

12.32 hrs.

MOTION RE. INTERNATIONAL SITUATION

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

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

Sir, on the 17th of this month I made a statement in the House bringing to the attention of hon. Members of the House a brief review of some of the important international events that took place during the period that elapsed between the last session of the Lok Sabha and the present session. If I may say so, Mr. Speaker, very significant events of very great international importance have taken place during this period. There was the conference of non-aligned countries attended by heads of governments or States of a large number of countries from Africa, Asia, Europe and the American continent too.

Shri Ranga (Chittoor): From all the five continents.

Shri Swaran Singh: There was change in the governmental set-up in two important countries of Europe. There has been the change of leadership in the Soviet Union after the retirement of Premier Khrushchev.

Shri J. B. Kripalani (Amroha): Retirement?

Shri Nath Pai (Rajapur): Due to advanced age.

Shri Swaran Singh: Another government has come into power but the same party continues.

Shri Nath Pai: Due to bad health.

Shri Swaran Singh: Whatever may be the reasons, those are not important. We have to see the change rather than carry on research into the modalities of that change.

At the same time, as a result of a general election in the U.K. the Labour Party has been voted into power and they are already in position.

With regard to these two changes we have the assurance which I mentioned this morning while replying to certain supplementary questions. We have got the assurance from the new leadership in the Soviet Union that the policies that had been pursued by the Government headed by Premier Khrushchev—the policies of peaceful co-existence, support of the concept of non-alignment, friendship and close relations with India—will continue. This is a matter of satisfaction for us.

In the U.K. the Labour Party has assumed power and is running the government now. They have taken some steps internally and have moved vigorously in the pursuit of certain objectives that they had placed before the country before the elections. Those are essentially internal matters. So far as we are concerned, our Defence Minister was there in the U.K. and has returned only the other day after a successful visit and after discussions and consultations with the leaders of Government there. I have it from him that before long he will share the information with this hon. House and will let the House know of the work that he has done there, the various arrangements that have either been renewed or strengthened or fresh arrangements that have been entered into. Our relations with U.K. have been friendly and there has been understanding on major matters and the change of Government there, if anything, should really still further strengthen the friendly relations that exist between our two countries.

There has been in this interval fresh Presidential elections in the United States of America...

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया (फर्रुखाबाद) : विदेश मंत्री जरा बता दें कि रूस के साथ और ज्यादा दोस्ताना ताल्लुक़ात कैसे होंगे ।

Shri Swaran Singh: I do not know why Dr. Lohia talks of Soviet Union when I was talking of the Presidential elections in the United States of America.

ड० राम मनोहर लोहिया : उन्होंने पहले रूस के बारे में भी कहा था ।

Shri Swaran Singh: The election of President Johnson with an overwhelming majority is a significant event and demonstrates the determination of the people of the United States of America to pursue the policies of peace and of increasing co-operation amongst the friendly countries and it is really a vote against forces of extremism or forces of taking rigid attitudes in important international events. All these events are of significance. Nearer home, Mr. Speaker, the House has been rightly exercised and has shown concern over the explosion of a nuclear device by China. All these matters have been mentioned by me very briefly in my statement which I made before this House some days ago. It is not my intention to go over all this ground and I would prefer to reserve my observations or comments after I have had the benefit of hearing the views of the hon. Members. There are only a few points which I would like to elaborate further before the hon. Members start the discussion on international situation.

The Cairo Conference of non-aligned countries showed that notwithstanding the forces which unfortunately do continue to exist in the world, forces of confrontation, force of conflict, the overwhelming trend was in favour of conciliation rather than confrontation. The five important principles that emerged as a result of the deliberations of the Non-aligned Conference at Cairo may be described thus:

- (1) Non-alignment;
- (2) Peaceful co-existence;

(3) Settlement of difference between States by peaceful means;

(4) Inviolability of the frontiers of States as they existed at the time of Independence; and

(5) General and complete disarmament and their determination that steps might be energetically pursued to bring about complete and full disarmament.

Shri Nath Pai: Why do you call them new five principles which emerged out of that conference? I think these are well established principles, the Panchsheel.

Shri Swaran Singh: The principles of Panchsheel need not really be based in that tone. These are matters which are the result of the discussions and they are embodied in the declaration that was issued at the end of the Cairo Conference.

Shri Nath Pai: Every conference has to issue a communique. So, what is the novelty about it?

Shri Swaran Singh: Whatever name you might give them, these are important principles and even my colleague opposite will readily agree irrespective of the nomenclature that he gives to these principles, Panchsheel or whatever name he wants to give. These are principles which are the embodiment of good international behaviour and which hold out a hope for the world to be saved from conflict and disaster; and the continued adherence by a large number of countries to these principles, notwithstanding the occasional lapses that might take place, is the only hope for the emergence of a world which is free from conflict and is free from all troubles and difficulties.

With your permission, I would now like to say a few things about our

[Shri Swaran Singh]

present relationship with Pakistan which is a matter of interest to hon. Members, as was evident from the large number of questions even this morning during the Question Hour.

Shri Kapur Singh (Ludhiana): The less said, the better.

Shri Swaran Singh: For instance, I would like to give a brief review of the present situation about our relations with Pakistan. I have repeatedly affirmed the Government's policy in regard to our relations with Pakistan, which is that we shall strive sincerely for the improvement of our relations and for the creation of an atmosphere in which the various differences between India and Pakistan can be resolved peacefully and honourably. In this spirit, it has been our endeavour to initiate the processes of discussions and consultations with Pakistan at various levels.

