the German Democratic Republic. I hope to be able to secure some positive response from the Government in regard to the proposition I am putting forward and I expect that there should be some positive response on point of principle as well as for reasons of practicality. On both these counts, there is no reason why we should not fully recognise the German Democratic Republic without any further delay. In my view, already delay has been unconscionable and unworthy of our country.

There is, as a matter of fact, some kind of *de facto* recognition for quite some time as far as India and GDR are concerned and there is a large number of friendly exchanges between our two countries. We have had official trade agreements since 1954 and up to 1964, trade increased tenfold to Rs 240 million. GDR, as a friendly country, was the first among the different countries to introduce rupee payment in its trade with India, thus helping us in our foreign exchange difficulties. In November, 1963, we had a shipping agreement. In February, 1964, we had a cultural agreement.

The late Prime Minister of GDR Otto Grotowohl visited India. The President of the GDR Parliament has been to this country twice. Minister and other personalities including the GDR Foreign Minister Otto Winzer have visited this country.

I particularly wanted to say, Sir, if you don't mind, that you have been among those dignitaries in our country who have been very hospitable to some of these visitors, like the Foreign Minister, Otto Winzer who was here only the other day.

As early as 22nd and 23rd August, 1961 Jawaharlal Nehru said in Parliament some very important things in relation to the position as between India and GDR. He wanted the country to take note of the fact of the existence of the two Germanys.

[Shri H. N. Mukerjee]

He stressed that there should be a clear acceptance of the post-war frontier, specially the Oder-Niese frontier with Poland, thereby demarcating this country away from the attitude taken by the Federal Republic of Germany. Jawaharlal Nehru also stressed the danger of militarism and of nuclear armament of West Germany and he spoke in regard to the utmost importance of a peaceful settlement through negotiations. These ideas of Jawaharlal Nehru were reiterated by Lal Bahadur Shastri at the conclusion of his Soviet visit in May, 1965. If the Prime Minister was here, she would have recalled that at the conclusion of her visit to the USSR in 1966, she had repeated those same principles in regard to the two Germans.

In spite of this reiteration of this policy and principle for more than 7 years now, the negative stage of things persists. The Government of India does not recognize the GDR diplomatically. The Government of India does not even have consular relations with that country. The Government of India has not even a trade representative in Berlin on a normal governmental level.

There are no official government agreements with GDR and the Government of India confines itself to exchange of letters only. Sir, very irritating things happen. For instance, Government of India does not recognise GDR passports but issues its visas on special sheets of paper. Government of India does not permit its Ministers to go. My friend Shri Bhagat if he wants to go would not be able to go in response to official invitations which are always there. But GDR ministers when they come they see the Prime Minister, they see you, Sir, and other dignitaries but everything is unofficial, they are not official calls.

If we had a truly non-aligned independent foreign policy it means that we treat the Federal Republic of Germany and the German Democratic Republic equally and recognise the reality of the two German States. If we had a really independent foreign policy it would have involved that we do not give preferential treatment, internationally speaking, to the Federal Republic and discriminate against GDR. If we had an independent foreign policy it

would have meant automatically that we reject, what is called, the Hallstein Doctrine, that scare-crow which frightens nobody today but a doctrine which implies interference in the internal affairs of other States. If we had an independent foreign policy we would not be bowing down to West German blackmail which is being practised with impunity for so many years.

In common with GDR we have so many things—the idea of anti-colonialism and anti-imperialism, the idea of the peaceful settlement of disputes, the idea of co-operation with and support to all States. On the contrary, with the Federal Republic of Germany we have nothing in common. I am not asking for severance of diplomatic relations with that country. It is on the map, it is there and it has to be recognised. But if there is a question of affinity, economic, moral or whatever else it might be, with the Federal Republic of Germany, we have nothing whatever in common. It is a militarist and fascist State. President Luebke has been accused of having been a war criminal and even American experts have come forward to give evidence in that regard. I was myself in Buchenwald Concentration Camp and I saw there material relative to the involvement of Chancellor Kiesinger in regard to action which dubbed him as war criminal. There is no doubt about it. That is why when I returned from Germany last year in November, I was ashamed to see the portrait of that man, that unfamiliar portrait adorning the road from Palam airport. I do not understand what has happened to the country of Jawaharlal Nehru who when the Nazis took over Vienna could not even rest when he went to the Himalayan resort of Khali because he heard "the tread of barbarian feet" in the lovely streets of Vienna. I wonder what has happened to the country of Jawaharlal Nehru where Kiesinger can be acclaimed as a guest to be welcomed so wondrously.

There is an axis, Shri Bhagat ought to know, of the West German State, with Lisbon and Pretoria and Salisbury—of course, London and Washington need not be mentioned. They are using it to influence our policy. That is why they are making us discriminate against the GDR,

Why are we afraid? The GDR has made good. It had got a very difficult inheritance but it has made a very big success of its job so much so that the *Guardian*, the liberal English newspaper wrote on the 26th September, 1967.

"for a state which, as far as the West is concerned, does not exist, the GDR is doing right well. In fact it is no exaggeration to characterise its economic progress as the East German economic miracle. East Germany is working and flourishing. It would be harmful to us to overlook this market."

This is what the British say. Why do we treat this country, the fifth industrial state in Europe and the eighth in the world, a country which has a socialist constitution only recently ratified by an overwhelming popular vote, a country run by a national front including different parties with which you, Sir, are familiar, in this way? My friend, Shri Madhu Limaye is here. He has seen the working of how that coalition performs its jobs. It is a country where there is some kind of co-existence also between the private sector and the public sector in a fashion which should be an eye-opener to honest capitalist elements in this country if there are any.

But with that country we do not seem to have any truck. We are afraid. Government is in fear and trembling, because Bonn would penalise them. My submission is that this fear is absolutely foolish; it is not only an injury to our pride, to our self-respect as a country, but it is a foolish and practically an utterly insane idea that Bonn can penalise us.

I will give you the example of Yugoslavia, which establish full diplomatic relations with GDR in 1957. The Bonn Republic demonstratively broke off diplomatic relations with Yugoslavia, to punish Yugoslavia. Bonn had to eat the humble pie when the facts of life ruled out such impudence. Let us not imagine that they can do this dirty trick on us because we happen to be truckling down to them from time to time. If Yugoslavia is too distant, let us take the case of Burma. In 1960 Burma exchange Consulates-General with GDR. West Germany protested for the time being but in Rangoon, in 1962, two years afterwards, West Germany raised her representation to the status of an Embassy in Burma.

They had to eat the humble pie. In February 1964 Ceylon exchanged Consulates-General with GDR. Bonn threatened for the time being stoppage of all aid. Ceylon stood firm. Ceylon showed that moral calibre which we do not dare show. Ceylon stood firm and rejected the Bonn demand saying that this sort of thing should not be done at all. Threats did not work with Ceylon. But, in our case, threats appear still to be working, which is rather shameful. We should eliminate it.

All the Socialist countries have full-scale embassies in GDR. A country like UAR or Cambodia have special representation with diplomatic status. In Cairo the GDR has a Government Commissioner who has got the powers of an Ambassador Plenipotentiary. Consulates-General were exchanged between GDR and Burma, Ceylon, Indonesia, Iran, Syria, Tanzania and Yemen. Official trade representations are there in Algeria, Brazil, Finland, Guinea, Lebanon, Morocco, Sudan and Uruguay. Mali has also joined it last year. Then, there are Trade Missions and so on and so forth from many other countries. We do not have anything; nothing at all and perhaps they are thinking of some footling little thing which might be more of an irritant than anything else.

GDR has her trade representation in New Delhi. We do not reciprocate even that gesture. We do not have a trade representation in Berlin. Even UK, France, Sweden, Belgium and Netherlands have found it necessary to have representation of their chamber of foreign trade. But we have, of course, nothing of that sort and I do not know what the Government has in mind.

Bonn is still trying its blackmail against some countries like Switzerland, Sweden and India. Against this we have got to fight. Because, the idea is quite clear. What they have in mind is quite clear from what appeared in a Big Money paper in the Federal Republic of Germany, one of the Springer Trust papers. The Springer Publication Unit have published dastardly articles against which the students in Berlin are demonstrating, led by a young man called Dutschki, and the whole of Berlin is in flames. One of these papers, *Die Welt*, reported the ruling party's foreign policy idea in these words:

[Shri H. N. Mukerjee]

"Bonn could not renounce the use of diplomatic and economic deterrents in the future when countries of the third world might try to use the Belgrade example as an alibi for also exchanging Ambassadors with East Berlin."

Even Switzerland is sought to be portrayed as a Communist country, if it dares to have diplomatic exchange with GDR. Against this, a newspaper of Zurich, *Volksrecht* wrote something which I quote :

"In recognizing foreign governments Switzerland has always based itself on the question as to whether they really exercise territorial rights over the territory of their state. Furthermore, it makes constant efforts, because of its policy of neutrality, to extend its relations universally. Nobody can dispute that the government of the GDR really exercises government power on its territory. This means that the prerequisites for recognition are present."

But in spite of that they are being threatened by Bonn as long as they are in a position to threaten.

India is the biggest Afro-Asian country. India is a country which professes non-alignment as a matter of principle which, she says, she cherishes. But our practice as regards relations with the GDR are at the lowest level in the group of non-aligned Afro-Asian countries.

They talk about improving the image of India abroad. Where? In which country, if in Afro-Asian countries there is an impression that India is so beholden to the mighty dollar? God knows what has happened to the self-respect of India that she treats a country in this discriminating fashion.

And the reason is quite obvious. It is fear of Bonn. Then, surely, all the brave talk about national integration and appearing before the world outside as an integrated country and all the rest of it would make not much sense. That is why one has to behave in foreign policy matters at least, where India had a better tradition in the past, differently. In foreign policy matters at least India should behave differently.

Why must we act out of fear? I have said it often in this House that if Gandhiji taught us anything, it was not non-violence which nobody really and truly is able to practise in real life but he taught us *abhaya*, fearlessness of whoever might stand up against us. If we have right on our side, we need not be afraid. But this Government is afraid. They are pusillanimous; they shake in their shoes and appear as if in fear and trembling because the might dollar is there. Therefore with the dollar-supported Mark doing some damage, we behave as they us to behave.

The Federal Republic of Germany is extracting a price from us. They are giving "aid" to us and they make a lot of song and dance about the Bonn "aid" to this country. The annual trade turnover is roughly of Rs. 1,000 million and involves a heavy deficit for us, to the extent of Rs. 700 million to Rs. 800 million a year. They have collaboration agreements which are so much liked by most members of the Cabinet which lead to all sorts of things like the Fakhruddin Ali Ahmed incident and that sort of absurdity. They have these collaboration agreements and economic influence is deliberately used to obstruct normalising of relations with the USSR. The correct attitude is shown by Yugoslavia, Burma and Ceylon, who have made the Bonn Republic capitulate and swallow the Hallstein nonsense. But we have not tried to do anything in that regard.

In spite of our economic contact with the two Germanies, we have a very adverse balance of trade with the Federal Republic of Germany. In 1961-62 the adverse balance amounted to Rs. 97,53,00,000; in 1965-66 the adverse balance rose to Rs. 1,18,74,00,000 and from June 1966 to February 1967 the adverse balance was Rs. 94,71,00,000.

On the contrary, the balance of trade with the GDR is favourable as far as we are concerned. In 1962-63 it was Rs. 57 lakhs in our favour; in 1964-65 it was Rs. 4 crores in our favour; in 1965-66 it was Rs. 69 lakhs in our favour and from June 1966 to February 1967 it was Rs. 7 lakhs in our favour.

