

[Dr. Sarojini Mahishi]

Minister of Tourism and Civil Aviation had stated that the trainees who had obtained their Private Pilot's Licence and had done 150 hours of flying on 31st March, 1970 had been permitted to avail of subsidised flying up to the maximum limit of 250 hours subject to the usual conditions. The correct date, however, is 31st March, 1971 and not 31st March 1970. This was a typographical error and is very much regretted.

13.03 hrs.

STATEMENT CORRECTING ANSWER
TO SUPPLEMENTRY ON S Q. No.
1534 RE SETTING UP OF
NEW LARGE SCALE
PROJECTS IN
PUNJAB

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT (SHRI GHANSHYAM OZA): While replying to a Supplementary Question put by Shri B. K. Daschowdhury on Starred Question No. 1534 for 3.8.1971 tabled by Shri Prabhudas Patel and Shri P. Gangadeb for answer on the 3rd August, 1971, I regret to say that I inadvertently mentioned that 9 applications for setting up of new undertakings in the State of Punjab were received by my Ministry in the year 1970 and 10 applications for the same purpose were received during 1971 (upto 30.6.1971). I would like to correct these figures. According to the information available to me 36 applications were received by my Ministry for the setting up of new undertakings in Punjab in the year 1970 and 15 applications in the year 1971, upto the 30th June.

I would like to add that 19 letters of intent and one licence were issued to various parties for the setting up of new undertakings in the State of Punjab during the year 1970 and in the first half of 1971.

I would be grateful if Members take note of this change of information.

13.05 hrs.

MOTION RE: STATEMENT OF MINISTER OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS ON INDO-SOVIET TREATY OF PEACE, FRIENDSHIP AND COOPERATION

THE MINISTER OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS (SHRI SWARAN SINGH): Sir, I beg to move :

“That the Statement made by the Minister of External Affairs in the Lok Sabha on the 9th August, 1971 regarding the Treaty of Peace, Friendship and Cooperation between the Republic of India and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, be taken into consideration.”

I have no intention to make any opening speech because I would like to leave more time to the hon. Members to make their observations. I have already made a statement giving the salient features of the Treaty and I would take the opportunity of replying to any points that might be raised in the course of the discussion.

MR. SPEAKER : Motion moved :

“That the Statement made by the Minister of External Affairs in the Lok Sabha on the 9th August, 1971, regarding the Treaty of Peace, Friendship and Cooperation between the Republic of India and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, be taken into consideration.”

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE (Gwalior) : Sir, how much time is allotted for the discussion.

MR. SPEAKER: We could not meet in any Business Advisory Committee. I think we should not place any hard and fast limit.

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE : According to the Order Paper discussion on the working of the nationalised banks is to be taken up at 4 p.m. It should be shifted.

MR. SPEAKER : You do not want to take up that item today.

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE :
Tomorrow, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER : I am told we have already approved agenda for tomorrow. It has already gone. So, I cannot commit for tomorrow because I have already fixed the business for tomorrow. We will think over it as to when and where to put it.

I will look into the business and see that it is fixed somewhere during the coming days.

SHRI A. K. GOPALAN (Paighat) :
Mr. Speaker, Sir, we welcome this treaty between the Soviet Union and India. This treaty comes in the background of the threat of aggression by Pakistan which has been armed to the teeth by American imperialism with the latest modern weapons. Even the terrible genocide in Bangla Desh has not influenced the USA to discontinue the supply of arms to Pakistan.

We attach particular importance to articles 3, 6 and 9 of the treaty. With regard to article 6, it provides for the further development of trade on the basis of the most-favoured-nation treatment. We hope that this will enable us to change the present pattern of our primary dependence hitherto on the Western powers. It is this dependence and the loans and aids such as we got from them that hampered our independent growth and led to a series of collaboration agreements between the monopolists of our country and of the other countries. India suffered tremendously by reason of unequal trade terms as well as by the attempts of the imperialists to pass on the burdens caused by the inflationary pressures acting in the USA and various European countries on to our shoulders and of other developing countries. We hope that this position will now improve for the better as a result of our taking concrete steps in faithful implementation of the terms of article 6.

Article 3 says ;

“.....the High Contracting Parties condemn colonialism and racialism in all forms and manifestations and reaffirm their determination to strive for their final and complete elimination.”

It continues :

“The High Contracting Parties shall co-operate with other States to achieve these aims and to support just aspirations of the peoples in their struggle against colonialism and social domination.”

This is the essence of article 3. It is important.

The recent publication in America of the Pentagon papers has clearly exposed the designs of US imperialism to impose its aggression not only on Vietnam but on entire Indo-China comprising Laos and Cambodia as well. US imperialism has prevented the unification of Korea. Its neo-colonialist ambitions in South-East Asia are well known. It was America that broke the Geneva agreement regarding Indo-China in bringing about which our country played an important part. It was due to American pressure that in the war in Vietnam we claimed to have a neutral attitude and called for the withdrawal of all foreign troops from the soil of Vietnam instead of making the forthright demand that US troops must quit. It was US inspired Israeli aggression that was responsible for menacing peace, security and independence of the Arab States.

We hope that after this treaty, no vacillations or wobbings will be there in our foreign policy. We hope that the India Government will aid this process of elimination of colonialism by the immediate recognition of the Peoples' Revolutionary Government of South Vietnam and the Sihanouk Government of Cambodia.

We also hope and demand that all American troops must completely be withdrawn from Vietnam and leave the people of Vietnam to settle the problems as far as their country is concerned.

Although we played an important role in Korea, we have acquiesced in the occupation of South Korea by US even today. US imperialists are preventing the unification of Korea. We should accord full diplomatic recognition to North Korea at ambassadorial level and demand also the withdrawal of U.S. troops from South Korea.

[Shri A. K. Gopalan]

There is no trade with Cuba now. I do not know what is the reason. There also, we hope that after this treaty we will improve relations and have better relations with that country also.

So, after a long delay, the Government of India have taken a step to accord diplomatic recognition to the German Democratic Republic but only at Consular level. With regard to the Federal Republic of Germany however, we have diplomatic recognition at Ambassadorial level. There is a discrimination between the two. This discrimination must go.

Coming to article 9, there is clear declaration that the USSR will abstain from giving armed assistance to any country at war with us and that is welcome. We trust that the terms of this article will act as a deterrent to the sabre-rattling of Yahya Khan talking of unleashing a war on India. This in our opinion removes also one of the biggest hurdles for the immediate recognition of the Government of Bangla Desh by the Government of India. Legally, we are entitled to recognise the Bangla Desh Government. Ninety-nine percent of the people there, by supporting the Awami League, have already expressed their desire and aspirations of the people. Till the West Pakistani Army came in strength, it was Mujibur Rahman's writ that ran in Bangla Desh and not that of Yahya Khan. Hence, I request the Government of India that Bangla Desh be immediately recognised and all help given to end military rule of Yahya Khan in Bangla Desh.

This treaty is not an end in itself. As one of the parties, we are also a big Asian country. In the spirit of this treaty, our relations with our Asian neighbours must be greatly strengthened. In this connection, I want to point out what the Foreign Minister said recently about improving our relations with China. I quote what he said in the Rajya Sabha :

"Whatever may be present differences, we do not take any rigid view in this respect, and depending upon proper response, we are even prepared to create conditions for the improvement of relations.

This is our general attitude and approach and we will continue to adhere to that policy."

This is what he said and, I hope, specially, after this treaty, the Government will see that they adhere to this policy and do something in that matter.

Lastly, I would say that treaties are not enough commendable as they might be. Our country's strength will depend ultimately on the building of independent economy and strengthen it. We have seen China grow in two decades into a powerful country. We too can develop our industrial and defence capacity. This can be done only by not depending on imperialist positions that grip our economy by radical land reforms, by curbing monopoly and by going in for industrialisation in a big way and by removing the poverty of our people and strengthening our economy.

As far as this pact is concerned, welcoming the pact, again, I wish to point out to the Government that these things must be remembered. The strength of our country does not depend only on pacts but depends on our own economic strength.

SHRI S. D. SHARMA (Bhopal) : Mr. Speaker, Sir, I rise to congratulate the Government for achieving this land-mark in our foreign policy. It is an important land-mark. Of course, though it is a land-mark, it is in continuation of our policy. It in no way changes our policy.

I have heard some remarks that we have abandoned our policy of non-alignment. Our policy of non-alignment was at no time a negative policy. It has always been a dynamic policy adjusting itself to the circumstances of the situation. No country having its own interest in mind can take rigid attitudes. This thing has been reiterated by our Government and, before we came in the Government, by our Party in resolutions after resolutions. While going through this treaty I was reminded of the resolution passed by the Indian National Congress at Calcutta in 1928. In 1928 itself we made it clear that our policy will be to stand for the people who are oppressed, our policy will be to see that peace is strengthened and our policy will be that

we do not get entangled or we do not subordinate our foreign policy to any power bloc, however strong it may be.

Now, so far as this question of non-alignment is concerned, it is very interesting that we find that those who were criticising us for abandoning the policy of non-alignment are those very people who are making fun of us for following the policy of non-alignment. We have heard time and again that India has no friends, India's policy has led us into a position where we are friendless. Of course, we know that these people may be aggrieved because we have not gone into a policy or adopted a policy where we would subordinate our interests to the interests of capitalist nations. At the present moment, I know that they dare not say that because the whole world is seeing that at the present moment, the United States of America whose voice we heard here at time through our own representatives, is acting in a manner which is condemned by Indians from whatever walk of life they will be coming from. This is, I am specifically speaking, because at the present moment even the big capitalists of India dare not support what is being done by the United States of America. Of course, we know that their action is the logical conclusion of the policy which is being followed at the dictates of the pentagon by the leaders of America and which is followed by them at the dictates of the ornament manufacturers. Naturally, a country which depends on or which specialises in arms and selling of arms to other nations is not a country which can be interested in peace. Secondly, no Indian has been taken by surprise because we have been told time and again that the United States of America stands for and has stood for peace and has stood for the oppressed. We find that in the case of the Bangla Desh they are supplying arms. Of course, in the beginning we were told that no arms will be supplied to Pakistan. Then, we were told that arms were being supplied because these agreements have been reached earlier and they are being fulfilled. Now they have even stopped telling that. Under these conditions and under these circumstances, our country has taken the right step. We have entered into an agreement with a neighbouring

country which believes in ending colonialism which believes in socialism and which has at time stood for the oppressed people and with whom we have found our policy being similar.

Sometimes when our critics were talking about our siding with Russia, it was replied by our Prime Minister. Why do you talk our siding with Russia? Why not think in terms that Russia has sided with us? There have been occasions when we and Russia have voted together or acted together...*(Interruptions)*

SHRI SAMAR GUHA (Contai) : Don't you know the Newton's Law of Gravitation?

MR. SPEAKER : No please.

SHRI S. D. SHARMA : These have been the cases where we have stood by the oppressed people. Now, at the present moment when India is convinced with our policy of standing together with the oppressed people, the oppressed people of Bangla Desh, it has taken an approach and has taken a decision to support the oppressed people. The USA and certain other countries started trying to equate these two countries, trying to show that this is conflict between India and Pakistan.

They even suggested that there should be Observers posted on the borders of India and of Bangla Desh, their objective being very clear, namely, they have been thinking to stop the Bangla Desh fighters from acting on the border. It is natural. I think that there should be no hesitation of our asserting that this whole House and the people of India, to every man, stand committed to helping the people of Bangla Desh who are fighting their battle for democracy, for secularism and for socialism and for better relations between the neighbouring countries of India and Bangla Desh. We will support them to the full. In that context, when this question came, there have been people talking about our finding it difficult. I would say that in this Agreement certain things have come out very clearly.

First of all, I would like to state that this Agreement supports our view that the oppressed people must be supported. This Agreement clearly lays down India's policy

[Shri S. D. Sharma]

of fighting against colonialism, which is a right policy.

In Bangla Desh, at the present moment, what is sought to be done by the military junta of Pakistan is nothing else other than military suppression and exploitation of the people of Bangla Desh. This Agreement brings this out clearly and I think this is an achievement of ours. Sometimes it has been said by some that it is a military pact. It is not so. It is not a military pact. As it is not a military pact, we have not deviated from our policy even a bit. In the military pact, it is usual to add clauses to the effect that in the case of aggression against one of the parties, the other party will automatically enter in the conflict. This Agreement does not provide for that. It provides that in the case of aggression or threat of aggression, there will be mutual consultation. The two countries will consult together and take effective steps, which can include supply of arms and by various other ways. But there is not that kind of automatic action on the part of the other party which is a pattern of the military pacts. There is also no question of a common command. So, from all these facts, it becomes very clear that it is not a case of any military pact.

Mr. A. K. Gopalan has rightly pointed that the emphasis has been rightly laid on development of economic relations. Our economic relations with Russia and the socialist countries have been growing continuously and by this Treaty they will grow further. There is no doubt about it. The clause relating to most-favoured nations is, I think, an achievement on the way we have been developing our relations so far as Russia is concerned. This will definitely improve in coming months. Our cultural relations should also improve. That has also been provided in this Treaty.

There are certain people who talked in terms of our having been aligned or of departing from our policy of non-alignment. There is no such thing here. We must remember what has been repeated time and again that our policy of non-alignment has been a policy whereby we will not subordinate our national interest to the interest of

any super-power, whatever it may be. This is the policy which has been followed, as I said, which was advocated by the Indian National Congress before Independence and this is what has been followed also ever since our Independence. It was in the year 1947, on 4th December, in this very House, in the Constituent Assembly, that Pandit Nehru made it clear :

“We propose to look after India's interests in the context of world cooperation and world peace.”

This sentence is very significant. We have made it clear that we will look to India's interests and we will look to world peace. Both are important. There is no question of subordinating one, namely India's interests in any way whatsoever. Pandit Nehru was very clear in his speech in the Constituent Assembly. He went on to say how India's interests would be seen, and he said :

“We are not going to join a war if we can help it and we are going to join the side which is to our interest when the time comes to make the choice. There, the matter ends.”

Consequently, we must remember that our policy of non-alignment is a policy which is in the national interests. He made it clear in 1948 again that we had adopted the policy of non-alignment not only on the idealistic plane but it was a practical policy which was in the national interests.

So far as this treaty is concerned, I would like to say that this is a treaty in the interests of our country. I think that in a way here the matter should end. We have taken this decision at a time when there was sabre-rattling going on by the military regime of Pakistan. We have taken this decision when India was being threatened by Yahya Khan. This should be a warning to Yahya Khan and this should be a warning to those who are instigating Pakistan in these actions. From this point of view, this should be welcome.

Of course, one thing more is there. We have made it clear that this is not directed

against any country whatever. We would like to enter into similar agreements with other countries. Consequently, I think that there could be no two opinions about the basic facts. The first is that this treaty is in the interests of India. The second is that this treaty has come at the right time when India was being threatened by its neighbour, and the third is that this treaty is in accordance with the basic policies which were adopted by our nation even before Independence when we were fighting for Independence. At that time, we said that we would stand for the oppressed people, and today we are standing for the oppressed people, and in the wake of it, whatever difficulties may come, we are going to face them, and in facing them here is a big power which comes to our help. This should be welcome. This is welcome. We do not want to sever our relations with any country whatsoever. There is no question of our relations with America deteriorating. They should really improve. Really speaking, it should be known to Mr. Nixon and Mr. Nixon should realise that the people of America are not with his policy. This is very clear inasmuch as he has tried to curb the statements by some of his colleagues. My personal feeling is that in this matter, Mr. Nixon is isolated, so far as the American public opinion is concerned. I hope that this treaty or agreement will have a sobering effect and as a result of this, Mr. Nixon, the leader of the USA may take a more realistic approach and give up his predilections in favour of Pakistan, which had been known even before he became the President of the USA.

Consequently, I congratulate the Government on this decision, and I hope that as a result of this, many more agreements will follow after this and the whole thing will serve the interests of peace in the world, for which India stands.

SHRI H. N. MUKERJEE (Calcutta-North-East) : Mr. Speaker, Sir, the Indo-Soviet Treaty of Peace, friendship and co-operation which has just been signed is a landmark in contemporary history. Speaking on behalf of my party, I consider it a privilege that we are enabled in our national forum to express our sense of happiness which I have no doubt is shared by the overwhelming majority of our people that this treaty has been brought about.

Our mind goes back the days before independence when radical opinion in this country had hitched its wagon to the red star of the Soviet Union. Those were days when Rabindranath Tagore, Prem Chand and Vallthai at one end and Jawaharlal Nehru at the other, were friends of the Soviet Union. When our country was in the throes of a freedom struggle which appeared to some people to be not quite in conformity with the international policies of the Soviet Union, our national leadership never hesitated to point out that the Soviets were a precious asset in world politics which this country wanted to cherish to the best possible extent.

I remember also—because it is something which cannot be forgotten—how a short while before our independence, in late 1945, when at San Francisco there was a conference to inaugurate the United Nations Organisation India was represented by a few nominees of the British Government who had gone, to speak, in the baggage of the British Government, but on that occasion the Soviet representative, M. Molotov, had made a speech in which he said that the day was not going to be distant when independent India would take her place in the UN. I remember this because it was related to me by Shrimati Vijaylakhmi Pandit who was present on that occasion and she told me that when she heard those words, she could not resist tears welling into her eyes. It was a declaration by a power which was the victor in the anti-fascist war that its sympathies, as ever, with the independence aspirations of the Indian people.

We know also how after our achievement of independence, when we discovered our western patrons, the big-monied countries, were interested in carrying on their policies of exploitations in a different way, when we discovered that they wanted to retain us in a state of planned backwardness in the context of their metropolitan economy, it was the Soviet and other socialist countries which had come into the picture, largely on account of the Soviets having been there on the world map, and began to offer us the kind of economic assistance which enabled us to build the basic aspects of our economic structure. That is why we have discovered the Soviet

[Shri H. N. Mukherjee]

Union assisting us. It was her interest to see an India always free and growing; it was the interest of the Soviet Union to see that India developed in such a fashion that we have a socialist society in this part of the world; therefore, it was natural for the Soviet Union to assist us in building our economy. So we found that in the department of iron and steel, in the sphere of oil exploration and production, in the field of heavy machinery building, in the aspect of basic chemicals, in agriculture on a large scale, as in the Surajgarh Farm, and in so many other ways, the Soviets came forward to assist us so that we could develop our economy and make it so powerful that we would not be at the mercy of those elements in the international life which tried to make mincemeat of the kind of freedom that we enjoyed.

We have found, therefore, in the Soviet Union, a friend, a friend in need which has been a friend indeed, a friend who helped us over Kashmir, over Goa and over very many other aspects, whenever we were in difficulty, and our difficulty was caused not because we were wrong but because we were put in a corner by the vested interests in big money circles in international affairs. It was the Soviet Union which came forward to assist us. That is the background which we today remember.

We may have had our differences from time to time and this country being an independent country, where live one in every five of the world's population, it is not always easy to see in the same manner as a big power like the Soviet Union or the United States. That is a different matter. But we have discovered in the Soviet Union a friend which stood by us in fair weather and in foul, and that is why today there is a special, added significance to the Indo-Soviet treaty of peace, friendship and co-operation.

It is also, as the Minister said yesterday, a treaty of non-aggression, and it provides a creditable assurance that in the event of an attack or a threat of an attack, the contracting parties shall immediately consult each other in order to remove such a threat and to take appropriate effective measures to ensure peace and the security of their

countries. We know how this country has gone through searing experience; this country has seen perfidy of an order which perhaps to many of us was not quite imaginable before. This country has seen over the issue of Bangla Desh where unarmed people were being put to the sword, tortured and killed in a manner defies every canon of humanity. We have seen how over the issue of Bangla Desh, there has come about the collusion, a calculated, conscious connivance between the United States and Pakistan, joined today by China with a perverse sense of partnership in a sort of international guilt which should not have besmirched the escutcheon of a socialist country. But we have found this kind of thing happening.

We have found particularly in the United States, imperialists who have been the international gendarmes of reaction and who have kept their bases in different parts of the world in order to maintain their supremacy and their hegemony all over our globe. We have seen the United States sipping in our cup and dipping in our dish and intervening in our affairs in every imaginable manner that was open to them. We have seen the United States also professing to be friendly, talking to the Foreign Minister in a manner which was completely repudiated by their action when they gave Pakistan a sort of diabolic assistance to be utilised against the wonderful freedom urge of the people of Bangla Desh with whom we have declared in this Parliament our solidarity and our complete sympathy.

So, we had gone through a period of spiritual searing of the soul. We have seen these imperialist powers in action. We have seen how even when their people were roused to a consciousness of the enormity that was being perpetrated by the yahoos of Yahya Khan, even then, the great powers like the United States and the United Kingdom could not do a single thing in order to assist the movement in Bangla Desh, but on the contrary, could assist those barbarians in power in Islamabad, who are not only endangering the security of our country but who are besmirching the entire idea of civilisation.

That was the experience to which we have been witness, and that is why we discover that we have to have a friend who

would come to our need and we knew that in the Soviet Union we had a friend who is ready all the time to assist us to the extent that was possible.

I know that our strength has ultimately to be our own strength. We can never rely on others whoever it might be, but of course, friendship is important; if civilisation has any meaning, if human intercourse has any kind of qualitative aspect, friendship is important. We rely on our own strength; there is no doubt about it. We are an enormous country; we have a country with a stupendous civilisation to make ourselves proud of our past and to make us confident about the kind of future that we shall build.

We know at the same time that we carry too heavy a load because we are an old and complicated country. Our country is old, our civilisation is old, our land is tired with the cultivation of four to five thousand years. We know that in every way we are an entire country, but at the same time we are a country which has a tremendous future, and we have to build our own future on the basis of our own strength, there is no getting away from it. We are not a country to be taken for granted by any country, whichever it might be. We are a country which is going to build a self-reliant economy and that sort of thing, but that can only be done in the conditions of the modern age, amid the restless technological engines of today, by a process of friendly intercourse. And friendship is possible with those whom we can trust. And as far as our international experience is concerned, we can trust the Soviet Union. They have stood by us in fair whether and in foul, and they are ready to assist us, and they have shown it by their conduct. They have assisted us, they have helped us to build our own independent structure of economy even in so far as our military strength is concerned. No other country has come forward, has shown the least little inkling of coming forward, to help us build our independent economy, independent in military production as well as in every other sphere of economic production. They have done it, and that is why we look upon them as friends whom we can trust, and, therefore, I would like to second what my hon. friend Shri Gopalan has said.