As the House is aware, there was a friendly meeting between the Prime Minister and the President of Pakistan in Karachi, when the Prime Minister was returning from the Cairo Conference of Non-aligned Nations in Cairo. In the joint communique issued after this meeting, both Heads of Government affirmed their desire for the development of friendly relations and co-operation between the two countries. Unfortunately, however, there have been certain developments in Pakistan in recent weeks which threaten to reverse the trends towards betterment of the relations between India and Pakistan. There have been increasing violations by Pakistan of the cease-fire line in Kashmir. In some sectors of our eastern border between Assam and Tripura and Pakistan, trigger-happy Pakistan armed persons frequently fired on the villagers and our border police in violation of existing status quo agreements. The increasing seriousness of the incidents and attacks from the Pakistan side of the cease-fire line in Jammu and Kashmir have been a source of much

concern to us. With a view to reaching a gentlemen's agreement for avoiding incidents and provocations along the cease-fire line, we proposed to Pakistan in July last year that there should be a meeting between the representatives of the two countries to find ways and means of eliminating needless conflict and loss of life on both sides which only tended to heighten an atmosphere of tension and further to embitter relations between the two countries. In September, the Pakistan Government replied, agreeing to our suggestion, and after mutual consultations through diplomatic channels, it was arranged that a delegation from India should visit Karachi for talks on the 2nd November, 1964, with the representatives of the Pakistan Government on the restoration of tranquillity along the cease-fire line and along the international boundaries between India and Pakistan. However, on the eve of the talks, the meeting had to be postponed at Pakistan's request. After weeks of diplomatic consultations, the Pakistan Government had suggested a date after the 22nd November for talks in Rawalpindi between the Home Ministers of the two countries. We agreed to have these talks in Rawalpindi from the 23rd November, 1964, that is, from today, for two days. The Indian Delegation was announced and necessary preparations had been undertaken for the meeting. But, again, the Pakistan Government, a few days ago, asked for a postponement of the meeting.

Thus, these two important conferences which we had hoped might result in agreements between the two countries, however limited, have not materialised. This has been a source of disappointment to us. However, we hope that the postponed meetings will be held in the near future. Our policy of seeking a *detente* with Pakistan remains.

The Government of India have been greatly surprised to see that in

recent weeks, an attempt has been made in Pakistan to inject an anti-Indian campaign in their election propaganda. Not only in the press and radio but in the statements of Government members and leaders of the Government party, all sorts of allegations are being made against India of interference in Pakistan elections, of favouring Opposition Parties etc. Isolated critical or analytical comments appearing in Indian newspapers have been highlighted through newspaper advertisements. It is very interesting that certain newspaper reports published in India were reproduced in the Pakistan press in the form of an advertisement.

Shri Ranga: Who pays for them?

Shri A. P. Jain (Tumkur): The Pakistan Government may be paying for them.

Shri Swaran Singh: The allegations are, of course, preposterous. Neither the people nor the Government of India have any interest in the outcome of the elections in Pakistan other than the natural interest and curiosity of a neighbouring country on such occasions. Not only are the allegations baseless, but they must be deplored; they can only cause ill-will and further vitiate the atmosphere between the two countries which we, on our part, have been striving to improve. It is a pity that responsible members of Government like the Home Minister and Information Minister of Pakistan should have allowed themselves to make such allegations. We have protested to the Government of Pakistan against these. We hope that whatever may be their own internal troubles or requirements, we shall greatly welcome if we can be spared this unnecessary resort to whipping up a campaign which can well be described as 'Hate-India' campaign. We wish them well, whatever may be the result of the elections; it is an internal matter, but we feel greatly concerned that such an occasion is used to whip up

feelings against India, when we on our side are doing our best to improve relations with Pakistan, and our Prime Minister on his way back from Cairo stopped in Karachi for some time to be able to establish personal contact with the President of Pakistan; and the joint communique that was issued after the meeting of our Prime Minister with the President of Pakistan jointly expressed the common desire of the two leaders to improve the relations between the two Governments and also to take steps which might create the proper atmosphere for resolving whatever may be the differences in a peaceful, friendly and co-operative manner.

Pakistan is our neighbour, and we have always endeavoured to have the best of friendly relations with them, but this is a matter in which for us to succeed and for the two countries to be able to improve their relations, it is necessary that there should be the requisite reciprocity from Pakistan leaders.

There is one other matter about which with your permission I should like to say a few words, and that is about the recent agreement between the Prime Minister of India and the Prime Minister of Ceylon....

Shri Ranga: A shameful agreement.

Shri Swaran Singh: ...about the future of the persons of Indian origin who are in Ceylon. I had made a brief mention of this in the statement that I had already made. I want to mention only one or two important aspects of this agreement so that the House might be able to appreciate the real import and implication of this agreement.

As the House is no doubt aware, we have agreed to take 5,25,000 persons of Indian origin to India spread over a period of 15 years. About 1,30,000 persons of Indian origin have already been granted Ceylonese citizenship after an earlier agreement.

Shri Nambiar (Tiruchirapalli): It was something like second-rate citizenship.

Shri Swaran Singh: Please—I am coming to that.

So about 4-1/2 lakh people, if we take into consideration the increase of population over the years, would be taken over by Ceylon and about 5,25,000 would be repatriated to India over a period of 15 years.

There are two important features of the agreement which I would like hon. Members to keep in mind. One is that this is spread over a period of 15 years.

श्री रामेश्वरानन्द (करनाल) : अध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं एक निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ। उसे आप सुन लें। मैं जानना चाहता हूँ कि जो आप पांच लाख 25 हजार आदमी यहाँ बुला रहे हैं, जो पचासों वर्षों से वहाँ बसे हुए हैं, इस के क्या प्रधान कारण है। यदि आप इस तरह से उन को बुलाते रहे तो सारी दुनिया में हिन्दुस्तानी कोई रद्द ही नहीं सकेंगे।

Shri Swaran Singh: If Swamiji had waited a little, I was trying to elaborate that point. But he is a little impatient. Probably the simultaneous translation helps him a great deal now, of which I am happy.

I was mentioning that there are two important features of this agreement, one that the repatriation is to take place over a period of 15 years, and two, that the Government of Ceylon will provide the necessary foreign exchange to enable these repatriates to bring their assets with them when they come over to India.

Shri J. R. Kripalani: Did the Government take them to be Ceylonese citizens or Indian citizens?

Shri Swaran Singh: That is, those who remain there?