India is a principal overseas trade part-

ner of the GDR. India was the biggest exhibitor at the Leipzig Fair. We have had a new long-term trade and payments agreement extended to 1968 as a result of an agreement signed in Berlin in November 1967. The GDR, in spite of being a highly advanced industrial country, is ready and willing and is showing its readiness by action to buy all sorts of things and at the present moment there is a very good possibility of our exporting railway wagons to the GDR as we are doing to the Soviet Union.

On account of all these things and so many other points which I need not expatiate, I feel that in all right minded thinking it does not stand to reason that we discriminate between the two Germanies. As I said earlier, I am not asking for us to have no relations with West Germany, much as I dislike it. I detest the ruling group in that country which is reviving fascism in a manner which is becoming patent in everyday news. But that is no reason for me to suggest to the Government that we have no relations at diplomatic level with Bonn. That reminds me that sometime ago a leader of the Jana Sangh, Mr. M. L. Sondhi—he does know a thing or two about international relations and there was a discussion held in this House on the 8th December, 1967 on Dr. Kiesinger's flight over Pakistan—occupied Kashmir—was terribly annoyed and very rightfully annoyed and he referred to a book by Franz Josef Strauss, called *The Grand Design—A European Solution to German Reunification*, which he quoted in regard to the Hallstein Doctrine, being what it is, and then he said angrily to the Prime Minister :

“May I ask whether it is not a fact that the West Germans provide music for the Government of India and for the city of Delhi while military, diplomatic and strategic support is being promised and provided to Pakistani revanchists and *Jehadists*? Does the Prime Minister now consider that the German action has the real purpose of forcing India to acquiesce in Pakistani aggression by pressuring India to accept a certain international settlement which is in the making and of which we are getting some straws in the wind? May

I ask pointedly why the External Affairs Ministry did not inquire as to what are the guarantees of German neutrality on the Kashmir question? May I ask why is India tied down to Hallstein doctrine? May I ask, finally why was the Indian High Commissioner in no hurry to lodge a protest?”

The German Democratic Republic was the first foreign country to stand by India when India had trouble with China in October/November, 1962. The German Democratic Republic is pursuing the really creative traditions of Germany; Germany, the land of Marx and Engels; Germany, the land of the great Indologists, and a country which, after all the sufferings and agencies of two World Wars is now trying to build socialism.

I submit that my Resolutions should be accepted by Government because I want to ask : Will India fence herself away from contact with this superb new phenomenon, the socialism being built with characteristic thoroughness by the German people, the people to whom belong Marx and Engels? Are we to make friends with a Germany reborn, ready and able to build on the foundations of peace and human happiness or are we merely to hang on to the coat-tails of the revanchists, neo-imperialists and neo-Nazis of Bonn? That is a question which we have to answer.

Let Government come forward and say that far too long we have dallied with this question. What Jawaharlal Nehru said in August, 1961 remains to be redeemed—here in 1968. I suggest that the House do accept this Resolution and Government acts accordingly.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : Motion moved :

“This House is of opinion that the Government of India should accord immediately full diplomatic recognition to the German Democratic Republic.”

Now, Shri Madhu Limaye has given an amendment. I have gone through it. For the benefit of the House, I read it :

“After the word ‘this House’ delete the rest and insert the following :

“This House being of the view that all existing regimes throughout the world, no matter what their ideologi-

[Mr. Deputy-Speaker]

cal complexion and the character of their economic system be, should be recognised and full diplomatic relations established with them all, directs the Government of India to accord full diplomatic recognition to the German Democratic Republic also."

Apart from being time-barred, I must make it very clear that this preamble completely changes the character of the Resolution itself. If we tag this to the Resolution before the House, it means that, simultaneously, Government will have to make up its mind not only with regard to Israel—perhaps, that is in your mind—but also to Taiwan or South Africa. This is the most incongruous amendment. Therefore, as it is drafted, it is out of order.

श्री मधु लिमये (मुंबेर) : कैसे यह आउट ऑफ आर्डर हो गया ? उसमें कोई असंगति नहीं है ।

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : It widens the scope of the Resolution. Completely, it changes its context, It is completely out of order.

श्री मधु लिमये : हमारे नियम बने हुए हैं और आप हमें बतलायें कि आखिर किस नियम के अन्तर्गत आप इसे आउट ऑफ आर्डर करार दे रहे हैं ?

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : I am prepared to argue with you. I have given a serious thought to it.

श्री मधु लिमये : वह अलग नीति का सवाल है । कोई देश हमारे साथ लड़ाई करेगा तो उसके साथ रिश्ते तो टूटेंगे ही लेकिन बाकी देशों के साथ तो रिश्ता हो ।

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : I will point out. Apart from it. I will read the general rule relating to amendments :

"An amendment shall be relevant to, and within the scope of, the motion to which it is proposed."

What is the scope of the motion ? As you have said in the preamble, whatever

be the ideological thing or the economic system or the political system, if you tag this on as a preamble to the main resolution, then the purpose of the main resolution is completely lost sight of. It is not relevant at all. This is my view.

श्री मधु लिमये : यह प्रस्ताव इस सिद्धांत पर आधारित है, वर्ना सवाल ही पैदा नहीं होता ।

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : It is no question. He has made his position very clear. He has pin-pointed the attention of the Government so far as recognition of GDR is concerned and he has confined his argument to that. The resolution also has that as the main purpose to serve. If we tag this on, then it will certainly widen the scope by the preamble. Therefore I rule it out of order.

Mr. Amrit Nahata are you moving your amendment ?

SHRI AMRIT NAHATA (Barmer) : Yes, Sir. I beg to move :

"That is the resolution :—

add at the end—

'disregarding the outmoded Halstein doctrine.'" (1)

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : Shri Indrajit Gupta.

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA (Alipore) : Sir, I beg to move :

"That in the resolution,—

add at the end—

'in consonance with the late Prime Minister, Shri Jawaharlal Nehru's admission of the existence of two Germanies.'" (2)

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : So, the two amendments and the Resolution are before the House.

How much time will the hon. Minister need for his reply ?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE
MINISTRY OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS
(SHRI B. R. BHAGAT) : Not more than
10 minutes.

SHRI PILOO MODY : You require
10 minutes to dispose this of ?

श्री अमृत नाहाटा : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, सब प्रथम जब हम जर्मन समस्या पर विचार कर रहे हैं, मैं सदन का ध्यान दिलाना चाहता हूँ कि मैं नहीं जानता यह ऐतिहासिक आकस्मिकता है या क्या है, लेकिन कल सारा विश्व एक ऐसे महान दृष्टा, विचारक और दार्शनिक की 150वीं जयन्ती मना रहा है जिसने मानव विचार में एक क्रान्ति पैदा की, जिसने बतलाया कि न केवल प्रकृति बल्कि मनुष्य समाज भी कुछ निश्चित नियमों से चलता है, संचालित होता है, और मैं भी अपना कर्तव्य समझता हूँ कि उस महान मनीषी, दार्शनिक और विचारक कार्ल मार्क्स के प्रति अपनी श्रद्धांजलि अर्पित करूँ ।

यह सही है कि जर्मनी एक महान राष्ट्र है, यह मार्क्स और हेगल का राष्ट्र है, लेकिन यह भी सही है कि जर्मनी में हिटलर भी पैदा हुआ था, जिस ने सारी मानवता के चेहरे पर एक कलंक पोत दिया था । इसलिये जब हम जर्मनी की मानवता की बात करते हैं तब यह नहीं भूल सकते कि आज वह जर्मनी दो देशों में विभाजित है । दोनों में अलग-अलग व्यवस्थायें हैं । चाहे कोई किनना ही क्यों न चाहे कि जर्मनी एक बने, लेकिन इस बात से इन्कार नहीं किया जा सकता कि दो जर्मनी आज इस विश्व की एक यथार्थता हैं, एक सच्चाई है, एक हकीकत है । और इसलिए मैं इस सदन का ध्यान दिलाना चाहूँगा पंडित जवाहरलाल नेहरू के उस वक्तव्य की ओर जिस में उन्होंने कहा था कि दो अलग-अलग जर्मनी इतिहास की एक वास्तविकता है, इससे इन्कार नहीं किया जा सकता है । यदि हम इस बात से शुरू करते हैं कि दोनों जर्मन राष्ट्र एक यथार्थता हैं, वास्तविकता हैं, दोनों अस्तित्व रखते हैं

अपना, तो इस का तार्किक परिणाम यह निकलता है कि हम दोनों जर्मनियों के साथ अपने कूटनीतिक सम्बन्ध स्थापित करें, दोनों जर्मनियों को एक समान हम समझें और दोनों के साथ हमारे समान सम्बन्ध हों ।

यद्यपि पश्चिम जर्मनी में ऐसी बहुत सी चीजें हो रही हैं, जिन्हें हम पसन्द नहीं करते, लेकिन मैं यह नहीं कहूँगा कि हम पश्चिम जर्मनी से अपने कूटनीतिक सम्बन्ध तोड़ लें, लेकिन मैं यह अवश्य कहूँगा कि पूर्व जर्मनी से भी हम कूटनीतिक सम्बन्ध स्थापित करें । यह एक बड़ी विडम्बना है कि उस पश्चिम जर्मनी के साथ तो हमारे कूटनीतिक सम्बन्ध हैं जहाँ वापस एक बार फिर फासिस्ट ताकतें सिर उठा रही हैं, फिर से वहाँ एक प्रकार से वापस ऐसी व्यवस्था कायम की जा रही है जो फौजीकरण, शस्त्रीकरण के आघार पर जिन्दा है, जहाँ हर सरकारी अधिकारी और उच्च से उच्च अधिकारी, हिटलर की पार्टी में और हिटलर के अपराधों में साक्षीदार थे । मैं बतलाना चाहता हूँ कि चाहे पश्चिम जर्मनी के ल्यूबके हों, चाहे किंसिगर हों, वह बराबर हिटलर के तमाम अत्याचारों में साक्षीदार थे, जिन से आज मानवता का सर झुका हुआ है । अब एक हवाई जहाज के ग्रैंडरग्राउंड हैंगर का पता चला है पश्चिमी जर्मनी में जिस में मजदूरों को लेजा कर बन्द कर दिया गया था, और वह वहाँ से जिन्दा वापस नहीं आये थे । उस हवाई जहाज के इनचार्ज किंसिगर साहब थे, जो हमारे यहाँ आये थे, और कहा गया कि काश्मीर के सवाल पर वह हिन्दुस्तान के और पाकिस्तान के बीच तटस्थ हैं, लेकिन जब वह पाकिस्तान गये तो वह उस इलाके पर उड़े जिस पर पाकिस्तान ने गैर-कानूनी कब्जा कर रक्खा है । उस इलाके पर उन का हवाई जहाज उड़ा और उन्होंने उस इलाके का हवाई दौरा किया । जब किंसिगर साहब से पूछा गया कि वह वहाँ क्यों गये तो उन्होंने कहा कि उनका पाइलट और पाकिस्तानी सरकार हवाई जहाज को

[श्री अमृत नाहाटा]

उधर से ले गये थे, उन्हें पता नहीं था। जब कभी इस प्रकार की बातें होती हैं और वेस्ट जर्मनी से पूछा जाता है कि वह पाकिस्तान को क्यों हथियार बन्द कर रहे हैं, शस्त्रास्त्र दे रहे हैं, तब वह कहते हैं कि हमें पता नहीं, प्राइवेट कम्पनियां हैं जो हथियार बेचती हैं, हम कुछ नहीं कर सकते।

