

अध्यक्ष महोदय : इस तरह से फैसला नहीं होगा। जो रिप्रिजेंटेटिव हैं पार्टीज के व मिनिस्टर, पार्लियेन्टरी एकेडेंस आस में बैठ कर बात कर लें

Shri Daji: I move that this Report may be referred back to the Business Advisory Committee for reconsideration.

Mr. Speaker: which motion?

Shri Daji: Let the Committee reconsider the report.

Mr. Speaker: There is no report.

Shri S. M. Banerjee: Sir, it is possible to discuss some at least by sitting longer hours. May I point out that the Minister has not touched the question of dearness allowance for Government servants? One hour at least may be given to that.

Mr. Speaker: I suggest that the leaders of groups and others who might desire to have discussion on particular subjects might sit with the Minister of Parliamentary Affairs and thrash out what they want.

Shri J. B. Kripalani (Amroha): Why should we not sit on next Friday? Gandhiji will be very happy if we do business on his birthday.

Mr. Speaker: That might also be discussed with the Minister of Parliamentary Affairs.

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : चार छटांक अर पीने छ: छटांक का क्या हुआ ?

अध्यक्ष महोदय : अब तो हम पूरे सेर पर चले गये हैं ।

Government of India in relation thereto be taken into consideration."

Sir, as this is the first occasion that I have the privilege of moving this motion before this august House, I would like to state at the outset the main elements of our foreign policy which guide and govern us in our relations with other countries, and in the role that we are called upon to play in international affairs generally and in the councils of nations. I can do no better than reiterate what our Prime Minister said in his broadcast to the nation on the 11th of June, 1964 about the basic principles of our foreign policy. These are: (1) We shall continue to seek friendship and develop our relations with all countries, irrespective of ideology or their political systems; (2) non-alignment and peaceful co-existence will continue to be the fundamental basis of our approach to world problems and our relations with other countries; (3) it will be our special endeavour to further strengthen our relations with neighbouring countries; (4) we shall continue to work for freedom of the peoples of Asia and Africa from colonial rule and we shall continue to collaborate with sister nations of Africa and Asia in the common cause of world peace and freedom of the people. As a member of the United Nations we shall unflinchingly support that organisation for bringing peace and freedom to humanity.

Shri Hem Barua (Gauhati): Sir, on a point of information. May I know whether he is making the same speech which he made in the other House?

Mr. Speaker: It is for him to say. How can I know?

Shri Hem Barua: Are you making the same speech? I am asking this because the language is the same.

Shri Swaran Singh: We do not take notice of what happens in the other House.

12.40 hrs.

MOTION RE: INTERNATIONAL SITUATION

The Minister of External Affairs (Shri Swaran Singh): Mr. Speaker, Sir, I beg to move:

"That the present international situation and the policy of the

Mr. Speaker: Yes, he might continue.

Shri Swaran Singh: I may say that it is somewhat different.

The House will notice that these five principles are those that have been consecrated as foundations of India's foreign policy ever since our independence. The architect of these and of the superstructure of foreign relations that has been built thereon was Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru. It has been stated many times by our Prime Minister, and I would like to repeat it today, that the Government is determined to pursue steadfastly the policies of peace, non-alignment and peaceful co-existence which have been the sheet-anchor of our foreign policy.

These principles are good principles, not only because they accord with the traditions and the heritage of India but because they are based on righteousness and sound practical common-sense. They have stood the test of time and they have proved without any doubt to be best in our national interest. If Shri Hem Barua is comparing, he will find it is a different language.

Shrimati Vimla Devi (Eluru): Sir. Swamiji is making so much noise that we are not able to hear the proceedings... (Interruptions).

श्री रामेश्वरानन्द (करनाल) : आप कौन होते हैं ?

अध्यक्ष महोदय : मैं स्वामी जी का बहुत आदर करता हूँ, स्वामी जी को महिलाओं की भी इज्जत करनी चाहिये ।

श्री रामेश्वरानन्द : अगर कोई अनुचित आक्षेप करे तो इस का क्या भय है । क्या उन को ही बोलना आता है ।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : मेरा खयाल है कि इन माननीय सदस्यों को नजदीक नहीं बैठना चाहिये । अगर श्रीमती विमला देवी आगे आ जायें तो अच्छा रहेगा । (Laughter) ।

श्री हरि विष्णु कामत (होशंगाबाद) : आप ने उन को यहाँ बिठलाया है ।

Shrimati Vimla Devi: My seat has been provided here.

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty (Barackpore): This is not a matter for laughter, Sir. It is very often that we find that this gentleman sits there and talks so much that it is impossible for anybody to follow the debate. Therefore, it is right for us to ask the Chair to protect us and we have done the right thing. The way he talks "तुम कौन है, आप कौन है" । is such that you should check it. He may be a swami, but he must be polite.

श्री रामेश्वरानन्द : क्या उन को ही लाइसेंस मिला है बोलने का, हम को नहीं लाइसेंस मिला है ।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : मैं ने उस दिन भी कहा था कि अगर माननीय सदस्य एक दूसरे का आदर नहीं करेंगे तो सारे संसार में सदस्यों का कोई आदर नहीं करेगा । जब हम एक दूसरे के साथ बोलते हैं तो उस वक्त कुछ इज्जत से, आदर से, सम्मान से, बोलना चाहिये । हर एक मेम्बर उसी इज्जत के काबिल है जैसे कि दूसरा है । आपस में बोलते हुए हम सोचें कि इस सदन में जो बात उचित न हो वह न बोलें । हम एक दूसरे की इज्जत करेंगे तो लोग हमारी इज्जत करेंगे । अगर हम एक दूसरे की इज्जत नहीं करेंगे तो कोई भी हमारी इज्जत नहीं करेगा । इसलिये अगर हम एक दूसरे के लिये अच्छी तरह से नहीं बोलते तो हम अपनी इज्जत ही कम करते हैं ।

श्री रामेश्वरानन्द : मेरा निवेदन सुन लीजिये इस सम्बन्ध में । मैं कभी किसी

प्रकार से किसी सदस्य के लिये या सदस्या के लिये अपशब्द नहीं कहता। मैं तो केवल मंत्री महोदय से कुछ कहना चाहता था और यह बीच में आ कर अध्यक्षता बन कर बैठ गई। आप चूँकि यहाँ बैठते हैं इसलिये आप का काम यह जरूर होता है। आप हमें कुछ कह सकते हैं या मंत्री महोदय उत्तर दे सकते हैं। लेकिन यह जो अनुचित शब्दों का प्रयोग करती हैं उसे मैं सहन नहीं कर सकता। आप इन का प्रबन्ध करें। मैं ने कोई अपशब्द नहीं कहा। यदि मैं ने कोई अपशब्द कहा हो तो मैं उसे वापस लेने के लिये तैयार हूँ।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : यह तो बड़ी अच्छी बात है। जो भी बोलेगा, मेरा फर्ज है कि उसे रोकूँ।

The hon. Minister might continue.

Shri Swaran Singh: Sir, the policy of non-alignment, though semantically described in a negative form, is a live and dynamic policy. It inspires and motivates friendly relations with all countries irrespective of their ideologies and social system. It brings nations together instead of dividing them. It acts as the mainspring of international co-operation and many a time the active and practicable application of this policy in the United Nations has saved world peace.

In pursuit of our policy of developing friendly relations with all countries irrespective of their social or political systems it is my intention to pay visits to friendly countries in order to establish personal contacts with leaders of Governments of those countries and thus promote better understanding with them. To begin with I have just completed visits to four of our closest neighbours,

namely, Nepal, Afghanistan, Burma and Ceylon. In all these countries I found abundance of friendship and warmth of feeling for India. This was immensely heartening and, if I may say so, I found these visits, which were my first after my assumption of my responsibilities for India's external affairs, most encouraging and instructive. I feel that these visits have contributed to further strengthening of our relations. The development of even closer and more co-operative relations on the basis of mutual understanding and benefit with our neighbours will continue to be our aim.

It is but natural that there should be problems, large and small, between neighbours. Such problems have to be resolved on the basis of mutual understanding. It is of the essence of good neighbourliness that any irritants in our relations with our neighbours with whom we are bound by age-old historical and cultural ties should be removed by friendly discussions. We are constantly endeavouring to do so and I believe that my personal contacts with the leaders of Governments of the countries that I have just visited would help to some extent in better understanding of each other's point of view and in the removal of some irritants.

I would not pretend to say that some of the problems which have attracted the attention of hon. Members of the House have been resolved. I am referring in this connection to the problems faced by Indians departing from Burma or the problems of persons of Indian origin in Ceylon. We have begun earnest discussions in order to reach understandings and mutually satisfactory arrangements and I am hopeful that if we try to understand each other's point of view, we shall find honourable and equitable solutions to these problems.

As the House is aware, there is close economic co-operation between

[Shri Swaran Singh]

Nepal and India. We have been providing some technical assistance to Nepal. The Government of Nepal would wish to see the scope of such assistance further expanded and during my visit I assured them of our anxiety to do the utmost in this matter within the means and resources at our disposal. I further assured them that our technical and economic assistance to Nepal will be continued in the next Plan period.

An agreement for the construction of a road by us in Nepal, a new project, at a cost of Rs. 9.11 crores was signed during my visit. We also agreed to construct two small roads and transmission lines for electric power. One or two other minor projects are also under consideration. We feel that our association with Nepal in a co-operative endeavour is a matter of privilege for us.

I might add here that we are not only providing to Nepal such assistance as we can, we also receive from them such assistance as they are in a position to give us.

In Burma I had the privilege of meeting and having talks with General Ne Win, Chairman of the Revolutionary Council of the Government of the Union of Burma. I was happy to find an excellent understanding of our position on various issues by the Burmese Government. During my visit discussions were held both at the ministerial and the official levels, in regard to the problems faced by Indian nationals who are leaving Burma because of the consequences of the Burmese Government's measures for nationalisation of trade and shops etc.

I would like to say here that the Burmese Government has adopted a policy of leading Burma to, what they call, the Burmese way of socialism and are making strenuous efforts to achieve their goal. What we want is

that Indian nationals who have nothing useful to do further in Burma and who, because of the consequences of Burmese Government's socialisation measures, are unable to continue in Burma should be able to leave in conditions of human dignity and self-respect and that reasonable facilities should be given to them for their departure.

The question of what is to happen to their assets is an important problem. Official discussions were held on this subject and we are hopeful of reasonable arrangements being arrived at. I was assured by the Burmese Government—and I accepted the assurance—with satisfaction—that the socialist measures that they had taken were entirely non-discriminatory.

Shri Ranga (Chittoor): Question.