Now that Government has entered into this treaty, this treaty of friendship, of co-operation, of non-aggression, a treaty which is in entire conformity with our principle of non-alignment, a treaty which does not make us play a subordinate role to anybody, a treaty which has nothing in it of the nature of a subsidiary alliance which is a feature of even the P. L. 430 Pact which we signed with the United States, a treaty which is between independent partners all on a level of equality, now that we have got this treaty, and now that the headache over the Pakistani-engineered crisis in regard to the Bangla Desh issue has to some extent been mollified, now that we feel that we are not without friends even when there is a threat of war and we have to counter it entirely on the basis of our own strength which happens to be not very large, now that we have got this treaty, let us shed our approach of cold feet in regard to many matters. We have shown this cold feet mentality for far too long. Over the issue of the recognition of Bangla Desh we have shown this cold feet mentality. This cold feet mentality should be discarded. Over the issue of giving full diplomatic recognition to the Democratic Republic of Viet Nam there should no longer be any hesitation. Over the issue of giving the recognition that is appropriate to the National Liberation Front of South Viet Nam there should be no further delay. Over the issue of recognising the Democratic People's Republic of Korea full diplomatic recognition and elevation of the present Consular status to Embassy exchange, there should be no further hesitation. Over the issue of the recognition, full diplomatic recognition, of the German Democratic Republic there should not be any further hesitation.

I do not say that it all happens overnight. Let not things be done in that kind of petty, dramatic fashion. That is not the point, but the point is that we are not without friends. We never should have thought that we were without friends. I know my hon. friend the Foreign Minister did assure us earlier that we were not without friends. Perhaps he could do so because he did have contacts with different Chanceries, he had been to Moscow and elsewhere, and he knew where friendship could be expected, he knew that from the socialist countries and socialist countries

[Shri H. N. Mukherjee]

alone we could look forward to the kind of sustained assistance which is India's due, and that is only natural because other countries would take us at our word. We profess socialism, *garibi hatao* and all the rest of it leading to socialism. Since we profess socialism, the other countries naturally take us at our word and want us to advance in the direction of socialism. That is the wonderful vested interest which the Soviet Union has in this country, and very rightly so. That is the one silken thread which nothing can break, that is the bond which nothing can destroy. That is why the Soviet Union, knowing that India is likely and likelier to move in the direction of socialism, in spite of certain gentlemen trying to put spokes in the wheel of progress, is our friend. We know it is on account of that the socialist countries led by the Soviet Union would be our friends, our consistent friends. They have shown already by their conduct, political, military, economic, diplomatic and every other way, in international forums and elsewhere, that they are our friends. That is a feeling which has been consolidated and codified in this treaty of peace, friendship and cooperation.

I do not wish to prolong my speech. But I would like to say that this is a treaty which is in entire conformity with our policy of non-alignment, which again is fundamentally a policy of peaceful co-existence. This treaty enables us to go ahead, not too fearful of the dangers that appear to be in the way at the present moment. Therefore, this treaty enables us to shed cold feet mentality and to make bold steps in national as well as in international affairs. This is a treaty which is, therefore, to be welcomed, which would enable India to refashion. This is a treaty which underlines the great fact of contemporary history, which is that the forces of socialism are advancing, and as sure as the sun will rise tomorrow, as sure as night follows day or day follows night, whichever way you look at it, the forces of socialism are going to overpower a world which is now in decline as far as big money interests in this country and elsewhere are concerned. That is why India today is beginning to fall into line with this radical march of the people towards a new kind of society, a society

without exploitation, a society where equality of opportunity would enable the flowering of civilization in a manner which has so far been the dream of Utopians and the illusion of philosophers. But that is the kind of society which has got to be achieved and which can be won only by the kind of concerted effort in regard to which we are taking certain steps. That is why this treaty is to be welcomed.

I am very happy that we are all enabled to rejoice over something which at long last this Government has done. I do hope that they do something to follow it up, so that the rejoicing might not be something which is a temporary phenomenon. Let it be part of the political structure of the world today and let India go ahead and play her role in that world.

MR. SPEAKER : Shri Hari Kishore Singh. (*Interruptions*). Order, order. Mr. Samar Guha, you have no licence to get up every time. It is a very bad habit. (*Interruptions*). This gentleman is unmanageable. Any time he likes he gets up. After all, we have to seek some solution for it and I need the cooperation of the House for that. He does not look towards the Chair at all; Shri K.D. Malaviya.

13.47 hrs.

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

SHRI K.D. MALAVIYA (Domariaganj): Sir, in many respects, yesterday was a great day. It was 9th of August and it is well-known to all members of the House why it was such a great day. It was the day on which Government introduced the Bill which finally settled the fate of a class of people in this country which was most insignificant and yet was a dead weight on this country. It was also a day when a treaty was signed between the two great countries, India and USSR, which only reminded us once more that we have moved forward in a big way, we have taken once more a big stride, towards the realisation of the great goal that was put before us by our great philosopher and visionary, Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, namely, peace and solidarity with all developing countries of the world and world peace itself. Therefore, this is a great occasion when we should all

congratulate ourselves that the two great nations have entered into a treaty which has far greater implications for the future peace of the world and, more especially, for our own great continent of Asia.

It is going to compel many of our political parties of India to revise their entire concept of the future. It is going to compel many of our political parties to give up their own wrong notions about what is happening round the world. And ultimately it will establish faith in those people who were isolated, who were called mad people, but who were dedicated and devoted to the cause of world peace and solidarity of developing nations of the world.

Yesterday's great act of the treaty between the two great countries will also remind us that there is a country, which is a great country, the United States of America, whose leadership mostly acted unwisely in the last four or five decades. The leadership, in spite of the fact that it was advised intelligently and honestly by people, has always taken great pride in its policy and philosophy resulting in the spread of discord, disunity and exploitation of the poor world. Therefore, I have no doubt in my mind that those isolated parties, which are hesitatingly supporting the great treaty that we signed yesterday, will give up their hesitation and will whole-heartedly support it with understanding. I do not agree with my friend, Shri Hiren Mukerjee, when he said that our government was developing cold feet on Bangla Desh. If it were so, yesterday more than a million people would not have come out in the streets of India to give their verdict in favour of the great leader...
 ...*(interruptions)*.

SHRI PILOO MODY (Godhra) : I want to know why more people did not turn up. Did you run out of money ?

SHRI K.D. MALAVIYA : There has to be a little sense of proportion in the understanding of the psychology of the people, so far as my hon. Friend, Shri Mody, is concerned: He seems incapable of appreciating the fact why and how million people gathered when so many people never gathered. He is always dazzled by the tinkling of money. He sees money when there is no money; he sees sin where there is no sin. I have all

my pity for him and I hope he will get wiser now. Let him now not display that political foolishness which his party had been showing so far. I still hope that in future he will very seriously think as to what changes are taking place in the country.

Great changes are visible in this country. But I am not going to deal with them now. I only wish to emphasize that considered from every angle. World peace is very fundamental for our country. World peace, in my opinion, is the opposite side of the coin of economic development programmes of all recently freed countries. The two are inseparable phenomena. If there is no world peace, our economy will remain in jeopardy. Therefore, in the interest of our own country, we have to take steps which will ensure peace, understanding and co-operation between all the countries. This document which was signed yesterday has repeatedly, in almost every page, emphasised the necessity of peace and cooperation not only between our two countries but peace for the whole world. This document is a re-dedication to the cause of peace a cause which was declared necessary by our great leader. Therefore, even from the practical point of view, and not only from the idealistic point of view, even from the point of view of justifying what we have done in the case of Bangla Desh, it is very necessary for all political parties of the country to support us and to note that the Government of India has received the verdict of support from millions of our people. This was once more illustrated yesterday.

I would again like to refer to the thinking bankruptcy of the leaders of U. S. A. When Mr. Eisenhower was the President of his nation he chose his younger brother, Milton Eisenhower, to go to Latin America to see why the dollars that were being showered on Latin America were not bringing back friendship from that country. What Milton Eisenhower had to report to his President brother was that not friendship but a revolution in Latin America was coming, it was inevitable and the country wanted to be free from the imperialist influence of dollars as well as the U. S. A. supported military dictatorship from that country and a period was coming when America would lose all its influence because of its imperialist policies and the evil that imperialist

[Shri K. D. Malaviya]

philosophy always brings about the American people themselves gave warnings to their President whether it was a war on Negroes or whether it was a war of aggression in Vietnam. I would ask my friend, Mr. Pilloo Mody, to specify a single case in the last 15 years where the people of America had not challenged their leadership on political arrogance and stupidity of the leadership of that country. They suffer from a cancerous disease, and that disease we call the disease of Imperialism. They want to exploit the poor people. They want to invest their money in order to enslave the people. With all their good aspirations, those people who have been recently freed, they want to forget that they are a free people now. Now what we have done in Bangla Desh has only justified our faith in freedom, in international justice, in national independence; and the atrocities of the military regime will be challenged and will not survive.

14 hrs.

Therefore it is because we have to vindicate all those values for which we have stood in last decades that people are now supporting our Government to go ahead in support of the Bangla Desh cause. But this treaty is much more than that. It gives a warning to countries which want to act in a stealthy manner against the interests of developing countries. I would like to ask those people who have any doubt about it as to why Mr. Nixon arranged in such a mysterious fashion a meeting between himself and the leader of of China at distant time without giving notice to those countries which were really interested in knowing about it. India is the next door neighbour of China and, as they say, if the American leadership is interested in the peace of the world, why did they not inform India as to why Mr. Nixon was going to meet the leader of China; what was the motive behind it? It is too mysterious a mission be called a journey for search for peace.

But we would not like to denounce it. If Mr. Nixon wants to go and see Mr. Mao Tse-tung, it is his business. If he wants peace, we welcome it. If he does not want peace, we are ready to face them because we have the satisfaction that we are with the cause of the exploited people.

This treaty only opens the gate for going further and entering into agreements with those countries of our own continent who want to cooperate for the common cause which has been described in it, that is of peace, cooperation, understanding and security of their own countries.

I am in full agreement with the two hon. Members of the two differing Communist Parties which do not agree among themselves. I agree that a time has come now when we should have a new look at the pace of the movement which we have been building to enlist friendship and increase cooperation with those countries which have extended their friendship to us. Friendship is a two-way traffic in international diplomacy. If we want it, we must respond to friendly gestures of others.

If the world movement of peace is going to succeed, it will have contribution from the people and the Government of India. I have no doubt that the Government of India has the fullest understanding of the implications and the philosophy of the world peace movement. It might be a little different thing when a certain step has to be taken. That is a point where there could be a shade of difference among ourselves. But we have got to leave the final judgment to the Government which has the general support of the people, of world opinion and of all those developing countries of Africa, Asia and Latin America. There can be no doubt about it that India today stands as one of the most important countries towards whom the people of developing countries are looking.

Against this background I want the political parties on my right to reassess their understanding. Let them not get emotionally disturbed as my hon. friend, Shri Samar Guha, sometimes does get disturbed. Let him not be disturbed as to what happened at a particular point of time between two countries or what the USSR did with regard to Hungary. Let us see what has happened recently and what we have done. We are now rededicating ourselves for those values which we have followed and for which we have been loudly committing ourselves publicly, both nationally and internationally.

As I said, this document repeats and emphasizes the fundamental aspect of peace and cooperation and strengthening of our two countries. The policy of non-alignment has also been recognised by the High Contracting Parties. I would like to quote what our great leader Nehru said about non-alignment. This policy of non-alignment cannot be defined in any specific terminology. It is not a scientific but surely a popular word in diplomacy.....

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE :
Neti, neti.

SHRI K. D. MALAVIYA : It is a question of understanding. If I am not wise, I will not understand non-alignment....

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE :
He has the monopoly of wisdom.

SHRI K. D. MALAVIYA : I am very keen on sharing my wisdom with him. But he is refusing to share wisdom. What can I do? I am just trying to explain to the House what Nehru said about non alignment. He is quite clear and, I hope my hon. friends will get some light. He says :

“As a matter of fact, we go as far as possible to try and win them over. It is not our purpose to enter into other people’s quarrels. Our general policy has been to avoid entering into anybody’s quarrels. If I may say so, I have come more and more to the conclusion that the less we interfere in international conflicts, the better, unless, of course, our own interest is involved.....”

That is the policy of non-alignment. It is not neutrality. According to our respected leader Mr. Kunzru, he thought that the policy of neutrality was more dynamic than the policy of non-alignment. Nothing can be more wrong than that, nothing can be more unfortunately misunderstood than that. Then, he says :

“.....for the simple reason that it is not in consonance with our dignity just to interfere without producing any effect.....”

If we can produce any effect in bringing about peace and justice to developing countries, then we have to interfere. That is also a dynamic aspect of non-alignment. He made is quite clear.. It is for us to understand now. We have the right to interfere where we feel that for the cause of peace and international justice we should interfere. Therefore, we have to interfere and we will interfere.

Further, he says :

“.....We should either be strong enough to produce some effect or we should not interfere at all.....”

Nothing could be more dynamic and more practical than what he said within the sphere of scientific meaning of the word “non-alignment”.

“I am not anxious to put my finger into every pie. Unfortunately, sometimes, one cannot help it. One is dragged into it. For instance, there is the Korea Committee. Well, not only are we in that Committee but ultimately our representative becomes the Chairman of that Committee.

Now, even when had expounded the philosophy and theory of non-alignment, he sent a representative of India to be the Chairman of the Committee on Korea. All that only shows we can interfere when it is our own interest and it is a common interest of all those countries which are exploited and which have been recently freed after the Second World War. The peoples of Asia, Africa and Latin America are of a common brotherhood. That is why we look for peace in the interest of our own economy and in the interest of our own national solidarity.

Here is a situation where freedom is in peril in our neighbouring country. Bangla Desh has been threatened with extinction. Therefore, it is our sacred duty to see that in our own interest as well as in the interest of freedom, peace, security and cooperation of all countries which are exploited we go with them.

I take this opportunity to congratulate the Government on signing the treaty and, I

[Shri K. D. Malaviya]

hope, this treaty is going to be the first step. The next step should be more radical showing concretely and clearly that we are moving towards socialism, economic independence and peace in the world.

SHRI K. MANOHARAN (Madras North) : The Indo-USSR Treaty has been characterised as the land-mark in the contemporary history of the world and has been considered one of the greater moments of this country and the red letter day in the history of international relations of this great nation.

Much has been said about the treaty. On behalf of my Party I think I must also submit something for the consideration of House. The treaty that has been entered into and signed yesterday reflects the mutual understandings between the two countries of the world and it reveals the mutual trust that we have reposed in ourselves. It explains the mutual appreciation of the international situation and particularly, the situation which obtains in this part of the world and it ushers in a new era as its war and future consolidation of the Indo-Soviet friendship is assured.

This treaty is not intended to sound the bellicosity, on the contrary it is designed to find out areas where peace is assured and it is designed to extend the horizon of peace nothing but peace. So, to that extent, it is the patriotic duty of each and every citizen of this country to welcome the treaty that has been signed yesterday.

I am very happy to note, Sir, that without any single solitary exception, all the political parties supported this treaty. Today morning only I came to know surprisingly enough, but pleasantly, that Mr. Vajpayee also has supported this treaty. Mr. Vajpayee always used to live in his own isolation not only with regard national matters but also regarding international matters. I asked him in the morning, 'Like a bolt from the blue a sudden reaction from your side'. He said, 'I whole-heartedly support this treaty, but.....', the 'but' has its own meaning (*Interruptions*).

In general, this treaty has been accepted by all the political parties of this country. So, I think it is my duty to congratulate (1) the Prime Minister and (2) the External Affairs Minister, Mr. Swaran Singh. But, I am not satisfied with two because, according to paper reports, attempts have been made for the past two years in the External Affairs Ministry for this particular treaty. If it is true, the real credit must go to the former Foreign Minister, my good friend, Mr. Dinesh Singh who was the architect of this treaty.

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE : Now we are not clapping.

AN HON. MEMBER : Are they against Mr. Dinesh Singh ?

ANOTHER HON. MEMBER : Might be.

SHRI K. MANOHARAN : Mr. Deputy Speaker, I have gone through the treaty that has been signed. The operative part of it is Art. 9 which rightly explains the purpose of the Treaty. So, we can have every satisfaction to believe that this is not a war treaty on the model or pattern of what my friend, Mr. Piloo Mody, is going to say, the Warsaw Pact, (*Interruption*) because we had our secret confabulations. So, this is, according to me, a non-aggression pact. It is a peace pact. It is a pact intended for peace, nothing else. So, unless we believe ourselves, unless we believe our friends, I doubt very much whether we can be anywhere at all. The operative part says, I quote :

Each High Contracting Party undertakes to abstain from providing any assistance to any third party that engages in armed conflict with the other Party. In the event of either Party being subjected to an attack or a threat thereof, the High Contracting Parties shall immediately enter into mutual consultation in order to remove such threat and to take appropriate effective measures to ensure peace and the security of their countries.

This does not mean immediate declaration of war. It means mutual consideration

and consultation in order to remove such threats. It is not against any countries, as rightly pointed out by our External Affairs Minister. It is not at all against any country, whatsoever.

Now, let me quote Article 11. This is something which we cannot think of appreciating. According to Article 11, the duration of the Treaty will be 20 years. It says:—

This Treaty is concluded for the duration of twenty years and will be automatically extended for each successive period of five years unless either High Contracting Party declares its desire to terminate it by giving notice to the other High Contracting Party twelve months prior to the expiration of the Treaty.

I think, this 20 years' duration, though not criminal, is something which we cannot think of, we cannot appreciate. According to the United Arab Republic treaty, the period was only 15 years. Here, the period is 20 years. It is not yet ratified, according to reports. I think if it is possible, this might be reduced to five years. I don't say that once this duration of 20 years is agreed upon, India will become a stooge of Russia or that Russia will become a stooge of India. But then, even psychologically speaking, 20 years duration is something which can be altered if possible, before the Treaty is ratified.

Also, there is enough possibility of having such kinds of relations and contacts with other countries of the world. That also is there, including United States of America. This Treaty does not mean that USA is written off for ever. Because, I want to draw a line in between the hawkish military junta of United States of America and the dovish people of the United States of America. 80 to 90 per cent of the people of USA are for peace. But it is the so-called nucleus of villainry which is functioning in the Pentagon which is against all sorts of treaties. If there is any possibility of extending or accelerating our diplomatic functioning in such a way as to include the United States of America, it is all the more good.

And, utilising this opportunity, I want to suggest one thing. So far as South

East Asian countries are concerned, there are only two countries which could be looked upon by other countries in this region as natural leaders who could lead. One is obviously India and the other is Japan. But regarding Japan, I am sure, all such countries have already burnt their fingers and their experience with Japan was bad and bitter. The only country which could be taken as a leader in the entire South East Asian Region is India herself. This is a very good opportunity for the Government of India to explore the possibility of establishing such contacts with these countries in this part of the world.

I will not take much of time of the House. Before I conclude, I want to ask our External Affairs Minister only one question. It is a sort of clarification for myself. I have explained my position very clearly. We welcome this is about Article 1, on which I would like to have some clarification. This Article says:—

The High Contracting Parties solemnly declare that enduring peace and friendship shall prevail between the two countries and their peoples,

O.K.—

Then, what does it say? It says:

Each party shall respect the independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity of the other Party and refrain from interfering in the other's internal affairs.

My simple question is this. I presume that before this treaty was signed, Soviet Russian had already accepted our boundaries and our territorial integrity and in turn we had accepted the territorial integrity of Soviet Russia. I want to know from the External Affairs Minister whether the USSR has categorically assured us and accepted openly that they are committed to our own territories and whether on that basis they are prepared to change the maps already published there. I do not mean anything bad of the High Contracting Parties, but I want to know that. If the answer from the hon. Minister is in the affirmative, namely 'Yes'; and he says 'Yes, we have

[Shri K. Manoharan]

got those clarifications, and the USSR has already agreed', it would be wonderful. If in his anxiety to sign the treaty, the External Affairs Minister has forgotten completely to get these clarifications, from Moscow, my humble submission to him would be this. He must get a categorical assurance from the Government of the USSR that this means that and we need not entertain any doubt. According to the newspaper reports, Mr. Gromyko will be here in India for four days. Before he leaves this country, let the External Affairs Minister extract from him such kind of assurance, if that assurance has not been given so far. This House has got every right to be informed about it. Before the Parliament is adjourned, let us be informed about it. The hon. Minister of External Affairs may just have his own confabulations with the Foreign Affairs Minister or his counterpart from the other country, and tomorrow or the day after let him come out with a statement before us saying, 'yes, I have already got the clarifications, and they have accepted our boundaries and they are prepared to change and remodel the maps which have been already published there and they are prepared to correct those maps in time'. I would request the hon. Minister to do this.

In conclusion, I would say that I welcome this treaty. As I have said already, it is a red-letter day in the history of our country, and I once again congratulate the Ministers responsible for this.

SHRI R. K. SINHA (Faizabad) : Yesterday was a day of great decision. In the foreign policy debates in this House, mostly our rightist friends in the Opposition ran down our foreign policy. They inflicted us with their bug of inferiority complex. They have never had faith in the policy of non-alignment and the future of this country. The only tragedy with them is this that they do not realise that our great leader the Prime Minister and her able External Affairs Minister have given us a decision which will have its echo and reverberations all over the world.

The decision to sign this treaty represents the will of the people of India. That

is why even reluctant customers like Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee are also forced to welcome this treaty. Even though they are reluctant, we are happy that a sense of patriotism has also permeated them to welcome something which approximates to our national interests.

Let us examine what happened on the issue of Kashmir and on the issue of our confrontation with China, and who stood with us. On the one side in the world there is an opportunistic Sino-American collusion. America is not going to go communist. Taiwan is not going to float back to mainland China, and North Viet Nam shall not be happy. They share many problems between the USA and China. Today, there is an opportunistic get-together and a collusion between those whose worst sins are the sins of Bangla Desh. Today, when Bangla Desh is dripping with blood, our great friends like Shri Samar Guha would be for condemning the people who are perpetrating the atrocities in Bangla Desh but not the masters of Yahya Khan and the yahoos of Pakistan, those who sit in the Pentagon and those who manipulate the operations of the CIA. There are moments in history when history has to be recounted. There was a day when standing on the soil of Kashmir, the Soviet leader said : 'Across the border, we stand; when India is threatened, you have only to call us and we shall be at your back and call'. Then let us not forget that it was the Soviet veto which gave us the time factor which assured the people of Kashmir of their proper place in the Indian Union. Let us not forget these things when some of our mimicking friends in the Opposition try to equate the Soviet Union and USA whenever such questions are brought before this House.

I have also read in a blessed national daily in India on the front page a story of Soviet arms to Pakistan when there was none and then a parliamentary peroration in this House equating Soviet friendship with that of the USA, when the only conspiracy afoot was to make India give up Indo-Soviet friendship.

So today when we assert and reassert Indo-Soviet friendship, we are asserting something which is a thing which has grown with time. Let us not forget the first con-

ference of the Friends of the Soviet Union which was inaugurated by our great leader, Jawaharlal Nehru. Let us also not be oblivious of the fact that all over the world the Soviet Union has stood up to fight against colonialism. Let us also remember that when there was a problem with China (*Interruption*).

मैं आपको भी जवाब दूंगा। मैं भी आपकी ही पार्टी में था, सोशलिस्ट पार्टी में था। My jaundice is not as much as that of Shri Dandavate and his friends, who have read only CIA-published books, books of Arthur Koestler and Burnham who have carried on their anti-communist campaign sitting in the citadels of America, and who understand just one set of ideology.