इतना ही नहीं पश्चिम जर्मनी के ऐटलसों में और किताबों में उन के नक्शों में काश्मीर को बराबर लगातार स्वतंत्र राज्य बतलाया गया है, भारत का अभिन्न अंग नहीं बतलाया गया। पहले भी मैं इस सदन के सामने पेश कर चुका हूँ और आज भी पेश करना चाहता हूँ वह नक्शे और ऐटलस जो पश्चिमी जर्मनी में छपे हैं, और जिन में काश्मीर को स्वतंत्र राज्य बतलाया गया है। एक बार तो यह कहा गया कि यह नक्शे तो पहले से चल रहे हैं। यह सही है कि एक हरम ऐटलस है जो म्युनिख, फ्रैंकफर्ट, बरलिन और हेमबर्ग से छपा है, जिस में काश्मीर को स्वतंत्र राज्य बतलाया गया है, वह 1963 में छपा था। आप कह सकते हैं कि यह पुराना है, लेकिन दूसरा नक्शा ओवरसीज जर्नल में छपा है जो कि वेस्ट जर्मनी में छपता है, वह मार्च 1967 का है। केवल एक साल पुराना है। उसमें भी काश्मीर को स्वतंत्र बतलाया गया है। दूसरी मँगजीन निकलती है इंडो-एशिया मँगजीन, अक्टूबर 1967 की छपी है, यानी मुस्किल से छः या सात महीने पहले का इश्यू है। उस में काश्मीर को स्वतंत्र राज्य बतलाया गया है। यह जर्नल वही है जो इंग्लैंड में बेचे जाते हैं और उनमें यह ऐटलस हैं। वहाँ की सरकार इस जिम्मेदारी से अपने आप को बरी नहीं कर सकती। उस राष्ट्र के साथ जो काश्मीर को स्वतंत्र मानता है, भारत का अभिन्न अंग नहीं मानता है, उन के साथ तो हमारे कूटनीतिक सम्बन्ध हैं, लेकिन पूर्वी जर्मनी के साथ, जिसने हमेशा इस बात का समर्थन किया है और इस बात की घोषणा

की है कि काश्मीर भारत का अभिन्न अंग है, जिस ने भारत-पाक युद्ध के समय या भारत-चीन युद्ध के समय भारत का साथ दिया है, जिस का व्यापार हमारे देश के साथ लगातार बढ़ता जा रहा है, उस पूर्वी जर्मनी के साथ हमारे कूटनीतिक सम्बन्ध नहीं हैं, यह एक बहुत ही सेवजनक बात है।

जिस चीज की ओर मैं विशेष रूप से ध्यान दिलाना चाहता हूँ, और जो मैंने अपने संशीघ्रता में कही है, वह है कि यदि हेल्स्टाइन सिद्धान्त के अनुसूचक कोई राष्ट्र कहे कि आप इस देश को मान्यता दें और इस देश को मान्यता न दें तो यह निश्चित ही हमारे आन्तरिक मामलों में हस्तक्षेप है। हम किस राष्ट्र के साथ कूटनीतिक सम्बन्ध स्थापित करें और किस राष्ट्र के साथ न स्थापित करें यह हमारा अपना मामला है। हमें वह कभी बदलित नहीं करेंगे कि दुनिया का कोई दूसरा देश हमें यह डिवेक्षण दे और कहे कि अगर हम फलां देश के साथ सम्बन्ध स्थापित करेंगे तो वह हमें से सम्बन्ध तोड़ लेगा। इस तरह की धमकी और इस प्रकार का अपने आन्तरिक मामलों में हस्तक्षेप हम बदलित नहीं करेंगे। हेल्स्टाइन डाक्ट्रिन मर चुकी है। वह यह बात कहते जरूर हैं कि सम्बन्ध तोड़ लेंगे लेकिन उन का स्वार्थ इस बात में है, उन का हित इस में है कि वह भारत से अपने सम्बन्ध कायम रखें। चूंकि भारत का अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय क्षेत्र में महत्व है, भारत सारी दुनिया में एक नैतिक स्थान रखता है, इसलिए वह यह अवश्य चाहते हैं कि भारत सरकार पूर्वी जर्मनी से अपना सम्बन्ध न जोड़े। लेकिन मैं आपकी यह विश्वास दिलाना चाहता हूँ कि यदि हम पूर्वी जर्मनी के साथ अपना सम्बन्ध स्थापित करेंगे, तो इसका कतई भय नहीं है कि पश्चिमी जर्मनी हम से अपना सम्बन्ध तोड़ लेगा। वह ऐसा करने नहीं आ रहा है।

मैं एक और बात कहना चाहता हूँ कि

दलील एक यह दी जाती है कि वह राष्ट्र संघ का सदस्य नहीं है इसलिए हम उस के साथ कूटनीतिक सम्बन्ध कैसे जोड़ सकते हैं। इस सिद्धांत को हम ने आज तक नहीं माना है। कोई देश राष्ट्र संघ का सदस्य है या नहीं है, यह प्रमाण नहीं हो सकता हमारे कूटनीतिक सम्बन्ध स्थापित करने का।

पश्चिमी जर्मनी भी तो राष्ट्र संघ का सदस्य नहीं है।

श्री रामसेवक शर्मा (बाराबंकी) : चीन भी नहीं है।

श्री अमृत नाहाटा : चीन को छोड़िये।

श्री इन्द्रजीत गुप्त : क्यों छोड़िये ?

श्री अमृत नाहाटा : जैसा कि मैंने कहा है, कि पश्चिमी जर्मनी भी राष्ट्र संघ का सदस्य नहीं है, लेकिन उसके साथ हमारे कूटनीतिक सम्बन्ध स्थापित हैं। इसलिए यह कोई दलील नहीं है कि चूंकि पूर्वी जर्मनी राष्ट्र संघ का सदस्य नहीं है, इसलिये हम उस के साथ कूटनीतिक सम्बन्ध स्थापित नहीं कर सकते।

यह भी दलील दी गई है कि यह मामला पेचीदा है, इसलिए इस पर गम्भीरता से विचार करना पड़ेगा। इसमें कोई पेचीदगी नहीं है।

श्री ब० रा० भगत : किस ने यह दलील दी है ?

श्री अमृत नाहाटा : मुझे क्षमा किया जाये, ये दोनों बातें प्रधान मंत्री जी ने कही हैं। उन्होंने कहा है कि यह मामला बहुत पेचीदा है, इस पर गम्भीरता के साथ विचार करना पड़ेगा। मैं निवेदन करूंगा कि सिर्फ एक पेचीदगी है—हमें डर है कि पश्चिमी जर्मनी नाराज हो जायेगा। इसके अलावा कोई पेचीदगी नहीं है। यह बिल्कुल सीधी बात है कि हमें पूर्वी जर्मनी के साथ कूटनीतिक

सम्बन्ध स्थापित करने चाहिये और हाल्स्टाइन डॉक्ट्रिन को ठुकरा देना चाहिये।

इन शब्दों के साथ मैं अपना संशोधन पेश करता हूँ।

SHRI PILOO MODY (Godhra) : Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, I am indeed most distressed at the fact that I have to disagree with my very dear friend Shri H. N. Mukerjee. He is a loveable man, although I must admit that I cannot get myself to agree with almost anything that he says.

The recognition of the German Democratic Republic has been justified on many ground, some of political expediency and other of trade, a smattering of history, a statement made by a Jan Sangh Member, namely Shri M. L. Sondhi, and indeed a map that was produced somewhere. I cannot find these argument for the justification of recognising a particular country. I would like to draw the attention of my hon. friend to certain maps that have been printed in this country. Would he, therefore, suggest that we should either put out or not recognise ourselves?

Today, you are going to hear a spate of arguments on why the Government of German Democratic Republic should or should not be recognised, arguments which will descend to the level of providing analogies that do not apply or comparisons that do not conform. You will hear sooner or later Viet Nam being mentioned or Korea and a host of other countries including Israel and Formosa.

But the real fact of the matter is that the German problem is quite unique, without parallel in contemporary history. Therefore, I find that I should give a certain background of the history of Germany, even though it will be very sketchy, over the last fifty years. The Germans more than any other race are a united people, proud of their heritage and culture, and even though they have been misguided into two wars, they have preserved their identity and indeed their sanity, with the minimum recrimination for the fatal leadership that dragged them through two devastating wars, because they believed in the integrity of their nation and the greater glory of their Fatherland.

[Shri Piloo Mody]

After the disastrous treaty of Versailles, parts of Germany were ceded to neighbours, which ultimately provoked and caused German national resurgence. Even the areas, that were ceded to France opted back for Germany, in spite of the superb quality of French wives and women, not to speak of their perfumes. Such a nation was invaded on many sides at the fag end of World War II, but the Allies were wise on this occasion and did not repeat the blunders of Versailles. At Potsdam in 1945, they agreed "that during the period of occupation, Germany shall be treated as a single economic unit."

Accordingly, in the joint administration of Germany upto 1949, the Four Power Agreements that Governed Germany jointly occupied and administered the country as one political unit, but the Soviets violated these agreements and created within the area under their jurisdiction a communist dictatorship. Frustrated that they could not bring about the reunification of Germany, the Western Powers terminated the occupation and signed a peace treaty and created the Federal Republic of Germany, which in turn enacted a basic law, pending the writing of a constitution, which clearly stated that it was acting on behalf of even those Germans to whom participation was denied, and that the 17 million Germans living under Soviet dictatorship against their will shall also possess full civil rights in the Federal Republic of Germany.

If the nefarious Berlin Blockade failed, it was not because of efficiency of American airmen and the airlift, but because the Germans would not allow a link with the rest of their people in West Germany to be lost for ever. Thereafter, Soviet intentions began to unfold themselves, revealing a drama of attitudes and methods. The entire issue of German reunification was mixed up with the question of European security, with the West on the one hand maintaining that it was necessary to reunify the country in order to preserve European security and the Soviets on the other, demanding a chunk of Germany for the price of European security.

I will not take you into the tiresome and frustrating details and negotiations

that led up to the conferences in London and Paris, finally culminating in the Summit at Geneva in 1955 when a joint directive was issued. I will quote to you the Geneva directive which reads :

"The Heads of Government"—

this is a directive in which the Soviets also participated—

"recognising their common responsibility for the settlement of the German question and the reunification of Germany, have agreed that the settlement of the German question and the reunification of Germany by means of free elections shall be carried out in conformity with the national interests of the German people and the interests of European security".

What followed the Geneva directive is common knowledge indeed. Soviets interpreted the 'reunification of Germany' and the 'national interests of Germany' and the 'interests of European security' as being a formation of two German States. As a matter of fact, Mr. Khrushchev, when he visited Paris in 1956 admitted to the then French Prime Minister, Mollet, that he would rather see 17 million Germans in the Soviet bloc than 70 million Germans in a neutral Germany. Well, 17 million Germans are still in Soviet bloc, but that does not mean that we must connive at it.

During the years 1949—61, 3½ million Germans from east moved to the west and sought asylum in west Germany. This truly represents the feelings of unity that the German people have, and yet the same people are supposed to be living in a 'democratic republic'. As long as the Soviets keep using teese words, I supposed that even in this Parliament, they will find some currency. But here were people who were leaving a 'democratic republic' not in thousands, not in a million, but 3½ millions of them left. While the Western Powers through the Marshall Plan pumped into the German economy \$ 1333 million, the Soviets plundered, under the name of war reparations, \$ 6,000 million worth of machines, manufactures and commodities.

It is only the death of Stalin that put an end to this plunder.

Fed up, tired, oppressed, the East Germans revolted against this foreign domination only to find that their puppet German Government 'popularly' elected with 99 per cent of the popular vote using Soviet tanks manned by the Soviet Army crushing the German people. Three years later this pattern was to be repeated in Poland and Hungary.