Shri Swaran Singh: They applied to Burmans and to foreigners alike. The Burmese Government also assured me that they did not wish that foreigners belonging to the working class should leave Burma.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: How many Chinese have left Burma?

Shri Hem Barua: And Pakistanis?

Shri Swaran Singh: The Chinese also have been treated in the same manner as the Burmese . . .

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: How many have left Burma?

Shri Swaran Singh: . . . I do not have the number of Chinese who have left.

Shri Hem Barua: And Pakistanis also?

Shri Swaran Singh: Most of them want to go back to Formosa and the Burmese Government have not not got any diplomatic relations with Formosa.

The rapport that I was able to establish with the Foreign Minister of Burma and other dignitaries and our further meetings in the future will, I am sure, be extremely useful for promoting further understanding between the two countries and in helping in the solution of the complicated problems that have arisen in connection with the mass departure of Indians in Burma. The Foreign Minister of Burma accepted my invitation to visit India at an early date and we are looking forward to his visit.

In Afghanistan I found a great friendship for India based on historical, religious and ethnic ties. The Afghan Government is engaged in a tremendous task of nation-building and economic development. I assured the Afghan Government that in this noble task we shall be very happy to extend our co-operation.

In Ceylon I had the privilege of discussing with the Ceylonese Prime Minister Mrs. Bandarnaike questions relating to the non-aligned conference and other international problems of mutual interest. During these talks, we both agreed that every effort should be made to find an equitable and honourable solution to the problem of persons of Indian origin in Ceylon.

Our talks were followed by preliminary discussions at the official level between the Permanent Secretary of Ceylon and our Commonwealth Secretary on this question. This problem is a complex one and has hitherto defied solution in spite of several meetings between the Prime Ministers of the two countries.

The Prime Minister of Ceylon has done us the honour of agreeing to come to Delhi in the last week of October for talks with our Prime Minister. Her visits to India are always a source of great pleasure to us, and we are looking forward to her visit. We hope that with goodwill and understanding which exists in abundant measure between the Gov-

ernments and the peoples in the two countries, the meeting between the two Prime Ministers will be successful.

The House would naturally wish to be informed about our relations with the other two of our close neighbours namely China and Pakistan. I regret to inform the House that there has been no abatement of China's negative and intransigent attitude towards the Colombo Proposals and her hostility and propaganda against us. While China pays lip-service to her desire for settlement with India and directs her propaganda towards convincing other countries of this, she continues her misrepresentation and propaganda against India, particularly in Asian and African countries.

The House is aware that there has been some correspondence between the Prime Ministers of Ceylon and India on the question of withdrawal of Chinese posts in a demilitarised area in Ladakh. Our stand on this question is clear and unambiguous. We have said that we are willing to regard the vacation of the seven Chinese posts in this area, should China undertake it, to be substantial compliance with the conditions set forth in the Colombo Proposals. If China agrees to this, we are willing to enter into negotiations with China in the manner envisaged in the Colombo Proposals. We have thus gone to the farthest limit possible within the ambit of the Colombo Proposals in order to enable negotiations to take place between the two countries.

The ball is now in China's court ...

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: What exactly is meant by the word 'substantial'? What is the difference between the Colombo Proposals, and this one that you have finally climbed down to?

Shri Swaran Singh: There is no question of climb-down. We call zero number of posts on either side as equal number of posts.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: That is a climb-down.

Shri Swaran Singh: The ball is now in China's court. China has to make up her mind and say whether she is agreeable to removing her posts in the demilitarised area in Ladakh.

Although the Prime Minister of Ceylon has persevered in her efforts to see the beginning of negotiations between the two countries under the aegis of the Colombo Proposals—and here, I would like to pay a tribute to her sincerity of purpose and for all the efforts she is making—there is yet no indication from China of her willingness to withdraw her posts from the demilitarised zone. On the contrary, the officially-controlled press in China has taken the stand that it is China's internal affair to set up civilian posts, and that no one can ask China to withdraw the posts from what they call China's own territory. The House is, of course, aware that what China calls its own territory is the 20 k.m. demilitarized area, which was seized by China during its massive military operations in the autumn of 1962. It is part of the 14,500 sq. miles of Indian territory illegally occupied by China. It was from this very same 20 k.m. belt that the Colombo Conference had asked China to withdraw its troops.

It is clear that the Chinese propaganda that while she is willing to go to the conference table it is India which is refusing to do so, has no legs to stand upon. The whole history of the last two years is replete with instances of Chinese stratagem of never agreeing to any suggestion and of trying to throw the blame on us.

I would like to repeat, as had been stated in this House many times over, that in consonance with our policy of non-alignment and peaceful co-existence, we are in favour of settling all differences by peaceful negotiations. It is for this reason that we accepted the Colombo Proposals though they were not entirely to our

liking, and we further accepted its slight modification which was suggested in Mrs. Bandaranaike's letter, namely that instead of an equal number of Indian and Chinese posts in the demilitarised area, the Chinese should remove their seven posts. But we shall not go to the conference table on Chinese terms and we shall never give up our rights in territory which was illegally and by Forces occupied by China. It is for China to give evidence of her sincerity to seek a settlement which she has singularly failed to do so far.

As regards our relations with Pakistan, the House is no doubt aware of the various developments that have taken place during the last few months, which I need not repeat here. The period since the passing away of Prime Minister Nehru has been notable for public statements by President Ayub of his keen and sincere desire for Indo-Pakistan friendship. These sentiments have been reciprocated by our Prime Minister. It is our earnest desire to settle all our differences with Pakistan by mutual discussions and in a spirit of good-neighbourliness.

I feel that I shall be giving an unduly rosy picture if I did not inform the House that although there have been encouraging statements by the President of Pakistan, the Government-controlled press and radio in Pakistan and some Pakistani Government leaders have reverted to their previous propaganda line against India. This to our mind is unfortunate, since it might prevent the creation of an atmosphere in which the discussions between the representatives of the two Governments on various matters should have the maximum chance of success. The resumption of bitter propaganda against India also stands in the way of the calming of the situation which led to the unfortunate disturbances in Pakistan and India some months ago.

Even today, an average of nearly 3000 refugees from East Pakistan

are coming into India every day. Despite the assurances given by Pakistani leaders, evidently the minorities in East Pakistan continue to feel a deep sense of insecurity. However, despite the unhelpful attitudes to which I have referred, we do not wish to deviate from our course. We shall seek every opportunity of rapprochement with Pakistan and of finding solutions to our differences which in essence are the legacy of the colonial era in our sub-continent.

The meeting of the Home Ministers is expected to be resumed in the latter half of next month. As the House is aware, the Home Ministers met in April last and had discussions on three issues, namely restoration of communal harmony, the question of refugees from East Pakistan and the question of eviction of Pakistani illicit immigrants and infiltrators from Assam and Tripura. Although the discussions at the April meeting did not lead to agreed conclusions, in our view, they were useful as they helped in understanding of each other's point of view. The meeting was held in a cordial atmosphere and had a calming effort on the communal situation. The meeting of the Home Ministers next month will resume the discussions from where they were left in April. The House will, I am sure, wish these talks success.

In pursuance of our policy of making use of every opportunity for discussions on the problems with Pakistan, with a view to arriving at understandings and agreements, I have accepted an invitation by the Foreign Minister of Pakistan. Owing to my preoccupations during the next few weeks here and in Cairo at the Non-Aligned Conference, I am not in a position to say when I shall be able to visit Pakistan, but I hope to do so as soon as possible. I hope the Pakistan Foreign Minister will approach the talks and discussions between us in the same spirit as I intend to do. I intend to go over the 1229 (A) L.S.D.—3.

whole range of Indo-Pakistan discussions. I think our talks would be useful if we could explore ways and means of how to deal with the various problems and try to create a suitable atmosphere for the Summit talks between the President of Pakistan and the Prime Minister of India, which are likely to be held in the not too distant future.

The compulsions of geography, a common history and the community of culture demand that India and Pakistan should live as good neighbours. Towards achieving this objective, both India and Pakistan have to work sincerely and patiently. If that objective is kept steadfastly in view. I feel that we can make progress towards improving our relations and towards resolving our problems.

13 hrs.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, it is a matter of great regret to us that the picture of Asia, particularly South-East Asia, today is one of an area torn by conflicts and bitterness among Asian nations. Laos and Vietnam have been the scene of internal conflict for many years. There has been interference with these two countries of various kinds and from various quarters with the result that they have not been allowed to enjoy the fruits of their freedom in peace. The Geneva Agreement of 1954 in the case of Vietnam and of 1962 in the case of Laos were devised to bring internal peace and stability to Vietnam and Laos in an atmosphere of freedom from outside interference. These purposes have not been fulfilled. The International Control Commissions in both countries, of which India is Chairman, have recorded many violations of the agreements. In any case the spirit of agreements has not been observed and today Indo-China presents a grave danger-spot menacing international peace. We stand by the Geneva Agreement of 1962 in the case of Laos of which we were a signatory. We also uphold the Geneva Agreement of 1954 in respect of Vietnam,

[Shri Swaran Singh]

although we were not participants in the Geneva Conference on Indo-China in 1954. As Chairman of the International Control Commissions in Laos and Vietnam, we have an onerous responsibility. We have discharged the responsibility to the best of our capacity with impartiality and without fear or favour.

In regard to Laos, it is absolutely essential that there should be agreement between three main political factions in Laos. Without such an agreement, which hitherto has not come about, there could be no solution of the Laotian problem. We are glad that the representatives of the three Laotian parties have been meeting in Paris and have made some progress in their talks though they are still far from bridging the gap between their respective points of view on the two or three important issues on which they stand divided. We hope that they will persevere in their efforts and we wish them success.

We consider that the best chance of sorting out the Laotian situation is to convene the 14-nation conference and as the House is aware, we have strongly supported the convening of such a conference which has been formally proposed by the Soviet Union. We hope that the impediments which still stand in the way of holding such a conference will disappear as a result of the talks that are going on in Paris.

In Vietnam the situation in some ways is much more complicated and dangerous from the point of view of world peace. The people of Vietnam today are deeply divided. The Governments of North Vietnam and South Vietnam, have not only functioned in the last 10 years separately and independently, but have been locked in conflict with each other. Various factors—internal and external—have further complicated the situation. The Government of India do not wish to make *ex cathedra* pronouncements on how the situation in Vietnam should

be resolved. They are of the opinion that eventually political rather than military solutions will have to be found for the problem of Vietnam and we hope that the futility of a continuing conflict in Vietnam and the danger in presents of big power conflict will be realised by all concerned who should orient their thinking and actions towards a patient search for political solutions in Vietnam.