I want to talk about our national interest. On the issue of the border conflict between India and China, it was the Soviet Union which warned China and then the Chinese withdrew their troops. It was because of the Soviet Union's support to India that the Sino-Soviet conflict started. When it was a question of choosing between 'Brother and a friend', when the Chinese invoked it, the Soviet Union abandoned China for India. I want to open before our lukewarm friends in the opposition the pages of history to show that the Soviet Union has stood with India. Did the USA support us in this, in our border dispute with China? Is it not a fact that the USA supported the claim of Taiwan on the Indian issue? Is it not true that the USA only wanted to use the India-China conflagration for getting bases in India, getting American armed personnel into India? They never wanted to be friends of India.

Then let us not forget that this mongrel child of international imperialism, Pakistan was manipulated and masterminded by world imperialism. What happened? Who has been sucked into the net, who has been the feeding mother of Pakistan, if it has not been the USA, the great leader of world imperialism? Why should we forget it? Who armed Pakistan to shoot its bullets into our soldiers in the confrontation of 1965? This is what I want to ask of the Samar Guha's, my former colleagues of the Congress Socialist Party, the Dandavates and others. I want to place before them

the pages of history that today it is on our interests and what is happening again—the Sino-American collusion. The greatest sin of history is happening in Bangla Desh. And then the Americans and the Chinese are combined together and if we had kept quiet, if no action had been taken by the Government of India, these men would have said, "Look at India; India is friendless; India is isolated; India has not got the support of the peoples of the world." No, Sir. On the bar of history stands Mao Tse-tung; all his pretensions of communism and international socialism are gone and were gone on that day when he broke up the international socialist camp. Shri Mao Tse-tung, the great Mao Tse-tung broke up the association of Afro-Asian solidarity. That is why when the bombs fell on Sinai, when the Israeli aggression came, it was the Arab armies that withdrew because of the division in the Afro-Asian camp, and the division in the international socialist camp. The same happened, for, every bomb that fell on North Viet Nam the Chinese have been responsible for it. So are the great Chinese. Now, these Chinese, the great heroes of history still have Napoleonic dreams, because once Napoleon said that there is a dragon sleeping and if the dragon gets up, the world will be shaken. But there are not only the Chinese in the world; there are other people also in the world, and that is forgotten.

The great, historical quotation of Lenin is forgotten. He had said that the Soviet Union shall begin it, China shall carry it forward but India shall complete it. In that, it was never said that any country will have the particular type of monolithic system. It was only said that victory of the poor people in the world shall be possible if the Soviet Union, the land mass of the Soviet Union, if the people of India and the people of China stand together for the ideals of peace, anti-colonialism and for progressive ideals and outlook in the world. Who broke it but the Chinese imperialists? They are the Chinese imperialists who can shake hands with rulers of Hindu kingdoms, who can shake hands with the monstrous Yahya Khan who is worse than Hitler. Stalin talked of communism, but that great Chinese leader who goes trading in Hong Kong talks of colonialism! What is happening in Macao where the

[Shri R. K. Sinha]

worst stinking corruption takes place? That is the idealism of what they say and what they do.

I think this growth of Indo-Soviet friendship is a growth from our pre-freedom days. It is a growth which is possible because of the fact of Soviet support to us in Kashmir. It has been possible to us because of Soviet support to us on the issue of our borders with China. It is a growth which is possible because in the public sector growth in India, the Soviet Union has come out with massive aid.

May I ask these friends, whenever it has been a question of India being armed, we could not get arms because of our policy of non-alignment. We could not pay hard currency. It was the Soviet Union which came out and gave us not the type of know-how by which you have got to go back to the master again and again, but the type of know-how where factories will be installed in India, aircraft factories and other factories to make India self-reliant in the matter of defence. Why should we not be happy and be proud of the fact that it was yesterday, the great day of the August revolution, that the treaty was signed between us and the Soviet Union, by which we have told the world, "Look here; do not think India is isolated." On the issue of Bangla Desh, the peoples of the world have supported us. More than 200 Members of Parliament in Great Britain supported us. The American Senate went on record in support of us; and President Nixon continues to go on sending arms aid, clandestinely and openly, and every time we have been told it is not so. That is why there is no credence possible of American credibility.

Why is it that yesterday when this announcement was made, everybody was happy with it? Because, as a great theoretician said, foreign policy is an expression of the inner urge to progress. What is our national policy today? It is *garibi hatao*, the national policy of strength which was demonstrated by two million people who were marching on the streets of Delhi yesterday, a great day which has given us strength.

I wish to say further that our foreign policy, so ably piloted by our Foreign

Minister, has brought India and USSR closer together, and it does not threaten anybody's boundaries, it is within the limits of non-alignment, it is a treaty of peace, it is for the growth of peace in the world.

I would like, however, to suggest some minor changes in our foreign policy. One is recognition of the German Democratic Republic. I consider the recognition of the German Democratic Republic symbol of the progress of the country itself. The more reactionary a country, the more away it is from recognition of GDR. The more a country moves towards socialism, the nearer it gets to recognition of GDR. We should not be influenced by Dollar imperialism or Western imperialism which tries indirectly to influence our foreign policy. Today India has stood up as never before. Yesterday on the streets of Delhi people from the whole of the country have given a warning to the yahoos of Pakistan that the Indian border shall not be touched, that Bangla Desh shall be sovereign and free. We shall achieve this purpose which has always been before us. The people of India will win.

श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी (ग्वालियर) :
उपस्थित महोदय, भारत सरकार और सोवियत
रूस के बीच में शान्ति, मित्रता और सहयोग
की जो सन्धि हुई है, मैं उस का स्वागत करने
के लिए खड़ा हुआ हूँ।

मैं सन्धि का स्वागत करता हूँ क्योंकि
यह सन्धि हमें एक मित्र प्रदान करती है—ऐसा
मित्र, जिस पर विश्वास किया जा सकता है,
ऐसा मित्र, जो आड़े वक्त में हमारे काम आ
सकता है।

हमारी विदेश नीति के अकुशल संचालन ने
भारत को मित्र-विहीन बनाने में कोई कसर नहीं
छोड़ी है। जब जब भारत के भांग्याकाश पर
वाहरी संकट की काली घटाये घिरी हैं, जब जब
हमें आक्रमण का सामना करना पड़ा है,
जब जब हमारी सीमाये संकटापन्न हुई हैं, हम
ने अपने को एककी पाया है, हम ने अपने को
अकेला पाया है।

1962 में जब चीन ने हमारी प्रभुसत्ता को चुनौती दी, हमें वांशिंगटन के दरवाजे पर दस्तक देनी पड़ी। 1965 में हमें सोवियत रूस की ओर समर्थन के लिए देखना पड़ा। दोनों महाशक्तियों ने हमारी कठिनाई का लाभ उठाने का प्रयत्न किया। अमरीका ने कश्मीर के सवाल पर हम पर अनुचित दबाव डालने की कोशिश की। सोवियत रूस ने 1965 की लड़ाई के बाद हमें ताशकंद का समझौता करने के लिए विवश किया। लड़ाई के मैदान में हमने जो विजय पाई, वह ताशकंद की टेबल पर बैठ कर हार गये। हम युद्ध में जीत गये, लेकिन शान्ति में पराजित हो गये।

हमें मित्रों की आवश्यकता है, संकट के समय काम आने वाले सहयोगियों की आवश्यकता है। हम स्वावलम्बी नहीं हैं। स्वाधीनता के तेईस वर्ष बाद भी हम भारत को अपने पैरों पर खड़ा नहीं कर सके हैं। और केवल हमें क्यों, आज रूस को भी मित्रों की आवश्यकता है। आज अमेरिका को भी सहयोगियों की आवश्यकता है। यह संधि अगर हमें एक सच्चा मित्र प्रदान करती है तो उस का स्वागत किया जाना चाहिए।

मैं इस संधि का इसलिए भी स्वागत करता हूँ क्योंकि यह संधि पाकिस्तान के आक्रामक इरादों को पस्त करती है। अनेक दिनों से हम याह्या खां की धमकियाँ सुन रहे हैं। धमकियाँ सुनते सुनते हमारे कान पक गए। हम से यह भी कहा जाता रहा है कि पाकिस्तान अकेला नहीं है। बंगला देश को बहाना बना कर हमारी सीमाओं को हमले का निशाना बनाया जा रहा है। यह संधि पाकिस्तान के आक्रामक इरादों पर पानी फेरने में कामयाब हो सकती है। इस्लामाबाद का सुनार 100 चोटें करता रहा है। इस संधि के रूप में नई दिल्ली के लोहार ने एक चोट मारी। सचमुच यह नहले पर दहला

है। अगर ठीक कहना चाहें तो यह इस्लामाबाद के गुलाम पर नई दिल्ली की वेगम है।

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, इस संधि का मैं इसलिए भी स्वागत करता हूँ क्योंकि संधि भारत और पाकिस्तान के किसी भी संभावित झगड़े में चीन के हस्तक्षेप और शरारत को रोकने में, उस पर अंकुश लगाने में, कारगर हो सकती है।

जब कभी भारत और पाकिस्तान में तनातनी होती है चीन मौके का फायदा उठाना चाहता है, पाकिस्तान की पीठ थपथपा कर हमारे लिए कठिनाइयाँ पैदा करना चाहता है। 1965 में चीन ने ऐसा ही किया। इस समय भी जब बंगला देश में इस्लामाबाद का सैनिक शासन नर-संहार कर रहा है, मानवों के रक्त की होली खेल रहा है, अत्याचार और अन्याय की पराकाष्ठा कर रहा है, पैकिंग न केवल इस्लामाबाद के साथ प्रेम की पेंगें बढ़ा रहा है, बल्कि उस को अत्याचार करने के लिए प्रोत्साहन भी दे रहा है। यह संधि चीन के लिए भी इस बात का संकेत है कि भारत और पाकिस्तान के झगड़े का लाभ उठाने का उस का प्रयत्न अब पूरी तरह सफल नहीं होने दिया जायगा।

मैं इस संधि का इसलिए भी स्वागत करता हूँ क्योंकि इस संधि के पहले अनुच्छेद में कहा गया है मैं उद्धृत करना चाहता हूँ—“प्रत्येक पक्ष दूसरे पक्ष की स्वतंत्रता प्रभुसत्ता और क्षेत्रीय अखण्डता का सम्मान करेगा तथा दूसरे के आंतरिक मामलों में हस्तक्षेप नहीं करेगा।”

यह बात अभी तक मौखिक रूप से कही जाती रही है। लेकिन इस के बावजूद सोवियत रूस द्वारा भारत के आंतरिक मामलों में दखल देने की घटनाएँ होती रही हैं। अभी डी. एम. के. के हमारे मित्र श्री मनोहरन ने सोवियत रूस में प्रकाशित उन नक्शों का उल्लेख किया जिन

[श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी]

में हमारा भू-भाग चीन का भू-भाग दिखलाया गया है। कई वार नई दिल्ली द्वारा याद दिलाने के बाद भी वह नक्शे न तो बदले गए न वापस लिए गए यद्यपि यह आश्वासन हमें मिला है कि उन नक्शों पर विचार किया जायगा। मुझे विश्वास है कि अपने को इस लिखित संधि में बांधने के बाद सोवियत रूस इस तरह के नक्शे प्रकाशित नहीं करेगा और जो नक्शे प्रकाशित किए हैं उन्हें वापस लेगा।

मैं यह भी आशा करता हूँ कि मास्को रेडियो और रेडियो पीस एंड प्रोग्रेस भविष्य में भारत के अंदरूनी मामलों में किसी तरह का दखल नहीं देंगे। रूस में रेडियो सरकार का उपकरण है। रेडियो जो कुछ बोलता है वह सरकार की नीति को प्रतिबिम्बित करता है। हमारे देश में लोक तंत्र है। लोक तंत्र में मतभेद स्वाभाविक है। रूस को इस बात की इजाजत नहीं दी जा सकती कि किसी को प्रतिक्रियावादी कहे, किसी को प्रगतिशीलता के शिखर पर पहुंचाए, गद्दारों का अभिनन्दन करे और देशभक्तों की निन्दा करे।

मैं चाहता हूँ कि यह बात सोवियत विदेश मंत्री से साफ होनी चाहिए कि मास्को रेडियो और रेडियो पीस एंड प्रोग्रेस द्वारा भारत के अंदरूनी मामलों में दखल नाना बन्द किया जायेगा।

हमें बुरा भला कहने के लिए प्रधान मंत्री ही कफी हैं। उस के लिए मास्को की सहायता की आवश्यकता नहीं है। हमारे विरुद्ध जो कुछ कहा जाता है और सारे देश में फैलाने के लिए आल इंडिया रेडियो पर्याप्त है। उस के लिए मास्को रेडियो या रेडियो पीस एंड प्रोग्रेस की मदद की जरूरत नहीं है।

कल प्रधान मंत्री ने कांग्रेस पार्टी द्वारा आयोजित एक रैली में भाषण दिया। वह रैली कोई सरकारी रैली नहीं थी। राज्य द्वारा आयोजित कोई रैली नहीं थी। लेकिन उसके बाद भी आल इंडिया रेडियो ने उनके भाषण को रेडियो पर दुहराया, टेलीविजन पर दिखलाया। मैं जानना चाहता हूँ क्या यह अवसर विरोधी दलों के नेताओं को भी दिया जायगा? सरकार और सत्तारूढ़ दल के बीच में कोई लक्ष्मण रेखा है या नहीं?..... (व्यवधान)....कोई रेखा नहीं है। कल उस लक्ष्मण रेखा का उल्लंघन कर दिया गया।

DR. HENRY AUSTIN (Ernakulam): In a democracy all the policies are enunciated at the party meetings. That is the democratic way of functioning.

श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं आशा करता हूँ कि सोवियत रूस हमारे अंदरूनी मामलों में दखल नहीं देगा। उसके अंदरूनी मामलों में हम दखल देंगे इसका तो सवाल पैदा ही नहीं होता।

इस संधि में एक बात यह भी कही गई है कि जिन देशों के बीच में यह संधि की जा रही है वह अन्य देशों के साथ ऐसा कोई समझौता नहीं करेंगे जो एक दूसरे के हितों को हानि पहुंचाने वाला हो। इसके साथ ही एक बात और कही गई है। मैं उद्धृत करना चाहता हूँ—

“प्रत्येक महान संविदाकारी पक्ष वचनबद्ध है कि वह किसी तीसरे पक्ष को, जो महान संविदाकारी पक्ष के दूसरे पक्ष के विरुद्ध सशस्त्र संघर्ष में लगा हो, किसी प्रकार की सहायता नहीं देगा।”

मैं जानना चाहता हूँ इस संधि की व्याख्या के अनुसार आज भारत और पाकिस्तान के बीच में सशस्त्र संघर्ष की स्थिति है या नहीं? बीच में सोवियत रूस ने पाकिस्तान को हथियार दिये थे। यह जानते हुए हथियार दिए थे कि

पाकिस्तान उन हथियारों का प्रयोग भारत के विरुद्ध करेगा। आज भी हमारे और पाकिस्तान के बीच में सशस्त्र संघर्ष की स्थिति है। काश्मीर का एक भाग पाकिस्तान के कब्जे में है। पाकिस्तान आक्रमण पर आमादा है। क्या सोवियत रूस को यह स्थिति मान्य है? क्या हम यह समझ लें कि भविष्य में सोवियत रूस द्वारा पाकिस्तान को शस्त्र नहीं दिए जाएंगे? मैं तो संधि का यही अर्थ समझता हूँ लेकिन मैं विदेश मंत्री के मुख से सुनना चाहता हूँ।

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, इस विवाद में कल से चर्चा चल रही है कि यह संधि नान-एलाइनमेंट के चौखटे में आती है या नहीं आती है। क्या नान-एलाइनमेंट कोई पूजा को वस्तु है? क्या नान-एलाइनमेंट कर्म—कांड है? क्या नान-एलाइनमेंट कोई नया मजहब है? अगर देश के हित में नान-एलाइनमेंट की नीति नहीं है तो उस में परिवर्तन करने में संकोच नहीं होना चाहिए। अगर नान-एलाइनमेंट मरता है तो मुझे खुशी नहीं होगी और अगर जीवित रहता है तो मैं मातम नहीं मनाऊंगा।
(व्यवधान)

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, समय की कोई सीमा नहीं है। मैं दल का दृष्टिकोण रख रहा हूँ। अगर आप बीच में घंटी बजाएंगे तो कैसे काम चलेगा?

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: It is not correct to say that there is no time limit. Five hours have been allotted and out of that your party gets 11 minutes.

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE: How can I speak on such an important subject in 11 minutes?

MR. DEPUTY--SPEAKER: So, I want to be helpful and accommodating. I know you have a point. So, I will give you five more minutes.

श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी : उपाध्यक्ष जी, आपने बड़े वेमोके घंटी बजाई। ऐसा लगता है कि हमारा नान-एलाइनमेंट ब्रिटेन की मोनार्की की तरह से है जिस क्षण ब्रिटेन का राजा या रानी मरते हैं, उसी क्षण नया राजा या रानी जीवित हो जाते हैं -- किंग इज डेड, लॉग लिव दी किंग -- इस संधि के बाद मैं कहना चाहता हूँ -- नान-एलाइनमेंट इज डेड, लॉग लिव नान-एलाइनमेंट !

विदेश मंत्री ने माना है कि नान-एलाइनमेंट की नीति के अन्तर्गत बदलती हुई दुनिया की परिस्थितियों के अनुसार परिवर्तन हो सकते हैं। ऐसा लगता है हमारा नान-एलाइनमेंट स्पिनवुस पक्षी की तरह से है जो अपनी चिता में से फिर ज़िन्दा हो कर खड़ा हो जाता है। मैंने कहा है। सरकार नान-एलाइनमेंट की बात करे, मुझे आपत्ति नहीं है, लेकिन नान-एलाइनमेंट एक नीति है, सिद्धान्त नहीं है। नान-एलाइनमेंट एक साधन है, साध्य नहीं है, एक मार्ग है, मन्ज़िल नहीं है नान-एलाइनमेंट देश के लिये है, देश नान-एलाइनमेंट के लिये नहीं है।

उपाध्यक्ष जी, दुनिया की स्थिति तेज़ी से बदल रही। अत्र विचारधाराओं के आधार पर विदेश नीति का निर्धारण नहीं होता, अब नंगे स्वार्थों के आधार पर मित्रसम्बन्धों का निश्चय हो रहा है.....

श्री क. ना. तिवारी (वेतिया) : मैंने अखबार में पढ़ा है कि आप ने तो इस का स्वागत किया है।

श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी: मुश्किल यह है कि तिवारी जी आधा अखबार पढ़ने हैं, आधा छोड़ देते हैं।

उपाध्यक्ष जी, चीन कम्युनिज्म को मानने वाला है, अमरीका लोकतन्त्रवादी है--दोनों निकट आ रहे हैं.....

श्री अमृत नाहाटा (वाड़मेर) : दोनों ही गलत हैं। न वह कम्युनिस्ट हैं, न वह लोकतन्त्रवादी हैं।

श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी : मुझे लगता है कि दुनिया में नाहाटा जी के अलावा कोई कम्युनिस्ट और लोकतन्त्रवादी बचा नहीं है।

श्री स्वर्ण सिंह : श्रीर वाजपेयी जी के अलावा कोई समाजवादी नहीं है।

श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी : मैंने समाजवाद का नाम भी नहीं लिया है।

उपाध्यक्ष जी, इस परिस्थिति में विचार-धारार्यें गौण हो गई हैं और अपने अपने देश के हितों का संरक्षण और ममवर्धन ही प्रमुख हो गया है। चीन और अमरीका निकट आ रहे हैं, दूसरी ओर रूस को भी मित्रों की आवश्यकता है। विदेश नीति पर जो चर्चा हुई थी उसमें मैंने कहा था कि पिण्डी, पीकिंग और वाशिंगटन के बीच में जो त्रिकोण बन रहा है इसका एक कोण मास्को की तरफ है और दूसरा कोण भारत की तरफ है। यह नितान्त स्वाभाविक है कि हम और रूस निकट आये लेकिन हमें इस बात को सोच कर निकट आने का प्रयत्न करना चाहिये कि केवल हमें ही रूस की आवश्यकता नहीं है, अब रूस को भी हमारी आवश्यकता है। यह अनुभूति होगी तभी हम बराबरी के आधार पर मित्रता के सम्बन्धों का निर्धारण कर सकेंगे। हमें मित्रता चाहिए, पिछलग्गू बन नहीं। हम किसी देश के उपग्रह के रूप में जीवित रहें यह हमारे भविष्य में नहीं है। काश्मीर से लेकर बन्ध्याकुमारी तक फैला हुआ विशाल भूखण्ड, 55 करोड़ जनता, प्राकृतिक साधनों से भरपूर धरती, एकमहान इतिहास— भारत विश्व में एक महाशक्ति के रूप में उदित होने के लिए पैदा हुआ है और दुनिया के किसी भी देश से हम दार्शनिकों का हाथ मिलाये, उसका

आधार बराबरी होना चाहिये, उसका आधार पिछलग्गू बन नहीं हो सकता।

मैं कुछ प्रश्न पूछ कर समाप्त करूंगा। इस संधि के बाद कुछ प्रश्न उठते हैं और मैं चाहूंगा कि विदेश मंत्री बड़ी सफाई के साथ इन का उत्तर दें। क्या यह संधि बंगला देश के मामले में हमें कोई एक-तरफा फैसला करने से रोकती है? एक तरफा शब्द मेरा नहीं है— विदेश मंत्री महोदय ने कांग्रेस पार्लियामेन्ट्री पार्टी की बैठक में विदेश यात्रा से लौटने के बाद कहा था—अगर दुनिया के देश हमारा साथ नहीं देंगे तो हमें कोई यूनीलेट्रल कार्यवाही करनी पड़ेगी। क्या इस संधि के बाद वह स्थिति कायम है? क्या इस संधि के बाद भी बंगला देश को मान्यता देने के सवाल पर हम आगे बढ़ सकते हैं? क्या सोवियत रूस इसमें बाधक बनेगा? अगर बाधक नहीं है तो मैं चाहूंगा कि सरकार बंगला देश को मान्यता देकर दिखाये कि इस संधि के कारण उस पर कोई ऐसा बन्धन नहीं लगा है जो हमारी प्रभुसत्ता को सीमित करता है।

उपाध्यक्ष जी, मुझे ताज्जुब हुआ, सोवियत रूस के विदेश मंत्री अभी भी बंगला देश की समस्या के राजनीतिक समाधान की बात कर रहे हैं। कैसा राजनीतिक समाधान? याहिया खां ने सारे राजनीतिक समाधानों के लिये दरवाजे बन्द कर दिये हैं। अवामी लीग के 79 पार्लियामेन्ट के मेम्बरों को अयोग्य घोषित कर दिया गया है। अवामी लीग गैर कानूनी है, शेख मुजीबुर्रहमान पर मुकदमा चलने वाला है, उनकी जान खतरे में है। इस संधि पर चर्चा का जब विदेश मंत्री जवाब दें तो हम चाहेंगे कि सोवियत रूस के दिमाग में बंगला देश की समस्या का जो पोलिटिकल साल्यूशन है, उसका स्वरूप क्या है, वह राजनीतिक हल वहाँ कैसे लागू किया जायगा और अगर याहिया खां राजनीतिक

हल नहीं मानते तो उन पर दबाव डालने के लिये भारत क्या करेगा और भारत की मदद के लिये सोवियत रूस क्या करेगा—इस पर भी प्रकाश डालें

दूसरा सवाल—क्या यह संधि सारत को एटम-बम के निर्माण करने का फैसला करने से रोकती है ? हम बनायें या न बनायें, यह फैसला हमारा होगा, लेकिन क्या यह संधि हमें ऐसा करने से रोकती है ? देश के हित और शान्ति की रक्षा का तकाजा है कि भारत को अणु अस्त्रों का निर्माण करना चाहिये। क्या इसके लिये हमें मास्को के ग्रीन सिगनल भी जरूरत होगी ? जो निर्णय नई दिल्ली में होना चाहिये, क्या वह मास्को में लिये जायेंगे ?