But the barbarities and the brutalities of the ages pale into insignificance when, in defiance of moral law and complete disregard of civilised behaviour and total contempt for human dignity, the Soviets built that most monstrous of monuments against the freedom of man—the Berlin Wall. Free man build walls to protect themselves against intruders, for shelter. This type of wall is only built for jails, to stop East Germans from escaping to freedom. Even so, 24,000 of them risked their lives to escape from the prison that you want to be recognised.

If the Government of India believes in the reunification of Germany, to recognise the German Democratic Republic would merely compound felony. In any case recognise whom? Are we recognising the separate identity of the East Germans and give a separate identity to these people who wish to reunite with their brethren in the west? Or, are we recognising a coterie of gangsters, German stooges of Soviet masters, supported by Soviet tanks? Is it necessary to recognise Moscow twice—once in Moscow and another time in East Germany?

SHRI ONKARLAL BOHRA
(Chittorgarh): Why not?

SHRI PILOO MODY: In that case we should do it three times. It is indeed a great sorrow that a part of Germany is under foreign domination; it is a great sorrow that 17 million.

East Germans are under colonial rule and do not enjoy the blessings of freedom. But this is an internal problem and we can extend what sympathy we can and lend our moral support. But we cannot interfere.

So, I warn you and the House that we must develop the capacity to think dispassionately of problems and resist the temptation of submitting to ideological

weaknesses and clever arguments and irrelevant analogies. Otherwise, we shall never earn for ourselves the reputation for responsible leadership or moral authority. Imagine for a moment that the Chinese who occupy 47,000 sq. miles of our territory set up a puppet Government in that area and imagine for a while that West Germany or for that matter any other country were to recognise that Government, what a preposterous position it would be. This is precisely the position of Germany in the context of world history. Let us not fish in the troubled waters of European politics and let us not upset the delicate equilibrium of European security. More than any other races the Germans believe in one nation and they have but one dream and that dream reunification of Germany. We have enough problems of our own; let us not create problems for others.

SHRI BAKAR ALI MIRZA
(Secundrabad): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, we just heard a very eloquent speech on the evils of communism. I would humbly request the hon. Member to use the very same arguments in the case of Viet Nam or Korea. He talked about three and a half million people going to West Germany in spite of the Berlin wall that has been created to stop them. What about the millions who are infiltrating from North Viet Nam to South Viet Nam through the wall not of cement and brick but a wall of steel created by the United States with an expenditure of 30,000 million dollars? Therefore, it is not a question of what ideology that particular country holds.

I am not going to condemn West Germany because of a particular type of ideology it has. It is her affair. If she wants Fascist rule or communist rule, it is the people's choice as long as that choice is free. But the point with us is, if you would recognise a country, why do you do it? Are there certain set of rules like the rules which Mr. Madhu Limaye quotes every day, and if things come within those rules, you would recognise or you do not recognise? If you recognise, it is done in the best interests of your country. I maintain, whatever the reason for our not recognising it so far, and I do not agree with Mr. Mukerjee

[Shri Bakar Ali Mirza]

that it was due to fear. After the world war, the conflict and the cold war between east and west were very, very acute and any little step would have made quite a difference. And therefore, hoping that one day the two Germanys will unite and come to some agreement, we kept out so that the trouble there should be at the minimum, but later on in practice, we acted in a different way.

16.58 hrs.

[Shri R. D. Bhandare in the Chair]

We acted as far as possible to behave with East Germany as if it is already a recognised country; It should now be formalised and that, I maintain, would be the correct step. What is the attitude of East Germany towards us, and what is the attitude of West Germany towards us? I am not thinking of the forms of Governments that exist there. West Germany has been supplying arms openly and secretly to Pakistan and every time when our interest was involved, she took a stand which was more or less hostile to us. East Germany, on the other hand, has always been friendly; her methods of co-operation and aid are on the basis of trade and however much the amount that comes from the west in millions and millions of dollars, it is the quality of the aid that is much more important. I believe that the aid we get through trade with Soviet Union and East Germany, which they are following, is in the best interests of the country, and the aid which consists of just throwing dollars so that it could act as a pressure is really not in our interest. The sooner this type of aid is stopped, the better it is for our country.

Therefore, it seems rather strange that a country that is friendly with us, we hesitate to recognise, and the country that is hostile to us, we ran and recognise it. Some people think, we were influenced by the threat, that if East Germany is recognised, the other Germany would break off diplomatic relations. That is not true. In fact, when we took that step long ago, this threat was not there. This threat of West Germany came much later. Many countries have defied that, and West Germany

had to yield, as Prof. Mukerjee has pointed out.

I would not like to link up Formosa, Israel and other countries with this question. This has to be dealt with on its merits. I personally feel that the Government of India should make its policy clear. It is high time that we put in a formal way what we are doing in practice. I wanted postponement of this debate in the beginning, because it is such an important matter that only the Prime Minister can take a decision on this question. I hope Mr. Bhagat will convey to her the feeling of the House. I would press the Government of India to revise its views and accord formal recognition to East Germany.

17.00 hrs.

श्री रामसेवक यादव (बाराबंकी): सभापति महोदय, जो प्रस्ताव प्रस्तुत हैं मैं उसका समर्थन करता हूँ। मैंने अभी श्री पीलू मोदी का भाषण सुना जिन्होंने इस बात का विरोध किया कि दोनों देशों की मान्यता की बात उठे। जो दूसरा महायुद्ध हुआ उसने इस दुनियां को एक बड़ी गलत देन दी है, और वह है भारत और पाकिस्तान का निर्माण, वह है पूर्वी जर्मनी और पश्चिमी जर्मनी का दो टुकड़ों में बांटा जाना, साथ ही साथ इजराइल, फारमोसा, उत्तर तथा दक्षिण कोरिया और वियतनाम। वह सारी चीजें, जो आज दुनियां में मौजूद हैं। यदि श्री पीलू मोदी को एकता के भावना के बारे में सचमुच पूछा जाय, तो मैं चाहूंगा कि यह देश एक हो जायें, और यह सब से अच्छी चीज होगी, लेकिन चूंकि वस्तुस्थिति यह बन चुकी है, ऐसा लगता है कि निकट भविष्य में जो भी विभक्त देश हैं वह अभी जल्दी एक होने वाले नहीं हैं। इसलिए जो भी बुद्धिमान भावमी है वह वस्तुस्थिति को देखते हुए यही कहेगा कि जो भी इस तरह के राष्ट्र बन गये हैं भारत सरकार उनको मान्यता दे। उनको मान्यता न देकर वह कोई बुद्धिमानी का काम नहीं करेगा।

में कहना चाहूंगा कि भारत सरकार बार बार दिल लगाव की नीति की दुहाई देती है, लेकिन दरअसल उसकी नीति दिल लगाव की नहीं है। उसकी नीति भय वाली है, और इस तरह से भय वाली है कि कभी रूस को खुश करने के लिये कोई काम करता है और कभी अमरीका को खुश करने के लिये कोई काम करता है। जब पूर्वी जर्मनी को मान्यता देने का प्रश्न उठता है तब इस से इन्कार करके वह अमरीका को खुश करना चाहता है। अरब जब फारमोसा को मान्यता देने का प्रश्न उठता है तब वह रूस को खुश करना चाहता है। दरअसल उसकी कोई स्वतन्त्र नीति है नहीं। अगर स्वतन्त्र नीति होती तो आज तक इन देशों को मान्यता देने का सवाल पीछे न पड़ा होता। वह बहुत पहले ही ब्याप्त हो गया होता क्योंकि वस्तुस्थिति यह है और पूर्वी जर्मनी के अस्तित्व से कोई इन्कार नहीं कर सकता। हम चाहते हैं या नहीं चाहते हैं, यह प्रश्न नहीं है। हम उसकी विचारधारा को मानते हैं या नहीं, यह प्रश्न नहीं है क्योंकि जो स्वतन्त्र देश होंगे उनमें से किसी की विचारधारा हम से मिलेगी और किसी की विपरीत होगी। कुछ मुद्दे उठेंगे तो किसी मुद्दे पर हम और वह सहमत होंगे और किसी मुद्दे पर एक दूसरे का विरोध करेंगे। लेकिन यह चीज मान्यता के रास्ते में नहीं आनी चाहिये। मान्यता के लिये एक सीधा और साफ सिद्धान्त होना चाहिये कि अगर कोई देश ऐसा है जहां पर एक ठोस सरकार चल रही है, मजबूत सरकार चल रही है और काफी अरसे से चल रही है, तो सरकार को आखिरी मूंद कर उसको मान्यता दे देनी चाहिये। जब भारत सरकार इस काम को करेगी तब सचमुच दिल लगाव की नीति चरितार्थ होगी और लोग यह समझेंगे कि सचमुच इस देश की दिल लगाने की नीति है, तथा उसने जो अपनी नीति बनाई है उसके कार्यान्वयन में कहीं पर कोई पक्षपात और भेद-भाव नहीं है, किसी तरह की मन में कोई निराशा और डर नहीं है।

मानलिया: अब तक कोई काम नहीं हुआ तो उसके लिये यह तक नहीं दिया जाना चाहिये कि अब भी उसको उसी तरह से चलते रहना चाहिये, बल्कि जो गलती हुई है उसको अब ठीक कर लेना चाहिये। जो जो भी देश ऐसे हैं जो वस्तुस्थिति के तौर पर हमारे सामने हैं, अस्तित्व में हैं, तो उनको हमें मान्यता दे देनी चाहिये। इस सन्दर्भ में मैं कहना चाहूंगा कि पूर्वी जर्मनी या फारमोसा या इजराइल में वस्तुस्थिति यह है कि वहां सरकारें चल रही हैं। यही नहीं, रूस ने इजराइल को सबसे पहले मान्यता दी। तब फिर भारत सरकार क्यों हिचकती है उसको मान्यता देने में।

श्री ब० रा० भगत : इसमें किसका डर था। जो माननीय सदस्य कह रहे हैं।

श्री रामसेवक यादव : इसीलिये तो मैं कह रहा हूँ। अच्छा किया कि आपने छेड़ दिया। इजराइल को आपने इसलिये मान्यता नहीं दी क्योंकि रूस के साथ अब थोड़ा सा सम्बन्ध बिगड़ गया है। सबसे पहले रूस ने उसको मान्यता दी थी लेकिन यूनाइटेड अरब रिपब्लिक के साथ जो रूस के गहरे सम्बन्ध हैं उनको लेकर अब इजराइल के साथ उसके अच्छे सम्बन्ध नहीं हैं। भारत सरकार इसलिये इजराइल को मान्यता नहीं दे पायेगी कि रूस उससे परेशान हो जाता है। अब चूंकि फारमोसा और इजराइल को आप मान्यता नहीं देते और अमरीका इससे परेशान हो जाता है इसलिये उसको खुश करने के लिये आप पूर्वी जर्मनी को मान्यता नहीं देते। इस तरह पर हम चल रहे हैं लेकिन यह नीति भारत के लिये उचित नहीं है, यह नीति हमारी स्वतन्त्रता के लिये ठीक नहीं है और दिल लगाव की जो नीति भारत सरकार अपनाती है, यह उसके लिये मौजूद नहीं है।

इसलिये मैं आपसे कहना चाहता हूँ कि जो भी देश दूसरे महायुद्ध के परिणामस्वरूप आये हैं सामने, और वह अस्तित्व में हैं, उनको मान्यता देने में ही बुद्धिमानी है और इसमें देर

[श्री रामसेवक यादव]

नहीं लगानी चाहिये। जब हम चीन जैसे देश से कूटनीतिक सम्बन्ध रख सकते हैं उसको मान्यता दे सकते हैं, जो आक्रामक है, जिसने हमारी भूमि पर कब्जा कर लिया है, तब मैं समझ नहीं पाता कि हम पूर्वी जर्मनी को मान्यता क्यों न दें या दूसरे देशों को मान्यता क्यों न दें। मैं भारत सरकार से अनुरोध करना चाहूंगा कि वह वस्तुस्थिति को समझे और जो भूल उससे हुई है उसको खत्म करे तथा जो देश अस्तित्व में हैं उनको मान्यता दे तथा पूर्वी जर्मनी के साथ अपने कूटनीतिक सम्बन्ध स्थापित करे।

SHRI K. R. GANESH (Andaman and Nicobar Islands): Mr. Chairman, Sir, I rise to support the resolution moved by Professor H. N. Mukerjee and I congratulate him for bringing this resolution at this timely situation. I say timely because, as one of the previous speakers has mentioned, the world is celebrating the 150th anniversary of Karl Marx one of the greatest teachers of mankind and a philosopher who had shown that the world can be changed and man can create a new society by his own efforts. I take the name of this great teacher because his philosophy and his economic interpretation of history is being creatively worked out in the German Democratic Republic.