Shri J. B. Kripalani: I wanted to know whether in the opinion of the Government of India, these people were naturalised citizens of Ceylon or did this Government consider them to be citizens of India yet?

Shri Swaran Singh: On the legal status of these persons of Indian origin, there has been a long controversy between the two Governments. The Government of India's case was that those people who had gone there and had settled there, were not Indian citizens; they could be described as persons who could be stateless. That was our case . . . (Interruptions).

Shri Ranga: Why should we call them stateless at all? It is the contention of the Ceylonese Government that they are stateless. Why should we accept their contention? It is wrong on our part to do so.

Shri J. B. Kripalani: We have not accepted that contention. We never accepted that position, that they are stateless persons. We have always accepted the position that they are naturalised citizens of Ceylon.

Shri Swaran Singh: There can be a difference of opinion about the wisdom of the agreement, as to whether it is good or bad . . .

Shri Ranga: No, no.

Shri Swaran Singh: Let us be quite correct about the factual position.

Shri J. B. Kripalani: You cannot invite foreigners here.

Shri Swaran Singh: Let me explain. I know what is in his mind. I am giving the factual position. The factual position so far as the status in relation to citizenship is concerned is this. These people had not been given Ceylonese citizenship . . .

An Hon. Member: Unwisely.

Shri Nath Pai: Unjustly.

Shri Swaran Singh: Whether it is just or not, I am stating the exact position as it was.

An Hon. Member: It is not our responsibility.

Shri Swaran Singh: It is also our responsibility. You can have difference of opinion.

Shri Ranga: What was the stand taken by the Government of India? Why did you not state the position?

Shri Swaran Singh: I would state the position. The debate is continuing for two days.

The point is that there was in 1954 or 1955 a legislative measure passed by the Ceylon Parliament which authorised the Government of Ceylon to confer Ceylonese citizenship rights on persons of Indian and Pakistan origin. This is an important fact. In response to certain provisions contained in that legislative measure, large numbers of applications were being made by persons of Indian origin asking for the conferment of the right of Ceylonese citizenship on them. Therefore, to suggest or to argue that they were already Ceylonese citizens and hence by some process of law or some constitutional provision they had become Ceylonese citizens is factually not correct and is not borne out by the facts. (*Interruptions*).

Shri Ranga: As a matter of fact, my hon. friend has used the word 'confirmation'. What does that mean? Something which is already there, which has had to be confirmed. Either he must be very strict about the use of his own words or he must be quite fair to the House in explaining the position. They consider themselves to be citizens of Ceylon. In the light of that legislation, they wanted the Ceylonese Government to confirm it—that which already existed. My hon. friend himself used that word.

Shri J. B. Kripalani: If some American citizens are made stateless, are we going to take them? Any Government may declare its own nationals stateless. We have nothing to do with that.

Mr. Speaker: Of course, these are things that can be discussed. The time is there. Members shall have opportunity. I cannot stop the External Affairs Minister from saying what he likes. That is Government's case. Members should hear it and then criticise in their turn. I will give them opportunity to say what they like.

श्री रामेश्वरानन्द : मेरा जो प्रश्न था उस पर मंत्री महोदय नहीं आ रहे हैं। मुझे जो मौका मिलेगा तब मिलेगा। मैं पूछ रहा हूँ कि यह क्यों मान लिया गया है कि जो लंका में हिन्दुस्तानी रहते हैं वे वापस आ जायें। क्या भारत के आदमी बाहर नहीं रह सकते और भारत में विदेशी आ कर रह सकते हैं।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : आप सब कुछ अभी कह लेंगे तो तकरीर में क्या कहेंगे।

श्री काशी राम गुप्त (अलवर) : मंत्री महोदय जो बयान गलत दे रहे हैं

Mr. Speaker: He is not giving way. Two Members cannot speak simultaneously.

श्री किशन पटनायक (सम्बलपुर) : मंत्री महोदय गलत बयान दे रहे हैं क्योंकि उन लोगों को स्टेटलेस सिटिजन कर के नहीं माना गया था।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : वह जो कह रहे हैं उसे मुनिये, जब आप की बारी आयेगी, तब आप उसे दुरुस्त कर दीजियेगा।

Shri Swaran Singh: May be that the word I used was not properly followed by Prof. Ranga. I said 'conferment', that is conferring the rights, not confirming the rights. (*Interruption*). May be that my English is not as good as Principal Barua's. I do not claim that.

Shri Joachim Alva (Kerala): It is not fair that he should be interrupted like this.

Shri S. M. Banerjee (Kanpur): You are doing it.

Shri Joachim Alva: A hundred interruptions.

Shri Swaran Singh: A little interruption is spice in parliamentary life. I do not grudge it. If there is any clarification needed, I am here to clarify.

Shri Kapur Singh: On a point of clarification. While opening the statement on the subject of the Indo-Ceylonese agreement, the hon. Minister for External Affairs stated that therein there were two "impotent" features. Did we hear him correctly?

13 hrs.

Shri Swaran Singh: I would suggest that the time of the House should not be taken in such light-hearted comments. I never said it, and it is not proper to suggest such a thing. I would suggest to the hon. Member to withdraw it, because I never said that. I take strong exception to his making a suggestion of that type.

Shri Kapur Singh: I wanted a clarification if we heard it correctly, I have made no imputation.

Mr. Speaker: Could he conceive that it would be the word?

Shri Swaran Singh: Any clarification asked for is most welcome, but if it degenerates into this sort of thing, it is really a great pity, and I take strong exception to taking these matters in this light hearted manner.

Mr. Speaker: I agree with the hon. Minister.

Shri Swaran Singh: I was saying that in response to a provision in the India and Pakistan Citizenship Act adopted by the Ceylonese Parliament, applications were invited for grant of citizenship rights, for conferring citizenship rights upon persons of Indian origin and persons of Pakistani origin. A very large number of applications were made, something to the tune of

seven to eight lakhs. It is quite evident that if these persons were already Ceylon citizens and if this was our case, then there was no point in making applications asking for the grant of Ceylonese citizenship by them. We may have other reasons that these are people who have settled there, who have been living there for a long time, and therefore they should not be disrupted. The validity of that is something which can be considered, and we claim that we did give due consideration to that aspect, but about the legal implications of the position that we took there should be no doubt in our mind, and we should not adopt an attitude which may appear to be inconvenient to us, but it will be very wrong really on the facts to take up a position which is not correct.