The incidents which took place in the Gulf of Tonkin some six weeks ago caused us deep concern to which we officially gave expression at that time. Fortunately, these have not led to a wider conflict. It is our sincere hope that there will be no escalation of conflict which would be disastrous for the peoples of South-East Asia.

The conflict between Indonesia and Malaysia has greatly distressed us and I should tell the House frankly that like many other Asian countries of this region we are deeply embarrassed since we have friendly relations with both Indonesia and Malaysia. We do not wish to go into the merits of the specific issues that are dividing Indonesia and Malaysia and to take sides. The differences between Indonesia and Malaysia, whatever they might be, should be settled at the conference table and there should be no resort to military means. Malaysia's solid support to India at the time of the Chinese attack has created a deep feeling of appreciation and gratitude in us.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: Have you reciprocated it now?

Shri Swaran Singh: We have great sympathy with the people of Malaysia in the difficulties and dangers that they are facing at present.

Shri U. M. Tripathi (Mandsaur): Only sympathy.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: Send medical aid or mission at least.

Shri Swaran Singh: India's relations with African countries are based on our historical ties and our common experience of colonialism. We have always stood for the rights of colonial peoples to equality and independence. We have firmly declared this in the past and will continue to do so until the last vestige of colonialism is removed from that great continent. A major portion of Africa is now independent and we have established relations with 28 independent African States.

Shri U. M. Trivedi: We are avoiding others.

Shri Swaran Singh: I would remind the House that there is happily already a great degree of affinity with these States in the pursuit of a common policy of non-alignment, promotion of international peace, anti-colonialism and anti-racialism. We have welcomed the formation of the Organisation of African Unity as a manifestation of the African peoples' desire for unity. We welcome the declaration by all members of the OAU of their adherence to the policy of non-alignment. It is our earnest desire to continue co-operation with the African nations as a means of promoting Afro-Asian unity.

One of the problems causing concern not only to the African people but indeed to all right-thinking people in the world, and which concern we wholly share, is the racist policies of the Government of South Africa. The flagrant manner in which South Africa has violated the many United Nations resolutions amounts, at it does, to a defiance of world opinion, on the question of apartheid, which policy, if pursued, cannot but escalate into an open conflict. In pursuance of the UN resolutions, we have already taken steps to impose an economic boycott on South Africa. Indeed, India's record has been a proud one in this respect. I would assure the House that we shall continue to support the just demands of the African people in South Africa for their political and economic emancipation.

Shri U. M. Trivedi: What about the demands of the Indians themselves?

Shri Swaran Singh: Portuguese colonies in Africa present another problem and we have welcomed and support all that is being done by the Organisation of African Unity, to liberate these areas. The brutal repression of the people of Angola and Mozambique by the Portuguese authorities is a challenge to the conscience and will of the United Nations. It is the inalienable right of these people to freedom and independence. We urge the Portuguese Government not to create tension and conflict by suppressing or resisting the just aspirations of these people. We also urge Portugal to respect her obligations under the Charter of the United Nations and direct her action and policy in accordance with the resolutions adopted by the world organisation.

Shri U. M. Trivedi: Have we established diplomatic relations with Portugal?

Shri Swaran Singh: The question of Southern Rhodesia was discussed during the recent Commonwealth Prime Ministers' Conference and it was agreed that an independence conference to which leaders of all parties of Southern Rhodesia may be invited should be convened, so that Southern Rhodesia should proceed to independence within the Commonwealth on the basis of majority rule. It was also agreed that to prepare the way for such a conference, the Government in Salisbury should release all detained African leaders. During recent talks that have taken place between the Prime Ministers of Britain and of Southern Rhodesia, an assurance has been given that the minority Government of Southern Rhodesia will not take any steps towards a unilateral declaration of independence. We have made it quite clear that India will not recognise any unilateral declaration of independence by the present minority Government of Southern Rhodesia.

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया (फर्रुखाबाद):
कितने पन्ने घौर हैं ?

श्री स्वर्ण सिंह : अगर माननीय सदस्य जरा सब करेंगे, तो पता लग जायेगा। क्या वह बताव हो गये हैं? अफ्रीका के मुताल्लिक मैं ने जो कुछ कहा है, क्या वह नागवार गुजरा है ?

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : चाहे जितनी मुसीबत पड़े, मैं मंत्री महोदय को आखिर तक मुनना चाहता हूँ। इसलिए मैं यह सवाल कर रहा हूँ।

Shri Swaran Singh: Government have been taking active steps to promote economic and cultural ties with the independent African nations by the exchange of visits at all levels. We have demonstrated our readiness to share our experiences in nation-building activities. Our universities and other educational institutions are open to African students and I am glad to say that a number of students are studying in Indian universities and institutions. It is also our intention to promote trade to our mutual benefit and to foster economic and technical collaboration by making available the services of technicians and experts. A delegation from India is now in Africa to explore possibilities of joint collaboration in the industrial field. I am confident that all these steps will pave the way to closer collaboration and understanding with our African brothers.

India's relations with the Arab world have been close and cordial from historical times. There have been cultural and commercial exchanges between the Arab people and India continuously throughout the centuries. This historical affinity has found a new basis in the modern times, based on a common outlook on secularism and a desire to give economic content to the recently acquired political freedom. In the international field, the

countries of West Asia are bound to us by our common policy of positive non-alignment, peaceful co-existence and a passionate desire for promotion of world peace. We are also cooperating in the noble task of eradication of the remaining vestiges of colonialism and discrimination based on racialism.

India has welcomed recent efforts of the Arab States to normalise their relations and to forge Arab unity. We welcomed the first Summit Conference of Arab Kings and Heads of States held in Cairo in January this year as a right step towards achieving Arab unity. This has been carried forward at the second Arab Summit Conference held recently in Alexandria.

Hon. Members know that India is in sympathy with the aspirations of the Arab people on the Palestine question. The Jordan Waters issue constitutes a source of tension and friction in West Asia and it is a matter of concern that the Palestine problem still remains unresolved. In keeping with our traditional ties of friendship with the Arab countries, we have supported the just claims of the Arab people in respect of the Jordan Waters issue and the rights of the Palestine refugees wishing to return to their homes.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: What about friendly ties with Israel also?

Shri Swaran Singh: The hon. Member will have ample time to express his views.

In regard to Aden and the Protectorates of South Arabia, we stand for their independence with the least possible delay.

As a means of strengthening our existing cordial relations with the countries of West Asia, frequent exchanges of visits are being promoted from both sides. The visit of our Vice-President to the Maghreb countries a few months ago brought better understanding of India's aims and objectives among the people of that area. The visits of two non-official delegations

who made a goodwill tour of selected countries of West Asia and Africa brought home to the people there our secular approach to national and international problems. In this we are in tune with the Arab countries whose approach is also secular in character, as recently demonstrated by their stand on the Cyprus issue.

The Prime Minister will be paying his first visit to the United Arab Republic in a week's time. His visit to this friendly non-aligned country would further help to bring better understanding and forge new bonds of friendship. The Prime Minister's participation in the Non-aligned Nations' Conference to be held in Cairo would also be a landmark in demonstrating our adherence to the policy of positive non-alignment, which has contributed so much to strengthen the forces of world peace. The assembly of Heads of States and Governments or their representatives from nearly 50 non-aligned nations would be an event of major significance in demonstrating the will of these countries to consolidate peace and to help eliminate causes of friction from the world scene.

We have a great deal in common with the United States of America sharing, as we do, our common belief in democratic principles, freedom of the individual and many other principles which have been enshrined in the constitutions of our two countries. Hon. Members will recall the spontaneous support received by India from the U.S. Government at the time of the Chinese attack in October, 1962. The United States continues to be the largest contributor of aid in various forms in India's development effort. More recently, the U.S. Government have rendered valuable assistance to relieve a difficult food situation.

The willingness of the Soviet Union to give massive aid to India, necessary for the preservation of our territorial integrity and for our economic and industrial progress, reveals the importance attached by the Soviet Union to

friendship with India. The Soviet Government has recognised and endorsed India's efforts towards the maintenance of international peace. The Soviet Union has accepted the position that the policy of non-alignment, to which India subscribes, is a valuable asset in the cause of world peace. She has given unstinted support to India on the Kashmir question in the United Nations and has as well deplored Chinese aggression against India in October, 1962. She has upheld India's position on the Sino-Indian conflict and impressed upon China the need for settling the Sino-Indian border dispute in accordance with the Colombo proposals.

Hon. Members would agree with me that if a country or two is hostile to India in spite of our best efforts, we are more than compensated and encouraged by the massive support received from the others. When China suddenly attacked India in October, 1962, the great question arose: will the socialist countries of Eastern Europe support China for ideological reasons? This was the moment of trial for our policy and before long the correctness of our stand was established. One after the other, the countries of Eastern Europe—Bulgaria, Hungary and Czechoslovakia passed resolutions at successive party meetings, denouncing the Chinese action against India. These countries with whom we have built up strong trade and cultural ties over the years, stood by India.

ड० राम मनोहर लोहिया : एशिया के कम्युनिस्ट देशों का भ्रम बताने चाहिए ।

Shri Swaran Singh: Our relations with the countries of Eastern Europe are thus important politically and it is a good thing that our policy over the years has come to emphasise increasing trade ties and cultural contacts with the countries of this region. Czechoslovakia has stood by us not only on the Sino-Indian border conflict but on Kashmir question. With Yugoslavia, which has its historic differences with China and occupies a

[Shri Swaran Singh]

unique position amongst the socialist countries as well as amongst the non-aligned nations, we have exceedingly friendly relations.

The basic reason for the friendship of these countries for India is their appreciation of India's role in international affairs, which stands for peace and moderation. They have appreciated what late Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru had told western leaders, much before the events, that there would be a thaw in the cold war as there was genuine and sincere desire amongst the masses, both in the socialist countries as well as in the west, for preventing another war. India took a leading part in the disarmament negotiations and continues to do so, even though we are not a nuclear power. It was, therefore, in the fitness of things that we were one of the first to sign the Partial Test Ban Treaty after the nuclear powers, USA, USSR and Britain.

Amongst the western powers, France has come to occupy an increasingly important position. Under the wise leadership of President de Gaulle, France has not only given independence to Algeria, but there has been a miraculous development of French economy. France has been taking keen interest in South-East Asia and China, areas of vital interest to India; therefore, the growth of cordial and friendly relations between India and France are a welcome development.