In the German Democratic Republic today a situation has come into being where the German Democratic Republic has shown great industrial growth, has adopted a socialist constitution and has been able to establish itself as a great industrial power in Europe.

On the contrary, the Federal German Republic, in spite of the initial economic growth, is today facing an economic crisis. The student upsurge in West Germany shows the vulnerability of the political system of West Germany. The victory of the extreme right wing neo-Nazi party in one of the regions of West Germany shows that even after twenty years the soil of West Germany is still ready to take some of the fascist theories that Hitler preached.

We know that West Germany has been hostile to India whenever the interest of this nation was at stake. Whether it is the question of supplying armaments to

Pakistan, whether it is the question of producing maps which show Kashmir as an independent State, which affects the national interest of this country, whether it is the question of trade with China, West Germany has been hostile to India. Also, on international question, whether it is Rhodesia or the Israeli aggression on the Arab people, or the Pakistani aggression, or the apartheid policy of South Africa, West Germany has always taken a stand in favour of colonialism, racialism, aggression and war.

The two German States are a reality and a fact of history. There are two political systems and two ideologies in the two German States. Now if we base our policy on this reasoning that the recognition of the German Democratic Republic will retard the process of unification of the German nation, I think we are living in an illusory world because the two German nations is a fact of history and a reality and even the two power blocs are not in a position to influence the bringing of the two German States together.

As has been pointed out here the Hallstein doctrine is dead, is in shambles and, there are countries like Burma, Ceylon, Yugoslavia and Rumania which have recognised both Germanys and the West German Government has not been able to do anything with these governments. We are a very vast and big country and we do not want any interference in our internal affairs. But the very concept of the Hallstein doctrine means interference in the internal affairs of another country.

GDR has been a friendly nation and we have cultural economic and friendly ties with G.L.R. GDR has supported this country at every critical period of our national history, whether it was the aggression of China or Pakistan. On international matters our policy corresponds to the policy that is being pursued by GDR, like peaceful co-existence, outlawing war, achievement of world peace and nuclear disarmament.

It was very interesting to hear a cold war speech by one of the hon. Members of this House at a time when cold war seems to have become an obsolete instrument in international affairs, at a time when the two power blocs are coming together. At such

a time, in this hon. House in which Shri Jawaharlal Nehru propounded his international policies, to hear a cold war speech from one of the hon. Members indicates that in this country there are persons who want to live in the past, there are persons who are more loyal than the King.

It has been said that there are Soviet tanks in Germany. I would like to mention this : in Rumania, Czechoslovakia, in Poland are there Soviet tanks that are moving about ? The people of those countries after having established a Socialist State, want to liberalise Socialism that they have built up want to democratise the system they have built up so that they may have a society in which the largest number of people can participate.

SHRI BAL RAJ MADHOK (South Delhi) : Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the passionate plea that Professor Hiren Mukerjee has made for the recognition of GDR, but I fail to appreciate the strong language that he has used against President Leubke and Chancellor Keisinger of West Germany. After all, we have friendly relations with West Germany. If somebody attacked in the same way even Ayub, who is the head of our enemy country, Professor Mukerjee would have protested. He is a very senior and sober Member of the House and, therefore, I did not expect that kind of language from him for the leaders of a country which is friendly and who recently visited us.

The question is that we should recognise the GDR. GDR is a fact of history; it is a fact of life. It is a reality. It does exist. How it came into existence, that is past history—I need not go into that. But it is a fact of life and we must accept it. Therefore I do not see any reason why any country, whether it is a West Germany or anybody else, should pressurise us that we should not recognise the GDR. We should recognise it so long as it exists.

Today Germany stands divided. Today Korea stands divided. Today Vietnam stands divided. Today India stands divided. I do hope that a time will come when Germany will become one, when Korea will become one, when Vietnam will become one and when India will become

one ; but so long as they remain separate let us recognise them. I do not see any reason why we should not.

But then the question is of the policy you want to pursue. Shri Hiren Mukerjee talked of an independent foreign policy. I fully endorse it. I stand for it. But I do not understand his obsession with non-alignment. What is this non-alignment ?

AN HON. MEMBER : It is independence.

SHRI BAL RAJ MADHOK : It is not independence. Every country has to be aligned and non-aligned at the same time. In life as it is, every individual has certain friends, certain enemies and then there are others about whose he is not bothered. Similarly, every country has to be friendly with some and inimical with some, whether they like it or do not like it, and it has to be indifferent or neutral about others.

Take, for example, the classic example of the UAR. UAR, you say, is a non-aligned country ; but UAR has military pacts with Iraq and Syria and otherwise it says that it is non-aligned. Of course, I do want that India should be non-aligned as between the USA and the USSR, but I cannot understand how India can be non-aligned in our dispute with Pakistan. How can we be non-aligned when we are fighting with China and Pakistan ? China and Pakistan are allies, As against China and Pakistan we have to have allies : we have to be aligned. But where our interests do not directly come in, we must try to be non-aligned.

Non-alignment is not a Veda *vakya* ; it is not a principle, it is a policy. Just now hon. Shri Ganesh was saying that we should not talk of the past, that we should not live in the past. Then why should we go on harping on Pandit Nehru ? Whether Pandit Nehru was good or bad, I do not want to say anything about him. But he has gone and the situation in which he propounded certain policies has also changed. The whole country is suffering from the policies that he propounded.

Therefore today the time has come when we must rethink. We are a dynamic people ; we are not a static people. We have to develop and change policies accord-

[Shri Bal Raj Madhok]

ing to the needs of the country and according to the needs of the situation. Therefore let us not harp on what Pandit Nehru said or did not say. We have to formulate a policy which suits the country today.

Today I feel that there is no reason why we should not accept the GDR. But it has been said that we should do it because West Germany has done this or that, because West Germany has provided arms to Pakistan or because West Germany has published a map in which Kashmir has been shown as an independent country. May I ask : If you can have full diplomatic relations with Pakistan which wants to grab Kashmir and which is using arms from Germany, America or China to beat us, why not have diplomatic relations with those countries which at least are not fighting with us ? We have diplomatic relations even with Communist China which has been attacking and maligning us everyday. ...*(Interruption)*.

SHRI AMRIT NAHATA : Nobody said that diplomatic relations with West Germany should be broken off.

SHRI BAL RAJ MADHOK : That is no argument then. You argue why should we have relations with G. D. R. Why argue whether West Germany has done this or that ? We should not bother about the political system that a country has. The people have a right to have their own political system. So far as political system in East Germany is concerned—I have not been to East Germany—I had an opportunity to go to East Berlin for a day and I could see the difference between the socialist system and the free system. It was just like going from a marriage ceremony into a condolence meeting. There is a contrast between West Berlin and East Berlin. They present the best examples of what a free system of economy and a regimented economy can be to a people. Therefore, don't go into whether it is regimented system or not. I want that we should have full relations with G. D. R. because it is a fact of history and it is a fact of life. It is a separate country and so long as it exists, we must recognise it.

Once you accept this principle, I ask : How can you deny full diplomatic recogni-

tion to Israel or to Taiwan ? Israel is as much a fact of life as East Germany and Taiwan is as much a fact of life as East Germany. Now, about Israel, we say that U. A. R. or the Arab countries will get angry. If we are opposed to West Germany dictating to us not to have relations with East Germany, if we are opposed to Hallstein doctrine, we have to be equally hostile, equally critical of Arab dictation, and we must condemn pressure tactics of U. A. R. or the Arab countries.

So far as the question of recognition is concerned, it has been argued that a number of countries recognise both East Germany and West Germany—there are 5 or 10 such countries. But there are more than fifty countries which have full diplomatic relation with both, Israel and U. A. R. If so many countries can have full relation with both, why can't we have full diplomatic relations with both these countries ? You cannot have double standards. We should see whether our interests demand it or not. Even if our interests do not demand it and if the country is there, we must recognise it. We should not treat any country as untouchable unless basic moral issues are involved as in the case of South Africa.

So far as Israel is concerned, our interests do very much demand it. It is a very important country. It is the most advanced country in West Asia. It has developed in so many ways. Its progress will be very much helpful to us. In this West Asia, Pan Islamic bigotry and fanaticism, is taking the better of people's sanity. Anything can happen there because they are playing the game of Pakistan. We should have dependable friends in West Asia and the only dependable friend that India can have for many years to come is Israel. Therefore, I suggest that we have full relations with G. D. R., so also with Israel and so also with Taiwan. Taiwan is a big country with 13 million population and it occupies a very strategic position. It can provide a better window on Communist China than any other place. Therefore, even if you want to have information about Communist China, even then the relations with Taiwan will help us. From there, we can get the most reliable information.

So, my submission is that in international relations, in the matter of foreign policy, let us give up obsession with ideologies. Let us not be whimsical; let us get rid of whims and fancies of Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru which formulated the foreign policy. Let us have a foreign policy which is rational and at the same time, national. It should be both rational and national. It should care for the country's interests. In international relations, let us not allow our ideological obsessions or ideological predilections to take the better of us : let us act as patriots.

SHRI S. KANDAPPAN (Mettur) : Mr. Chairman, Sir, I welcome the Resolution moved by my hon. friend Shri H. N. Mukerjee and I fully support it.

The one dissenting voice that we have heard today, in this House, is the voice of Mr. Piloo Mody. It is a lonely voice. It sounded very pathetic also. I have never seen him so illogical and inconsistent in his arguments as I have seen him today.

Sir, he started by saying, 'Are we guided by political expediency or trade considerations?' He ruled out both. But as he went on saying things, though he did not spell out on what considerations he was talking about, he sounded as if he is basing all his arguments on ethical grounds. But, Sir, the arguments that he advanced, are solely guided by the obsession he has for Communism and nothing else.

SHRI PILOO MODY : I have no use for it.

SHRI S. KANDAPPAN : If that is taken away from his mind, I am sure he will agree with the resolution as moved by Shri Mukerjee. For example, he referred to the Geneva directive. I can remind him about the Geneva accord with regard to Viet Nam. He condemned Russia and other countries that they did not come forward with the Elections and all that, but, in the Geneva Accord of the same year—I think it was in 1954—it was specifically mentioned that under international supervision there should be an election in 1956. But the Diem regime in South Viet Nam did not accept it, and the Americans also supported them. If that question is posed to hon. Shri Piloo Mody, I do not know what answer

he is going to give. So, he is solely guided by his obsession with Communism and not a sort of objective approach to the problem.

SHRI PILOO MODY : I have armed myself against irrelevance.

SHRI S. KANDAPPAN : Again he is being illogical.

SHRI J. B. KRIPALANI (Guna) : The answer will be given by the Minister and not by the hon. Member.