तीसरा प्रश्न—इस संधि के आर्टिकल 7 में कहा गया है—महान संविदाकारी पक्ष विज्ञान, कला, साहित्य शिक्षा, जन-स्वास्थ्य, प्रंस, रेडियो, टेलीविज़न, सिनेमा, पर्यटन और खेल के क्षेत्रों में आपसी सम्बन्ध एवं सम्पर्क को और अधिक विकसित करेंगे।”

क्या इसका अर्थ यह है कि इन सभी क्षेत्रों में सोवियत रूस को छा जाने की पूरी छूट दी जायगी ? क्या इसका अर्थ यह है कि इन सभी क्षेत्रों में सोवियत रूस के सलाहकार आयेंगे...

श्री स्वर्ण सिंह : आप यू. एस. एस. आर. भेजना चाहें तो भेज सकते हैं।

श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी: यहां बड़ी बड़ी बातें कहने से कोई फायदा नहीं है। मैं आप से प्रश्न पूछ रहा हूं और चहता हूं कि आप गम्भीरता से उत्तर दें। जिन देशों के साथ सोवियत रूस ने इस तरह की संधि की है, वहां रशियन एडवाइज़र्स की फौज की फौज जाती है, क्या अन्य देशों के अनुभवों से हम कोई लाभ नहीं उठा सकते। मैं जानना चाहता हूं कि यह जो धारा रखी गई है, इसका क्या अर्थ है ?

कोई इस बात से इन्कार नहीं कर सकता कि यह सन्धि हमें सहारा देती है, मगर सहारा हमारा स्वभाव नहीं बनना चाहिये। बैसाखी कभी कभी मदद के लिये ठीक है, लेकिन बैसाखी पांव की जगह नहीं ले सकती। आज हम अकेले हैं, संकटग्रस्त हैं, आज हम पर आक्रमण का खतरा है, इस लिये हमें मित्रों की आवश्यकता है, लेकिन इस मित्रता और सन्धि का परिणाम यदि यह होता है कि हम अभाव-धान हो जायें, भारत को स्वावलम्बी बनाने का अपना संकल्प छोड़ दें, अपने पैरों पर खड़े होने के लिये कुछ न करें, तो यह संधि हमारे लिये संकट का कारण बनेगी। यह तात्कालिक दृष्टि से ठीक है, मगर इसका लाभ उठा कर हमें प्रयत्न करना चाहिये कि एक स्वावलम्बी, स्वाभिमानी, सर्वप्रभुता सम्पन्न भारत की रचना करें। यदि हम ऐसे भारत की रचना कर सकें और उसके लिये ऐसे भारत की रचना का संकल्प अपने मन में जगा सकें तो यह संधि हमारे लिये सहायक हो सकती है, अन्यथा यह घातक भी हो सकती है।

15 hrs.

SHRI KRISHNA MENON (Trivandrum): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, the House has before it the text of the Treaty concluded between the Government of India and the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. There is also a statement from our distinguished Foreign Minister the purpose of which is to inform Parliament and, I presume, to inform public opinion also.

If I may say so by way of introduction, if euphoria and statesmanship do not go together, it is vitally important that we do not mix this up with the so-called historic visit of Mr. Kissinger to Peking nor should we have followed up Mr. Kissinger with our own Kissingers. If you introduce melodrama in this, we cannot match the melodrama of people who play with people's lives.

15 hrs.

[SHRI K. N. TIWARI in the Chair]

I want to tell the Foreign Minister seriously one thing. He must have been

[Shri Krishna Menon]

perturbed as I was when we read the headlines in newspapers this morning. This treaty is a Treaty of Peace, Friendship and Cooperation. Practically, everyone of our national newspapers—they would not like inspiration from this Ministry of External Affairs—comes out with 5-column headlines on the security pact between India and Soviet Union. No one would regret it more than the Soviet Union and the Government of India. But the fact is that even at this stage the public education on this matter has become inadequate in the sense that our national newspapers should come out and say that there is a security pact between ourselves and the Soviet Union. We would then justify the SEATO, the NATO and all that and abandon the very basis of the existence of our foreign policy.

The Foreign Minister has, rightly, said and also others have said that this is a land-mark in the growth of India's foreign policy or history of India, whatever you may call it. But a land-mark means the course that is being followed. A land-mark is not something that descends like a man from heaven. A land-mark means a point that is reached in the course of a journey undertaken over a period of 20-30 years, even the pre-Independence period.

The people of India through their national movement who then represented the people of India as a whole welcomed Soviet Resolution and welcomed the break-down of the Czar empire and the action, at that time, of renouncing imperialism and the proclamation of equality of races and equality of nations. From that time onwards, the national movement as a whole has not owed its allegiance to the Soviet Union, as is sometimes suggested, but respected and understood what has been happening.

In the Congress session at Lucknow, the then President of the Congress, Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, devoted a considerable amount of the time to the role of the Soviet Union and the impact it had by its very existence on the history of the world. Why I say all this is not to brush up my knowledge of history. But to say and look upon

it as though something new happened yesterday as a departure from our policy and raise the question whether non-alignment is or is not, only shows perhaps an inadequate understanding of the situation.

My submission is that every attempt should be made to understand this. I have no doubt that if the Foreign Minister reads the text of the Treaty itself, it will be possible for his official machinery and others to educate the public properly on this question.

This Treaty is a Treaty of Peace, Friendship and Cooperation. Friendship is a bilateral affair. In that sense, this Treaty has a bilateral aspect. Peace is a world affairs and it refers to international relations. I, therefore, regret to see in the first two paragraphs of his speech of yesterday the reference to regions, to our region, and this has an effect of creating a situation that we are trying to find some antidote to the SEATO complex: that is to say, following so closely upon the mysterious visit of Mr. Kissinger, we take an extraordinary, unusual, step of sending our new Ambassador to that country to negotiate our relations. Now that may be necessary. But to create an atmosphere of drama about this is not to subserve the purposes of this treaty. Although I can say that that does not in the slightest degree detract from my regard for the achievement that it represents also I want to say that it did not come about just yesterday. This was being negotiated for the last two years and no one knows it more than the Foreign Minister; and what is more is that this relation between the Soviet Union and India has been made possible by our attitude during the pre-Independence period also during the Post-Independence period and by the role the Government of India has played in its contribution towards peace in the world whether it be in Korea or in Indo-China or in Cyprus in the middle East or anywhere else, where it has demonstrated to the world, Soviet Union included, that she has a considerably effective part to play in the world. And I bear witness to the fact that during all this greater part of this period we had the highest degree of co operation from the Soviet Union, not in the sense of our saying 'Yes' to what

they say or their saying 'Yes' to what we say. These was always an approach which was one of equality. We had never been a client State of the Soviet Union in international relations. We have never been told how to vote or what to vote for and in the debate on the Korean affairs and in the debate on the Korean resolution, at that time the then Soviet representative more or less said, 'We better mind our peace and views' and we did. We voted just as we liked. That is to say that there has been no attempt to interfere and certainly an attempt to influence just as we make to influence them. There is no diplomacy unless we are prepared to be influenced by somebody else also because if we prevent ideas coming into our mind and by shutting the doors of our mind, it is possible for us to escape from ourselves and to convey our feelings to other people. It is essential, therefore, that as per the law of diplomatic relations we should accept the fact that the other fellow might have something to say.

I need hardly say that I welcome this development and it has come at a time when, while it may be clogged with the Kissinger visit and the unfortunate testimony of the importance of Nixon's visit that was expressed in this Parliament and modified soon afterwards, that should not cloud the main issue. Nor should it be clouded with the issue which my friend, Mr. R. K. Sinha, referred to as 2 million or 5 million. I do not know how you count the people. According to him, it is. Mr. Vajpayee says it is about 10,000 people there. Mr. R. K. Sinha will say that there were three million people. I would say, "I don't know because I was not there. And so on. May I say with great respect without being in the slightest way cynical, that there have been occasions in history when there had been tremendous demonstrations which were followed by events which altogether were not to the credit of the people who promoted them. Chiang Kai-shek — Tremendous demonstration just before his departure to Formosa; sixty million people. Same was the experience of the Czar of Russia at the Duma from 1905 to the disasters of 1914-1915. The Duma recorded record votes in support of the Czar's Government and it was said that the people at that time were behind them. They were certainly behind

them. They remained there behind them long afterwards. Therefore it is very unfortunate Members of the Foreign Minister's Party have a greater degree of responsibility than some of us who are back-benchers, because they represent power, and making statements of this kind that because there is a tremendous support, therefore this treaty is effective in that way, would take away from its importance. It is far too important a matter to be talked about in this way or to tread on the horns of party politics in this way.

Sir, foreign policy cannot stand in a Parliamentary system if there is not a general agreement, —general agreement as represented by our professional dissenter, Mr. Vajpayee, today. There must be this degree of agreement in regard to foreign policy, —not in regard to the various items of the various approaches.

Now, I come to the question of the Foreign Minister. I may request the House also to remember that this is not the first Treaty we have signed with the Soviet Union. We have signed so many of them, whether they are called Treaties or otherwise. But, taking the latest one for example, the one in 1970, in respect of economic relationship, what has happened to it? Because, we have got the machinery of bureaucracy on one side and a degree of public opinion represented through vested interests, who have.....(Interruption)

SHRI PILOO MODY : What are you saying ?

SHRI SWARAN SINGH : I am saying, the record will not show that you are naming him.

SHRI KRISHNA MENON : Mr. Pilo Mody is not 'interested' ; he is not 'vested'.

Anyway, there is considerable agreement for a considerable volume of foreign trade and economic development ; there has been growth in it, but it has dragged its feet and has not shown the progress it should, because dynamism has not gone into it.

Now, with regard to alignment and non-alignment, I am not going to be drawn into

[Shri Krishna Menon]

discussion of definitions. Somethings cannot be defined. The Foreign Minister is a very able person, and outside the context of the House, if you ask him to define a horse, I am sure he cannot define it.

SHRI PILOO MODY : Not even a mule.

SHRI KRISHNA MENON : If You defined it I could find reasons why the definition is inaccurate. If he is asked to define an elephant, he would not be able to define it. Yet, one does not say that he does not know the difference between an elephant and a horse. Therefore, definitions are not necessary for this purpose. Everybody knows what non-alignment is, not being pre-empted to war, not being pre-empted to military alliance, and what is more, the independence of our foreign policy, a factor from which there is very considerable departure when we refuse, when we decline the GDR and so on, because of other foreign influences. And therefore this is no departure from non-alignment. Now at least we have found a friend. This is not like the Americans why say, you must stand up and be counted; otherwise you are not with us, you have no affection for us. Why should we take affection in this way?

Now, there has been no evidence in the past that on account of the so-called policy of non-alignment we have no understanding or friendship in the world. On the contrary, we have been able to contribute a great deal to the development of peace movement as such.

And that takes me on to the paragraph here which deals with these matters. It is not merely just an affirmation of friendship and cooperation when it says : 'Both countries commit themselves to the development of disarmament, arms control' and so on. And, I think, to the extent India has signed this treaty, it is perhaps an indication that it has got out of the trough of what may be more or less called 'isolation.' That is to say, during the last 6 or 7 years, we have made very little contribution, effective contribution, towards the progress of disarmament discussions. It is also perhaps an

indication that in respect of scientific development, particularly in the field of electronics communications, we are not likely to be bound down by any particular part of the world. I do not want to develop any further on this. It is very important that in that particular context of space developments communications in that way, the paragraph here dealing with cooperation and technological development receives some substance. We are also told that the assistance given to a third party who is inimical to us would be a hostile act. Well, how this works out, one cannot say; there are too many countries who are inimical at any one time. But, it is a commitment on the part of each of us to resist any country that threatens war against us, the recognition for the first time, in a document where an agreement is not about war, but about threat of war.

The United Nations has been trying for the last 15 years to define aggression; they have not been able to do so; but, at the same time, everybody knows what aggression is, when one gets it. But here, we have made an advance in saying, not only aggression, but a threat of aggression. Doubts have been raised by Shri K. Manoharan and Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee—it is not my business to answer them, Government will answer them—whether the respect for the territorial integrity of India does not require some clarification. Time and again, the Soviet Union has said not only in Moscow but in international forums that she respects the frontiers of India. So far as they are concerned, there is no question to whom Kashmir belongs. That is to say, they have taken the view that it is a settled question and they do not want to enter into it. Unfortunately, whatever may be the reasons, half of our territory is occupied, and we have not been able to get its evacuation. That is another matter. Therefore, this must be put on one side in that way.

Then, I would like the Minister of External Affairs to look at the various articles that we have here and see that these articles do not suffer the same fate as some of the provisions of the economic and cultural treaties and that greater dynamism is imparted into discussions and participations in the development of disarmament policies, in the cooperation in regard to

space research in a way that it does not get diverted into other channels. I am not amused by the fact that I have been told that the UN project is coming and so on. It is one part of the world where considerable development has taken place, and we should participate in that.

It also takes us to the question of some courageous revision in regard to the non-proliferation treaty. It is not sufficient for us to be logical about this non-proliferation treaty. I do not carry the House with me in this when I say that the non-proliferation treaty even if it is signed is an advance towards disarmament. That is to say, if the nuclear weapons were spread around and everybody had them including every gangster in the world, then the world would be in a very difficult situation. So, that by itself would be a very great advance. But it is not being shaped in the way we would like it to be developed. The fault is largely ours. Since 1962 we are on the collapse on the 18-nation commission or conference and we have left the discussions to the United States and the Soviet Union and they made things their own. It is our business now in view of this newer development to see whether we could get some arrangement made whereby we can contribute towards nuclear non-proliferation. For, proliferation particularly in the sense in which it is talked about and in the context of the general pressures in our own country to go into underground tests and what not is a very important matter.

There is not very much more that I have to say except to point out that it is frightfully important from our point of view that we do not present this treaty as though it is merely a reaction to the Pakistan-China-USA collusion or allow the inference to be drawn that it is an exclusive alliance. The Prime Minister has stated and the External Affairs Minister has stated that this does not preclude friendship with anybody else. It is friendship of the Soviet Union but not an exclusive friendship of the Soviet Union. We have always regarded, and I for my part have always been one of those who have regarded, very close relation with the Soviet Union as one of the vital factors for the maintenance of our Independence, not merely in military terms but also for our economic development. This has been so for a very considerable time. This does not in any way

deflect from the freedom that we have or the rights that we have to establish relations with the United States, China or with Britain or any other country. In fact, as the Prime Minister has said, this perhaps would assist us in a way to develop relations of this kind hereafter with other countries.

It has also been said that the timing of this perhaps is not right. With great respect, I beg to disagree. It could not have been delayed any longer, because there are troubles on our frontiers and if anyone has any doubts that perhaps this is a measure where very astute Soviet diplomacy is trying to exercise restraint upon them in their own interest. I think really that it is an unwarranted belief.

This agreement cannot in any way inhibit our sovereignty. The right to recognise Bangla Desh or not to recognise it, the right to recognise the GDR and so on, these are sovereign rights. It would be as wrong for the Soviet Union to tell us, 'You cannot recognise these people, if you do, then you will break this treaty', as for the Germans to say 'We have got the Hallstein doctrine'. The right of recognition is a sovereign right, and we exercise our sovereignty in our interest, and if we make a mistake, we take the consequences. That is how it is.

Therefore, the view that is expressed which is a natural one, but not a legitimate one, that we should think now that we have got together almost into an alliance—newspapers called this a security pact; one of my friends told me this morning that at least we have one friend in the world—must have arisen from a great state of despondency.

SHRI FRANK ANTHONY (Nominated Anglo-Indians) : I will reply to that.

SHRI KRISHNA MENON : I think the purpose is not to depend upon friends but to enable us to develop our self-reliance by the knowledge that there are no hostile factors in places where they do not exist. Therefore, any suggestion that this is a factor that would inhibit our ability to recognise Bangla Desh or GDR or North Vietnam, is unfounded and not legitimate, because recognition is a sovereign right and a sovereign function which must be exercised

[Shri Krishna Menon]

by us. Equally the idea that we could not ask the Soviet Union not to do this or that also would be wrong because they are a sovereign country too.

I remember the days when the Commonwealth countries used to bully the British Government a great deal and then their Foreign Secretary retorted: 'We are also a self-governing Dominion'. So the other partners to the alliance have also rights and I think it would be very wrong, a sign of political immaturity, to think that because they have signed a treaty with us, their action should be judged in Delhi and not in Moscow. This is a treaty, an agreement, between two equal partners based on mutual self-respect and self-interest.

So far as non-alignment is concerned, there was a time when the western world first scoffed at it, opposed it and, what is more, spoke about it as a proclamation of weakness, a proclamation of lack of allegiance to the Charter of the UN and so on. From there one moved on to the situation when the US took a rather cynical attitude towards it, until we come to the more modern period when they say they accept it. But the Soviet Union has at all time recognised it and taken no umbrage against it, that we are a non-aligned nation in the sense that we have got a position of our own and what is more, a positive contribution to make to world development, taking up the cause of each colonial country to assert its independence, and contributing to opposition to imperialism.

Finally, I hope that this treaty we have signed will be a factor which will stimulate and invigorate the forces of anti-imperialism not only in the governments but in all countries because so long as imperialism lives, there is no scope for national liberty either in India or in any other part of the world. Imperialism is the breeding ground of war and it is our business to be not merely against it in phraseology and resolution or by way of membership of the anti-colonies committee but go the whole hog in total identification with those who resist imperialism. That is the only way we shall prevent the designs of imperialist countries when they jump from one arena, from the

South Pacific gallery, and move on to another, Bangla Desh, to set up thousands of bases in foreign countries against liberty, threatening the liberty of mankind; that is the only way to liquidate these designs.

For all these reasons, the present step that has been taken is a substantial contribution, with the modification I have mentioned, that it is not a sudden adventitious growth in that way. The development of our policy has been a normal, natural and healthy one. It has been speeded up, and I hope that the dynamism that it represents will now transfer itself both in terms of this treaty and the actions that come hereafter.

SHRI B. R. BHAGAT (Shahabad) : Yesterday was a day of achievement for our nation. As has been evident from speeches made by hon. Members, there is almost a unanimity of national will behind this agreement, and on this the Government should be congratulated.

Sir, many considerations have come in the minds of the hon. Members when they have analysed this important document. Some have gone by the momentary considerations of the situation and realism prevalent along our borders and in those regions, but I think it would be better to view this treaty in the long-term perspective and the historic evolution of our national foreign policy.

It has been said by some hon. Members that even before Independence, rightly, and surely after Independence, we followed a policy of peace and friendship with all countries. For more than a decade, this expression of the policy of peace and friendship and co-operation with other countries found a most concrete and fruitful evidence in the growth of our relationship with the Soviet Union. Many facets of the relationship that grew over a period of years, since the days of Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru and Mr. Khrushchev, when they formulated this policy of peace between the two countries, have grown steadily. Whether in the economic field or in the scientific field or in the commercial field or in the various issues, the various crises that came during this period, in the world, there has been a certain identity of purpose and identity of approach between the two countries. Therefore, this

has been the most fruitful and satisfactory relation so far as the growth of relationship between these two countries is concerned.

Viewed in this respect, it is but natural that a treaty of this kind should have been signed with the Soviet Union. It is true that certain urgent relevance has been attached to it because of the timing of it ; the situation in Bangla Desh on our border and the continuing threats, verbal or otherwise, of the President of Pakistan, and then recently the famous, emerging detente or attempt to create a dialogue between the United States and China. These have provided certain urgent relevance to this, and certainly they cannot be ignored. But the basic fact is that here are two countries which have developed relations on the basis of mutual respect, on the basis of peaceful co-operation, friendship and equality. This is a very important aspect.

If you see this record against the growth of another super power, the United States of America, in their foreign policy in relations with Asia or Africa or the Latin American countries, or against some other countries, for example, the Chinese attitude, although it is entirely a different system, as against the hegemonistic approach or as against the approach of having a balance of power in certain areas, trying to parcel out the world in certain spheres of influence, here is an example of the relation between these two countries which,—I think the Minister of External Affairs was right when he said can be a model for other countries to follow.

What is this model ? The model is, here are two countries which have the right or the freedom to decide about their own destiny, have a peaceful approach to the world problems or have been trying to maintain peace and stability in the world and following a policy of co-operation. There is no example on record in which either the Soviet Union or India has tried to approach the world problems in any respect other than that of peaceful development and co operation. Therefore, this is in complete contrast to the approach of other alliances or of parcelling out the world in terms of spheres of influence or of treating the countries of Asia as pawns in the chess game of national interests of global

powers. And that is the reason why war has flowed out of these basically erroneous policies.

The United States has a democratic system. I do not believe that the United States has an authoritative system, but there are authoritative tendencies there, there are certain pockets. For instance, the monopoly capital or the multi-national companies have power more than any national Government, they have international power. The Pentagon has got great military power concentrated in it. There may be certain authoritative tendencies, but America remains a democratic country, and that is why that society is divided over basic issues. Whether it is Bangla Desh or Viet Nam or any other basic issue, the American society is divided. If there is any case of the failure of a foreign policy of a Government, it is the case of the United States so far as Asia or the Middle East is concerned. It is the right of the Government of every country to provide stability to itself and to develop relations with its neighbours, and not to be dictated by a super power in its own national interests. The United States has been viewing Asia as an extension of the national interests of the United States which is a global Power, which is a super Power. And that was the reason why, although it professed that it was going to create stability, it could not create stability in Korea, it blundered in Viet Nam and it is finding it very difficult to get out of the situation. Perhaps President Nixon is going to the Durbar of the Imperial Court of Mao Tse-tung to achieved that object of getting America out of the difficult situation.

Similarly in Bangla Desh they have followed the same wrong policy because they are guided not by the merits of the issue. They do not see it as a situation in which the democratic rights, expressed in an unprecedented manner unanimously by the people, are being suppressed by a militarist junta, but they are guided by the consideration of the role that Pindi has to play in their global strategy, and that is why they have blundered in Bangla Desh too.