Canada is another Western power with which India has come to develop valuable and friendly relations. Canada has distinguished herself in the field of peace keeping operations and International Commissions, where India and Canada have found themselves together. Canadian help to India has been generous and valuable in the field of peaceful uses of atomic energy and development projects. At the time of the Chinese aggression, Canada was one of the first countries to offer transport aircraft to India.

Similarly, in Latin America, we have developed friendly ties with Mexico, Bolivia, Chile, Brazil, Argentina and Cuba. There are good prospects of expanding India's trade in this area.

To sum up, therefore, the biggest achievement of our foreign policy is that we are not confined or shackled to one area or one bloc of countries. Basing our policy on certain recognised principles of international conduct, we have found increasing appreciation and support from an ever larger number of countries. We retain our flexibility, as well as strength.

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : फतेह
हमारी, जमाने दुश्मनों को ।

Shri Sawaran Singh: Mr. Speaker, far-reaching changes are taking place in the field of international relations. The differences between the two blocs which had grown during many years, are not so acute now, and a new trend is developing in which many of these differences are losing their validity. Above all, the peoples of the world, no matter where they live, and which bloc they may belong to, are aware that in this age of thermo-nuclear weapons, out-moded dogmas and postures have little part to play. An encouraging development for world peace is the expanding area of agreement between the USA and the USSR. In the developing rapprochement between these two great countries and super powers lies the best hope of the death of the cold war, increasing mutual co-operation and world peace.

The policy of non-alignment of which Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru was father, and the efficacy of which had been questioned by many in the past, is now being acclaimed and accepted as a correct policy not only for India, but also for many other countries in Asia, Africa, Latin America and Europe. It is in this context that we can not but view with disappointment, the bellicose attitude of the Government

of the People's Republic of China which is bent upon ignoring the main-stream of world opinion and pursuing a policy which is fraught with grave danger to peace, particularly in Asia where she is surrounded by peaceful neighbours who have clearly no aggressive designs towards her. China has started a new kind of cold war and its advocacy of revolutionary wars in other countries and its near glorification of nuclear war is a most disturbing factor for world peace and understanding. It is my earnest hope that the leaders of China will see the error of their ways and re-shape their policies based on friendship, peace and co-operation.

Mr. Speaker: Motion moved:

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

There are some substitute motions.

Shri V. B. Gandhi (Bombay Central South): Sir, I beg to move:

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

"This House, having considered the present international situation and the policy of the Government of India in relation thereto, approves of the policy of the Government of India." (1)

Dr. Ram Manohar Lohia: Sir, I beg to move:

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

"This House, having considered the present international situation and the policy of the Government of India in relation thereto, resolves that the Ministry of External Affairs do institute an inquiry into the causes of the failure or unsoundness of the foreign policy covering both the aspects

of principle as well as practice, and that there should be a comprehensive inquiry covering the whole world and also separate enquiries about the strained relations with important countries, and the House desires that the report of the enquiry should be submitted to the House by the next session." (2)

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: Sir, I would like to make a request in this connection. As you were pleased to allow on a previous occasion, as this debate will continue till Monday evening, I hope you will be so pleased as to allow hon. Members on both sides of the House to table substitute motions by tomorrow evening or tomorrow afternoon.

Mr. Speaker: Not tomorrow evening, by tomorrow morning at least they ought to be there by one o'clock.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: Tomorrow means Monday because we are not sitting tomorrow.

Mr. Speaker: But the substitute motions can be sent in tomorrow.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: Tomorrow by one o'clock.

Shri U. M. Trivedi: In view of today's long speech of the hon. Minister covering the whole world—for the first time all the various countries have been named—even if we talk for one minute on each it will take a long time. Therefore, the time of 5 hours that has been allotted for this debate is very small. I request that the time must be extended at least to ten hours and the debate must continue till Tuesday.

Mr. Speaker: It was for the Minister to go over the whole policy. Hon. Members can confine themselves to certain aspects of it. They can choose what they like.

Shri U. M. Trivedi: It is very difficult. We are interested in all.

Shri Banga: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I am glad my hon. friend, Sardar Swaran Singh, the new Foreign Minister, has made a comprehensive, sober and peace-making statement today. If one were to depend entirely on his own speech as it was being delivered and as it should be read later on, one would think that there is no trouble at all in this world, that everywhere there is peace, all problems are very easy to be solved, they are going to be solved and, therefore, there would be no need at all for India to be worried about. My fear is, the actual conditions are not like that.

At the same time, this is the first occasion on which this House is discussing foreign affairs without the presence of Jawaharlaljee. An old friend of most of us, a personal friend of mine for many decades as well as political opponent for some time, naturally, we miss his presence today.

13.25 hrs.

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

As Prime Minister and Foreign Minister, he used to help this House to come to grips with the foreign policies that were being pursued by Government. So many of us were glad to agree with him on many occasions and were equally keen on disagreeing with him on other occasions. At all times, his presence added spice and strength to our debates.

I am also glad to say that the Inter-Parliamentary Conference which met at Copenhagen in August paid a glowing tribute to Jawaharlaljee, as a statesman of world stature. Let us hope that the debates of our Parliament and the management of our foreign affairs by Parliament and Government will continue to succeed to hold the attention and gain the respect of the world's parliaments.

Sir, I am glad the Prime Minister has accepted the advice tendered to him by some of us that at long last there should be a departure made and the foreign ministership should be

separated from the prime ministership. That was a demand which I used to make several times when the former Prime Minister was alive, and I am glad the present Prime Minister has accepted that suggestion. I welcome the present Foreign Minister into this House and I wish him and the country success during his tenure.

I am glad he has made a reference to Jawaharlalji's and this country's passion for helping all those colonial people, who were suffering under imperialism of one type or the other, to achieve their national freedom. I am also glad that it stands to the credit of our Government, after we have achieved our freedom, that we have rendered material help and assistance to the people in Africa. Unfortunately, we have failed to help those people in what are known as satellite countries in Europe, ten of them, which have come to suffer from Communist regime just because of the failure of the world's leaders including our own leaders to see that impartial, free and full democratic elections were held in order to help their people to elect their own true representatives to their parliaments and have their own governments. I sincerely hope a time would come when our Government also would be able to buck up courage to assist Soviet Russia, England, America and France, the parties to that yalta agreement, to see that those countries would come to have truly democratic and fully representative parliaments to give satisfaction to their people and assuring them of a democratic regime.

Then, Sir, I am also glad, my hon. friend has made a survey of the conditions that prevail *vis-a-vis* our country in the neighbouring countries, and that he has visited some of them. But I cannot agree with him in the statements that he has made assuring us that not much trouble would have to be expected by our people in Burma and Ceylon, and that the Burmese Government is dealing with our people in an impartial manner, and the Ceylonese Government has been decent

and considerate towards those lakhs of Stateless people. I do not see any reason why all those lakhs of people who have been there during this generation as well as the previous generation too, who have been taken over there by their Government, whether it was the British or some other power, to develop their social economy, should be left in the lurch in the manner they have been left and should be denied the right of citizenship and, what is even worse, now that they should be placed at the tender mercies of the local Government. I am glad my hon. friend has stated that while we should try and strive to achieve friendship with these countries, we should not slur over the problems and points of difference that arise between us, and it is in this regard that I feel that if only greater consideration from the viewpoint of all those people who had been there, large sections of them from different parts of our country, had been paid and greater attention had been paid by our Ambassadors as well as our Foreign Minister and Foreign Ministry here, their fate would have been much better than what it has been.

I am not one of those who would like to have these officers distributed according to geographical divisions of our country. But, certainly, a South Indian could have understood, I dare say, their plight much better, with greater keenness, than has been the case till now.

Now what is our position? As a result of the world survey that my hon. friend has made, he would like us to believe that on the basis of the views and positions that are taken up by various countries India's position is on the whole on the positive side. He has tried to draw a balance sheet and has stated the minuses are not so many, but the plusses are so many, therefore, we are on the winning side and we need not feel so despondent. I cannot feel the similar sense of confidence.

He has also failed to give sufficient prominence to the ideological as well

as political aspect of the aggressive attitudes and postures of Communist China. It is true he has stated that the attitude of Communist China in regard to some of the countries in Asia has not been very favourable or peaceful or helpful. But why is it that Communist China is taking up this particular attitude? There was a time when there was a need, some of us felt, some of us also agreed with Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, that there was a need—for the policy of non-alignment because at that time Soviet Russia was adopting an aggressive attitude and there was cold war between Soviet Russia and the United States and other democratic countries. Today that situation has changed. As he has himself admitted, between those two great powers of the West as well as of the East, peaceful relations are now coming to prevail and they have gone so far towards each other that today America does not get angry when Soviet Russia comes to give us military assistance. Similarly, Russia is not suspicious because we are getting military assistance from America and England. That is all for the good. This is a new development and we must take stock of it.

But, then, what else is happening? Another force has come, another menace has come to world peace and people's freedom, and that is Communist China. Communist China is now an expansionist power, out for aggression, out for the blood of as many of her neighbours as possible, not excluding her own, what should I say, political kith and kin, that is, Soviet Russia. She is making territorial claims on Soviet Russia, as she has made territorial claim on so many of us. I do not know whether at any time Communist China would be able to buck up enough courage to aggress against Soviet Russia, as she has done against us. But Russia is certainly not happy about the prospects and, therefore, Russia is willing, as my hon. friend has just now suggested, to help us to maintain our territorial integrity as against Chinese ambitions, claims and aggression.

[Shri Ranga]

Then, what should we do? Should we not try to look out for friends in all these areas where Chinese influence is growing, is being made to grow instead of entirely depending upon only these two or three countries? I am very glad indeed that the Finance Minister, when he happened to be at Kuala Lumpur there, was good enough to offer our sympathy, of understanding to support Malayasia. We must remember that the Malaysian Prime Minister stood heroically with us when we were in trouble. I am also glad that the present Government appreciated the strong action taken by America when in Tonkin area Chinese aggression showed its face. I am also glad that we are trying to help Viet Nam and Laos against Communist aggression.

But do not all these things indicate that the biggest enemy to world peace is Communist China? If that is so, what is it that we have to do? Should we not try our best to pursue a positive policy? Should we merely pursue this policy of non-alignment? Against whom is it? Not against Russia, because it is not necessary; nor is it against USA, because it is not necessary. Because, both of them are coming together, there is the test-ban treaty and, on top of that, the West European countries are competing with one another in offering technical know-how, scientific assistance and machinery also to Soviet Russia and other Communist countries in South East Europe. Under these circumstances, what is the special purpose that this policy of non-alignment is going to serve, whom is it going to help, at the same time, preventing conflict between each other and saving world peace? Are we not, on the other hand, going to provide a platform for all those countries which would try to be non-aligned as against India, which would try to help China? That is the danger.