SHRI S. KANDAPPAN : If ethical standards or moral standards are to be the guiding principles in our international relations, I have no hesitation in saying that we should have snapped our ties with USA long ago. Sir, that is a country—I am just quoting it for argument's sake, not that I demand it and it will be an impossible thing to demand it—

SHRI PILOO MODY : Demand it.

SHRI S. KANDAPPAN : Just for argument's sake I quote it. I am quoting from the speech of Dr. Linus Pauling in the Azad Memorial Lectures only last year—Page 29 :

"Last year I was shocked to read that Mr. Henry Kuss, Jr. Assistant Secretary of Defence in the United States, had received the United States Department of Defence. Meritorious Civilian Service Medal for his imaginative leadership in the Military export sales programme. He was given this medal because he had succeeded in selling to the developing countries of the world 1500 million dollars worth of sophisticated weapons, just bombers, tanks, machine guns, and other equipment, in one year. In his speech of acceptance he said that 'with the proper amount of energy, imagination, and vigour', we should by 1971 be selling 15,000 million dollars worth of sophisticated military equipment to the developing countries."

Can anything be more degrading and more appalling to the sense of human dignity than a country which is affluent by all means depending on its trade promotion of selling armaments to developing countries, bringing devastation and bringing war into the world without any human consider-

[Shri S. Kandappan]

ation, without any decency, without any dignity and decorum? If these kinds of things cannot be condemned and if you still talk of moral relations in the world, that is hypocrisy.

SHRI PILOO MODY : Is the hon. Member aware that we have ourselves asked for it?

SHRI S. KANDAPPAN : That is immaterial. I am sure if these people ask for some atom bombs or hydrogen bombs, probably they may be prepared even to sell them. They do not care a jot and do not have the moral courage to work for the survival of humanity. So, whether somebody asks for weapons is not material, that is not relevant here at all.

So, there is no logic in his argument. Neither he has given any kind of yardstick or criterion with which we have to be guided in our international relations. I agree with Prof. Madhok when he says that we have to see the facts of the situation and we have got to recognise them as they are without going into the merits of the case. Last year I had been to Nepal with a delegation headed by our hon. Speaker. In a reception given to us, he supported the Nepal Government and he spoke of the goodwill and the good relations that exist between the two countries. Then, Sir, one night at a dinner, we came across some radical people there -- I do not want to give names -- but one of them told us, "Why are you giving your support to this feudalistic, to this out-moded Government headed by a monarch?"

Then we said, 'This is not our concern at all. It is the concern of your people and your country'.

If the radicals get the upper hand, if they overthrow the monarchy and if another Government is established there, when we go there we have to say that we are their friends. Giving some sort of an example, I will say this. In Madras from about 1930 onwards till today there is a reformist who talks very vehemently about Hinduism. He is a Hindu. He condemns the superstitious beliefs of our religion and mythological stories. If a Mussalman were to do it, I do not think anybody would tolerate it. It is because he is a

Hindu himself that he talks about it in this way. So, in our own country people may criticise our country, they are welcome to do it. It is not for a foreigner to say whether our system is good or correct.

Therefore, I do not agree with the arguments advanced by Shri Piloo Mody that it is under Russian occupation. I have never been there myself but from a commonsense point of view and from what I have heard and read I can say that the East German people also are equally intelligent and clever as their West German brethren. The 17 million Germans who are living in the G. D. R. today are not in any way illiterate or less educated than the Germans living elsewhere. They are equally educated and they are equally industrious and self-respecting. If there were any kind of oppression and repression they would have raised in revolt by now. Even the all-powerful America were not able to suppress the Vietnamese. How could Russia suppress the Germans who are well-advanced? Shri Piloo Mody has made out a poor case. It is impossible to agree with such arguments. Whatever the circumstances, it is a sovereign government. It has been recognised by many nations. So it is high time, as the Mover of the Resolution has said that we have got to accord diplomatic recognition to this country.

MR. CHAIRMAN : The hon. Member's time is up.

SHRI S. KANDAPPAN : There are many countries with whom we have diplomatic relations, but our trade with them is not developed to the extent as it is developed with the German Democratic Republic. I have seen in one small town in my State, in the Sivakasi municipal town, the GDR has set up 70 printing machines today. There are such good trade relations and whatever possibilities are there for improving the trade relations we should try to strengthen them. There is scope for rapid development of trade between our two countries. What harm is there in further developing the existing trade relations and according diplomatic recognition to GDR? With these words I support the Resolution.

SHRI INDER J. MALHOTRA (Jammu) : The Resolution moved by Shri Hiren Mukerjee has received support practically from all sides of the House. The only hon. Member who has objected to or opposed the Resolution is Shri Piloo Mody. A number of points has already been raised in favour of the resolution for recognition of the GDR. I would like to say one or two things in favour. From the interruptions made by the hon. Minister and his facial expression I can visualise that he is not going to accept the Resolution. Shri Bal Raj Madhok has very rightly stressed the need for giving a new look to the basic aspects of our foreign policy. I would have felt very happy if the hon. Prime Minister could have been here and sensing the attitude taken by practically all sides of the House Government could have taken a decision for the recognition of the German Democratic Republic. I cannot by any stretch of imagination or reason understand what reasons could now be put forward by the hon. Minister for not accepting the resolution.

On the Kashmir issue, the German Democratic Republic has always supported us. I do not say that this can be the only argument for recognising the German Democratic Republic. As my hon. friend Shri Bal Raj Madhok has very rightly pointed out, in the world of today certain facts do exist, and we cannot close our eyes to them and say that they do not exist. Here are two Germanys and nobody can about it. These two Germanys are going to exist. Whatever type of administration or political system is there in the two Germanys is to be treated as their own internal problem. When we say that no foreign country has got any right to interfere in our political system or in the type of administration that we want in this country, we have also got no right to say that the East Germans should not have this kind of administration or that type of political system. As has been pointed out already, when we are still giving full diplomatic recognition to China, how on earth are we going to explain to the people of this country that on such and such grounds we did not recognise the German Democratic Republic and we are still not going to recognise it ?

I give my full support to the resolution moved by Shri H. N. Mukerjee. I would very strongly plead with the hon. Minister that in case he has got instructions not to accept this resolution, he should at least advance such arguments in his speech as would leave the matter open so that in the very near future Government could take a decision keeping in view the sense of the House and the attitude of hon. Members and the need of the hour to recognise the German Democratic Republic.

SHRI P. GOPALAN (Tellicherry) : I wholeheartedly support the resolution moved by my hon. friend Shri H. N. Mukerjee, which demands the recognition of the German Democratic Republic. For various reasons which involve political, economic as well as moral issues, I support this resolution, which, if accepted, would mean a very wise step on the part of Government to undo an injustice that had been meted out to a democratic State.

It is a historically established fact that two German States are existing at present, the Federal Republic of Germany and the German Democratic Republic. One stands as a symbol of the culmination of the fight against Nazism and another namely the Federal Republic of Germany reflects the existence of the vestiges of Nazism on the face of this earth. This is the clear distinction which we can see. When I say that Federal Republic of Germany reflects the existence of the vestiges of Nazism, I can advance certain arguments to prove my allegation or contention. I can refer in this connection to the President of West Germany, Mr. Luebke against whom Shri H. N. Mukerjee had used certain strong words, at which Shri Bal Raj Madhok was very much annoyed.

It has been clearly proved that the President, Mr. Luebke was the man who was instrumental in ordering the construction of the Nazi Concentration camps. In *Newsweek* of March 11, there is a write-up in which it has been clearly stated that Mr. Luebke has admitted to a certain extent that he does not remember whether he had signed a document ordering the construction of the Nazi concentration camps.

Shri Piloo Mody was arguing that for the sake of the unification of these two

[Shri P. Gopalan]

German States, India should not extend diplomatic recognition to East Germany, and he wants the unification of Germany to take place under the ex-Nazis. Who are the rulers of West Germany at present? They were the criminals of Nazi crimes.

I will give an example. The American weekly, *Saturday Evening Post*, writing in its issue on 26 October, 1966 said 'To be precise, of the 361 top executives who were members of the Nazi Party, only 33 have been arrested. All the others are still free'.

This is the picture of West Germany as at present existing to whom our country has extended diplomatic recognition, while it refuses to do so with regard to East Germany.

As for the economic reasons, Prof. Mukerjee has made it very clear that our trade relations with East Germany are improving day by day. In 1957-58, our trade with that country was to the tune of Rs. 63 lakhs only; in 1966-67, our imports from East Germany rose to Rs. 13.03 crores. Our exports in 1957-58 were of the value of Rs. 1.5 crores; in 1966-67, they were to the tune of Rs. 13.40 crores. That means we have no balance of payments difficulty with them.

With regard to the trade with West Germany, in 1957-58, our imports from that country were to the tune of Rs. 127 crores; in 1966-67, from June to February, they were to the tune of Rs. 114 crores. We exported in 1957-58 goods worth Rs. 16 crores; in 1966-67, our export is Rs. 20 crores. This means we are having an adverse balance of trade with them.

Despite all these facts, we are not still prepared to extend diplomatic recognition to a State with which we are having improved trade relations at present.

Lastly a few more points. I know why Government have not given recognition to East Germany. It is the Holstein doctrine which is troubling the minds of our rulers. I would give you certain facts concerning the experience of certain countries when they recognised East Germany. In February 1954, when Ceylon agreed to raise the trade delegation to the status of a Consulate General, the Federal Government declared in a press release

'it has been made particularly impossible for the Federal Government to continue economic aid to Ceylon in a manner wished by both sides and to justify it before the German people'. This was the case with UAR also. When UAR invited President Ulbricht to their country, the Federal Chancellor, Dr. Erhard, announced on 7th March 1965 'the decision of the Government that the decision of UAR to invite Herr Ulbricht has been answered by the Federal Republic by stopping economic aid. This meant that the Federal Government would not participate in the Second Egyptian Five Year Plan.

Our Government fears that if it extends diplomatic recognition to East Germany, the economic aid that we get from West Germany will come to a stop. We succumb thus to the pressure of the Halstein doctrine. I whole-heartedly support the resolution moved by Shri Mukerjee as it is high time that the injustice meted out to that State was undone.

SHRI SAMAR GUHA (Contai) : The United Nations, I should say, has set the pattern how a State should be given diplomatic recognition. Whether a State has come into being by the evolutionary process of history or whether it pursues a certain political ideology—these are not considerations for giving recognition to a State. The point for consideration in the post-war world is : whether a state exists as a reality. It is on that basis recognition is given. It is a tragedy of the Second World War as also the post-war world that many new States have emerged artificially; many States had also been divided. States have emerged as a result of conquest by army as in the case of East Germany or West Germany; other States have emerged as a result of intra-chamber imperialist conspiracy as the division of Palestine into two States or the division of Egypt and Sudan and also the monumental example of the division of our motherland. States have also emerged due to insurrectionary seizure of power over part of a country as the two Viet-Nams, two Koreas and two Chinas and also as a result of annexation by one State by other as in the case of Tibet. These States exist today not by the Will of the people who inherit the part of the lands

which comprise these States but due to extraneous considerations. Whatever may be the origin, the world does not bother about the political ideology of a State in giving diplomatic recognition to it.

In the case of India, we have differences in the type of relations with different types of States but we do not bother about the political ideology of any State, while giving recognition to the State; the only consideration guiding us is whether it exists as a State in reality.

SHRI PILOO MODY : Irrespective of who the mother was.

SHRI SAMAR GUHA : That is the fact of today. Therefore, my party thinks that the question whether East Germany should be recognised should not be decided on any political considerations. India should follow a uniform standard of giving recognition to a new State. In that light, we want to say that our party will be willing to give recognition to East Germany.

SHRI J. B. KRIPALANI : Your party cannot give recognition; Government has to give recognition.