Therefore, this is a contrast. This treaty is a contrast to the approach that is being followed in the present-day world

[Shri B. R. Bhagat]

by certain Powers which has resulted basically in many of the world crises. Wars, whether local or bigger ones, have arisen from that erroneous policy. Therefore, I think the Government has to congratulate itself, and the House also I think is unanimous on this point that this is a correct step that we have taken and that it has far-reaching implications. That is the correct view to take about this matter.

Despite all the eloquence of Mr. Vajpayee in supporting this, it appeared that he could not but welcome this seeing the general approval in the country of this step and the success of the policy that the Government has been following for over two decades. He said that non-alignment was not a religion. Who is saying that it is a religion? The non-alignment that we have been following is a cardinal principle of our foreign policy, and the basic factor of our non-alignment, as Mr. Krishna Menon said, is freedom to decide. But freedom to decide what?—not to enter into military alliances or military pacts or to wage war, but the freedom to decide about basic questions of war and peace, through peaceful cooperation, the right not to interfere in anybody's internal affairs, settling issues through peaceful means and equality of nations. Can there be any other basis in the present day world, which is a most complicated and troubled world than this?

When we go through this treaty article by article, we find that the cardinal principles of our foreign policy are enshrined in it: Article I—equality of nations and mutual benefit; Article II—complete disarmament. We are the one country saying that if the world is to be rid of war, there should be complete disarmament, both nuclear and conventional. Another cardinal principle of our foreign policy has been that we are opposed to any form of colonialism, including neo-colonialism or any form of racialism. This has found place in Article III. Friendship and peaceful cooperation and settling issues through peaceful negotiations—these are the cardinal policies enunciated by Shri Jawaharlal Nehru and we have been following them for 20 years. These are the very things which

have been enshrined in this treaty. What can be a better vindication of the correctness, the effectiveness and relevance of our foreign policy in the present day world than this? You compare it with the disaster of the American foreign policy in Asia and the discomfiture of the President of the United States today in seeking the help and cooperation of China. Therefore, to say that we were friendless and now we have got one friend, that we have been nonaligned so far and now we have become aligned and therefore it is to be welcomed, etc., is to miss the basic point of our foreign policy.

It has been said that the Soviet Union has been entering into treaties like this with all countries and therefore, it is not a new thing. They might have entered into treaties with other countries, but those treaties are different. We have also entered into similar treaties with many other countries. It is not a new thing for us. For example, the India-Burma Friendship Treaty of July 7, 1951, India-Egypt Friendship Treaty, April 6, 1955, India-Indonesia Friendship Treaty, March 3, 1951; India-Iraq Friendship Treaty, November 10, 1952; India-Nepal Friendship Treaty, July 31, 1960; India-Switzerland Friendship Treaty, August 14, 1948, India-Syria Friendship Treaty, February 25, 1952 and India-Muscat Treaty of Friendship, Commerce and Navigation, March 15, 1953. So, it is not as if this is the first time we are signing a treaty with any country. But the relevance and historic importance of this treaty has a special significance, if you see it from the long-term objective of our foreign policy. We want Asia to be an area of peace, as our country is situated in Asia. We believe that this peace can be ensured firstly by strengthening the independence of the countries of the region, many of whom are facing very difficult problems. Their independence has been threatened by outside countries. We want that threat to be removed. Each country on the basis of its national independence, on the basis of the strength of its economy, on the basis of following an independent economic policy, has the right to decide what arrangement to forge so that while its identity can be preserved it can influence the other countries. As Shri Krishna Menon has said, diplomacy essentially does not mean being a camp follower but to influence, and be influenced by, other countries.

We do not seek any sphere of influence. We do not seek any concept of super powers and their satellites. What we do seek is that when the problems of Asia in particular come up—I am not speaking in the world context, even though there the position is not different—every country should have independence and freedom to develop as it wants without outside interference and that is the only way in which the peace and stability in Asia can be maintained.

It has been said in some papers today that this treaty is the same as the treaty with UAR. There is a basic qualitative difference between our treaty and the treaty that UAR has entered into. What UAR has done might have been in their own national interest. Our treaty stands on a different position. So, to say that we placed ourselves in the same position is not correct. For example, article 8 of the treaty with UAR says :

“In reinforcing the defensive strength of the UAR, the two high contracting parties will continue to promote co-operation in the military sphere on the basis of the suitable agreements between them. This cooperation will particularly include aid in training the personal of the UAR armed forces, and in their assimilation of arms and equipment supplied to the UAR for strengthening its capability to remove the traces of the aggression...”

But Article IX of our treaty says :

“Each High Contracting Party undertakes to abstain from providing any assistance to any third party that engages in armed conflict with the other Party. In the event of either Party being subjected to an attack or a threat thereof, the High Contracting Parties shall immediately enter it into mutual consultations in order to remove measures to ensure peace and the security of their countries.”

So, you can see the qualitative difference between the two treaties. Therefore, I say this is not a mutual security pact and it is not a military alliance ; nor does this treaty mean the giving up of non-alignment.

SHRI PILOO MODY : Then what is it ?
It is nothing.

SHRI B.R. BHAGAT : The treaty, as I said, is the extension of the principles of non-alignment. We are now having a dynamic situation. In the seventies the situation is different. When many things are happening in this part of the world I think this treaty, which is a treaty of peace between India and Soviet Union, will be a great deterrent, so far as Asia is concerned, against any threat, be it from Pakistan or any other country. It is a deterrent against aggression or intervention by any power in our affairs. Therefore, this treaty should be hailed as a great historical achievement in favour of peace.

SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA (Begusarai) : Mr. Chairman, Sir, in all conscience the government was facing a difficult situation and also a moment of decision in a rather reasonably good way. Therefore, my party supports it.

It was significant that this treaty was signed on the momentous day of August 9. The implication could not therefore, be that while on the 9th of August 1942 we asked the British imperialism to get out, today we are going to ask the Russians to come in.

Mr. Chairman, we have got differences with the Government, but we do not distrust the Government to the extent that they would have in an indirect way thrown the red carpet for this Red Super-Power to come to our country. And why also distrust the people ? The Government would not be allowed to do it. People would not allow it to do it. We have confidence in ourselves.

Now, Mr. Chairman, it is obvious that this is a Treaty not in the normal circumstances. The crisis which the country was facing had indeed many dimensions, and all of them might not be known to us, but perhaps they could be ignored only at grave peril to our national interest. It would have been better if the Government had taken the country into confidence about some of the hidden dimensions of this threat that the country was facing, but if they have chosen not to do so we do not make any complaint or grievance about it on this occasion. But one thing, Mr. Chairman, which cannot fail to hit the eye is that the Government has been driven to taking this step in the situation

[Shri Shyamnandan Mishra]

created by Pakistan actively aided and abetted by the U.S.A. and China. Now sometimes, Mr. Chairman, in conditions of grave crisis in the country one is compelled to take steps which one would ordinarily avoid, taking steps which might be disagreeable and unwholesome in the normal circumstances.

I can do no better than recall to this honourable House what Winston Churchill said when Russia entered war during the Second World War...probably in 1941. On Sunday June 22, while the Prime Minister was at Chequers, he was informed that Russia had entered the war.

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA (Alipore) : Russia was invaded on June 22.

SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA : All right. The Prime Minister came to the Radio and broadcast to the nation. What did Winston Churchill say :

"No one has been a more consistent opponent of communism than I have been for the last 25 years. I will unsay no word that I have spoken about it. But all this fades away before the spectacle which is now unfolding. Any man or state who fights on against Nazidom will have our aid. Any man or state who marches with Hitler is our foe."

That was how Winston Churchill reacted to the association of Russia with the Second World War.

Now, Mr. Chairman, we would like to believe and there have been assurances prolific that this does not affect our policy of non-alignment. But it does not mean that we can do anything with non-alignment and yet call it non-alignment. If it were so we would in effect be saying something like this : Just as any fashion queen, say for example, Mala Sinha whatever she wears is fashion, and whatever India does is non-alignment. (*Interruption*).....then I have been wrongly informed by persons who ought to know. I am prepared to accept any other replacement.

It is India which had pioneered the policy of non-alignment two decades ago and

it is this policy which has given substance to our independence. It is this policy again to which more than half the number of members of the United Nations are wedded and devoted. We have not compromised this policy in the darkest hours of our history in the past and we would like to believe that the Government would passionately uphold it even in the times to come.

It is good to remind ourselves in this connection of what the progenitor of non-alignment, Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, had said after the Chinese aggression in 1962. He wrote in the *Foreign Affairs*, the American quarterly, about democratic planning inside and non-alignment abroad. This is what Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru said :

"(They) are not the product of any inspiration or arbitrary choice, but have their roots in our past history and ways of thinking as well as the fundamental national exigencies."

Again, he has said :

"By aligning ourselves with any one power; you surrender your opinion, give up the policy you would normally pursue, because somebody else wants you to pursue another policy.....If we align ourselves, we would only fall between two stools."

This is what the great Prime Minister, Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, said even after the great shock we had received in the year 1962 as a result of the Chinese aggression.

But all the same Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru also emphasized the fact that any country pursuing non-alignment cannot remain non-aligned with its own national interest. Non-alignment does not mean lack of alignment with the national interest; in fact, it is the first requisite of non-alignment that we must remain aligned to our national interest. Therefore the Algerian Prime Minister, Ben Bella, once said, "we are aligned with nobody; we are not even aligned with non-alignment."

That is the spirit in which we have chosen to pursue this policy which gives us the utmost flexibility, and independence and manoeuvrability.

The country will naturally judge this treaty by certain tests. The first test will be what amount of goods does it deliver to India. If it keeps us where we were and only provides us a sense of security about remaining where we were; it will turn out to be another damp squib.

This can, indeed be, an instrument for the promotion of our national interest. The immediate test, as has been emphasized by many hon. Members, is whether it helps us resolve the problem of Bangla Desh in a satisfactory manner and within a reasonable space of time. That would be the real test. There has been a national demand about the recognition of Bangla Desh. I think, if the Government does not want to take any precipitate step—there is probably no hawk in this House who would like the Government to be forced into taking that step without due consideration—that seems to be the only way of preventing it and posing it to the international community so that they sit up and think. That is the only way—the recognition of Bangla Desh.

Sir, the long-term test to my mind would be as to whether it helps or hinders India's emergence as an independent centre of power or a power in itself. Here, I would like to stress that this is what many people are now thinking whether we would have a sense of umbrella. I must say that some of the hon. Members on the other side of the House have not done justice to this Treaty when they called it as a kind of reaction from a position of weakness. It does not come by way of reaction from a crisis which could we have considered manageable on our own. We could trust the Government to look after the crisis effectively if the confrontation was meant to be only between India and Pakistan or even if it was meant to be one between India and China. This is indeed a reaction from the understanding of a diabolical situation that was emerging. Therefore, it will not be correct to say, as some hon. Members have tried to say, in effect that we have got a saviour now. Saviour is no one but India itself. We do not believe in an umbrella theory. So, such an approval will be doing a great injustice to the soul of the Treaty. That is a point which must be emphasized.

Now, there is another side to it. How does it affect the power balance in Asia? We have been trying to avoid any kind of conflict between the two powers in Asia so that Asia is not converted into a cockpit of conflict. This, indeed, means that this will have a long-term impact on the balance of power in Asia. One balance that was emerging was that of China and the United States on the one side and on the other side, the balancing of power was lacking. Probably, this might redress the balance of power to some extent. I may say that India's role has always been one of preventing Asia becoming the playground of super powers. Therefore, we will have to watch this very carefully.

Finally, I will have to say a few words about the body of the Treaty itself. I am rather sorry to find that there is no reference to the defence of Liberty. In this Treaty, while there are all kinds of laudable references to anti-colonialism and things of that kind, there is no reference to the defence of Liberty. Similarly, what is very much fresh in our minds is the act of genocide in Bangla Desh; but there is no reference at all to the need of preventing genocide anywhere in the Treaty. In fact, that is a categorical must for any country subscribing to the Charter of the United Nations, because every member of the United Nations is expected to subscribe to the Convention on Human Rights and Genocide.

Then, there is a reference to disarmament in the Treaty. May I ask the hon. Minister as to whether this disarmament will really relate to India only? If it means that India will now be forced to sign the Treaty of Non-proliferation, then, I should think, it is not for the strength of India but for its weakness.

One more thing I would like to ask whether this would mean automatic rescission of the Sino-Russian Treaty which has been in existence.

Before I conclude, I like to say that this Treaty which we welcome and support should not lull us into any sense of complacency and that we will have to build our own strength in order to give India a place which is very legitimately due to it.

SHRI P. VENKATASUBBAIAH (Nandyal) : Mr. Chairman, Sir, while wholeheartedly welcoming the Treaty of Peace, Friendship and Cooperation signed by the two nations of the world, I would like to make certain points emerging out of the observations made by the Members of the Opposition.

16 hrs.

It is really heartening to see that this Treaty has evoked a large measure of support from the Opposition parties also, Barring a few Opposition parties, the Opposition parties' spokesmen that have participated in this debate have had their own mental reservations about the efficacy of this treaty. It reminds me of a story of five blind men and an elephant. Mr. Vajpayee sees in this treaty a dominant interference in our internal affairs and he has at the same time hailed this treaty. But, on the other hand, he says that it may lead us to a position of a satellite of the Soviet Union. Earlier Shri Shyamnanjan Mishra, while welcoming the treaty as a whole, has had his own mental reservations and he does not want to give the full credit to the Government. This is a historical occasion as has been pointed out by several of our friends.

Many years back, on the historic occasion of the Quit India Movement in 1942 the Congress gave a clarion call to the people of this country.

SHRI PILOO MODY : What is that call ?

SHRI P. VENKATASUBBAIAH : Perhaps Mr. Modi is not aware of such a thing. As has been rightly pointed out by the Foreign Minister, this is another landmark in the history of our country. The clarion call given by the Prime Minister yesterday addressing a mammoth rally here, has rightly cautioned the nation.

About the twist or distrust that is sought to be given to this treaty, many interpretations are being sought to be put. But one factor which we should not forget is the circumstances under which this treaty has been effected. We should not lose sight of the fact that it is not a treaty between

unequal partners. It is a treaty for mutual security. I do not agree with Mr. Menon when he says that it has a misleading heading that has been given by the national papers that it is a treaty for security, a security pact. I would rather say that it is a treaty not only for peace, friendship and co-operation but also for mutual security. When we see the world events, we will be really surprised to know how events are taking place. As a matter of fact events are threatening to overwhelm us and overtake us. Should we caught in these overwhelming events. Should we still think in terms of ideological differences and ideological warfare ? The security, sovereignty and the territorial integrity for a country is supreme. Our national forces, our national policies do not get isolated by our foreign policy. Both have to be combined and co-ordinated. The foreign policy of a nation reflects upon the strength it possesses, upon the manner it manages its home affairs. We never acted in a manner, in a clandestine manner as the Americans have done in going *via* Pindi to Peking and entering into treaty with China. That clearly shows that they are guilty-conscience. That is how we could say. But here, Sir, the formal friendship and the informal friendship that existed between our two countries have been put on a formal footing and this has to be strengthened and in no way it can be construed that it is friendship between two unequal partners.

While going through the several Articles of the Treaty, one should understand the cardinal principle in this Treaty as has been stated by the Foreign Minister in his Preface to the Agreement that 'this Treaty, will, we are convinced, provide a stabilising factor in favour of peace, security and development not only of our two countries but the region as a whole.' I would say 'world as a whole'. We should not forget the fact that Russia is not only one of the biggest powers but it is also a most important Asian country. This is an Asian country is something that we should keep in mind when we deal with this matter of friendship with Soviet Russia.

It is also stipulated in the Agreement that whatever steps we take with regard to mutual cooperation and help will be within the framework or the guidelines provided

by the U.N. Charter, and also it will be in consonance with our territorial integrity and sovereignty and in furthering the peace of the world. What are we seeing in the international arena today? Even in respect of such an inhuman act that is going on in Bangla Desh, we are not able to rouse the conscience of the world Governments. It is a critical juncture and this Bangla Desh issue is not of our making, we never engineered it. Some 80 lakhs of people have been chased out of that country. We are faced with this stupendous problem. Still all these countries never cared to view this matter not only as a matter of human problem but also as a matter of military junta's barbaric acts. Some countries unfortunately have adopted a sort of deliberate and calculated silence. Some countries have adopted certain indifferent attitude. Some countries have come forward actually supporting the military junta in Pakistan. This is the type of balance of power they seek to create. Every such country is only guided by its own enlightened self interest. We find certain countries, whose cause we championed so much, keeping themselves deliberately out of this struggle—they have not expressed a word of sympathy of what a calamity has befallen on the people of Bangla Desh.

Shri Krishna Menon, our former Defence Minister had strayed into matters which perhaps were not relevant to this particular discussion. He made a very casual remark about the demonstration and rally that had been taken out in Delhi. Does he forget that when he faced the elections, he also had to contend with all these things and people's views were being given expression to in these forms? I am sure he knows this from personal experience. He was the Defence Minister of our country for some time, and he was also our representative at the UN. He championed our cause many a time in the international forums. So, I do not know why he should indulge in such sort of casual remarks about the foreign policy that is being pursued by our Government.

The most salient factor about this treaty is that it has created a tremendous morale-boost in the country. Not only the large millions of our population but the jawans fighting on the front,—in fact everyone,—

are electrified by this tremendous and historic event that has taken place.

The articles that are being scrutinised by our friends can only be scrutinised at the appropriate time, not now. The urgent need of the day is to see to what extent we shall be able to strengthen our bonds of friendship with the USSR and other like-minded countries. This treaty will not preclude us from entering into treaties with other countries also. This will not interfere with our territorial integrity or sovereignty. But at the same time, it will provide a stabilising factor in world events, and as the Foreign Minister has rightly pointed out, it will also act as a deterrent to further aggression or colonialism or imperial expansion.

So, I whole heartedly welcome this pact, and I would say that the nation owes a deep sense of gratitude to the Prime Minister for having effected this treaty and also for having enhanced the prestige of our country once again in the comity of nations.

SHRI FRANK ANTHONY (Nominated-Anglo-Indians) : Quite frankly, I am extremely happy at the signing of this treaty. Shorn of verbiage, and, even more, shorn of hypocrisy, it is a simple mutual security or mutual defence pact. I am particularly happy to read article 9. It spells out in plain, ordinary simple English the fact that not only in the case of attack but even in the case of threat of an attack, there will be concerned action to remove it.

For many years, I used to plead in this House for some sense of realism in our foreign policy. Over and over again, I had pleaded to the great Jawaharlal Nehru, 'If your non-alignment makes you allergic to regional pacts, then, for God's sake, have bilateral pacts.' I was regarded as a renegade, I was abused and I was criticised. That is what Government have done today. And thank God for it.

I am glad that my reading of this treaty is the same as the reading of my hon. friend Shri Swaran Singh. He has said in terms that article 9 gives notice to any potential aggressor; it is a deterrent. It is a mutual security pact; it is a mutual defence pact essentially. And I am extremely happy.

[Shri Frank Anthony]

Even Jawaharlal Nehru used to be angry with my hon. friends on the other side who did not know anything about this ; during the last few years of his Prime Ministership, I used to say with much respect that at a certain period, non-alignment had validity, when the super powers were jockeying for position, but several years before even Jawaharlal Nehru passed on, non-alignment had not only lost its validity but it had become a dangerous inhibition, because as soon as the power pattern changed from jockeying for position, and changed first to detente, and as we see today, more and more to *entente* between the super powers, it had become a dangerous inhibiting factor. I know that Jawaharlal Nehru used to get angry with me. But in that new context, non-alignment was not only a symbol of negativism, but it was a barren sterile concept ; it became synonymous with neutralism. That is why in a crisis no one could depend upon us except to get a little mealy mouthed so called moral support ; they could not depend upon us when it came to the crunch, and so, quite rightly, because in international affairs and in human affairs, there must be *quid pro quo*, we could not depend upon anyone when it came to the crunch. We were no one's ally, and no one was our ally. Thank God today that we have got at least one ally. That is the change that has been written into our policy. What were we before this ? Before this, we were a giant country, a giant occupying a key geopolitical position. But we were a flabby flaccid giant sitting on this fence of neutralism till the rusted iron of neutralism had entered our nonviolent souls. Today, thank God that this treaty has come about. As I said, Shri Krishna Menon may have been quite happy with non-alignment ; a few crumbs of friendliness were thrown to us by the Western democracy because we also subscribe to democracy. When we made frantic appeals in 1952 after the NEFA debacle and during the NEFA debacle, the Western democracies gave us some aid. But I was among those who pointed out that the aid was conditional some of us met Duncan Sandys. Jawaharlal Nehru was arm twisted and he was practically told in terms 'We will give you aid provided you make a concession on Kashmir'. Remember this also that at a later day, or in a later period, we wanted desperately certain sophisticated

planes from America ; they would not give them to us. When we wanted desperately certain submarines, the British and Americans cocked snooks at us. The only result of our non-alignment policy was this that we were inhibited in a crisis ; nobody could depend upon us to go to their aid, and in a crisis we were completely isolated, we were utterly friendless,

That is why I welcome this treaty. The immediate motives are identifiable. I am in a sense grateful and also pleased. I say that in a sense we ought to be grateful to the Nixon Government for having supplied the immediate motivation for this treaty. It was not only their stupidity, not only their amorality but sheer immorality on the part of the Nixon administration that has immediately precipitated our signing this treaty. I am grateful to them for this because it has taken us out of this barren, sterile non-alignment policy (*Interruptions*). Yes, I had said it. Jawaharlal Nehru used to get angry with me. Non-alignment continued to be a sacred cow, but unfortunately for India it was a barren cow. We still pay lip-service to this sacred barren cow.

Here was the Nixon Government, brazenly abetting genocide in Bangla Desh, unashamedly and brazenly abetting aggression against India. What is this if it is not aggression simpliciter, driving out millions upon millions of people in order to cripple not our economy but to cripple our whole way of life ? As I see it, the Nixon Administration have themselves to thank for this, and I thank them because it has given a positive orientation to India foreign policy at long last.

The Nixon administration had their own policy. They were not concerned with butchery in Bangla Desh ; they were not concerned with democratic values ; they were not concerned with human values ; indeed they were not even concerned with human decencies. As I saw it, the Nixon administration had decided, quite rightly to them that Pakistan which was within their defensive perimeter, was an accommodating client state, that at some further time in case of a confrontation between the super powers, there would be a client state which would give them bases. Therefore, they had decided that whatever the butchery, whatever the

destruction of democratic and human values, they should bail Pakistan out. Every step they took was a calculated step to bail Pakistan out.