The other day my hon. friend has stated that Indo-China dispute cannot be taken up at the Cairo Confer-

ence. Quite right. He is welcome to say that. But, at the same time, can he assure us that the Chinese lobby is not going to be there? Quite a large number of African countries which have also become recently free are under the influence of China, and they are going to align themselves, if not in practice, at least in spirit by the side of Communist China. Then, what steps are we now taking, positive and effective steps are we taking in order to win over as many of those countries as possible to our side and make them understand not merely the defensive role that we are playing, the role on behalf of the peace-loving countries of the world and especially in Africa, but in boldly standing up to the Chinese aggression? Our representative at the disarmament conference was accusing Soviet Russia as well as America because they were not so keen on disarmament. Now what else are we doing except arming ourselves today as against China? And when we are doing this thing, is it not necessary that we should be able to project our case in Africa as well as in Asia and win more friends for our cause? And what is our cause? Our cause is world peace; not merely our territorial integrity and regaining of the 14,500 sq. miles of our sacred land that has already been occupied by the Chinese aggressor, but world peace and also world democracy. Chinese Communist imperialism today is a threat to world democracy, to parliamentary system, to freedom, to human rights and, therefore, we must be prepared to make a clearer and more emphatic case in favour of the steps that we are taking in order to strengthen ourselves.

It is most unfortunate that, as is the case with most other people also, we stick to dogmas long after their use is over. I would like my hon. friend to demonstrate what was the negative role that non-alignment has played and what is the positive role that it is going to play. My fear is that it has no positive role to play

at all in the present circumstances. Even if you are enjoined to hang on to the dogma because it has come down to you as a heritage, even then, in addition to that, is it not necessary for us to look out for allies, for friend? Allies, not against Soviet Russia, allies not against United States but only against Chinese Communist aggressors. If Soviet Russia is willing to be our ally, she would be most welcome. But we know that she cannot afford to do it, she would not like to do it, because ultimately she and Communist China are agreed on their general ideological approach, the Communist approach. Therefore, the only natural allies that we can have, not against Soviet Russia—I am repeating it again—but against Communist China, can only be from amongst the democratic nations.

In this context my leader, Rajaji, has been advising this country and the people as a whole that it would be best for us to have a firm alliance, a firm friendship, with the United Kingdom, America, Australia, New Zealand, Canada and various other democratic countries which are willing to come into partnership with us in order to stem this tide of Communist aggression and in order to beat down this imperialism and make those people realise the value of world peace, democracy and human rights.

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty: They are supporting us over Kashmir.

Shri Ranga: Now they say that if we are to do this and if we are to effectively stand against this Communist aggression, we have got to turn our eyes to our own immediate neighbours, that is, Pakistan herself. My hon. friend has said that Prime Minister and the President of Pakistan are soon going to meet, after the forthcoming conference which is to take place immediately between the Home Ministers. Let us wish them all success. But then all issues have got to be taken up and placed on the discussion table. My hon. friend has

already said that it is going to be done in that way.

In this context I wish to make an offer on behalf of my party and my leader, Rajaji, that we are prepared to give all our support for whatever it is worth to this Government—any government for the matter of that in this country, which is anxious, willing, keen and earnest in achieving an honourable, peaceful and decent agreement with Pakistan. We would like to give first priority to this. Why? Because everyone knows that all this huge unbearable expenditure that we are now incurring on defence forces can be cut down by more than half if only we can have peaceful relations with Pakistan.

This trouble in regard to refugees coming over from there can be reduced considerably and this trouble also in regard to their people having been here for some time and now we have to send them out and the dispute arising therefrom can also come to be resolved. If we can both combine, the resources of both these countries and their allies, in the West, could be behind us to buttress our democracy and to strengthen our national integrity as also the integrity of the sub-continent. That is why we want first priority to be given to this.

My hon. friend says, "What about Kashmir?" Yes; what about Kashmir? Did we not warn the Government, as I read out some time back, as long ago as 1958, that it would be dangerous for our country to come to depend upon the tender mercy of one political party in that State and none else at all? We have all known the history of the so-called National Conference. It is so unfortunate that this Government has been dogged by bad luck in such a way that every time they think in terms of having any important person in detention, they seem to be doing it at the wrong moment. Was it necessary for them to have taken this gentleman, Bakshi Ghulam Mohammed, into custody and

[Shri Ranga]

put into jail just on the eve of the session of the legislature? Was it not possible for them to know that they had a majority of support from amongst National Conference MLAs. before they took this decision? But they have done it. We need not go into why they have done it and all those things. Even today we are in danger.

Is it not time that they should hold, just as they are going to hold interim elections in Kerala, interim elections here and give a chance for those people to make a choice of their leaders? As I had suggested in the case of Kerala, here also I would suggest to them to make an experiment of all groups and parties above a minimum strength, maybe five MLAs or more being brought together into a committee Government and expecting them to run the administration on the lines on which the Swiss Government has been run. If you do not do it, what is likely to happen is that you would be keeping Sheikh Abdullah outside the legislature and all those who support him as also many others who would be opposing him, belonging to the Muslim League and various other groups, with Shri Sadiq and his group ruling the roost in the Assembly in the name of the National Conference. I do not think that that would be a healthy development.

Therefore we have got to convince the world that we are trying our best to make democracy work in Kashmir in the most effective and practicable manner. If we do it, it is possible that the talks that are to take place between our Prime Minister and the President of Pakistan would have a much better chance of success than at present.

Having said these things, I am anxious that our country's economic development should be speeded up. It is not the monopoly of the other party to be keen about economic development. We are also keen. In order to be able to do it, we must, first of all, bring down the tax burdens on the

peasants and on the ordinary masses by reducing land revenue, tax burdens in the shape of excise duties and reduce defence expenditure and by bringing this Government also into effective control over expenditure that would be within its capacity to manage. Then we would have enough money for our economic development. We want economic development and we would like to give first priority to that. But before that the very first priority has to be given for our fight against Communist China. In doing that we must make friends with Pakistan. If we do that it would be possible for us to economise and to the extent that we can economise all those funds can be utilised for double purposes, as I have said, for reducing the burden of taxation and inflation and all the other evils that have come in the train of statism as also for economic development. We can achieve these things.

Shri K. D. Malaviya (Basti): How to make friendship with Pakistan? Let us know.

Shri Ranga: My hon. friend has tried his influence for several years while he was in Government. We know the results. Now I am asking other friends to make their experiments.

Shri K. D. Malaviya: We want you to explain it.

Shri Ranga: I have not yet become the Foreign Minister. It is not for me to do that. It is wrong for any Opposition leader to try to probe into details and then begin to give detailed advice to the Foreign Minister. All that he can do is to say that these are the objectives . . .

Shri K. D. Malaviya: I withdraw my request.

Shri Ranga: . . . which we would like the Foreign Minister to achieve with the aid of the Prime Minister and his colleagues including my hon. friend, Shri Malaviya. The only thing is that Shri Malaviya thinks that the first enemy is Pakistan and the second enemy is China, I suppose. I do not

know whether he considers China as an enemy at all because he has begun to make new friends.

Shri Kapur Singh (Ludhiana): China is not an enemy.

Shri Ranga: But then I cannot wish success for him that way. Therefore it is essential that we change our priorities.

My hon. friend, the Foreign Minister, has indicated the various directions in which the earlier Foreign Minister had functioned. In the priorities that he had developed he gave only the third priority to achieving good relations with our neighbours. I would like them to give so far as our own territorial problems are concerned first priority to Pakistan in making friends and in seeing that Chinese aggressive designs against India would not have any chance at all.

Would it be possible—let him say; let them consider it for themselves—for India alone to resist the Chinese aggression, to keep away the Chinese influence in the whole of this area? They might say, "We will reach some kind of an agreement by sitting round a table over the Himalayan heights". Would it be enough? Is India going to allow herself to be isolated as against China? Are we going to keep mum while Chinese influence in Burma and Ceylon increases and has been going on increasing, as you all know? In Indonesia it has been increasing all along, as you know and with what disastrous results. We have seen that also. The former Indo-China, all those three or four countries, that have come into existence there, if they were to be swallowed up through her influence and if they were to be brought under the paw of her political power and influence, what would be the fate of India? Not only as a matter of status but even in the matter of the ultimate freedom of this country, it would not be possible to be complacent. How else have all those ten countries from Rumania, Bulgaria, Yugoslavia, Latvia, Lithuania and other countries in Europe came under the influence of the Communists? Did

the local Communists ever succeed in getting a majority in any decent democratic election? No, Sir; it was because the Russian Red Armies went into those countries, helped them, gave them the protection or umbrella of their power that they were able to establish themselves in power. Similarly, the second group of Indian communists are also hoping to get power in this country. I do not blame them for this. They are politicians, and they want power just as my hon. friends opposite have had power here. Therefore, it is natural for them to look up to their spiritual mentor; namely the Chinese communists, so that they can also play their part here. If we allow that, what would happen in this country?

Recently, there has been so much of propoganda against this Government all over the world, saying that after Jawaharlal Nehru, the country is going to pieces; five thousand to ten thousand men have already been taken into jail, and everybody says that poor Mr. Shastri is such a nice man and yet he is not well and he is not strong, and the Government of India is going to pieces. This is the atmosphere that our enemies have been spreading all over the world. If that kind of atmosphere continues to be developed in the years to come, and country after country in our neighbourhood comes under the influence of the Chinese, then what would be the fate of our own democratic voters here in this country? Would they not be in danger of losing their souls? Would they not become unwilling to go and risk their votes for the ruling party or any of the other democratic parties including mine, and would they not go and vote in favour of the communists?

Of course, the communists may not come through elections in a majority all over India at the same time, but bit by bit they want to do it. They have already bored into Kerala and they have their place in Assam as well as in Bengal.

Shri Indrajit Gupta (Calcutta South West): They have bored in Andhra Pradesh also.

Shri Ranga: Last time when there was the Chinese aggression, we know what happened. We know the really disastrous role, unpatriotic and disgusting role that so many of these communists played in all those areas. They were hoping to be able to capture power bit by bit, and they would like to do it also.

Therefore, it is in the interests of India to see that she should not be thinking only in terms of fighting China all by herself because she would not be in a position to do it. For the fighting China, we need the support of Pakistan, and we need the support of all our other neighbours, that is, Nepal, Sikkim and Bhutan, and then in addition to this, we need also the support of the other countries, active or passive, psychological or physical or political, in the whole of South-East Asia. Beyond that, we must go also to Africa.