SHRI SAMAR GUHA : We support the move for according recognition. At the same time we must make it clear that there is no reason why India should not recognise Israel and the two Chinas. Then again, though physically Tibet does not exist as a sovereign State, it exists as a State, morally.

Therefore, why should we not accord diplomatic recognition to the government headed by the Dalai Lama? I want to conclude with only one observation: that no extraneous considerations should be brought in, and therefore, in deciding our policy of giving recognition to a State, we must not allow our vision to be blurred by any ideological considerations. The only consideration is whether a State exists as a reality, and on the basis of that the recognition should be given to all new States, and if East Germany is diplomatically recognised, then we become morally bound to accord recognition to Israel and Taiwan and to give moral recognition to the Tibetan Government.

SHRI SRADHAKAR SUPAKAR (Sambalpur): Mr. Chairman, Sir, the question of recognition of a country should not and has never depended on what type of government is there. Whether it is a fascist government or a socialist government is absolutely of no relevance when the problem of recognition is concerned. Nor is it relevant for the purpose of recognition whether a country is hostile to us or is very friendly to us. Therefore, these two considerations which have weighed very heavily in the debate today are, I think, not very relevant for the purpose of the debate. Nor is it necessary to ask the question whether a particular country is a fact of life or not. Because many of our friends, when confronted with the question whether Taiwan would get recognition at the same time as the People's Republic of China gets recognition and whether both of them are facts of life, would at once say that only the People's Republic of China is a fact of life and not Taiwan.

The main consideration of according recognition to a particular country is also not a question to be determined with any legalistic acumen. The question is one of political principle, or rather, not so much a question of principle as of policy. Therefore, the main question that should weigh with this Government today is whether at this period of time we should accord recognition to GDR. The learned mover, Prof. Mukerjee, while opening the debate, said that Pandit Nehru during his lifetime maintained very friendly relations with both the Federal Republic of Germany and the German Democratic Republic although, during his long period of premiership, recognition was not accorded to the German Democratic Republic in spite of our great and intimate friendship with the GDR. Now, the most question today is whether after the death of Pandit Nehru things have changed in such a manner that there is an essential necessity or urgency for revising that policy. I think that the main consideration which weighed with us at least during the lifetime of Pandit Nehru was that there was at least some hope that some day or other the two Germanys will unite and then it will not be necessary to make a choice, whether we should recognise both the countries. Although the possibility of the two

[Shri Sradhakar Supakar]

Germanys uniting is rather remote, it cannot be ruled out altogether.

Having regard to all these considerations, I think there is no necessity of India's revising the policy which it has adhered to for more than 20 years at present and giving recognition to GDR.

SHRI J. B. KRIPALANI (Guna) : Sir, I am afraid that the arguments advanced have nothing to do with the real facts. Some people have argued that the Government of India must recognise facts. I would ask Prof. Mukerjee whether he would plead for the recognition of Formosa and Israel ? He will hesitate and say that those are not States ; they do not exist. But so far as East Germany is concerned, it is a fact of history, as he put it. Others have argued that we have a growing trade with East Germany, that we have a favourable balance of trade with East Germany while with West Germany we have an adverse balance of trade, as if recognition and non-recognition depend upon favourable or unfavourable balance of trade. If we were to think in these terms, we have an adverse balance of trade with every country in Europe, with Japan, America, Canada and Australia. Shall we therefore break off connections with those countries ? I am only answering their arguments.

Some have said that we must follow in the foot-steps of Jawaharlal Nehru so far as foreign policy is concerned. I am afraid Jawaharlal Nehru had no fixed foreign policy. As a matter of fact, he had no foreign policy. He did what he thought proper at a particular time. On one occasion he said, taking arms from America or Russia would be joining that bloc. Afterwards, when we were invaded by China, he had no hesitation to take arms from America and England. Not only that, as one Congressman pointed out a year back, he had no hesitation to ask President Kennedy to send a portion of his fleet to the Bay of Bengal.

So far as Mr. Piloo Mody's idea that Germany wishes to unite is concerned, if it wishes to unite, I do not suppose our recognition or non-recognition would stop it from uniting. Germany will unite ; there is no doubt about it. But that has

nothing to do with the problem before us.

SHRI PILOO MODY : It will help in the process.

SHRI J. B. KRIPALANI : I do not think so. There are other forces which will decide it. Whether somebody recognises Pakistan or not, do you think there will be union between India and Pakistan ? These depend upon so many international and internal circumstances. If the people have the will to unite they will unite if not today tomorrow and nobody can stop them. I suppose nobody can stop Germany from uniting. This is a fact of life.

18.00 hrs.

[Mr. Deputy-Speaker in the Chair]

SHRI AMRIT NAHATA : Then it will be a socialist Germany.

SHRI J. B. KRIPALANI : I did not talk about socialism. It is no use talking about it. I am sure that America is more socialist than India. In spite of the Congress boasting that they are going to establish socialism here, the people are starving. They have not two square meals a day. They do not want radios, refrigerators and other such things, do you think they are bothering about your ideology of socialism ? Your socialism cannot give them bread, it only gives them words, it is not worth the name. So far as socialism you are talking of is concerned, Europe is more socialist ? There was revolt in Hungary. There was revolt in Poland.

There was revolt in eastern Germany. There is revolt in Rumania now. Are these free governments ? Have they been chosen by the people ? Do the people want them ? You say that America is sitting on South Vietnam. But you do not see that Russia is sitting on these nations. It was Russian army that put down the revolt in all these countries. So it is not a question of socialism. I have no doubt that these eastern European countries are not free today. Revolution is going on even in Czechoslovakia. There-

fore, that is not the question. The balance of payment is not the question.

But it must be admitted that generally the *de facto* governments should be recognised. But in that the Communist friends would not admit the recognition of Taiwan though Taiwan has developed more than other Asiatic countries. Chiang-Kai-shek was the only man during the war who said that India must be granted freedom. He was at that time our greatest friend, the greatest friend of Nehru. People have got to be consistent. I would like Shri Mukerjee to tell me here and now whether he would like the recognition of Formosa.

This question must be left to the Government, what policy it has followed in the past, what policy it wants to follow in the future and what is in our interest. I think this whole discussion has been futile. There is no basis at all. It is based on false premises. We have said many things that are inconsistent. My Congress friends said that America and Russia are coming together and there is no cold war. If there is no cold war why is our Government still swearing by non-alignment? Non-alignment means that we do not align ourselves with one bloc or the other. But when both the blocheads have come together where is the necessity of non-alignment. Non-alignment has no basis today as it originated. So all these arguments are beside the point. If we want to recognise governments that exist whether they are people's governments or not we have to recognise them all or some as it suits our national interest. Our Minister asked me "whom are we afraid of when we do not recognise Israel?" I cannot answer it in this House because the press reporters are sitting here, they will simply report it and our enemies will take advantage of it. If he wants to know, I will inform him about whom are we afraid of in recognising Israel.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : When Shri Nahata said both Germanys will unite he meant they will live in peace together, as you and Suchetaji are united, though differing in views. That was his implication.

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA (Alipore) : Mr. Deputy-Speaker, I would not have

asked even for one minute but I was provoked by Shri Pilo Mody, my dear friend, whose record in school is not known to me, unfortunately, but I may say that he must have got very poor marks in history. I only want to put the record straight. In the first place, it is not a fact that the German Democratic Republic was set up as a State first and then only the Federal Republic was set up. The actual facts are just the opposite. It was in September 1949 that the American, British and French zones were consolidated into one and set up as a Federal Republic and it was only after that, as a reaction to that, that the G. D. R. was set up. That is point No. 1

Secondly, the Potsdam Agreement, to which he referred several times, consists of some political principles and 9-point economic principles. The essence of both the sets of principles is that Nazism must be eradicated from the post-war Germany. They have spelt it out in detail. The whole point which I would like to know from Shri Bhagat is why the Government of India is so much enamoured of that Government in Germany which is consistently violating those basic tenets of the Potsdam Agreement that Nazism must be eradicated when they were allowing all the political leaders and military leaders who believe in Nazism to remain in power in West Germany when they are assisting the armament producers of Hitler like Krupp and Thyssen to produce more such armaments.

Then, in terms of my amendment, I would like the hon. Minister to make it clear as to what is their latest stand regarding the statements of Pandit Nehru and Prime Minister Shrimati Indira Gandhi regarding the existence of two Germanys. Why do they admit it only in a shame-faced way by the backdoor? Why are they not prepared to say openly whether they stand by it or they do not stand by it? Let them say something once for all. This kind of behaviour before the world is only making us a laughing stock.

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS (SHRI B. R. BHAGAT) : Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, I very much appreciate the sentiments and the arguments expressed on this Resolution by the Mover of the Resolution. He has put his case in a

[Shri B. R. Bhagat]

cogent manner, in a restrained manner and he has kept the perspective. But, I am sorry, some of the other hon. friends, who intervened have introduced elements which are irrelevant and extraneous. Probably, the hon. Member who provoked them was Shri Piloo Mody who unnecessarily brought in those considerations which do not exist and thus provoked the last hon. Member, Shri Indrajit Gupta, to make a speech. He is perfectly right in what he said. But I do not know what he expects me to say by expressing an opinion on the political situation of West Germany.

SHRI PILOO MODY : That hon. Member has used me only to accuse you. A simple strategy you do not understand after 20 years of government.

SHRI B. R. BHAGAT : I thank Shri Piloo Mody for enlightening me.

Similarly, we heard here doctrines on which a country should be recognised although Shri Bal Raj Madhok said in a simple way that any nation which exists has to be recognised; therefore, for that matter the GDR should be recognised, Israel should be recognised and Taiwan should be recognised. He forgets that we recognise Israel and so there is no question of recognising Israel. Also, the question of Formosa is not a question of recognition; the dispute is as to who represents China in the United Nations. I think, any man with commonsense will know that...*(Interruption)*. That is why I say that these are irrelevant issues and some of them are not issues at all.

SHRI SAMAR GUHA (Contai) : You are making confusion worse confounded.

SHRI B. R. BHAGAT : Where is confusion? Do we not recognise Israel? We have recognised Israel. Where is the confusion? We recognise Israel but we do not have diplomatic relations with Israel. That may be a different thing. We may or may not have diplomatic relations with any country we choose. But this does not mean that GDR and Israel are on the same footing. Therefore, the confusion is not on this side; the confusion is on the other side. Naturally, in

a matter like this if you bring other issues and larger issues—I do not say that they are not important issues; each one of them may be very important issues—but if you bring them to bear on this question, the difficulty comes in.

I would deal with the basic questions that the hon. Member, Shri Hiren Mukerjee, has raised. I would like to recapitulate the basis of the attitude and the policy that we followed. The name of the revered leader, Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, has been brought in very rightly by the hon. Member. I do not know why Shri Bal Raj Madhok should be provoked to say some not very complimentary remarks about him.

SHRI BAL RAJ MADHOK : I did not say anything uncomplimentary.

SHRI B. R. BHAGAT : You are in a minority of one in the House. He or the party he belongs to may have prominence today, but the whole country before independence, during the ethos of independence and after, and the society that we are building up will be grateful and owe a debt of gratitude to him.

SHRI BAL RAJ MADHOK : Do not bind us then. *(Interruption)*

SHRI PILOO MODY : After saying that extraneous issues have been brought in, he says this. I cannot see what is more extraneous than what he says.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : I hope, Shri Piloo Mody is serious.

SHRI PILOO MODY : I am. I hope, the Minister withdraws his remarks.

SHRI B. R. BHAGAT : It is not extraneous. The policy of Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru on this question is being questioned. That is very relevant.