Kissinger's visit to this country was not only a hoax; it was a calculated affront. That is the way I looked at it. He was not interested in even going to Calcutta. He had come here only to throw a smokescreen. He came as Nixon's international hatchet-man in order to have a secret meeting with Chou En-lai and had it arranged by their client, Yahya Khan. That was affront enough. If what the papers say he said to our ambassador is correct, then that was adding insult to injury. He is reported to have told our ambassador: "If you are involved with Pakistan, China is likely to intervene and we won't help you". I do not want to say anything very harsh about the Americans. Their credibility and their capacity for help in time of war has receded after being thrashed by a little country in South Viet Nam. They are not going to be of help to anybody on the ground; the Americans are not going to send their troops to help anyone on the ground; they may be able to help with their sophisticated weapons. Look at Kissinger's gall and impertinence. He sought to treat us like charity boys and charity girls. Here I blame Sardar Swaran Singh for being the purveyor of this sacred cow philosophy. We had invited this impertinence. We have cast ourselves in the role and image of supplicants, of good charity boys, and recently, of good charity boys, and recently, of good charity girls. So Kissinger thought he could send for our ambassador and say: 'Now, you Indians, you supplicants, you charity boys and charity girls, unless you behave like charity boys and charity girls, we are not going to give you any help.' That was the final insult to this country.

Today, personally I thank God, and after that I thank the Prime Minister for having taken us out of this policy of vegetarianism. I have said it before to my vegetarian friends: What is this non-alignment policy of yours? It is a vegetarian policy. It is a bloodless, meatless policy. Thank God, the Prime Minister has put some red meat into it—with apologies to my vegetarian friends on this side; she has put some red blood into it, some virility into it, and it has been oriented.

My friend quoted Churchill.¹⁰ He did not quote the most significant part. When Churchill was asked—that supreme realist—"How can you make common cause with that monster, Stalin, —master of a slave State, who murdered, butchered 10 million Russians and sent another 20 million to slave labour camps?"—Churchill replied, "When the security of my country is at stake, I will sup, if necessary, with the devil." I do not care whether we sup with the devil, half-devil and half-angel. But thank God, we have begun to sup with somebody and I hope we will sup with something more than orange and tomato juice.

Then, what my friend Swaran Singh said rejoiced my heart. He said that this will set the pattern for similar bilateral agreements. I want you to be as good as your word. We have got some arrangements with Bhutan and Sikkim. Now Nepal has regarded us as a flaccid, flabby, unreliable giant. Why can't you have a similar treaty with Nepal? You are going to Indonesia. Why can't you have a similar arrangement? Call it, for God's sake, a spade, a spade. Call it a mutual security pact.

Go further. Japan today is one of the industrial giants of the world. Just below the surface Japan has a tremendous nuclear capability. And you will find Japan also will be disillusioned with the Americans. They might be prepared to sign some kind of mutual assistance pact with us.

Finally, I come to this point which was made in a sense by my friend Atal Bihari Vajpayee. I was the first member who signed a memorial, signed by over a hundred Congressmen in those days when I was one of the few members of the Opposition. It was a plea to Jawaharlal Nehru not to let us be overtaken in this nuclear race. K. C. Pant was the moving spirit, but these young persons, when they become Ministers, lose their original convictions. I again said, and again Jawaharlal Nehru lectured me. I said you will be overtaken in this nuclear race; you will leave this country stark naked in that nuclear field, and then you will have to look around for umbrellas. I hope, to God, there is no semblance of non-alignment left. I hope there is nothing in this treaty

[Shri Frank Anthony]

that inhibits us from developing our own nuclear capabilities. I am not so certain. It looks dangerous as if we are going to sign that non-proliferation treaty; then it will be the greatest betrayal of this country, because I believe this, that until we develop our own nuclear capability, at very best, we can only be a junior partner of Russia. And even worse, we may later become a client and we may later become a colony. That is why I say this to my friends.

Let us go ahead. All right, make the best use of it. I think it is very good in the circumstances. Now that we have put this non-alignment policy into the wastepaper basket, whether we say it or not, put it into the dustbin of history or put into a good *goshala*—sacred cow—some kind of *goshala*; send it there.

Once we join the nuclear club, that day will give to this country a position of respect, commensurate not only with our geopolitical position but commensurate with our resources. Remember this. We have got a fine potential; we have the finest fighting material barring none in the world. Once you do that, it will give us the proper position of respect which we will never have otherwise, and once we join the nuclear club, it will also immediately relegate Pakistan to its proper position, as an irrelevant pygmy *vis a vis* India, in the mosaic of world *realpolitik*.

DR. V. K. R. VARADARAJA RAO (Bellary): I was rather surprised at my distinguished friend Mr. Frank Anthony talking so much about non-alignment and the way Mr. Jawaharlal Nehru used to get angry with him.

SHRI FRANK ANTHONY: You were not there.

DR. V. K. R. VARADARAJA RAO: That makes no difference. It was not necessary to be a Member of Parliament to have conversations with or to know Mr. Jawaharlal Nehru.

There is still some misunderstanding in some quarters about non-alignment. I do not want to elaborate on it, but even

assuming for a moment that non-alignment meant that you could not have any kind of military or pseudo-military understanding with any particular Power, it is correct for a country to join or even have a military understanding unless it has got some military power of its own? I suggest that if at all there was any fault in our policy, it was not in non-alignment, but in the fact that we did not equip ourselves sufficiently militarily, with the result that we suffered as we did in 1962. Till 1962 we were not worth anything militarily, nobody would have been interested in having any understanding with us. We would only have been a liability, we would have been no asset whatsoever. But, and I can say this I think with a certain amount of pride, we are now a military power, we are able to hold the Chinese at bay where they are, and we are able to take on Pakistan by ourselves without the help of anybody else. Therefore, even assuming all the logic of Mr. Anthony, though my Hindu mind is rather aghast at the prospect of a sacred cow being barren, I can assure him that the policy of non-alignment helped the world from having a Third World War. Any student of world history knows that but for Mr. Nehru there would have been a third World War and Heaven alone knows what would have been the fate of this country. In any case, all the time to say that non-alignment has gone, that Pandit Nehru's policy has failed, it seems to me, is not relevant, is not historically correct. And I can say with all the emphasis at my command that the policy that we are following today is nothing more than a logical culmination, flexible formulation, of the policy of non-alignment which is based on India's self interest and on the maintenance of peace in this region.

I read two leading articles in two leading newspapers of Delhi this morning, and I was rather surprised that both of them had the same heading, "Was this necessary?". And then I found that Mr. Piloo Mody had said the same thing. Evidently Mr. Piloo Mody has more editorial influence than I suspected him of having. It has been suggested in these articles that this pact came somewhat suddenly, that it was all done out of panic because we got scared, frightened, that Mr. D. P. Dhar had gone to Moscow earlier, that in five days everything was cooked

up, that Mr. Gromko came and we signed this pact. I do not claim to be an expert on foreign affairs, but I do have some interest in foreign affairs, and as far as I can claim any knowledge, the relationship between the Soviet Union and India has always been of a specially friendly character. Not only that, this friendship has been tested in the crucible of fire. It was tested in 1962, it was tested in 1965, and on both occasions Russia came out successful in the test. Not only that. If there is any one country which is helping us to become self-reliant and self-sufficient in the military field, it is the Soviet Union. It is because of the assistance of the Soviet Union, not only in the matter of heavy industries, that we are now fast becoming self-sufficient.

Though this treaty is spectacular in the context of Mr. Kissinger's secret visit to Peking, Mr. Nixon's projected visit to Peking and Mr. Kissinger's saying something to Mr. Jha, I would like to suggest for the sake of the record that this treaty is nothing more than a formalisation and telling the world at large that the Soviet Union and India are friends, that their friendship is permanent and telling the world at large that they will not act against each other that they will not help their enemies, that they will hold consultations with each other and if necessary come to each other's assistance in the case of threat of war against any one of them. We should view it like this and not think of its being something arising out of weakness.

Do you think the Soviet Union would have had these negotiations and signed this pact only because the Congress Party has now become a democratic socialist party? Some people are saying that Soviet Union has signed this treaty because we are becoming a socialist country. Let me say that the Soviet Union needs this country as much, if not more, than we need the Soviet Union. Any student of geopolitics and of the situation in the Soviet Union *vis-a-vis* China in the last few years, *vis-a-vis* United States and *vis-a-vis* NATO Pact, knows very well that geopolitical considerations make it imperative that the Soviet Union should have India's friendship. This

is not a one-sided affairs. It is not like a beggar going for aims and charity. It is a question of two parties recognising that they must get together in each other's national interest. That is what happened. It is high time we did not say anything either in this House or outside that would in the least denigrate India's position. For the first time, India's position has been recognised and we have been considered worthy of having this kind of agreement with, because we are powerful and both industrially and militarily we are more developed than we were sometime back.

I was rather surprised when I read in one of the papers that Mr. Nixon in his foreign policy message to the Congress had said that the Indian sub-continent is a continent where there are interests of the United States, interests of China and interests of the USSR and none of these interests must be allowed to become dominant. But what about India? Mr. Nixon evidently forgot that there was a country like India in the sub-continent. Did he mean by interest, influence? I want to suggest that this treaty has come at a very good time, because for the last 24 years, if not earlier, this country has been suffering from the partition which has brought into existence, encouraged and stimulated, because the powers which had to leave the country wanted to create a vacuum and a balance of power, where they can still continue to exercise their influence. The partition was brought about by British guile and diplomacy. Britain saw to it from the beginning that Pakistan and India were always equated. The Kashmir imbroglio came at the opportune moment. From then onwards, in every statement India and Pakistan have been equated. Thanks to Pandit Nehru, thanks to our planning and thanks to our democracy, when it was found that this country was making headway, creating international goodwill and becoming economically strong, the military alliance came and the United States supplied arms. Then came China. The attempt throughout has been to create a balance against India. This treaty sounds the death-knell to all the policies of the western imperialist powers about making a balance of power on the Indian sub-continent and showing a pistol at India's head by arming Pakistan.

[Dr. V. K. R. Varadaraja Rao]

This House welcomes the treaty and congratulates the Government on signing it. The people of India today feel strong and proud. We are friends of the Soviet Union. We are not their slaves and they are not our masters. I do not agree with Mr. Mukerjee who said that now we will become much more socialist. Let me say, if we become socialist, we will become socialist from our own steam, out of our own strength and conviction, not by prodding by the Soviet Union. Our national and internal policies are ours. We respect the Soviet Union, but this treaty is based on identity of mutual interest and geopolitics and not on ideology.

Sir, with these words, I support the signing of this treaty with the USSR.

SHRI PILOO MODY (Godhra): Mr. Chairman, Sir, I am afraid that I am going to sound a note of caution in all the enthusiasm, pride, boast and brag that you have heard today. I am also going to start reading between the lines because I understand that Comrade Swaran Singh and Sardar Gromyko can read the lines very well themselves. But it is between the lines that I want to read.

The first thing that appears to me is that this is a most intriguing sort of thing that has happened. At first when I heard about the treaty I was rather inclined to welcome it. I said that if this treaty was to help us *vis-a-vis* our problem regarding the refugees from Bangladesh, or if it was to help us regarding the aggression or the threat of aggression that we are suffering from Pakistan, that if this treaty was to help us to counter the American arms aid to Pakistan, that if this treaty was to help us to step up the arms supply from the Soviet Union, and if this treaty was to help us to counter Chinese intrusion or intervention in case we decide to take any action, we should welcome it. But the more I thought about this treaty, the more intriguing it became, the language, the method and the manner in which it was done.

There was a certain indecent haste about it. When we all read about the melodrama of Mr. Kissinger's visit to Peking and about the *detente*, about the so-called *detente* between President Nixon and Prime Minister

Chou-En-lai, I would have thought that such a situation would have brought us to the conclusion that as a result of this *detente* the options before our country had opened up enormously, that for once we had a great many options and those which apparently seemed closed to us for a while were opening up. It would also have brought us to the conclusion that the Soviet Union was getting somewhat isolated as a result of this Washington-Peking axis. But, instead of that, we got the fear that we were going to be isolated. We panicked when we read the statement made as late as the 9th of July by the Soviet Union still equating India with Pakistan and we rush in where angels fear to tread.

What is even more mysterious is the way in which my good friend, one Shri D. P. Dhar, after his term as Ambassador in Moscow is over, returns to India, installs himself in South Block as some sort of Officer on Special Duty, does some work within his room, then rushes back to a place where he was recently accredited, appears as a parallel Ambassador in Moscow, then returns back again and from the pictures that are available to us in the newspapers we find him and Mr. Gromyko together and he appears as if he was the parallel Foreign Minister of this country. Somewhere in the background you could see the rather picture of Sardar Swaran Singh who, it appears to all of us, appeared on the stage only yesterday as the Minister Plenipotentiary accredited for the purpose of signing this treaty.

I would really like to know whether Comrade Swaran Singh knew that Sardar Gromyko was coming to India to sign the treaty with us. I really doubt it. I do not think he knew it.

Why is this treaty being signed just now? The Soviet Union tried in 1969 to get us to sign the same treaty and we resisted it at that point. We have been resisting it ever since and, all of a sudden, they have become very amenable to the signing of a treaty of this nature.

16.40 hrs.

[SHRI R.D. BHANDARE *in the chair*]

Today, Sir, the Soviet Union was isolated. India had its options open and, therefore, I

want to ask myself—I do not intend to ask Sardar Sahib because you do not get any replies from him. By signing this treaty step up arms supply to India? Will the Soviet Union act as a deterrent to Pakistan? Will they stop blackmailing us about the supply of spare-parts for our military equipment? Will they fight on our side if it is necessary? Will they look after the Chinese on our behalf if it became incumbent? I receive no satisfactory answers even from myself. I recall to my mind the doctrine of “travaux préparatoires” which is a doctrine of Prior Conduct and looking at it why precisely at this point and no other point this Treaty was signed. Are there any reservations in this Treaty, any secret clauses? It talks about “immediate consultation” in the case of aggression. This implies that there is some known intention implicit in that clause. But then when I ask myself all these questions connected with today’s problems what do I find? Mr. T.N. Kaul, the Foreign Secretary, giving an official briefing on behalf of the Government of India said only day before yesterday :

“We have been working for this Treaty for over two years and it has nothing to do with the development with Bangla Desh or the attitude of the United States.”

I wonder if the hon. learned Members of this House have taken the official version straight from the horse’s mouth which is the Foreign Secretary and who has explicitly said that this has nothing to do with the present situation. Then why are they talking about Bangla Desh or preparations and armaments. How is this friendship going to help? It is, as my statement said, a logical culmination of what has been happening. Whether there is any culpability about it or not only history will tell us.

Does this treaty bind us in any way from having? Our own little detente with China or signing other treaties with other nations as has been suggested by so many of us? Sir, on examining the Treaty I find that this is a very common ordinary treaty which the Soviet Union has been paddling in every capital of the world. But if you look more closely, Sir, you will find that the Warsaw Pact is also couched in identical language

inspite of what my friend, Mr. Manoharan, may have said in my absence the fact of the matter is except for a clause or two which deal with an United Military Command the rest of the clauses are very similar. Am I to assume that had these two clauses been introduced in our little treaty we would have reached the commanding heights of becoming a satellite of the Soviet Union and that having been deprived of these we become only associate members of the Warsaw Pact. What is it? I just cannot understand because these are Soviet terms identical to treaties signed by the Soviet Union couched in Soviet language, with a Soviet draft? Even the Hindi translation was Soviet translation which was made by Russians in Moscow and not by Indians in Delhi. That has been accepted as the official translation of the Treaty.

SHRI R. S. PANDEY (Rajnandgaon) : What about the paper on which the Treaty has been written? Is it also Russian?

SHRI PILOO MODY : Could very well be. If they had made any creditable case, Sir, from what I can understand.....

Mr. CHAIRMAN : The time is short.

SHRI PILOO MODY : So is my speech.

If you were to analyse the treaty, I find that there is very little that we stand to gain as a result of the treaty. All the benefits that we stand to derive from the Soviet Union we would have got in any case without signing the treaty. I am convinced in my own mind about that. I think, had a certain amount of wisdom prevailed; that would have been the conclusion. Things should have been allowed to continue whereas the Soviet Union is desperate now because it has made an entry in a big way in the Indian Ocean and it is looking for bases and refuelling places. It is naturally looking towards us who have very many such facilities in the Indian Ocean for giving them these facilities. I would like to know from the Foreign Minister whether he intends to give such facilities over and above what is normal to the Soviet Union.

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA (Alipore) : Over and above what the Americans and the British have got,

SHRI PILOO MODY : Over and above what is normal. Let them also have equal facilities.

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA : They have not yet got them.

SHRI PILOO MODY : I am not attached, unfortunately.

AN HON. MEMBER : He is non-aligned.

SHRI PILOO MODY : Another thing I would like to know.

What happened to countries who have signed similar agreements with the Soviet Union? Would you like to think about China? Would you like to think about Petlad? Would you like to think about Hungary? Would you like to think about Czechoslovakia? Why do you not ask Dubcek? Let Shrimati Gandhi ask Dubcek what he thinks of it. What has happened in the UAR? Why is it that this agreement is going sour in the Sudan?

Are there any lessons to be learnt from history? The Brezhnev Doctrine, invented to explain and justify retrospectively the invasion of Czechoslovakia, claims that any country which calls itself socialist—and this we have started to do—can never escape from that net and that any attempt to bring it back to the path of liberal democracy would justify Soviet military intervention. Shrimati Gandhi has pushed us into that camp. I hope, we do not attract the same sanctions.

Finally, I would like to confess that I am at a loss. I would like to welcome this treaty if I can see any benefits for India. But I cannot see any and I certainly see many dangers. The Foreign Minister, Comrade Swaran Singh, will not enlighten me, I am sure. Sardar Andrei Gromyko makes very reassuring sounds, gives us assurances as if everything is going to be fine from now on. We have

been bound for twenty years and more.

Ultimately I take comfort from the attitude taken by the very people whom we are going to be friends with. The high priest of world Communism, Mr. Lenin, once said :—

“Promises are like pie-crust-made to be broken. It would be mad and criminal to tie our hands by entering into an agreement of any premanence with anybody.”

This was said by the high priest of Communism, Mr. Lenin, to which Mr. Stalin has added :—

“Words have no relation to actions. Otherwise, what kind of diplomacy is it? Words are one thing, actions are another.”

I hope, to these two epitaphs Sardar Swaran Singh will add a third one.

SHRI SWARAN SINGH : Comrade Swaran Singh !

SHRI PILOO MODY : At the last minute I decided to turn you back into a Sardar.

SHRI NIMBALKAR (Kolhapur) : Mr. Chairman, Sir, in peace there is nothing so becoming a man as modest stillness and humility, but when the blast of war blows in our ears, then imitate the actions of a tiger. These words come to my mind from Shakespeare when I see the actions of Yahya Khan now-a-days. But Yahya Khan probably does not realise that such words might have been appropriate at a time when Shakespeare wrote in the Elizabethan Era and put them in the mouth of a medieval king. Whereas during the time that Yahya Khan was spending in rattling as sabre threats to us, our Government, without revealing to us, perhaps, surely and slowly moved in the direction of this Treaty. Even if Mr. Piloo Mody does not find anything in this Treaty or does not see what is in this Treaty at all, I find that this Treaty is of the highest importance. I am quite sure that as time progresses, even Mr. Piloo Mody will agree with us.

The point is that this Treaty without involving us in such a manner that we should give up our internal policy ensures for us the type of security which we at present urgently need. This security is given to us in such a manner that if you study this Treaty, you will find that not only we are treated equally but what is more that we have got more from Russians than what we are giving them in return. Actually, if you see this Treaty, it puts upon us a certain burden which we should have realised much before time. We might not have found it necessary to have this Treaty at all. And that burden is, even though we want to be treated as equal with Russia and even if Russia in their magnanimity treats us equally still it is our duty to stand on our own feet and become strong with the help or without the help of anybody else.

This is a very important phase in the foreign affairs of our country, a phase which puts upon us a burden that in order to win friendship which we already have of Russia, we must also become, through our own efforts and through the help of Russia, if necessary, strong and equal to Russia. This means it is very necessary that just as our Government has, more or less, revised its foreign policy as Mr. Swaran Singh has said that the world is presenting a rapidly changing and dynamic picture, this Treaty embarks upon a beginning towards a dynamic foreign policy of India. For that, we have to certainly congratulate Mr. Swaran Singh and, I am quite sure this will embark upon a beginning not only of a new foreign policy but also a new defence policy in India.

I would like the Government to consider seriously now with or without the help of Russia to embark towards what others might call as dangerous and that is a nuclear weaponry. It is very necessary that we must now go in for an atom bomb. I will say that the difficulty that will really arise for this is not that we do not have the know-how or that our education is too low but the difficulty is that we have not got the necessary super-structure which is very expensive, and with that super-structure, a heavy load will be placed on the price structure of our economy. There will be a very negative influence on the price structure of our economy. The American people, they say, might find that this treaty is against

them. I don't think so. The real fact is that if this treaty is going to be against the Americans, Americans themselves are to blame for it, not Indians. It is a very important point that the future behaviour of America with us also will count in making this treaty either one which is not aggressive to America or aggressive. Some thing is with other countries. This treaty is not against any country unless it chooses to be aggressive against us.

Therefore, for the first time, India has embarked upon a policy of which we can be proud of and for the first time perhaps people on the opposite side will realise that Mrs. Indira Gandhi and her Ministers are not only capable of looking after the Indian interests not only in India but also outside India.

I thank you.

Dr. HENRY AUSTIN (Ernakulam) : My first duty this afternoon, I think, is to congratulate the Foreign Minister on this treaty which will, no doubt, have far-reaching consequences in the full of international relations. In spite of all that has been said against this treaty by a few hon. Members of the opposition and, particularly against one particular fact of our foreign policy, namely, non-alignment, I firmly believe that this really an affirmation or rejuvenation of our policy of non-alignment. I would further say that there is a sort of historic continuity in our foreign policy. Some of the hon. friends of the opposition have been trying to analyse the origin and growth of this particular facet of our foreign policy, I would say, the basic postulate of our foreign policy, namely, non-alignment. But I am sorry to say that they have not finally understood the basic moorings of this aspect of our foreign policy. The pre-ambule of this treaty would convince anyone that one of the basic reasons for us to embark upon this Indo—USSR treaty is the fact that both countries have been convinced, as is said in the pre-ambule, that in the world today international problems can only be solved by co-operation and not by conflict. I would like to say to my hon. friends that if we have now proceeded to enter into a formal legal treaty, it is because we are convinced that by this treaty we can still further affirm our basic moorings in non-alignment.

[Dr. Henry Austin]

In spite of the sabre-rattling by Pakistan in the wake of the Sino—US detente we have not jumped into any military alignment. If only we wanted to have a military treaty or a defence treaty with any country, perhaps we could have had it. But, in spite of this great provocation, we have stood fast to our basic moorings in our foreign policy, namely, the policy of peace, friendship and co-operation which this treaty enshrines. Therefore, if some hon. Members think that this is a treaty which deflects from the original policy of non-alignment, I feel that they have not studied the various implications and the various aspects of our foreign policy.

17 hrs.

The second point that I would like to highlight is this. This country is again a vindication of the next postulate of our foreign policy that we want friendship with all countries.