Recently, I came into touch with some of the leaders from the parliaments of the African countries, when they came to the Inter-Parliamentary Conference and also at some other international gatherings. I found to my surprise and regret that quite a large number—I do not wish to say the majority of them, but quite a large number of them—of the newly liberated and independent African countries are not convinced of the justice of our cause, are not convinced that we should be supported, are not convinced that China is in the wrong and that China is going to be an enemy not only of us but also of them. Just as we have flirted with China in the years past when Pdt. Jawaharlal Nehru was leading us, unfortunately wrongly, as we have discovered now so also, those countries are now pursuing and cherishing and nursing this wrong impression that communist China is a very peace-loving nation, and a very

democratic nation and is really keen on the equality of races and continents and equality between backward and advanced countries and therefore, there is nothing wrong with communist China. That is the threat to our peace. That is the threat to our place in the world. The sooner our Government make up their mind to gear their foreign policy as well as their foreign publicity in the direction of gaining more and more friendships in the democratic world and also in the semi-democratic world and also on the Soviet side of the world, as against communist China, the better it would be. Otherwise, it would be a very dangerous thing indeed for us to pursue the kind of goody-goody, peace-evoking and general invocation of peace for everybody which seems to be the new atmosphere in reaction to the earlier tempestuous period that we have had.

श्री के० वे० मालवीय : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, जब से सुनने और तर्जुमा करने वाली मशीन का इंतजाम हुआ है, तब से हमारे जैसे लोगों को यह प्रोत्साहन मिला है कि हम अपने दोस्त लोहिया जी से प्रेरणा ले कर हिन्दी में बोलने की कोशिश करें। मैं न हिन्दी में अच्छा बोल सकता हूँ और न ही अंग्रेजी में अच्छा बोल सकता हूँ। लेकिन इस यंत्र के आ जाने के बाद जरूर यह मेरी कोशिश होगी कि मैं हिन्दी में बोला करूँ। मेरा यह भी विश्वास है कि अंग्रेजी भाषा अभी बहुत वर्षों तक हमारे देश की एकता के लिए जरूरी है, इसलिए मैं डा० लोहिया से इस हद तक इत्तफाक नहीं करता कि उसका टायकाट कर दिया जाए। समय समय पर जब जरूरी होगा और अंग्रेजी में भी बोलना मुनासिब होगा तो उस में भी मैं बोला करूँगा।

जो भाषण अभी सरदार साहब का हुआ है, उसका मैं स्वागत करता हूँ। उनहोंने हमें काफी सूचना दी है, जिससे ढाढ़स बंधाता

है कि हमारी नीति ठीक तरह से चलेगी और जिस नीति का हम निश्चय कर चुके हैं, उसी नीति का आम तौर पर हम अनुसरण करेंगे।

मेरा विश्वास है कि किसी देश की विदेश नीति और उसकी राष्ट्रीय नीति में भी बहुत परस्पर विरोधी संघर्ष नहीं हो सकता है। हां, जमाने के बदलने से और तेजी से जो परिवर्तन हो रहे हैं, इस वक्त उनको देखते हुए यह जरूरी है कि आधुनिक काल में हमारी विदेश नीति के अन्दर स्वातंत्र्य हो, और नया रुख हो। इस नए रुख और इंडिपेंडेंस के विषय में बहुत पहले से हमने फैसला कर लिया है। आजादी मिलने के पहले ही से इस पर फैसला हिन्दुस्तान कर चुका है, हमारे देश की जनता कर चुकी है और देश की सरकार भी जो बाद में आई, वह कटिबद्ध हो चुकी है उन बुनियादी स्तम्भों के ऊपर जिस पर आज हमारी अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय और राष्ट्रीय नीति चल रही है। वह क्या है? शान्ति की, योजना की, समाजवाद की और प्रजातंत्रवाद की। ये सब एक दूसरे से नत्थी हैं और आज चाहे कोई विरोधी पार्टी कम्युनिज्म के हौवे से डरे या और कोई हौवा हमारे सामने रखे, हम इस नीति को छोड़ नहीं सकते हैं। हां, समय-समय पर परिधि के अन्दर, अस्थायी रूप में तबादला करने का जरूरत हो तो वह हम करते जा सकते हैं।

नान-एलाइनमेंट के डिनेमिक कंसैट के बारे में बहुत बातें हम सुन चुके हैं। सदन में माननीय सदस्यों ने इस पर विचार किया है। हमारे स्वर्गीय नेता ने भी बताया है, इसलिए आज कोई विशेष विश्लेषण करने की उसके सम्बन्ध में जरूरत नहीं है। सवाल तो यह है कि जैसा हमारे मित्र रंगा जी ने अभी कहा है कि क्या अब नान-एलाइनमेंट की जरूरत नहीं है? मैं बहुत जोरों से

उन से गैर-इतिफाकी का इजहार करता हूँ और यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि अगर किसी वक्त भी जरूरत थी नान-एलाइनमेंट के ऊपर जोर देने की, तो वह आज है। नान-एलाइनमेंट की नीति ने हमें फायदा पहुंचाया है। अगर फायदा पहुंचा है और हम दुनिया में एक उचित बैलेंस कायम कर सके हैं उस नीति के अनुसरण से तो न पश्चिम में, न पूर्व में, न उत्तर में, न दक्षिण में कहीं भी हम उस नान-एलाइनमेंट की पालिसी का परित्याग क्यों कर दें?

श्री विद्या चरण शुक्ल (महासमंद) :
चीन और पाकिस्तान तो कहते हैं।

14 hrs.

श्री के० दे० नालबीय : चीन और पाकिस्तान के मसले पर मैं बाद में आऊंगा चीन और पाकिस्तान के प्रति जो हमारा रुख बना है, वह मजबूरन है, शांति की व्यवस्था कायम रखने की इच्छा के बावजूद उस में परस्पर कोई विरोध नहीं है, न होना चाहिये और न कोई चाहता है।

मैं बहुत थोड़े समय में दी ही चार चीजों की तरफ सदन का ध्यान दिलाना चाहूंगा। एक तो मैं हिन्दुस्तान का सम्बन्ध ब्रिटिश कामनवैल्य के साथ क्या हो, कैसा रहा है, इस बारे में अपनी राय बतलाना चाहता हूँ। बड़ा मुश्किल है तर्क और दलील में जाना, लेकिन पिछला इतिहास हमें बतलाता है कि सामूहिक तौर पर, यह कहना बड़ा मुश्किल है कि ब्रिटिश कामनवैल्य ऐसी बड़ी जमात में रह कर हमें कोई विशेष फायदा हुआ। इसलिये मैं अपने स्वर्गीय प्रधान मंत्री जी के समय में भी उन से यह कहा करता था कि एक समय आयेगा जब आप को जल्दी फैसला करना पड़ेगा कि ब्रिटिश कामनवैल्य में रहने से हमें कोई विशेष फायदा नहीं है। जब गोभा का हादसा हुआ तब अंग्रेज सरकार की नीति

[श्री के० दे० मालवीय]

साफ तौर पर प्रकट हो गई। उस वक्त हम में से बहुत से धादमी बैचेन हुए, और हम ने तब भी यही कहा कि यह प्रमाण सामने आ गया है कि जब हमें फंसला कर लेना चाहिये कि कामनवैल्य में हम क्यों रहें। हम शान्ति चाहते हैं, हम दोस्ती चाहते हैं, ईमानदारी से दोस्ती चाहते हैं, किसी से लड़ना नहीं चाहते, लेकिन इस न.ति के परिणाम यह अर्थ नहीं है कि किसी क्लब के मेम्बर हम बने ही रहें। इसलिये मेरी यह निश्चित धारणा है कि क्या गोआ, क्या दक्षिण अफ्रीका में जो हम ने देखा नजारा पिछली कांफरेंस में, क्या पाकिस्तान के सम्बन्ध में जो हमारे साथ व्यवहार हो रहा है, किसी और मौलिक कारण से, जिस पर मैं बाद में आऊंगा, इन सब चीजों को देखते हुए हमें चाहिये कि हम अपने पैरों पर खड़े होने का विचार करें। अपने पैरों पर खड़े होने के कभी भी यह अर्थ नहीं हो सकते कि हम किसी से नाराज हैं या हम से कोई नाराज है। हमारी किस्मत पर हम को छोड़ दिया जाये तभी डाइनेमिक लीडरशिप इस देश में पैदा हो सकती है। जब तक भीख मांगने की प्रवृत्ति, और दूसरे के कन्धे पर हाथ रख कर चलने की प्रवृत्ति हमारी रहेगी तब तक हम एक मजबूत कौम नहीं हो सकते। मैं आप के विचार के लिये यह बात रखना चाहता हूँ। इस लिये जरूरत है कि हम अपनी बेबसी और बेकसी को दूर करने और अपनी नई दुनियां कायम करने के लिये, और नया सम्बन्ध दुनियां के सारे राष्ट्रों से कायम करने के लिये यह फंसला करें कि अब कामनवैल्य में रहना हमारे लिये जरूरी नहीं है। आज हमारी प्रतिभा अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय स्तर पर कम है। यह स्वाभाविक है। एक हमारा बहुत बड़ा इन्सान हमें छोड़ कर चला गया। उस ने हमारी एक छटा बनाई थी। उस में कुछ खामियां और कमियां बर्दाश्त हो सकती थीं, लेकिन अभी पिछली कामनवैल्य कांफरेंस की प्रोसीडिंस को देखने का मौका हमें मिला।

वहां जो कुछ हुआ वह हमें अच्छा नहीं लगा। इतना ही कह कर इस सम्बन्ध में मैं अपनी राय देना चाहूंगा कि ब्रिटिश कामनवैल्य में रह कर हमें कोई विशेष फायदा नहीं है। खास तौर पर जो चुनाव वहां आने वाले हैं उनमें अगर कंजर्वेटिव पार्टी फिर जीत गई, तब तो आप को फौरन फंसला करना ही पड़ेगा कि अपने देश के फायदे के लिये हम उस के सदस्य न रहें।