In the various stages of the talks which took place on earlier occasions—and these talks have taken place several times during the last 20 to 25 years: even before independence there were talks about the future...

Shri Ranga: Before independence, our interests were never let down in this way.

Shri Swaran Singh: Prof. Ranga always harps upon pre-independence times, and somehow or other, he thinks that things were better at that time.

Shri Ranga: In the pre-independence days, we fought the British Government; I do not think that my hon. friend was there.

Shri Swaran Singh: During all these discussions, the contention of the Ceylon Government consistently has been that these persons, notwithstanding their residence in Ceylon, are Indian citizens.

Shri Ranga: They have been there for generations.

Shri Sezhiyan (Perambalur): They are consistent, but we are not.

Dr. M. S. Aney (Nagpur): After independence, not before that.

Shri Swaran Singh: So far as we are concerned, we had said that persons of Indian origin who had gone to Ceylon and who have become domiciled there, and who are there, some of them for generations, . . .

Shri Ranga: Most of them.

Shri Swaran Singh: . . . they are people who have made Ceylon their home. You cannot compel another country to give them the citizenship right, because that is a matter within the sovereign right of any country, and it is decided by the laws of that country, just as we in our country are masters of this question of granting Indian citizenship rights to any person who comes and settles here. There are laws on that, and we can make laws, we can modify laws in that respect. So, this is the sovereign right of any country to grant citizenship right according to the various provisions that they might make, according to their Constitution, according to their law.

So, it is a fact that these people had not been given Ceylonese citizenship right. It is important, therefore, to consider this, that here is this mass of people whose future is uncertain. They were not Ceylonese citizens, they were not on their electoral rolls, they did not participate as full citizens in the scheme of their civic and political life. Therefore, it was a matter of great concern for us also that the future of these people of Indian origin should not remain in this uncertain condition; there must be some clear idea about their future.

We had all along pressed that it was a human problem. It is a problem where people who are settled there, who have made their homes there, should not be disturbed against their wishes. If anybody wants to come, well, consistent with the traditions that we have followed, though we may not like it, we have never closed our doors. Because of certain condi-

tions prevailing in a country, because of political or economic condition, people who find life in other countries not quite palatable or quite comfortable, might like to come back. There are many people who are coming back. We have to make a distinction between these people who are abroad on our travel documents and want to come back, and others of this type, i.e., people in Ceylon originally of Indian origin, who had gone there mostly as labour on tea estates. They had not been given Ceylonese citizenship rights, except the 130,000 persons about whom I made mention a moment ago. The others were there.

Even with regard to these others, ever since we started our discussions with the Ceylon Government, it was not our case that they were Ceylon citizens. At no stage during these talks have we taken up this position that they have acquired citizenship rights. So, this is the factual position.

In this background, we had to take a decision. The contention of the Ceylon Government throughout has been that these people, although domiciled by their physical presence in Ceylon, continue to be Indian citizens, whereas we had said that by virtue of this domicile there, they were not Indian citizens. If Indian citizenship is to be conferred, they will have to apply for it; if they come and comply with our laws and regulations, then India can grant Indian citizenship rights. This is the factual position as had obtained.

In this background, we had to take a decision, in view of the Ceylon Government's own policies of increasing employment opportunities for their own people and various other considerations, as to whether these people should continue to be in this uncertain position there, or whether something should be done which would be acceptable to the two Governments and which would establish friendly relations between the two countries, and which should also be

[Shri Swaran Singh]

broadly acceptable to the persons concerned.

Shri Ranga: Is it acceptable to them?

Shri Swaran Singh: When I went to Ceylon, I did have consultations with the leaders of persons of Indian origin there.

Shri J. B. Kripalani: And they consented?

Shri Swaran Singh: It is a fact that, whatever may be the reason, there is a good percentage amongst our people who are settled there, who want to return to India.

Shri Ranga: Question.

Shri Swaran Singh: It is a hard fact, may not be convenient or pleasant, but it is a fact.

Shri Ranga: It is not a fact.

Shri Nambiar: Do you mean to say that all the five lakhs of people want to come back?

Shri Swaran Singh: I do not say.

Shri Hem Barua (Gauhati): For that we need not have an agreement, they can come without an agreement.

Shri Swaran Singh: I do not say that all the 5,35,000 people are willing to come, what I am saying is that there is a good percentage of these people, . . .

Shri Ranga: What do you mean by a good percentage.

Shri Swaran Singh: . . . who want to come, whatever may be the consideration, and their number runs into lakhs, I may say. There is no doubt about it, and this is evident from the approaches that have been made to our High Commission for granting travel facilities for coming over to India and for arranging their repatriation. Let there be no doubt on that score.

So, we had to take a decision, we had to enter into an agreement whereby these people come in an orderly manner, in a phased manner, and a situation is not created where we are just off-loaded with a large number of people, who for various reasons find it not quite comfortable or congenial to stay on and then to come even without any assets. So, a choice had to be made between that sort of situation and an agreement had been reached so that this could be done in an orderly manner. There could be a difference of opinion as to why we should have taken 5 lakhs or 4 lakhs..

Shri Ranga: No. the very principle of it.

Shri Swaran Singh: When an agreement of that type has to be enunciated and finalised, it has to be done in a spirit of give and take. We have also to look to the difficulties of a neighbouring and friendly country who have got their own problems and should not take up an attitude of intransigence . . . (Interruptions.) I am not giving in. Therefore, we took this position and I repeat that the actual repatriation is spread over a period of fifteen years and that they can bring their assets or things.

Shri Ranga: What is the asset except their employment, that you cannot give them here?

Shri Swaran Singh: You cannot inflict your people on other countries.