Our Foreign Minister, after signing this Treaty had said, both in this House and in the other House that we are prepared to have a dialogue with China—not only a dialogue, but an understanding with China, provided they respond to our call. So, we have extended our hand of responsive friendship to China also, thus, it is not as though this Treaty is directed against this country or that country. It is largely with a view to consolidate peace in India and peace in the world that this Indo—USSR Treaty has been signed; it is therefore a significant contribution towards stabilisation of world peace.

Sir, doubts have been expressed by some of our hon. friends that the independence of our foreign policy will be lost as a consequence of this treaty. Every student of India's foreign policy, who has gone through the speeches of Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, the architect of our foreign policy, will no doubt own that if there is one thing that Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru had insisted upon, it was his passionate concern to preserve the independence of our foreign policy. If anybody thinks that merely because we have entered into a treaty of friendship, peace and cooperation with the USSR we will lose independence of action, I would say, he is living on a fool's paradise. Such persons have no basic faith in the people of India—

a country where one-sixth of the human race lives. Such a country can never be a satellite of any other country,—however militarily powerful that country may be.

We in this country and the foreign policy makers of this country are fully convinced of the basic strength of India. And this basic strength stems from the fact that we are one-sixth of the population of the world. If the Soviet Union or the United States or China or other countries think that we can be treated like that, they are not living in a world of reality.

I have already said that this Treaty is a great landmark. I would go further and say that this treaty has opened up the possibilities for the greatest socialist mobilisation of our times.

The USSR, with its vast experience of the last 40 years, had propounded certain theories. Not only that, they have also tried to implement them. The USSR, like the Republic of India, is multi-racial, multi-lingual and multi-everything, so far as the composition of the population is concerned. We can draw heavily from their experience as to how socialism has been constructed in that country. In India, after consolidating our political freedom, we have embarked on the next step of transforming our socio-economic fabric. The mobilisation of the resources and strength of these two countries will be a great gain in the great task of socialist mobilisation and construction.

Sir, this treaty also marks a great victory of geo-political realism. Our friends from the opposition, particularly of the Swatantra party, are always thinking in terms of aligning with the USA or other capitalist countries. We have found the futility of this step when countries like Pakistan entered into military alliance with the USA. We have seen the futility of such alliance in Vietnam. The United States could not do anything in North Korea either. A country which is thousands and thousands of miles away cannot come to the rescue of this country nor do we want any country to help which has imperialist motivation to help us.

So, when we entered into a treaty of friendship and mutual cooperation with the USSR, it reflects great geo-political realism; it is a country which is in our neighbourhood. So, this is a great victory for the

theory that neighbours should be good friends and we have achieved that. We have got a good friend on our borders. Sir, this treaty also serves as a great political mobilisation in a great landmark of the world. It will scare the people who live under the delusion that they can frighten this country. When Pakistan recently received huge military hardware from the USA and got logistic support from China, they thought they could frighten this country. Because of this political mobilisation now having been achieved between USSR and India, I think, that, sabre-rattling and war-mongering by Pakistan and its military junta will now be silenced. Sir, there is no need for any mutual assistance provision or a mutual defence arrangement in the treaty. The very fact that we have signed a treaty with the USSR and its timing are very important. Any student of international treaties knows that the timing of a treaty is much important as the treaty itself. China with her hegemonic aspirations and the USA with its imperialist motivations have been using Pakistan—a running dog of imperialism—to scare us into submission by a threat of isolation. But we showed by this political mobilisation that we can never be blackmailed by any power, whether China or the USA or by their combination. That is the significance of this treaty.

I would not like to refer to the real meaning of U.S. foreign policy and the *entente* that they have created, or the *denente* as it is otherwise called, between the USA and the People's Republic of China. As a student of US foreign policy, I have come to the conclusion, and I have shared my views with scholars that the real political motivation or the foreign policy objective of the USA is that if a war comes—and according to their calculation, a war is bound to come—it should be fought far far away from their frontiers. That has been their basic security concept. In pursuance of this policy they have been trying to create a conflict between the USSR, and China. First, they cultivated the USSR and then they are now befriending China. The basic idea is to gradually set China against the USSR, and if a war comes, their objective is that the war should come on the mainland of Asia. During the last war, they could have dropped the atomic bomb on Germany or any other European country.

But, instead, they picked up Japan to throw their bomb on. Similarly, now also they want to create a situation in which if war comes, it will come in Asia. That is their basic calculation. If we had not entered into this agreement with the USSR, then I am sure that this policy of the USA to set China against the USSR would have got another boost. But we have now checkmated, it, and to that extent, it is a big contribution towards peace in Asia and towards guaranteeing the security of the USSR also. When we enter into a treaty it is not as though its benefits should accrue to our country alone. If we gain some benefits from this treaty, the USSR also gains some benefits from this bilateral arrangement. As my hon. friend Shri Hiren Mukerjee has pointed out, a friend in need is a friend indeed. It was time that we needed a great morale-booster. It was time that we got some logistic support. This treaty has provided us with both at a crucial stage of our history. These detractors of our foreign policy who have been going around telling people that we have become friendless should now realise that the basic postulates of our foreign policy are now yielding rich dividends. Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee had said that our foreign policy had led us to a situation where we were friendless so far. I would not like to tell him that Rome was not built in a day, and a foreign policy formulation cannot yield the desired results in a decade or two. Now, we have found that the basic assumptions of our foreign policy do yield rich dividends. I would like to tell the detractors of our foreign policy that India will have friends; and if India is threatened by any country, they will find that in spite of the fact that we are neither a big military power nor a member of a power bloc, we will get wide support from the international community. That is because we stand for altruism, because we want to widen the area of peace. We shall have not only friends, but we shall have a large measure of sympathy and understanding of peoples the world over, as well. Sir, this Indo-Soviet Friendship Treaty will, I am sure, generate a great fund of goodwill which will eventually sweep the war-mongers away from the international scene.

DR. MELKOTE (Hyderabad): On behalf of the TPS, I welcome the treaty of

[Dr. Melkote]

peace, friendship and co-operation that the Government have entered into with the Soviet Union. Many members have tried to criticise the treaty in its various aspects. I have tried to closely follow the arguments they have adduced. While they have criticised quite a number of items, nobody has so far suggested a single item on which they could make an improvement. If the treaty is open to criticism, why did not the members criticising it point out where and in what way they desired an improvement.

It appears to me that this treaty has been very wisely and well-drawn. It has come as the culmination of certain events in world affairs. It is an exhilarating experience ; it is historic that this treaty was entered into yesterday. Apart from that, may I congratulate the Prime Minister and the External Affairs Minister on entering into this treaty at this juncture.

If America enters into an agreement with China and Pakistan, the same type of question that is being asked here today could be asked on the other side. What would happen to China and America? Will capitalist, imperialist America shed its colour? Will China become capitalist in its outlook hereafter? What would be the type of understanding that will come? Will they follow the pattern Pakistan has been following?

Questions of this type would naturally arise in every kind of treaty. What I would say is this. During this century, there have been two revolutions of very great importance. One was in 1918 in Russia emanating from the Marxian idea of revolution that has transformed the common man the globe over. Similarly in India with Gandhi in ideology we faced the mighties empire and through non-violence wrested power. One was democratic ; one got freedom ; one imbibed spiritual strength in each one of us. The other in Russia equally acquired a name for doing good for the common man everywhere and for peace, but it is dictatorial. If America joins Pakistan and China, America could never join Russia because of the technological improvement that has taken place. They are warring with each other ; they could never

come to an understanding. Therefore, the only method by which they could allay their misgivings is by entering into an understanding with the mass of the people of China. If these two join together and threaten India, what is going to happen? We have not entered into the treaty because of fear, but because of the consequences that flow from some of those understandings that have been arrived at. The coming together of Russia with her technological development and democratic India with her Gandhian ideology will possibly mellow both and it will lead to an improvement of international relations. That is how I look at this treaty.

Various aspects of the question have been discussed. I do not want to go into details. But at this juncture, the treaty has been entered into to tell the world that we are not friendless. At the same time, the world will know that we are peaceloving, that the treaty does not mean anything except an understanding to support each other when they are attacked by somebody else. I do not know whether there is anything between the lines in the treaty to be read. Oftentimes in treaties have such hidden meanings. If so, it is for the Foreign Minister to dilate on this. But as a plain-speaking document, I consider it as one of the first class documents to which we have appended our signature. There is nothing in it to which one could take exception. It is, therefore, on account of the time-spirit, on account of the revolutions that have taken place here and in Russia, that this has to be welcomed, and these two revolutions have a world-wide impact. And these two powers' coming together at this juncture might have a world-wide affect hereafter. That is what envisage.

Therefore, I feel that this treaty has got to be supported whole heartedly by everyone in the House.

Thank you.

श्री प्रबोध चन्द्र (गुरदास पुर) : चैयर्मैन साहब, दूसरी जंगे-अजीम में चन्द लफ्जों का फिक्रा बहुत मशहूर था — हाउ मच फार हाउ मैनी— कितना कुछ किया है कितनी दुनिया के लिये । चन्द आदमियों ने, उन का इशारा

चर्चिल रुजवेल्ट और स्टालिन की तरफ था, इन तीन आदमियों ने दुनिया जो लड़ाई के दहाने पर खड़ी थी, उस को अपनी काबलियत से कैसे बचाया। यही फिक्का आज आयद होता है, हमारी हमारी हिन्दुस्तान की प्राइम मिनिस्टर, हमारे फारेन मिनिस्टर और रशिया की जो लीडरशिप है, कि किस तरह से इन तीन आदमियों ने आज उस दुनिया को जो तबाही के दहान पर खड़ी थी काबलियत और अपनी हिम्मत की वजह से इस तबाही से बचाया है। आज सिर्फ हिन्दुस्तान ही नहीं बल्कि तमाम दुनिया हिन्दुस्तान की लीडरशिप की ममनून है। दुनिया आज इस बात से डरती थी कि कब जंग की चिंगारी हिन्दुस्तान या पाकिस्तान से शुरू हो कर तमाम दुनिया पर फैल जाये। लेकिन इस ट्रीटी ने उस को बचाया है।

दूसरे हम फख्र कर सकत हैं कि आज आजादी के 15 साल बाद हिन्दुस्तान की लीडरशिप को यह रिकगनीशन मिला है। आज हिन्दुस्तान के लीडर दुनिया के बड़े से बड़े मुल्क के लीडरों की बराबरी कर सकते हैं—काबलियत में या दूसरी बातों में। मैं आज फख्र करता हूँ कि हमारे मुल्क के स्टेट्समैन ने, हमारे मुल्क के लीडर्स ने खास कर हमारे फारेन-मिनिस्टर और प्राइम मिनिस्टर ने हमारे मुल्क का नाम ऊंचा किया है। लेकिन मुझे अफसोस है कि जैसे एक भाई ने कहा कि मुझे कुछ दिखाई नहीं देता, तो जनाब आपने भी एक परिन्दे का नाम सुना होगा, मैं उस का नाम नहीं लेता, उसे दिन में कुछ दिखाई नहीं देता। लेकिन इस में सूरज का कोई कुसूर नहीं है बल्कि कुसूर उभी का है कि उसे कुछ दिखाई नहीं देता। अगर देखना है कि आज हिन्दुस्तान के अवांम इस ट्रीटी के बारे में क्या सोचते हैं तो लाखों गरीबों की आंखों में भांक कर देखें कि इस

ट्रीटी के बाद उन की आंखों और उन के चेहर पर कल कितनी रोशनी थी। ... (व्यवधान)... बड़े लीडर्स जो यहां बैठे हैं, मैं और कुछ तो नहीं कहना चाहता, लेकिन उन की मिसाल यही है कि बकरी दूध ज़रूर देती है, लेकिन मँगन छोड़ जाती है। वाजपेयी जी ने बहुत कुछ बातें कहीं, लेकिन जाते-जाते अपनी आदत के मुताबिक, क्योंकि रशिया का फोबिया उन पर है, उन्हें अपने हिज़ मास्टर्डज वायस की बात ज़रूर कहनी थी। तो जनाब, मैं आज इस के लिये फारेन मिनिस्टर को मुबारिकबाद देता हूँ और अर्ज करता हूँ कि यह ट्रीटी जिस पर दस्तखत किये हैं वह दुनिया को अमन और शान्ति का रास्ता दिखायेगी और आज अवांम का जो ज़रूरत है, उन की भूख को दूर करने के लिये दुनिया के तमाम ज़राये उसी तरफ इस्तेमाल होंगे, —न कि हिन्दुस्तान और दुनिया की जंग में डालने के लिये।

बहुत लोग यह कहते हैं कि हिन्दुस्तान की हुकूमत डरती है, वह जंग नहीं चाहती। लेकिन वे यह नहीं जानते कि लड़ाई में कोई लड़कू तो बटते नहीं हैं बल्कि लड़ाई में गोले चलते हैं। पिछली 15 दिन की लड़ाई में हिन्दुस्तान का डबेलपमेन्ट पीछे चला गया था। अगर आज हिन्दुस्तान चन्द जज्बाती लोगों के नारों पर लड़ाई करता है तो हम उस से अपने देश को बरबादी की तरफ ही ले जायेंगे। इस लिये मैं अपने सभी साथियों से जो इधर बैठे हैं या उधर बैठे हैं, चाहता हूँ कि वे गवर्नमेन्ट को इस ट्रीटी के लिये मुबारिकबाद देगे और ऐसी कोई बात नहीं करेगें जिम से हमारे देश का जो बड़ा साथी और हमदर्द है, उस के साथ कोई गलतफहमी की गुंजाइश पैदा हो।

इन अलफ़ाज़ के साथ में आप का शुक्रिया अदा करता हूँ।

SHRI M. MUHAMMAD ISMAIL (Manjeri) : Mr. Chairman, Sir, the Indo-Soviet Pact that has been signed yesterday gives a concrete and definite shape to the principle of co-existence for which our country stands and has been advocating for a long time. There may be difference in ideology between one country and another, but that is no reason why they should shrink from each other as that would only harm the interests of the countries concerned. Apart from ideologies, there is a wide field in the case of every country on which there can be agreement and working on which will be of advantage to the countries concerned. India and Russia have identified this area of common interest and have pledged to stand together on such interests.

This treaty is not for pooling the strength of the two countries for purposes of aggression over any other country, but as has been rightly pointed out by the External Affairs Minister, it is a treaty of peace, friendship and non-aggression. But should there be any attack or threat of it, the contracting parties will take effective action to protect peace and ensure the security and interests of their respective countries. This will add to the stabilisation of peace and security not only of the contracting countries, but of those of their region as well. This treaty is, therefore, a salutary and effective instrument which would contribute to the peace of the world too.

Our non-alignment policy has done good to our country and it has been amply serviceable also to certain other countries in their struggle for freedom and in other matters concerning them. The present treaty with Russia cannot conflict with our country's non-alignment policy. This policy does not at all mean that we should not have anything whatever to do with other countries and its effect is not to isolate us from other countries. In the present-day context when some other countries have failed to properly understand our stand with regard to Pakistan, refugees and other matters, and when they do not appreciate our policies, it is but right and necessary that we must come to a firm arrangement with a country which is friendly and appreciative of our policies and position.

I welcome the Indo-Soviet Treaty and wish it well.

17.22 hrs.

(MR. SPEAKER *in the Chair*)

MR. SPEAKER : Shri Samar Guha.

SHRI N. SREEKANTAN NAIR (Quilon) : Each Presiding Officer comes and gives somebody some concession, and the other groups in the House which are voiceless are simply ignored. That is very bad, going too far. If trouble is what you want, we know how to give it.

SHRI SAMAR GUHA (Contai) : Today I speak not as a spokesman of the PSP, but as a spokesman of the Socialist Party born in the sublime unification of three socialist forces, the PSP, the SSP and the ISP.

I feel that realism of the situation demands that we should have friendly relations, very close relations, with Soviet Russia, but I think it is wholly unnecessary to codify this relationship of friendship with Russia in the form of a treaty binding us to the Soviet bloc politics for 20 plus 5 years. Whatever may be said about the nature of the treaty, that it is a treaty of peace and friendship with Russia, the impression in the country is more important. That impression has been reflected in the press by banner headlines that this treaty is meant as a defence shield against the aggressive designs of Pakistan, and that is why almost all the newspapers in India had headlines of seven or eight columns reading "Security Pact with Russia", "Defence Pact with Russia" etc. I have no doubt that the treaty has been originated as a result of the fear of the ghost of Chinese complicity with the aggressive designs of Pakistan. In a sense there is no doubt that it was the fear of China that was standing in the way of giving immediate recognition to Bangladesh. Now, I think the test of this treaty is this : The immediate reaction created all over the country is that the people expect that the Government will now have the courage not only to give immediate recognition to Bangladesh but also to give massive help to Bangladesh to complete their freedom struggle and consolidate their freedom. I want to

draw the attention of the House to the commitments made in this treaty. Article III says :

“The High Contracting Parties condemn colonialism and racialism in all forms and manifestations and reaffirm their determination to strive for their final and complete elimination.”

It is not my feeling alone; the Defence Minister himself a few days ago described the Pakistani army as a colonial army and an imperialist army. If that is so, the first and foremost obligation under this treaty is, India and Russia should declare that the Pakistani army is a colonial and imperialist army, that it is an imperialist army occupation of Bangladesh and to eliminate that imperialist, colonial occupation of Bangladesh, India and Russia, if they have any respect for this treaty, should jointly recognise Bangladesh.

Some friends talked very loudly this morning about the future expansion of the socialist system and ideology into our region also. Not only India and Russia, but all the socialist countries following Russia should, if they have any honesty and respect for this treaty, declare here and now that they are in favour of Bangladesh and that this colonial and imperialist rule of West Pakistan over Bangla Desh should end.

Without entering into this treaty, perhaps we had a greater freedom to recognise Bangladesh. But now I have developed a doubt that because of certain clauses incorporated in this treaty may stand in our way to act independently to give recognition to Bangladesh. I have also my doubt that this may not be to our advantage. I have delved into the complexity of the international Sino-Soviet conflict and the *detente* in Sino-US relations. Now it may very well happen that USA may ask China to supply more arms to Pakistan. That means the probability of war is there. In that probability, if there is any conflict between India and Pakistan, the conflict will be more costly, more destructive and perhaps it will be more prolonged as a result of this treaty.

There is one clause in the treaty which does not stand in the way of our having a

bilateral treaty, bilateral understanding with another country.

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE (Kanpur) : Are you supporting the treaty or not ?

SHRI SAMAR GUHA : There was no necessity of codifying our friendly relations with Russia. It was a long-standing friendship of 25 years. Why should we categorically emphasize the obvious ?

Then, another thing is that we should try to assuage the apprehension of China that this treaty is not meant against China. In the context of the present military alliances and political alliances and the Sino-Soviet conflict, China should not have at the back of its mind that this treaty is directed against her. It is the duty of the Government of India to assuage their apprehension that it is not meant against them. If we can do that that will mean realism, real political and diplomatic approach, removing the apprehension of China that it is not meant against them.

DR. RANEN SEN (Barasat) : Sir, he is making original contribution. He should be given more time.

SHRI SAMAR GUHA : Today it is a red letter day for them, because they are looking at everything through the periscope of Moscow. But I have my Indian eye. I look at the whole problem from the Indian eye.....(interruptions).

This treaty is no doubt historic. But it means a historic deviation of our foreign policy. In our foreign policy there is a thing called non-alignment.

SHRI AMRIT NAHATA : You have never supported our foreign policy in the past. So, why worry about it now ?

SHRI SAMAR GUHA : I know you; everybody knows, every Embassy knows for whom you speak, what is your object Even in the Congress Party people know you that your body is here and soul is else where... (interruptions).

MR. SPEAKER : I would request the hon. Member to look towards me and

[Mr. Speaker]

address me only. Let him not try to reply to the interruptions.

SHRI SAMAR GUHA : It is a historic deviation from the policy pursued for the last two decades. Whatever the word non-alignment may mean we have aligned ourselves with the Soviet bloc politically, militarily and also in other ways. Sir, the doctor will say when a man is killed that he is dead but a Poet will say he has passed into eternity. Likewise they say it is an extension of non-alignment but it means burial of non-alignment.

Sir, if you look from the long range perspective you will appreciate that we have got into the vortex of the Sino-Soviet conflict. There was no necessity to enter into such a conflict between two giants. We could have emerged as the first-class power in Asia. That possibility has been blocked.

I want to know from the Government whether this Treaty will bar India from having immediate negotiations with China and Japan. Again there is a clause about which I have apprehension—clause about non-proliferation. I want to know whether we are free to carry on with our peaceful explosion of nuclear test. (*Interruption*) My another apprehension is this treaty will give a scope for Russia to extend their bases in Indian ocean.

Lastly, it has a serious implication on our foreign aid. We must remember that more than 80% of our foreign aid is coming not from the Soviet bloc area but from the other areas. (*Interruption*).

As a patriotic Indian my party's stand is that India should give up the role of a global beggar—begging either from Moscow or from Washington or from Bonn. India should stand on her own national economy. India should stand on her own legs. (*Interruption*).

Let this Government have the courage to say that they will give up 80% of the foreign aid which they are getting from other countries and not from the Soviet bloc. It is my duty to point out that this Treaty.....

MR. SPEAKER : It is also my duty to save time. (*Interruption*).

SHRI SAMAR GUHA : This treaty may have the possibility of having an impact on our economy and on our planning.

I consider Soviet Russia as a friend of India and I want this friendship to continue.(*Interruption*). What I started by saying I will conclude by saying.....(*Interruption*).

SHRI K. BALAKRISHNAN (Ambalazhazha) : If he is not sitting down, I am also going to get up and start talking. He is encroaching upon our rights. There should be a limit to impropriety and indiscretion.

SHRI SAMAR GUHA : I conclude by saying that I stand for friendship with Russia I am all for friendship with Soviet Russia for our practical interest but not for codifying this friendship binding us for 20 plus five years into the Soviet bloc of politics. It may be helpful to some but not to our patriotic interest, the Indian interest.

SHRI SWARAN SINGH rose—

MR. SPEAKER : May I give only two minutes to Professor Shibban Lal Saksena ?

SHRI N. SREEKANTAN NAIR : On a point of order. You in your indulgence or kindness or whatever it be have accepted the smaller groups of the House as Opposition groups. The Leader of the House has also accepted them and is inviting them to conferences and important meetings. But on a matter of great importance, should you not at least give some time for the spokesmen of those groups in this House ? Or, is it left to whoever sits in the Chair to allot time to favourites, friends, specialists and sycophants ? Is it in order ?

MR. SPEAKER : It is not a question of sycophants. The names are before me already. They were given much in advance. But I had promised this morning two minutes to Professor Shibban Lal Saksena.

SHRI N. SREEKANTAN NAIR : I am not talking about him. He is a very senior Member and an old revolutionary. I am talking about what happened throughout this evening.

MR. SPEAKER : I did not expect it from you.

PROF. S. I. SAKSENA (Maharajanj) :
Mr. Speaker, Sir, I yield to none in my friendship for the Soviet Union. I have visited their beautiful country several times as their guest in trade union and peace committee delegations. But I am a patriot who cannot congratulate the Government on this Treaty in which India must naturally be a junior partner.