एक माननीय सदस्य : अगर लेबर गवर्नमेंट आ गई तो हमें वहां रहना चाहिये।

श्री के० दे० मालवीय : तब भी मेरी राय वही है।

काश्मीर के बारे में मैं बड़े धादर से यह कहना चाहूंगा कि जो कोशिशें इधर हुईं, किसी के जरिये हुईं, मैं समझता हूँ कि वह कुछ इलाटाइम्ड थीं, बेवक्त थीं। हमारी कोशिश हमेशा से रहे है पाकिस्तान से समझौता हो और आज भी है। कोई ऐसा मौका मुझे याद नहीं आता है जब हम ने साफ तौर से ऐलान न कर दिया हो कि हम पाकिस्तान से दोस्ती रखना चाहते हैं, भाई चारे का रिश्ता रखना चाहते हैं। हमारी भूगोल, हमारा इतिहास, हमारी संस्कृति सब बतलाती है कि हम मिल कर ही उनसे रहना चाहते हैं। लेकिन ऐसा नहीं हुआ। कुछ लोग नहीं चाहते थे कि हमारे और पाकिस्तान के बीच में मैत्री सम्बन्ध हों, बुनियादि कारणों की वजह से। दुनियां दो गुटों में बटी थी इस लिये एक गुट को यह पसन्द नहीं था कि हम और पाकिस्तान नजदीक आये यूनैटेड नेशन्स के अन्दर, जिस के इतिहास में जाने की मुझे जरूरत नहीं है, आप जानते हैं कि बराबर कोशिश इस बात की हुई कि हिन्दुस्तान का मामला ठीक तौर से दुनियां के सामने न आये। पीछे पीछे प्रचार किये जाते थे, और छिपे छिपे लोग आज भी कहने लगे हैं कि काश्मीर के मामले में अब इस सरकार को अपना हड्ड बदलना चाहिये। मैं आप से कहना चाहता हूँ कि अगर हमारी पालिसी काश्मीर के बारे

में बदली, पहले तो यह सम्भव नहीं है, लेकिन अगर बदली, तो हम एक बहुत खतरनाक दौर में पड़ जायेंगे और फिर हम आसानी से उससे निकल नहीं सकेंगे।

मजहब के नाम पर इमोशनल इंट्रिगेशन की बात करना बिल्कुल कृत्रिम है, गलत है, झूठ है। जब नागरिकों को सोशल जस्टिस नहीं मिलेगी तो झगड़े होंगे। देश के अन्दर भी झगड़े होंगे। आज पाकिस्तान में क्या हो रहा है। क्या आज ईस्ट पाकिस्तान और वेस्ट पाकिस्तान के अन्दर टालेरेशन है, समन्वय है, इंट्रिगेशन है। आखिर क्यों नहीं है। वे एक ही मजहब के मानने वाले तो हैं, एक ही मुल्क है, लेकिन बात यह है कि आज ईस्ट पाकिस्तान में रहने वालों को यह अहसास है कि उन्हें सोशल जस्टिस नहीं मिल रही है। बुनियादी चीज है कि जिस मुल्क के अन्दर सोशल जस्टिस का अहसास कम हो जायेगा, उस मुल्क की मजबूती, एकता, सब खतरे में पड़ जायेगी। आज मजहब के नाम पर काश्मीर के हमारे नागरिकों को भुलावा दिया जा रहा है। मैं उन को आगाह करना चाहता हूँ कि वे इस गलती में न पड़ें। मजहब के नाम पर मुल्क कभी एक नहीं हुए हैं। अफगानिस्तान और पाकिस्तान आज एक नहीं हैं, अगर ऐसा होता तो सारे वेस्टर्न एशिया के मुल्क आज एक हो गये होते। सब मुसलमान हैं। सारे योरप के रहने वाले ईसाई जो हैं वे एक हो गये होते। क्या ऐसा हो सका। ज्यादा फ्री और हिस्ट्री का इम्पैक्ट मजहब के इम्पैक्ट से हर मुल्क में ज्यादा हुआ करता है, वह कभी भी कम नहीं हो सकता। काश्मीर में और हिन्दुस्तान में ज्य.प्राफिकल और हिस्टारिकल इंट्रिगेशन है। उस सम्बन्ध में किसी का प्लेबीसाइट, डिबीजन या बातचीत का सवाल उठाना नितान्त गलती होगी, बुनियादी गलती होगी और अपने मुल्क को

कमजोर करना होगा। इसलिए, सुरक्षा परिषद की तमाम कार्रवाइयों को अच्छी तरह समझते हुए मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि वहाँ आप के साथ ज्यादाती की गयी और हमारे देश के साथ ज्यादाती की गयी।

सन् 1954 में डॉ० ग्राहम को यह मसला सुपुर्द किया गया कि वह हिन्दुस्तान और पाकिस्तान के झगड़े को सुलझाने का रास्ता निकालें, तो उन्होंने सिफारिश की कि जो फौजें पाकिस्तान की आ गयी हैं और जो फौजें हिन्दुस्तान की आ गयी हैं उनका प्रोपोरशन कायम कर दिया जाए। उनकी सिफारिश थी कि तीन हजार फौज पाकिस्तान की रहे और चूँकि हिन्दुस्तान बड़ा है इसलिए 12 हजार फौज हिन्दुस्तान की रहे। इस तरह से उन्होंने उस एग्जेशन को, उस पाप को लीगलाइज कर दिया, पाकिस्तानी पाप को धोने की कोशिश हुई। ग्राहम साहब ने कहा कि जो हो गया है तो उसे ऐसे ही रखा जाए, और भारत की वह सब जमीन हज्म। उनकी निगाह में आक्रमण नहीं रहा।

इसलिए मैं समझता हूँ कि ये सब बातें गलत हैं। चार पांच महीने से, मेरी राय में, गलती की जा रही है। शेख साहब को छोड़ दिया तब हमें उसका कारण मालूम नहीं और अब बकशी गुलाम मुहम्मद को गिरफ्तार किया गया उसके बारे में भी हमें मालूम नहीं है। ऐसी कम दिलचस्पी काश्मीर के मसलों में हमें नहीं होनी चाहिए, वह हमारी सरहद की स्टेट है। मैं समझता हूँ जल्दी ही इस मसले पर हमें गवर्नमेंट और बताएगी जिससे हमें इत्मीनान हो, ढाढस हो।

और शेख अब्दुल्ला साहब को मैं सलाह देना चाहता हूँ कि वह हमारी समस्याओं में और उलझन न डालें। घमं निरपेक्ष राज्य के लिए यह जरूरी नहीं है कि वे ऐसा रुख अख्तियार करें जो आज शेख साहब अख्तियार कर रहे हैं। वह काश्मीर के प्रश्न को हिन्दुस्तान के

[श्री के० दे० मालवीय]

सिक्यूलर कान्सेप्ट के साथ नाता जोड़ने की कोशिश ठीक से करें। आज जो उनका रुख है उसकी कोई जरूरत नहीं है।

हमारे देश के अन्दर धर्म निरपेक्ष राज्य जल्दी, और आसानी से तभी आ सकता है और हम उस अवस्था को तभी प्राप्त कर सकते हैं जब मुल्क के अन्दर हिन्दू और मुसलमान सभी को सोशल जस्टिस का आश्वासन मिल जाए। आज उन्हें ऐसा आश्वासन नहीं है। आज हर गरीब हिन्दू और मुसलमान के लड़के को यह इत्मीनान नहीं है कि ठीक तरह शिक्षा पाने के बाद उसकी बेकारी नहीं रहेगी, उसको मकान मिलेगा, उसके बच्चों को दबा मिलेगी। आज हमारा सारा एटेंशन डाइवर्टेड है। इसलिए मैंने शुरू में कहा था कि अगर हमारी विदेशी पालिसी और देशी पालिसी के अन्दर परस्पर विरोध हो गया तो कनफ्यूजन बढ़ेगा और दुनिया में हमारी और से गलतफहमी भी होगी। इसीलिए समाजवाद की रफ्तार को देश के अन्दर तेज करना है। धर्म निरपेक्ष राज्य को कायम करने के लिए शेख अब्दुल्ला साहब को ऐसा नेतृत्व हिन्दुस्तान भर का लेना चाहिए कि हिन्दुस्तान के अन्दर रेडीकल सोशलिज्म जल्दी आ जाए। वह जब तक नहीं होता तब तक सारे मसले फंसे रहेंगे। कोई भी रास्ता आप अस्वीकार करना चाहें, हम सब सब से या बेसब्री से इन्तजार करेंगे क्योंकि इस सरकार के अलावा और कोई इस मुल्क को मजबूत नहीं कर सकता। कांग्रेस की महान पार्टी का एक मेम्बर होते हुए मैं यह कहने की जुर्रत करता हूँ कि हमें जल्दी करनी है, बेसब्री दिखानी है और उस रेडीकल सोशलिज्म के प्रोग्राम की तरफ तेजी से कदम उठाना है। आज देरी नहीं की जा सकती। आज हम ने अफ्रीका के नए उभरते हुए मुल्कों के साथ नाता जोड़ा है एशिया के नए उभरते हुए मुल्कों के साथ, हम चाहते हैं कि वह हमें ठीक समझें। हम आज ईजिप्ट की कानफेंस में जा रहे हैं। हम चाहते हैं कि हम लोगों को समझा सकें और

उनको बता सकें कि जिस पालिसी को हम ने चलाया है, हम उस तरफ तेजी से बढ़ेंगे। यही है विदेशी पालिसी की सफलता की कि हम अपने देश के अन्दर जिस प्रोग्राम और कार्यक्रम पर कटिबद्ध हैं उसे तेजी से आगे बढ़ाएं। इसमें हैटरोजिनिटी की कोई गूंजाइश नहीं है, न प्रोग्राम की सहो कूजी है हैटरोजिनिटी की और न व्यक्तियों की। इतना ही कह कर मैं इस मसले को खत्मकर देना चाहता हूँ।

मैं अपने दोस्त फारिन मिनिस्टर को बड़े अदब से कहना चाहता हूँ कि हमारे विदेशी दफ्तरों का तेजी से पुनर्गठन होना चाहिए इस दृष्टिकोण से कि आदर्शवादी राजनीतिक विचार रखने वाले लोग पूरी तरह से उन हमारे एम्बेसीज को नेतृत्व करें। माफ कीजिए, कुछ पेंशन याफता लोगों का आर मगाह बनाने की वह जगह नहीं है। उसे डाइनेमिक बनाना है। हमको ऐसे नौजवान राजनीतिक पुरुषों को उन दफ्तरों में सिखा पढ़ा कर भेजना है जो उसे सफल बनायें। जब तक ऐसा नहीं होगा तब तक स्टैगनेशन नहीं जाएगा। आज ये दूतावास डाकखाने हैं, जीते जागते दफ्तर नहीं है। अगर आप उनको डाकखाना बनाए रहेंगे तो आपके पास कुछ खत आयेंगे, कुछ नहीं आयेंगे, कुछ खो जायेंगे, जैसकि डाकखानों में होता है।