Shri Ranga: They are not our people; they are the people of Ceylon.

Shri Swaran Singh: There is a subsequent development about which certain questions have been put, namely, the proposal mentioned in Ceylon Parliament of placing them on a separate register.

Shri Nambiar: Second rate citizens . . . (Interruptions.)

Shri Swaran Singh: I have said about the repatriation.

Shri Sezhiyan: They are not our people. They are the people of Ceylon which the Ceylon Government wants to push on to us.

Shri Swaran Singh: I would like to make it absolutely clear that this was a matter which was never mentioned by the Ceylon delegation during the talks . . . (*Interruptions.*)

Shri Ranga: Sir, when a legitimate clarification was asked for the hon. gentlemen did not have the courtesy to yield; he goes on insisting upon his right to continue, now allowing people here to question his wrong statement.

Shri Swaran Singh: Put the question now . . . (*Interruptions.*)

Shri Ranga: When my hon. friend there wanted a clarification, he did not give . . .

Shri Swaran Singh: Your friend is strong enough to stand on his own legs.

Shri Ranga: Why did you not have that courtesy earlier?

Shri Swaran Singh: It is my privilege . . . (*Interruptions.*)

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : अध्यक्ष महोदय, सीलोन की प्रधान मंत्री कभी किसी जमाने की हिन्दुस्तानी हैं कि नहीं ?

अध्यक्ष महोदय : अगर मिनिस्टर्स न बैठें तो मैं इजाजत नहीं दे सकता ।

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : खाली मैं यह कह रहा हूँ कि सीलोन की प्रधान मंत्री भी तो कभी किसी जमाने की हिन्दुस्तानी उत्पत्ति की हैं तो वह भी कभी यहाँ न भेज दी जायें ।

Shri Swaran Singh: I would very strongly appeal to the hon. Members that we should show a little greater courtesy and respect . . .

Shri Ranga: It should be mutual.

Shri Swaran Singh: . . . When we talk about a Prime Minister or other leaders (*Interruptions.*)

Shri Joachim Alva: Why do you put so many questions while he is speaking?

Shri Ranga: I need not have to ask for your permission.

Mr. Speaker: Order, order.

Shri Joachim Alva: Not once, Sir; but he has stood so many times.

Mr. Speaker: Therefore, I should allow him to speak as many times? I am asking them again and again not to do it. If he does a wrong thing, is he going to repeat the same.

Shri C. K. Bhattacharyya (Raiganj): We submit to you, Sir. You may ask the other side not do the wrong thing, they are doing.

Mr. Speaker: I have been asking them again and again.

Shri Swaran Singh: Prof. Ranga is so much excited that he got up but he did not put any question. He is saying that I am not giving way.

Shri Ranga: Earlier, with the Chair's approval I raised a point and interrupted him asking for some elucidation. What was the behaviour of the hon. gentleman? He holds a responsible position as I do and it is his duty to yield and hear our question, immediately they are raised. He did not do so and he thought he was all powerful. He must remember that he is in this House, not negotiating in the absence of the House, in this dishonourable manner.

Mr. Speaker: May I ask him to continue now? . . . (*Interruptions.*) Members should realise that only one Member can be on his legs. This courtesy should be shown to each other. If one or two interruptions come, then he might yield. When he finds that so many interruptions have been made and he

[Mr. Speaker]

wants to continue, of course the Members shall have to sit down.

Shri Ranga: I was the first person to ask for clarification. What did he do? Did he yield?

Shri Swaran Singh: I must confess that my inclination to give way is not very much encouraged. I gave way twice; twice another question was put and a protest is lodged that I did not give way on an earlier occasion. It is a strange behaviour and the hon. Member in an attitude of self-righteousness

Shri Ranga: Leaders in the Opposition are entitled to ask for elucidation and to interrupt and expect that there should be courtesy from the Minister.

Shri Swaran Singh: I have never denied it.

Mr. Speaker: I extend this courtesy to every Member but the Member has that right when the Minister sits down.

Shri Ranga: It was only after my hon. friend had declined to give way, not once but twice that I said to myself: he has got to face the House.

Shri Hem Barua: Hon. Minister should know that interruptions would sharpen his tongue.

Shri Ranga: If he has got it.

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : पूछा यह गया था कि सवा पांच लाख में से कितने वापिस नहीं आना चाहते ? वह कोई प्रोटैस्ट नहीं थी । मंत्री महोदय सिर्फ यह बतला दें कि वहां के कितने लोग वापिस नहीं आना चाहते ?

श्री स्वर्ण सिंह : ऐसी मेरे पास कोई संख्या नहीं है ।

I was elaborating the points that this question of whether these persons to be given Ceylonese citizenship are to be placed on a separate electoral register was not mentioned in the course of the discussions.

Shri Hem Barua: Have you protested on that?

Shri Swaran Singh: Please wait and see. If you are not satisfied, you can again ask questions.

Shri C. K. Bhattacharyya: This is not like an interruption; it looks like an organised attempt to frustrate the hon. Minister.

Shri S. M. Banerjee: Sir, on a point of order. The hon. Member says that it is an organised attempt.

Mr. Speaker: There is no point of order. He may sit down.

Shri Swaran Singh: I am the last person to get frustrated by these.

I was saying that the separate electoral register was not raised in the course of the talks. Secondly, I had already informed the House that 1.30 lakhs or more of persons of Indian origin had already been given Ceylonese citizenship rights, some eight or nine years ago and all these years these people were in the normal electoral register. It was not a matter which would occur to us and we had assumed that the same non-discriminatory treatment that had been accorded earlier to those who had been granted citizenship rights would be given to the others also. Therefore, there was nothing to excite any attention, suspicion or any doubt in our mind and we presumed that this will be the normal thing. Now that this has come to our notice, our

Prime Minister has already conveyed our concern about this, and our Prime Minister is taking this matter up with the Prime Minister of Ceylon, and we intend to put forward our viewpoint. To be fair to the Government of Ceylon, they are taking this position that this is an internal matter for them. But in a matter like this, where there has been an agreement between two countries to confer citizenship right, if that citizenship right is to be of a type different from the normal citizenship right, then, it is a matter which is very relevant and is very pertinent to the agreement which has been entered upon by the two Governments. These are the aspects which I wanted to mention before the House relating to the Indo-Ceylon agreement.