I am a strong votary of Jawaharlal Nehru's philosophy of non-alignment. It was his greatest contribution toward world's political philosophy. In his darkest hour in 1962, he stuck to his philosophy of non-alignment in spite of great pressures.

I am sorry, Sir, that today, his daughter has buried her father's philosophy of non-alignment. Mere words will not resurrect the doctrine of non-alignment. It is not treaties which move nations. It is national interest which guides them. Why did USA come to our help in 1962? We had no such treaty with them. They came to our help because it was in their national interest. Because she did not then want to allow China to become supreme in Asia by allowing India to go down.

Suppose Pakistan had attacked us and China had intervened on her behalf. Without this Treaty, Russia would have come to help us in their own interest. They are no less interested in our survival than we are. I am, therefore, sorry for codifying our existing friendly relations with the U.S.S.R. into a formal treaty. It obviously makes us a member of the Soviet bloc of nations. Our independence as a non-aligned country is finished. Whatever we may say, the way it has been done is not to our credit. If we wanted to do this, we should have done it in normal times, not in times of crisis. But the Treaty has been signed and my opposition will not stop its ratification. I will, therefore, judge it from its benefits now. I will see whether the Government recognises Bangla Desh. So far it has not been recognised obviously because we were afraid of invasion by Pakistan and China. I hope, after this treaty we will lose no further time in recognising the sovereign independent Republic of Bangla Desh without which we cannot help the Mukti Bahini to destroy Pakistan army of occupation there.

THE MINISTER OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS (SHRI SWARAN SINGH) :
Mr. Speaker Sir, I am grateful to the hon. Members, the leaders of the Opposition parties, who have given such a massive support to this Treaty. If I may say, this is one of the rare occasions when such an overwhelming support has been given to almost any act undertaken by Government.

Some friends have pointed out that there are some voices of dissent. There are. That is why I said a massive support has been given. If you add up a number of "minus points", it will not add up to much. If you add up the voices of dissent that they have registered, perhaps, it is a proof of the liberal democratic traditions that we follow and some of them who have a suspicion have adopted this negative attitude perhaps to demonstrate that they are really democratic. I am not sure whether they believe in what they say. I have great doubts about that.

Some of the wiser leaders who still hope to again rehabilitate themselves have read the signs of times. They have not got the guts to oppose it because they know, if they oppose it, they will be completely isolated. While supporting it, they have tried indirectly to pick out points to suggest certain doubts which really have no substance. This is the real psychology of these people today. And I give them credit because, at any rate, they have on this occasion reflected the will of the people although whatever may be their own predictions. While saying that they are in favour of the Treaty, they have also said other things which perhaps they wanted to register because mentally they do not appear to be fully reconciled to the Treaty. This is the only analysis that I can give.

There is another very interesting feature of this debate and, to be quite frank, Sir, it is difficult to reply to a debate when there is no opposition worth the name. There are no points to be met. Therefore, there is not much to be replied to.

श्री पीलू मोदी : चलो छुट्टी करो ।

श्री स्वर्ण सिंह : पीलू साहब, उस को छुट्टी न मिली, जिस ने सबक याद किया ।

[Shri Swaran Singh]

It is interesting that several hon. Members have supported this treaty but they have given their own reasons for supporting this treaty. One way is that if I were debate-minded and if I want only to controvert the arguments, perhaps I could have continued this debate for a long time. Although a particular member is supporting it but I don't agree with the reasons for which he is supporting it, if I were to take that attitude, perhaps I would have prolonged the debate. But, Sir, it is not my intention to do so. As a practical individual, I am interested in the final word, whether he supports it or opposes it and I am not concerned with the reasons that he has in his own mind to support it.

But it is very interesting all the same to mention that some hon. Members say 'We support it because it discards non-alignment'.

SHRI FRANK ANTHONY : Thank God.

SHRI SWARAN SINGH : Some people say that it is a deviation from non-alignment. 'Therefore, we support it'. All right. I am interested in your support and I hope you are genuine in your support when you say that support it for what it contains and not for what you imagine that it discards and what it deviates from. A certain concrete act which has reaffirmed certain principles and the adherence of countries to those principles and to support it or not to support it is something which is important and it is not my intention to go into this sterile debate and to pick up arguments with several hon. Members because I do not agree with their reasoning.

I am aware of a large number of judgments that are written by learned judges who ultimately come to the same conclusion very often by giving their own reasons for coming to that particular conclusion. It is an interesting intellectual exercise but, so far as this Parliament is concerned, I will be content with the operative part of their speeches rather than the reasoning that they give in support of the conclusion to which they have arrived at.

I know Mr. Piloo Mody is feeling uncomfortable because their dissent to this.

I will not go into detail, but I will try to confine myself to the salient features of this treaty. This treaty, if we analyse it consists of several parts and some members have given thought to the economic content of the treaty, to the political content of the treaty in relation to our postures towards important pressing problems, faced by the world and it has also got a security aspect and we have to read this treaty as a whole and have to examine it in its various facets and keep in view its entire content.

In the economic field and in the field of technological and scientific co-operation and collaboration this is a re-affirmation of the principle of the fruitful co-operation and collaboration between the two countries in these vital fields. Several hon. Members have rightly stressed that we have to work for the objective of ourselves becoming strong, ourselves having the strength to face whatever may be the problem. That is precisely our objective and it is for this reason that we greatly welcome the co-operation and collaboration in certain vital fields. Such co-operation and collaboration which enables us to build our real economic strength, which enables to the base of our further growth, which helps us to lay the foundations upon which we can build our economic and industrial growth. It is for this reason that we attach importance to the various clauses under which there is this agreement between our two countries to cooperate with each other, to collaborate with each other and to help in the matter of development of latest techniques, technological know-how and collaboration in all sophisticated and scientific fields. This is a very important part of the Treaty and this is in consonance and in line with the objective which has been stressed by several hon. Members that we have ourselves to be strong. And, the strength consists in developing our economy, in an independent manner, and our industry, in rapid manner, so that the infra-structure and the industrial base are such that give us not only the economic strength, but ultimately also the military strength, which again touches upon the security aspect, and this is also an important component of this Treaty.

A great deal of argument has been advanced by Constitutional pundits and political thinkers among the hon. Members who have tried to criticise the treaty from the angle that it is a deviation or a departure from our policy of non-alignment. I would not like to go into details. I would only draw the attention of the hon. Members to Clause IV of the Treaty. There cannot be a clearer proof than the Treaty itself and it is clearly provided in Clause IV that the USSR Government respects our policy of non-alignment and they also agree...(*Interruption*) Those perhaps who don't believe in non-alignment can smile on this. I am not sure whether he believes in non-alignment.....

SHRI SAMAR GUHA : I believe in independent foreign policy of India. You have given it a burial ; still you are insisting on it.

SHRI SWARAN SINGH : It is not a question of argument. It is a question of reading the terms of the Treaty. So, there is this positive commitment between the two countries, our position having been accepted by the USSR.

The second point that I want to say, —apart from this explicit mention, —is the absence of anything that could have been or might have been pointed out by any hon. Member either in this Treaty or anything flowing from this Treaty which detracts from the policy of our non-alignment. Not a single thing has been mentioned ; just vague ideas have been thrown about without any precise point which our policy of non-alignment may be said to have been compromised by our signing this Treaty. This is the only other point that I wish to mention in connection with non-alignment.

About the security aspect of the treaty. I agree with the observation made by several hon. Members who have pointed out that this is not a defence pact. This is not even a military alliance. This is not a security pact. And, I don't have to quarrel with the Press people if they spread this out in five-column banner headline two-column banner headline or one-column banner headline. It is their own interpretation, but I want to make it clear...

SHRI SAMAR GUHA : Please try to convince those friends that this⁽¹⁾ is not a security or defence pact.

THE PRIME MINISTER, MINISTER OF ATOMIC ENERGY, MINISTER OF HOME AFFAIRS AND MINISTER OF INFORMATION AND BROADCASTING (SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI) : When have they been right before ? On what occasions have these friends been right before ? I should like to know.

SHRI SAMAR GUHA : However most of them are right for you at least. Most of them are Indians and of the Indian Press ; perhaps at no time have they been so much in favouritism with you.

18 hrs.

SHRI PILLOO MODY : They were right when they published her speeches.

SHRI SWARAN SINGH : I have mentioned in my opening statement that this is a treaty for peace, a treaty for friendship and a treaty against war. Defence pacts or military alliances are couched in such words and they have such connotation that there is atomic drawal of one party if there is action by the other party of a particular nature. Anybody who has studied these three articles, namely articles VIII, IX and X carefully would fully agree with me that there is no such connotation, no such element, no such suggestion and no such mention of any such atomic drawal flowing from any unilateral action of any of the parties.

We must make a clear distinction in our own minds and I want to make it absolutely clear that these articles no doubt do provide a framework which is of importance to us ; it gives a framework within which steps can be taken by us to safeguard our security. This has to be distinguished from the usual defence pacts or alliances. I cannot help Shri Pilloo Modi if he cannot see the difference between the clauses of the Warsaw Pact and this treaty. Even if this has to be argued that this Treaty is different from the Warsaw Pact, I think I cannot convince Shri Pilloo Mody about anything. He has only to read the clauses of the Warsaw Pact and compare them with the articles here and the answer will be there. But for a person who

[Shri Swaran Singh]

refuses to see things, I cannot show any light. It is an absolute travesty to say that this treaty has got anything of that sort....

SHRI K. MANOHARAN : Pack him up to Warsaw.

SHRI SWARAN SINGH : I do not think that he would like to go to Warsaw.

SHRI PILOO MODY : Why does he not try to take me there ?

SHRI SWARAN SINGH : Perhaps in his usual jocular style—perhaps I cannot use the words 'style of buffonery'—he has used the expressions 'Comrade Swaran Singh' and 'Sardar Gromyko'. I do not know how Mr. Gromyko will react, but I am grateful to him for conferring this title on me.

SHRI PILOO MODY : I think it is a question of reciprocating the courtesy.

SHRI SWARAN SINGH : I would like to be a comrade and be their company rather than be in the company of capitalists.

SHRI PILOO MODY : I think he would also reciprocate.

SHRI SWARAN SINGH : Once in a while, even if buffonery has generated an expression, I greatly value it. He perhaps does not realise the implications of what he is saying. We are determined to bring about socialism. It is this policy that is bothering the capitalists. Therefore, they call us comrades. We accept that compliment. Whether this has got anything to do with this treaty or not is a separate subject.

SHRI PILOO MODY : It is not a separate subject.

SHRI R. S. PANDEY : The share bazar is down. That is why they are bothered.

SHRI PILOO MODY : Worms must not rise at the wrong moment.

SHRI SWARAN SINGH : The security clauses of this treaty—I have used the expression carefully—are these three articles,

and if these are carefully analysed, the essence of the treaty would become apparent.

First there is article VIII. This is another expression for a treaty of non-aggression. It reads thus :

"Each High Contracting Party undertakes to abstain from any aggression against the other Party and to prevent the use of its territory for the commission of any act which might inflict military damage on the other High Contracting Party."

Earlier, we have :

".....shall not enter into or participate in any military alliance directed against the other Party."

This is a very salutary provision, and I do not see why any objection should be taken to this article.

The next important article is article I. This has been referred to already. But I would like specifically to refer again to this article.

It says :

"Each High Contracting Party undertakes to abstain from providing any assistance to any third party that engages in armed conflict with the other Party. In the event of either Party being subjected to an attack or a threat thereof, the High Contracting Parties shall immediately enter into mutual consultations in order to remove such threat and to take appropriate effective measures to ensure peace and the security of their countries."

SHRI PILOO MODY : I can also read all this.

SHRI SWARAN SINGH : Shri Piloo Mody reminds me that he can also read this. If he had read this, he would not have raised that argument at any rate.

SHRI PILOO MODY : With your massive mandate, you can pronounce it any way you like.

SHRI SWARAN SINGH : Article is important, and this answers one of the questions raised by the hon. Member opposite.

It says :

"Each high contracting party solemnly declares that it shall not enter into any obligation, secret or public with one or more States, which is incompatible with this treaty. Each high contracting party further declares that no obligation exists, nor shall any obligation be entered into, between itself and any other State or States, which might cause military damage to the other party."

So whether or not there is any attack or or threat of attack, under this treaty no arms be supplied to any party which might cause military damage to other party. The interpretation is quite obvious and this answers some of the points raised.

I would like to say that the economic content this treaty, the solemn undertaking given in this treaty by the two countries to conduct their international policies in such manner as to give striking and stunning blows to remnants of colonialism and racialism is another important cornerstone of this treaty. The political content, the economic content the technological and scientific collaboration and the security clauses of the treaty taken as a whole, present a picture which is to the mutual benefit and mutual advantage of both countries.

I was rather amused when Shri Piloo Mody said that some talks were going on behind my back and that I was there only to put my signature to this treaty. I think Shri Piloo Mody does not know enough of me. If he thinks that I am so pliable that I can readily put my signature without being associated with the intricate negotiations that culminated in this treaty, he is taking much too superficial a view. Perhaps he is too thick-skinned or thick-fleshed to understand how Government works and I think this sort of attitude of oversimplification should not be adopted in such a serious matter that we are discussing today, that I was there only to put my signature and that all this we negotiated behind my back or anybody's back. I do sympathise with him

and others of his way of thinking because I do claim credit that these negotiations do signify to the fact of the conduct of our affairs in such a manner that nothing leaked out, although these negotiations were going on for a number of months. We did not want unnecessarily to raise either doubts or suspicions and we did not want a public debate to start before we finalised the document.

I would also like in all fairness to clarify that the signing of this treaty has nothing to do with the dramatic manner in which Dr. Kissinger went to Peking, because these talks had been going on at various levels for quite some time. I can say that the timing is such that it has been so well received in the country, that even those who want to oppose it want to save their skin while voicing their opposition to it. This is demonstration of the fact that the people also can take a decision, and I am sure that in this case the people are solidly behind this treaty.

Having said that, as a matter of fact, I am not giving out any great secret which cannot be divulged at this stage that these talks had further ferish time taken place, as the Prime Minister has already mentioned about two years ago. I myself was associated not only in my present capacity but when I was in charge even of the earlier Ministry. Even then, I was associated with it, and we were discussing to find some juridical and legal basis for the type of relationship that was developing between the two countries.

I am again amazed at some comments where some of the headings of certain articles have been picked up by hon. Member. Was it necessary? It is an amazing thing to ask: they do not say that there is anything wrong with it, but what they mean to say is that all this was already there; was it necessary, therefore, to give it a juridical and legal basis? It is quite obvious that if it is already there, then it means that all of you accept what was there was correct. If what is there is correct, and then it is our mutual benefit, why not give it a legal and juridical basis? I fail to understand this type of argument. If they cannot find any true, solid argument to oppose this, then it is a very easy thing to say it is a good thing. It is something which is beneficial to both; it is

[Shri Swaran Singh]

something which is good to both. But was it necessary? It is like saying that food is good but is it necessary to eat it. I think this type of approach does not take us anywhere.

I would now touch upon some specific questions that had been asked, and before I do that, I would like to express my gratefulness to all the political parties who have welcomed this except—I do not know whether all the components of this party are behind him in his analysis—Mr. Guha.

SHRI SAMAR GUHA : You are yet to know it. We had a whole night discussion yesterday, almost up to 1 O'clock. On the basis of that, I had spoken.

SHRI SWARAN SINGH : Probably you discussed it too long and did not come to the right conclusion. (*Interruption*) Even when he was arguing, what he said was that this is all right; all this was available; then why put it on paper that this is good.

SHRI SAMAR GUHA : I said that codification and writing it on paper in that way completely different things. (*Interruption*).

SHRI SWARAN SINGH : Then, may I ask which is the party to which Mr. Piloo belongs or Mr. Mody belongs or both of them belong. I do not know if his party also sat throughout the night to formulate their final view,—

SHRI PILOO MODY : It is well known that we do all our business by day.

SHRI SWARAN SINGH : Because. Rajaji, the veteran statesman, has given a statement from Madras; he has blessed this treaty. I do not know whether Piloo Mody or both of them are in touch with the views of the Swatantra party or perhaps the democratic ideals has penetrated so much that they do not care for the opinion of their leader, and each one wants to have his own opinion. They are swatantra to take a swatantra view! I would apologise here because there is a Member of the CPI whose name is 'Swatantra'.

I do not know, therefore whether the Swatantra Party is "Swatantra" to take his own view to oppose, not to oppose, or to remain quiet or to bring in an element of buffoonery into it and to detract from the seriousness of the occasion. I think this is one of the rare occasions when almost all political parties in the country have welcomed this proposal. This is representative of the will of the people of India and I can say that nothing recently has electrified the people so much as this signing of the treaty between India and the Soviet Union.

It has been mentioned that 20 years is too long a period. No period is long to carry on friendship, to work for peace and to cooperate in good purposes. Let us do it for eternity. These are very fine objectives, and I do not see why there should be any objection to this period. Is it that we cease to be devoted to the ideal of peace after 5 years? Is it that we do not want to have arrangements where our own security may be assured?

SHRI PILOO MODY : You have got tired of freedom of speech after 20 years.

SHRI SWARAN SINGH : You have not got freedom even now.

SHRI PILOO MODY : I can see that.

SHRI SWARAN SINGH : Therefore, this argument does not really hold water.

I am also questioned whether we would be prepared to enter into treaty arrangements with other countries. I have already said in my opening statement that we would welcome the conclusion and signing of these treaties with other countries. In this region also, in our neighbourhood, we would be willing and in fact we would like to enter into treaties with other countries because our treaty is not directed against any country, it is not aimed against any country. Therefore, we would be very willing, very happy, and in fact, we would work for the creation of an atmosphere where similar treaties can be entered into by the countries of the region with us or even among themselves, even though they do not want to have treaties with us. This is a good pattern and I am sure this would be a pace-setter.

A question has been put in a dramatic form by Mr. Vajpayee, and I have a strong temptation to give a very brief reply.

SHRI PILOO MODY : Please do not resist the temptation.

SHRI SWARAN SINGH : At any rate on this occasion I am inclined to agree with him.

He asked : does it stop us from taking unilateral action on Bangla Desh, can the USSR restrain us ? My reply is one word, no. It does not restrain us from taking any action that we may like on Bangla Desh and no country can restrain us, not even a friendly country like the USSR with which we have entered into this treaty. Mr. Vajpayee generally gives thought to these matters. Perhaps yesterday's observations were made by him when he was still in court arrest and today again he is a free man and, therefore, he has altered his views perhaps, because yesterday's reaction was a little more healthy.

SHRI PILOO MODY : Are you admitting that this is a police State in which he has to be afraid ?

SHRI SWARAN SINGH : If it were a police State, he would not have been here to argue today.

These are our own sovereign right and there is nothing in the treaty which restrains us from exercising our sovereign rights in any manner that we may like. But I do not agree with him that we should necessarily do a thing only to demonstrate our sovereignty. The action should be, no merits, a correct one, not merely to demonstrate that you are not bound or restrained by any other country. That is not a wise approach, not even a practical approach. He asked, "Does it debar us from developing our nuclear energy for any purpose we may like ?" I would reiterate our position, although my hon. friends opposite may not agree with it. We have taken a decision to develop our nuclear technology for peaceful purposes and we are wedded to that policy. I have no constraint in stating categorically that this is our policy and we want to pursue it. At the same time, there is nothing in this treaty to debar

us from departing from that policy, if we want to do so.

SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA : Would you stick to your decision about the nonproliferation treaty ?

SHRI SWARAN SINGH : This treaty has been signed by the Soviet Union with us knowing our attitude towards the non-proliferation treaty. There are a variety of reasons why we did not sign the non-proliferation treaty. I myself have spelt out those reasons in the UN and in this House on several occasions. But there is nothing in this treaty which comes in the way if we decide at any time to alter our policy, although at the present moment, our policy is firm and we want to develop our nuclear energy for peaceful purposes.

Something has been smelt in Article VII which does not exist. In a dramatic manner, he asked this question : The article says :

"The High Contracting Parties shall promote further development of ties and contacts between them in the fields of science, art, literature, education, public health,....."

He asked, "Does it mean that there will be Soviet Advisers in large numbers ? There can be a large number of Hindi advisers, if we want to send them to Soviet Union." It is a question of mutual agreement. If he is interested in helping the Soviet Union, if his party is prepared to change its attitude and in the cultural field, literary field, etc., if they want to send really learned people—not seemingly learned but solidly learned people—they can do so and help in the development of science and literature. This is our objective. No country has got such large number of advisers that they can easily be spared and let loose on any other country.

SHRI FRANK ANTHONY : Why don't you brain-wash Mr. Vajpayee ?

SHRI PILOO MODY : He does not know where the brain is located !

SHRI SWARAN SINGH : Mr. Mody is right, because his brain is located in his ankle.

SHRI PILOO MODY : You see, really he does not know where the brain is located ?

SHRI SWARAN SINGH : I do not know where your brain is !

Sir, this is a very fruitful agreement between our two countries by which there will be further development of ties and contacts between us in all these various fields. We have to learn a great deal. They may also have to learn a great deal from our experience, particularly in humanities, literature, culture and in several other fields. These objections that were raised were superficial and they do not stand the test of scrutiny.

While supporting the treaty, he expressed dissatisfaction about some peripheral matters. It is not my intention this evening to disabuse him of all the objections he may have on subsidiary and peripheral matters, because if I were to convince him on these points, perhaps he will not have any justification to retain a different party. Some of these differences he has to maintain, because he is heading a party different from ours. He declared that Non-alignment is dead. I do not think it was ever alive for Shri Vajpayee. It is for this reason that we have solemnly declared that is it not dead. It is strengthened. We adhere to the policy of non-alignment, which has been accepted by the USSR in this treaty in so many words. Our conduct in international affairs show that we are truly non-aligned, which means that we will follow our own independent policy, take decisions which are in our best interest in our own national interest and in the interest of the peace of the world. This is the essence of non-alignment and we are steadfastly adhering to it.

I have to disappoint Shri Piloo Mody because I have no intention of replying to what he has said as there is no substance in what he said. The best way to reply to what he said is to ignore that, because it does not bear any scrutiny. Therefore, I have no intention to say a word in reply to what he said. I again thank you, Sir.

SARI K. MANOHARAN : May I ask him to reply the question about the map, if it is not inconvenient ?

SHRI SWARAN SINGH : About that there is no problem. The Soviet Unions have already told us on several occasions that they respect our territorial integrity. Even about maps they have told us that they will take steps to correct their own maps.

SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA : What happens to the Sino-Soviet pact ? Does it automatically stand rescinded ?

SHRI SWARAN SINGH : That is theoretical. Anything that is inconsistent with the obligations undertaken by this treaty is not binding on any of the high contracting parties.

SARI PILOO MODY : Let us ratify it.

SHRI SWARAN SINGH : Luckily, it does not require your ratification.

18.27 hrs.

The Lok Sabha then adjourned till Eleven of the Clock on Wednesday August 11, 1971/Sravana 20, 1893 (Saka)