आखिर में मैं चीन के सम्बन्ध में दो शब्द कहना चाहता हूँ। मैं समझता हूँ कि स्व० प्रधान मंत्री जी का रुख इस सम्बन्ध में सही था। एक जमाना था जब मैं कहता था मैं यह आपके सामने स्वीकार करता हूँ मेरा सपना था कि एशिया के सभी अच्छे नागरिक रूस, पाकिस्तान, हिन्दुस्तान और चीन के नागरिक शान्तिपूर्वक रहें और अपनी गरीबी को दूर करने के लिए मिल जुलकर काम करें। एशिया के सभी मुल्क एक ब्लाक में आकर अपने भविष्य का निर्माण करें। चीन ने उस सपने को तोड़ दिया और शान्ति और जनसेवा के पथ से विमुख हो गया। इसीलिये

मैं नहीं मानता कि चीन आज कम्युनिस्ट चीन है। मुझे कम्युनिज्म से कोई डर नहीं है जैसा हमारे दोस्त स्वतंत्र पार्टी के नेताओं को है, जो कि रात दिन उससे डरा करते हैं, उनको उसके कारण पूरी नींद भी नहीं आती। कम्युनिज्म क्या है इसे हमको सोचना और देखना चाहिए। उसका रूप, रंग, आकार, विचार सभी बदल गए हैं। सन् 1956 में जब बीसवीं अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय कांग्रेस कम्युनिस्टों की हुई थी, उस दिन उसूलों पर चीन और रूस का मौलिक मतभेद तीन प्रत्यक्ष हो गया। ख्रुश्चेव ने कहा कि छोटी मोटी पालिसी और नीतियों की बातों को छोड़ कर आज के युग में कम्युनिज्म को एग्जिस्टेंस के आधार पर ही दुनिया में कायम रह सकता है। याद रहे कि हम अणुशक्ति के युग में (धरमो न्यूकलियर युग में) आ गए हैं, युग में कायापलट हो गया है और क्वालिटेटिव चेंज आ गया है जिससे कम्युनिस्ट फिलासफी पर बड़ा असर पड़ा है। वर्गवाद को सहअस्तित्व के उसूल को अपना पड़ा, यह ख्रुश्चेव ने कहा।

दूसरे श्री ख्रुश्चेव ने कहा कि जो यह कहते हैं कि साम्यवाद के प्रसार के लिए युद्ध अनिवार्य है, तो यह मिथ्या है। उन्होंने कहा कि छोटी 2 लड़ाइयां क्रांति को सफल बनाने के लिए तो हो सकती हैं लेकिन संसारयुद्ध अब साम्यवाद की सफलता के लिए अनिवार्य नहीं है, उस अनिवार्य युद्ध की धारणा को भी नए कम्युनिस्ट विचार ने त्याग कर दिया है।

तीसरे श्री ख्रुश्चेव ने यह भी कहा कि शान्तिमय ढंग से किसी भी मुक्त में समाजवाद आ सकता है। इस को उन्होंने कम्युनिस्ट पालिसी का एक मौखिक विश्वास मान लिया है।

इन तीन मौलिक खंडों पर उन्होंने अपना महल बनाया। वह गलत है या सही इसकी फिलासफी में मैं नहीं जाना चाहता। मैं केवल आपका ध्यान रूस और चीन के उस गहरे

मतभेद की ओर दिलाना चाहता हूँ जो कि उनके बीच में सन् 1956 के बाद पैदा हो गया और जो आगे जाकर परमानेंट होता जाता है। चीन और सोवियत झगड़ा बढ़ गया है, और आज एक तथ्य है, और ये झगड़े आज बढ़े गंभीर हो गये हैं। इसकी गहराई का अनुमान एक सक्रिय राजनैतिक को अवश्य करना चाहिए। हमारी गवर्नमेंट को उस का जितना अनुमान होगा उसी अनुपात से हमारी और सोवियत यूनियन की मैत्री बढ़ती जायेगी। कुछ लोगों को भले ही डर लगे पर वह मैत्री रुक नहीं सकती है। उस का बढ़ना संसार की शान्ति के लिए, अपनी समृद्धि के लिए और देश में समाजवाद को जल्दी से लाने के लिए अनिवार्य है।

मेरा निजी अनुभव है कि सोवियट मैत्री का आधार ईमानदारी का आधार है। उस से हमारे वर्गवादी होने का कोई ताल्लुक नहीं है। इस देशमें कम्युनिज्म नहीं आयेगा, ऐसा मेरा विश्वास है। पर इस देश में जल्दी से समाजवाद आयेगा और वह रुक नहीं सकता, ऐसा भी मेरा विश्वास है। और उस में देर कर के हम ही अपना नुकसान कर सकते हैं।

अतएव यह जरूरी है कि हम खूब अच्छी तरह से समझ लें कि दुनिया के दो गुटों से अलग रह कर, और देश में समाजवाद की तरफ तेजी से आगे बढ़ कर ही हम अपने पड़ोसियों के साथ अच्छा और मैत्री का सम्बन्ध तेजी से बढ़ा सकते हैं। इस में धोखा-धड़ी नहीं हो सकती है। इस में धोखा नहीं चल सकता है। नार्थ कोरिया का साउथ कोरिया से इमोशनल इन्टिग्रेशन हो जाये, जैसा कि और किन्हीं देशों का है, जिन की पालिसी एक है, वह बात नहीं मानी जा सकती है।

इसी लिए हमें शान्ति और प्रगति, शान्ति और समाजवाद का आधार मजबूती से पकड़ना है और ऐसे ही अपनी विदेशी न. ति

[श्री के० दे० मालव्या]

की प्रागे चलाना है। इस में मुलह नहीं होगी और अगर होगी, तो उसी हद तक प्रगति में देर भी होगी, नुकसान होगा और हम दुनिया के सामने अपनी स्थिति को साफ़ न कर सकेंगे। जो नये उभरते हुए देश हैं, आज वे हम से बहुत आशायें रखते हैं, क्योंकि हम ने उन को आशायें दी हैं, हमारे बुजुर्गों ने उन को आशायें दी हैं, हमारी सरकार के निश्चयों ने आशायें दी हैं। हम उन निश्चयों को अब वापस नहीं ले सकते हैं।

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, मुझे इतना ही कहना है।

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Shri Indrajit Gupta—he is not there. Then, Shri Hem Barua—he is also not there. Then, Shri U. M. Trivedi.

Shri U. M. Trivedi: Sir, in ten minutes I will not be able to cover all the points. On Monday I will not be here. So I am not speaking now.

Shri Heda: (Nizamabad): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, Professor Ranga was very harsh upon our policy of non-alignment. Unfortunately, he has not studied the two major developments in the progress of our policy of non-alignment. When this policy was enunciated, at that time, we were almost the lonely voice of non-alignment. There was so much misunderstanding even in the West that, I remember very well, the American Press and American politicians insisted on calling this policy of non-alignment as the 'neutralist policy'. I was present when the American Ambassador here, Mr. Allen, addressed a meeting in Delhi, and when he was pin-pointedly asked even then he did not use the word non-alignment. This was the extent of misunderstanding at that time. But what has happened now? The policy has been accepted in slow measures and today we find that practically every country has accepted this policy to a smaller or greater measure and the word

non-alignment has achieved respectability. That is why now the word non-alignment has been used by a number of countries, almost all the Asian and African countries and even Latin American countries. So, this development in the concept of the idea of non-alignment is a major development and that we have to take note of.

The second major development is that the world situation has changed very radically from what it obtained when this idea was mooted out. At that time the two power blocs of America and Russia were at loggerheads, the third world war was looming large and many times, to use the phrase of the American Secretary of State, they followed the "brinkmanship policy". Almost we were on the verge of a third world war. At that time we had a positive role to play and we did play it. Even today many politicians and historians in the west do admit that because of the policy that we followed, because of the great impact of the personality of our leader, many wars were avoided and world has progressed ahead on the path of peace.

And, what is the development today? Russia and America have come much nearer. They are not at loggerheads as they were at one time. Not only, that, they have developed a direct communication line between the American President and Mr. Khrushchev. In this development, naturally, our positive role of non-alignment automatically gets changed and that is not a bad thing. It may be that we have nothing positive or more positive to achieve, yet we should be happy, we should be joyful that we have achieved something substantial which will go into the history and which will be written in golden letters. Therefore, these two developments, one that the policy of non-alignment has been accepted by world in some smaller or larger measure and, secondly, that the two power blocs headed by Russia and

America are not at loggerheads as they were earlier, are very major developments.

Now, which are the countries that are at loggerheads? If you look from that point, we find that it is China on one side and America on the other side—it is not Russia. This development has not come to the full but it is heading towards it. And, situated as we are, a victim of the Chinese aggression, naturally, our policy of non-alignment will have a little different connotation, a different context from what it was, because we are primarily concerned with the vacation of the aggression of one, let me say, head of a power bloc, a country which has drifted in a different direction than the free world.

Professor Ranga and Shri Malaviya also referred to the rift, to the split between Russia and China. Yes, that split has started. It started long ago, about eight years before or even earlier. But it is not yet complete, and till it is not complete let us not take any action, let us not show any attitude by which we would be helping the slowness or the stoppage of this rift. The rift is going to be there, and when it becomes complete I think there will be another meaning, another context in the world and our policy of non-alignment will have to be adjusted towards it.

Therefore, my point is that it is not the policy of non-alignment that needs to be changed; we have to interpret that policy of non-alignment in the changing times and from time to time as the context would be changed. From this angle, Professor Ranga was not right when he denounced the policy of non-alignment and when he was asserting that this policy of non-alignment did not give us any dividends.

I will just give you an example to show how it benefited us. One of the major reasons, and this has been ac-

cepted by a number of columnists including Americans and others, that what stopped the Chinese forward march from Sela to Assam was the great impact of the letter addressed by Nehru to the heads of States all over the world.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The hon. Member may continue on Monday. We will take up Private Members' Business now.

14.30 hrs.

COMMITTEE ON PRIVATE MEMBERS' BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

FORTY-EIGHTH REPORT

Shri Hem Raj (Kangra): Sir, I beg to move:

"That this House agrees with the Forty-eighth Report of the Committee on Private Members' Bills and Resolutions presented to the House on the 23rd September, 1964."

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Motion moved.

"That this House agrees with the Forty-eighth Report of the Committee on Private Members' Bills and Resolutions presented to the House on the 23rd September, 1964."

Shri S. M. Banerjee (Kanpur): Sir, I have to say something on this report, in regard to the time allotted for Shri Raghunath Singh's Bill, which is only forty-five minutes. Now, the amendments which have come from Rajya Sabha are very important amendments, on which there was a division in Rajya Sabha, and I hope that we shall get ample time to move our amendments and speak on them.

Shri Raghunath Singh (Varanasi): There is already the Bill of Shri