I shall refer to a few things more before I finish, and they are some salient things about Africa. I will finish in a couple of minutes. The emergence of the Republic of Zambia as an independent State and member of the Commonwealth has been a source of satisfaction to us. We have welcomed the election of that wise statesman, Dr. Kenneth Kaunda, as the first President of the Republic of Zambia. We also welcome the independence of Malawi and Malta as equal members of the Commonwealth.

As the hon. Members are aware, the manifestations of colonialism in its worst forms are found in South Africa, Southern Rhodesia and in the Portuguese colonies. The situation in Southern Rhodesia created by the likelihood of the White minority Government in Salisbury declaring the independence of the country unilaterally has been the cause of much concern to the Government of India. Our thinking has been in tune with the aspirations of the African people, and the Government of India have reiterated its stand in categorical terms that no recognition will be given to a unilateral declaration of

independence. We continue to advocate the release of all African political leaders and the holding of a general election on the basis of one man one vote. The Government's stand received support not only from all African Governments but from most progressive Governments of the world. We welcome the public warning given by the new British Government to Mr. Ian Smith that a unilateral declaration of independence would amount to a betrayal and treason and would have disastrous political and economic consequences for the country. As a result of pressure exerted from various quarters, the Whiteminority Government has deferred decision on a unilateral declaration of independence. This is to be welcomed as far as it goes and we hope that wiser counsels will prevail in bringing about a satisfactory solution to the problem in Southern Rhodesia with the consent of the African majority.

We welcome the declaration made by the United Kingdom Government a few days ago, imposing an embargo on further arms supply to South Africa. This declaration of the United Kingdom, which brings it in line with the resolution of the United Nations, is sure to have a very good impact throughout the world and we hope that other countries, which are still supplying arms to South Africa, will also act likewise and in consonance with the resolutions of the United Nations. Sir, I move.

Shri Koya (Kozhikode): What about the Indians in Burma? Nothing about it has been said.

Mr. Speaker: He will reply afterwards if it is raised. Let me place the motion before the House.

Motion moved:

"That the present international situation and the policy of the

[Mr. Speaker]

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

There are several substitute motions.

Shri Yashpal Singh: 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, is of opinion that Government have failed in—

- (a) evicting the Chinese from the Indian soil despite the refusal by Chinese leaders to enter into negotiations after accepting the Colombo proposals;
- (b) re-orientating its policy in the light of the explosion of an atom bomb by China and the impending explosion by Indonesia;
- (c) safeguarding the interests and honour of people of Indian origin and the citizens of India, in foreign countries especially in Ceylon, Burma and South-African countries; and
- (d) keeping the dignity and honour of the people of Nagaland by pursuing the negotiations with leaders of underground hostile Nagas who are not prepared to recognise the authority of the Government of India over Nagaland." (1)

Shri Bibhuti Mishra (Motihari): 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 foreign policy of Government of India and urges upon the Government of India to start immediately the production of atom bomb for the security of her friendly countries and of herself." (2)

Mr. Speaker: Then there are others that have been received late. Ordinarily I would have rejected them but I am allowing them because the debate is to continue tomorrow also.

Shri Prakash Vir Shastri (Bijaur): 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, takes note of the Government's failure to—

- (a) arrive at a reasonable settlement with the Government of Ceylon concerning people of Indian origin; and
- (b) embark upon nuclear-based defence installations in the country." (3)

Mr. Speaker: Shri Bade—Shri Kachhavaiya—not present. None of them are present. Not moved.

Shri V. B. Gandhi (Bombay Central South): 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." (5)

Shri Shinkre (Marmagoa): 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, is of the opinion that a reappraisal of our foreign policy is urgently called for and therefore recommend to the Government of India the immediate appointment of an expert committee of Members of Parliament of all shades of opinion to go into the question and submit a report thereon within a fortnight with specific recommendations on the more important questions relating to our foreign policy, viz., our relations with China, Pakistan and other neighbours, our position or stand in the world political scene, i.e., the fundamental concept of the so-called non-alignment, etc." (6)

Mr. Speaker: Then **Shri Shukla's** amendment is the same as that of **Shri Gandhi**.

Shri Kishen Pattnayak: 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 relations thereto, recommends to the Government that—

- (a) diplomatic relations with China be severed;
- (b) special policy be formulated in relation to Tibet, Nepal, Sikkim and Bhutan; and
- (c) the issue relating to the liberation of Tibet should be raised by India in U.N.O."

(8)

Mr. Speaker: All these amendments together with the original motion are before the House for discussion.

About the time-limit, so far as speeches are concerned, ordinarily, the speeches would be of 15 minutes each, except that the leaders of groups might be given from 20 to 30 minutes.

Shri M. R. Masani (Rajkot): Since I shall be probably the only speaker of my group, I hope I shall be given more time.

Mr. Speaker: Then he can take the whole time allotted to his group.

Shri M. R. Masani: Thank you, Sir.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, two events of recent occurrence have so attracted and have been of outstanding importance to the world and particularly India that I would like to use the limited time at my disposal to concentrate on those two today and to consider the implications for our country and its future of those developments. I refer to the Chinese atomic explosion and the dismissal of Mr. Khrushchev. But before I move on to considering their implications, I think it is necessary in order to appreciate what they mean to us, that we might for just two or three minutes consider the situation which we found ourselves in our own neighbourhood on 15th October, 1964, when these developments commenced.

Casting a very quick glance around our frontiers, the House would find that to our west we had an unresolved dispute, over Kashmir with our neighbours in Pakistan, who were then engaged in a flirtation with our opponents, the Chinese communists. Further north, we find the Chinese communist armies poised on top of the Himalayas, with their guns pointing down at us, as a result of a military defeat that we unfortunately endured in 1962, and our failure in the last two years to retrieve either the territory we lost or the honour we lost at that time.