Therefore I only say that people of our generation, people who have fought for the independence of the country and people who have worked for bringing in a new society that we want, have been brought up in the tradition of Nehru,

SHRI SAMAR GUHA : At the same time people will not forget that he was the main architect of dividing the motherland .. (*Interruption*)

SHRI B. R. BHAGAT : Many things may have happened which we may not like... (*Interruption*)

SHRI BAL RAJ MADHOK : Go by what the country's interest demands. I said, forget Nehru and remember the country.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : By arguments you cannot alter his speech.

SHRI PILOO MODY : Let me make it clear that whatever the Minister may feel about this, he must accept the fact that there are a great many people in the House who do not feel that way and he has no reason to impose his opinion on all of us.

SHRI B. R. BHAGAT : I said that he is in the minority of one.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : It is his viewpoint ; they are in the minority.

SHRI PILOO MODY : But he says that it is viewpoint.

SHRI BAL RAJ MADHOK : He has got only 39 per cent of the votes. He is in a minority, not we... (*Interruption*)

SHRI B. R. BHAGAT : It will be a bad day when it happens. I can assure the hon. Member that it is not going to happen. A very large majority of this country will continue to follow the traditions of Pandit Nehru.

SHRI BAL RAJ MADHOK : See in a few years... (*Interruption*)

SHRI B. R. BHAGAT : After all, millions of people have suffered for shaping and building this country and their sufferings are not to go in vain.

SHRI BAL RAJ MADHOK : I resent. We have respect for all. Nehru was not the only man. Don't single him out ; don't do injustice to that man... (*Interruption*)

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : Order, order. You must understand. What he says has nothing to do with the Congress. There may be people in the Congress who may not follow the Nehru traditions. That is not the question.

SHRI B. R. BHAGAT : I never brought in the Congress here.

SHRIMATI TARKESHWARI SINHA (Barh) : May I submit that the foreign policy enunciated by Nehru was unanimously carried by this House ? Therefore, there has been an approval of this entire House. Unfortunately, Shri Piloo Mody was not there at that time. Whatever foreign policy we had enunciated was the foreign policy approved by this House.

SHRI PILOO MODY : Let me make my position clear. She has made an allegation that I did not approve of the foreign policy. Jawaharlal Nehru was the Foreign Minister of this country and it was his right to enunciate whatever foreign policy he wanted to enunciate and it had the sanction of this House. I have no argument against it whatsoever. I want to make it quite clear, whether it was right or wrong, that it is a matter of policy on which there can be a difference of opinion and it so happens that we have differences of opinion between the Minister and us.

SHRI B. R. BHAGAT : I would like to quote Jawaharlal Nehru. The foreign policy of this country was laid down by him. My hon. friend also referred to it. This remains basically our policy today in this matter. This is what he said on 17th August, 1961 in this very House. I quote :

"The fact of the matter is that we have been continuing to recognise the West German Government even before it became the West German Government. It is a war-time continuation, so it has continued. Of course, otherwise too we might have to recognise it, but it is a continuing thing. Now, since the East German Government came in, there has been talk of conflict, talk of two Germanys uniting or something else happening, and we have felt, therefore, that if we took that step it may rather come in othe

[Shri B. R. Bhagat]

way of this developing situation rather than help it."

Then, he goes on to say :

"De facto, we recognise it. They have now a Trade Representation here and we are dealing with them in many ways."

So, this is the basic policy that has been laid down and this continues today. This governs the attitude that we took with regard to the German question.

SHRI UMANATH (Pudukkottai) :

That was at the time when certain anticipations were there.

SHRI B. R. BHAGAT : Why don't you hear me fully ? I am aware of all those things. I am going to deal with them. Please have a little patience.

Sir, repeatedly, the spokesmen of the Government, various Foreign Ministers, have underlined this foreign policy. What is the situation today ? The policy underline is that we have good relations with West Germany. We are also expanding relations with German Democratic Republic which the hon. Member has rightly emphasized. We have cultural relations, we have trade relations and we are expanding trade relations. There are various other relations. With the passage of time, it has demonstrated unmistakably that the attitude our leader Jawaharlal Nehru had taken in this respect was the correct attitude. The hon. Member refers to the situation at that time. Today, Vietnam has become a very focal point on which the issue of war and peace hinges. At that time, Berlin was there; Germany was there. Therefore, as the situation prevailed at that time, we took a line that we would try to take an attitude by which a peaceful solution is helped and that we would not try to create more tensions in our attitude, whether it is unification of Germany, whether there is existence of two Germanys as following their own traditions and that, about the question of European security, firstly, the European countries themselves, the two super powers, the Soviet Union and the USA, should be persuaded to follow a line

so that this solution is arrived at peacefully. It should not be that it should become a focal point in a world war. So, basically, our approach at that time was this, and we have followed that policy of friendship. The hon. Mover himself has pointed out how our friendship has grown...

SHRI INDER J. MALHOTRA : The hon. Minister was talking of the situation in 1961. What about the situation in 1968 ? Let him say something about that also.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : I had allotted to the hon. Minister only 10 minutes. Already, 12 minutes have elapsed. Now, let him try to conclude.

SHRI B. R. BHAGAT : I would not take more than five to seven minutes, if I am allowed to continue without interruptions.

We have to recognise this fact that this is a very complicated question, and we have to pursue a policy by which we must try to attain our objectives. I agree with the sentiments expressed here; there is similarity in our objectives. But the question is what policy we should follow and what postures we should adopt.

I assure the House that we shall certainly take into consideration the views expressed by the different hon. Members, and also the new situation that has arisen, namely the fact that West Germany itself is trying to build up closer relationship with the countries of Eastern Europe. They have themselves taken the initiative.

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA : So, he is depending on West Germany's attitude.

SHRI B. R. BHAGAT : It is not that; it is wrong always to emphasise that in our attitude we are depending upon someone else; in this world, everybody is dependent on everybody else. We have to take note of the situation that is developing. A new situation is emerging. We shall take into consideration all the

and we are actually taking them into consideration.

Our present position is like this. India's relations with the GDR have been developing favourably on a *de facto* basis. We have good trading relations with each other which are mutually beneficial. We are both interested in the further expansion and the process has already commenced. We have participated in their trade fairs and exhibitions as they do so in ours. Other contacts are also progressing. Recently, the Foreign Minister of the GDR spent a few days in our country and we had an opportunity of meeting him and having useful talks with him.

The question raised in the hon. Member's resolution is a very delicate one. This is a matter of great international importance, and it would not be advisable to take a hasty course of action which might add to the existing tensions and upset the balance. We keep our relations with the GDR constantly under review in the light of the developing European political situation and also with a view to expanding the scope of our mutually beneficial contacts and exchanges which take a variety of forms.

We have taken careful note of the views expressed in the House on this issue and we shall keep them in mind in the further— I would emphasise this very much—development of our relations with the G. D. R. I give this assurance, and I would request that since this is a matter on which most of the people are agreed and there is a consensus, the hon. Member may not press this resolution.

SHRI H. N. MUKERJEE ; I am very grateful to the House for having given such very wide support to the resolution which I had brought forward. I wish I could say that I do genuinely appreciate whatever difficulties hinder the hon. Minister from coming forward more openly, as I think he ought to, to associate himself with the fairly well expressed opinion of the House, but he says he has his difficulties and I have to take him at that.

I am sorry that the seriousness of the discussion was to a certain extent vitiated by the intervention of a Member who is popular with us all and who, whenever he speaks, reminds me of what was said in

Sanskrit, namely : '*Amritam bala-labhamitam*', because I had an idea that we did not usually take his observations too seriously.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : The hon. Member may better translate the Sanskrit quotation.

SHRI H. N. MUKERJEE : It means that whatever is said by a child is nectar. I do not know why he chose to deliver himself of his pet views, the result being that a mouse came out of a mountain. In the radiant light of a world where Viet Nam has shown how the most powerful and prosperous country in the world cannot defeat the forces of liberty ; the mouse of anti-communism which hides its head in a hole came out only in order to disturb the proceedings of this debate.

I was asked also by some venerable members like Acharya Kripalani : 'Do you do this ? What do you say in regard to the recognition of Taiwan ?' Of course, I say, 'No, it is not necessary for us, it is not in conformity with principle for us to recognise Taiwan'. But in so far as the G.D.R. is concerned, I have no time to repeat what I have said earlier that on principle as well as for practical reasons we should do it. The only reason which used to hinder Jawaharlal Nehru, as far as we could understand him, was that recognition of G. D. R. at that particular point of time—which was 1961 might bedevil the waters of European politics and, therefore, we should not do anything hastily. But seven years have passed. Do we contribute to the idea of European security by recognising the Bonn Republic and not recognising G. D. R. ? How do we help it ? It does not help it.

That is why I say it is necessary that we do something in this regard. Besides, in view of the growing cultural, commercial and other relations between our two countries which are beneficial to us, it is most important that we do not humiliate G. D. R. virtually by refusing to recognise it.

For instance, their Ministers who come here cannot travel on the kind of passport which you carry with you when you go abroad. This is a sort of thing which should be put an end to. There is no reason why we should not recognise G.D.R.

[Shri H. N. Mukerjee]

and, therefore, I feel the Government should shed its hesitations.

But my purpose in bringing this Resolution was to bring this matter under the scrutiny of the House. It is extremely gratifying that members of the House from different parts of the House have expressed themselves in favour of the Resolution for one reason or for another. Even the Minister has suggested, even though in a halting way, that he has sympathy with the idea of the Resolution, and he cannot go any farther.

I am sorry the Prime Minister is disabled, by her having gone to Bhutan or Sikkim or somewhere up in the Himalayas to be present here. If she had been here, we possibly might have got her to make a more definitive pronouncement in regard to some tentative steps which they can take. At least they can open a State Trading Corporation office in a very different way than they are doing at the present moment. He has not suggested one single concrete step which would be a step in the direction of recognition in the near future.

That is why while I am disappointed with his speech, I do not propose to press this Resolution, because I do not wish to let idea abroad that the House does not support it. The House does support it and that is why I do not press it.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : There are two amendments. Does Shri Nahata wish to press his amendment ?

SHRI AMRIT NAHATA : While I would seek the leave of the House to withdraw my amendment, I would point out to the hon. Minister that when I said that the argument advanced against recognition of GDR is a complicated matter, the hon. Minister interrupted 'Who says it ?' He himself has said it.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : Has he the leave of the House to withdraw his amendment ?

Amendment No. 1 was, by leave, withdrawn.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : Shri Indrajit Gupta is not here. I will put his amendment to vote.

*Half-An-Hour discussion.

SHRI UMANATH : when the amendment is not pressed, why should it be put to vote ?

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : The procedure is clear. What can I do ? He is not here. That is the trouble. Otherwise, he would have sought leave of the house to withdraw it.

I shall put it to the vote of the House. *The Amendment No. 2 was put and negatived.*

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : Has the hon. Member leave of the House to withdraw his resolution ?

The Resolution was, by leave, withdrawn.

18.30 hrs.

RESOLUTION RE : POSTS IN CIVIL AND MILITARY DEPARTMENTS

SHRIMATI TARKESHWARI SINHA (Barh) : I move :

"This House is of opinion that with a view to ensure efficiency and economy, a high-powered committee be appointed to examine the question of creation of highly paid posts and selection of personnel in the Civil and Military Departments, including the existing procedure obtaining in regard thereto."

SHRI D. N. TIWARY (Gopalganj) : The next Resolution also should be allowed to be moved.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : No ; there is no provision. We shall now take up half an hour discussion.

18.31 hrs.

*PRICES OF IMPORTED NEWSPRINT

SHRI K. M. KUSHIK (Chanda) : It cannot be denied that the newsprint produced in our country is scanty and we have been importing it from foreign countries every year.