[Shri M. R. Masani]

Also to our north we find our neighbours in Nepal practising non-alignment between ourselves and the Chinese communists.

A little to the east, we find ourselves embroiled for the last 10 years in military operations against the Nagas in Nagaland, operations that we have been unable successfully to complete. In this context, may I say that we are happy that we have taken to the path of conciliation, and I was very glad when the hon. Minister a couple of days ago announced that efforts along the path of conciliating our Naga compatriots will continue and that we will not be provoked by anything that is said anywhere to be deflected from that path of conciliation.

Further east, we find Burma hostile to us, ill-treating our nationals and people of Indian origin, slipping gradually under Chinese influence. A little further east, we have Laos and Viet Nam being nibbled at by communist imperialism and infiltration from the north from the satellites of the Chinese communists, with the United States single-handedly trying to bolster the independence of those countries. Further south, we find our neighbours in Malaysia, our sister Commonwealth country, subject to attack from Indonesia, with the backing of Communist China and Soviet Russia.

This, Sir, is not a very pretty picture and if the resistance to communist attack and advance in Laos and Viet Nam were to collapse, if these countries were to be eaten up by the Chinese communists and their satellites, and if Malaysia were to succumb later, we would have the very unfortunate picture of being encircled by unfriendly elements all the way from Karachi down to Singapore. Today, it may be said that we have only two friendly neighbours, Afghanistan at one end and Malaysia at the other.

I mention this because it is fair to this Government to concede that this is the unfortunate legacy that they have inherited from the past decade and its faulty policies. We have neglected our neighbourhood and gone gallivanting round the world, and this has been the consequence. I am very glad that there have been signs that the present Prime Minister and the Foreign Minister are inclined to turn their attention to their immediate neighbourhood, to try and mend the fences and create better neighbourly relations between ourselves and our immediate neighbours. I hope those efforts will continue.

But one must concede that if the agreement with Ceylon about which a great deal of feeling has rightly been shown in this House this morning is an example of that effort, then it is not a very good start. We on these benches cannot accept that agreement. We think it is unsound in principle and that it is a violation of basic human rights. The Ceylon Government may take any path it likes. But it is a very sad day when our own Government makes itself a party to an attack on basic human rights and freedom, which should have been maintained by us and in the destruction of which we should have had no part or lot.

An enlightened journal of Indian opinion of November 17, named 'Opion' has this to say, pertinently, on this subject:

"To eat dog and not fill even one's ribs is the sad lot of the Government of India today. The disgraceful arrangement about the Indian-decended Ceylonese which Mr. Shastri entered into with Mrs. Bandarnaike is less than a month old and already that formidable female is proposing to whittle it down by putting even those whose Ceylonese citizenship she accepts on a separate Electoral Register. Briefly, they are to be second-class citizens and Mr. Shastri is not to concern himself about this. Says the lady, it is an internal matter for her to de-

cide, so she did not think it fitting to mention her intention during the negotiations."

The journal goes on to say:

"The theme song of our amazing Government seems to be:

'We are friends, oh! so friendly
To our dear beloved neighbour:
She kicks us long and heartily,
We sing and dance most joyfully,
For we're friends, oh! such friends
With our dear beloved neighbour.'

That is not the spirit in which we want good neighbourliness to be settled. I for one would suggest to the Prime Minister and the Government that now that the Ceylon Prime Minister has done something to strike at the very root of this agreement—as Mr. Swaran Singh just pointed out, the basis on which this agreement was made was that those who remain citizens would remain full citizens—now that the very basis of this agreement has been struck at by the Government of Ceylon, I invite our Government to consider whether this agreement should not be abrogated and we should not free ourselves from this commitment.

It is against this background then that Mr. Khrushchev fell and China exploded the bomb. Let us consider the implications of these two important events. With all respect, I would invite, on the part of our Government, this House and the country, what may be described or was described as "an agonizing reappraisal." The Chinese explosion cannot be ignored; it cannot be written off; it cannot be played down; it is of major significance. We are the country for which it has the most immediate importance. The Chinese explosion is a warning to the entire world that Mao Tse-tung's China has the power and will to strike. To India, it is a clear threat that any attempt on our part to regain our lost territory will invite nuclear retaliation. Already,

after their victory in NEFA over us in 1962, the Chinese communists have been looked at with awe and respect, unfortunately, by most of the new countries in Asia and Africa. Now they may be expected to exercise even a freer and stronger hand against us and in our neighbourhood.

The immediate psychological and political aspects are much more important than the purely military. The Chinese communists will no doubt claim the prestige that they are the first "coloured" country to break the white monopoly of nuclear weapons. But that is not true. This effort of theirs has been financed and helped to a large extent by Soviet Russia. Right from 1955 upto 1959 it was the Russians who gave the Chinese all the technique and all the assistance to make the bomb with. There were thousands of Chinese students studying at Russian Universities and thousands of Russians in China teaching the Chinese how to make the bomb. Already the first reactor had been produced with Soviet assistance before the Sino-Soviet Nuclear Assistance pact was abrogated in 1959. So, the colour aspect is a phoney one. This is very much a Russian bomb which the Chinese have been endowed with. But certainly many of the more backward elements in Asia and Africa will respond to this call.

In other words, this explosion and its possibilities hold our tremendous potentialities of political and diplomatic blackmail to be used by communist China against us and against the other free people of Asia. It will be used as a powerful support to Chinese Communist diplomacy to erode and undermine the freedom of India and the other free countries of Asia. This is something that we cannot ignore except at our peril.

The removal of Mr. Khrushchev is also a matter of some interest. I for one never accepted the view which was widely shared superficially, that

[Shri M. R. Masani]

Mr. Khrushchev was the great White Hope of Liberalism in Russia and that he was fighting the so-called Stalinists. I think this was a very phoney picture. In fact, he was fighting a rearguard action on behalf of the Communist Party Dictatorship against the forces from below, the new elite, the new middle class intelligentsia, which was trying to throw off the yoke of this dictatorship. He was giving ground and making concessions very much as an absolute monarch has to reduce his monarchy to a constitutional monarchy in order to keep up his rule.

Shri Nath Pai: It is a step in the right direction.

Shri M. R. Masani: I share Mr. Nath Pai's view and I might say that the new rulers will even take a further step in this direction and that Mr. Kosygin will not be any more reactionary than Mr. Khrushchev. He is an industrial manager; he is not a Communist Party boss, essentially. Given a free hand, he may be expected to modernise and liberalise the Soviet economic apparatus even further. Only in the last few days, the new Government has restored to the peasants the patches of private land that Mr. Khrushchev had taken away a year or two ago and Prof. Leiberman's theories of the profit motive in industry are likely to be accepted even more liberally.

But, having said that in fairness to the new Government of Russia, let me balance this by stating that so far as the international picture is concerned it would not be such a cheerful one. Marshal Chen-Yi has quite rightly described Mr. Khrushchev's removal as follows:

"It opens the possibilities of re-establishing the unity of the socialist camp."

In other words, the communist monolith, which was broken up, the axis that was shattered, is in very good

chance of being restored. Those who know the facts are aware that the schism between Moscow and Peking was as much personal as ideological. The hatred of Khrushchev for Mao Tse-tung and of Mao Tse-tung for Khrushchev was extremely well known to those who knew these two men. Everyone knew that so long as these two men were in position, there would be no rapprochement or detente between Moscow and Peking. But one of them has gone, and he has gone because he was coming in the way of that rapprochement. There can be no question that one of the reasons why Khrushchev was removed in this brutal fashion by his colleagues was that he was *persona non grata* to Peking and, what his removal, a detente becomes possible. I am not saying that the old Axis will be restored in all its glory. I am not saying that we shall be face to face with the monolith that we had under Stalin. But I do say that, to imagine that this means nothing to us and that the new Government of Russia can be depended upon to be as antagonistic to Peking as the last one was is to fool ourselves and our people.

We have to face the fact that we shall be now up against a Government in Moscow which will try to make every effort to make friends with China and if the friendship for us comes in the way, I may assure you that that will not be allowed to cause any tears to be shed in Moscow. Mr. Isaac Deutcher, one of the best commentators on this situation, says in the *Sunday Telegraph* at the end of October:

"Mr. Shastri at any rate should not count on the increased supply of arms which Khrushchev has just promised him."

I am aware that official assurances have been given. But I hope the House understands what official assurances mean when coming from a Communist Dictatorship. They mean nothing at all. It is against this

background of a new Government in Moscow which will prefer its "brotherhood" with China to friendship with India, to use Mr. Khrushchev's own words, that we must consider our own path.

Against this background what is the choice for this country faced with the Chinese atomic explosion? As I can see it—and I speak dispassionately—we have three possible alternatives open to us. The first is that we should appeal to the United Nations and world opinion, and thus force the Chinese Communists to abandon their nuclear weapons. That, Sir, as I understand, has been the burden of the Foreign Minister's statement. Frankly, if this is all that is intended, I would call it a policy of sitting pretty and doing nothing because, in all seriousness, in 1964, to expect world opinion to stop Mao Tse-tung from going his own way is to mistake illusion for reality. The Chinese Communist dictatorship has shown that they care two hoots for world opinion. Do they not ignore world opinion? Did they not offend it when they attacked Tibet in 1950 and again in 1960? Did they not flout world opinion when they attacked India in 1962? Is not every act of theirs a flouting of world opinion? Did they not show what they thought of world opinion when they ignored Khrushchev's appeal to join and sign the anti-nuclear test ban treaty? Therefore, to expect Mao Tse-tung to show any respect for world opinion and to court on world opinion to protect us from the Chinese nuclear attack is to expose the people of the whole of Northern India in a most callous and irresponsible manner to destruction and external aggression. We simply cannot rely upon world opinion in this context. I would like to caution and warn my hon. friend, the Prime Minister, that if he relies on world opinion in order to defend Delhi and the cities of northern India and the Industrial belt of Bengal and Bihar by depending on world opinion, he may find it a very brittle weapon indeed.

Sir, there are official spokesmen who say, as Shrimati Indira Gandhi said on 11th November:

"If there is a nuclear war, everyone is in it. It makes no difference whether India has the atom bomb or not.... it has to be a world war."

This is, again, another fallacy, another illusion. A country that chooses to keep isolated and non-aligned, a country that has no allies and friends, has no right to expect that if one bomb is dropped on its territory of a nuclear nature, the whole world is going to endanger its own existence. That, Sir, is not true. This assumption that Shrimati Gandhi has made is very dangerous. Of course, it is a very comforting one. If we can count upon it, certainly we can sit back happily. But I warn that this is a fallacy. There is nothing automatic about a nuclear attack of any kind becoming immediately a world war. It may or it may not. Supposing it did, supposing an attack that obliterated New Delhi or the whole of Bihar and Bengal with the industrial complex situated at Jamshedpur, Durgapur and all the rest of it, were to be followed by American bombing of Peking, is this the highest objective of our policy? Is this what we want—that we should be destroyed but somebody else also should be destroyed with us? That, Sir, is surely not what we are aiming at. What we are aiming at is to see that a bomb is not dropped on us. In other words, the objective of our nuclear policy should not be retaliation but deterrence. Today, as we are placed today, there is no such deterrence. Such a deterrent can only exist if one or more major Powers in possession of nuclear force bind themselves to us by agreement or treaty to retaliate in case we are attacked. Then there would be a deterrent.

Then, Sir, there is another argument that there is the policy of non-violence for us to consider. I think we need not spend too much time on it because only yesterday the Prime Minister

[Shri M. R. Masani]

talked about strengthening our armed forces and only two days ago Shri Chavan was in London trying to get more arms. Let us not talk about non-violence in this context. A conventional weapon is as violent as a nuclear one. It is a matter of degree, it is not a matter of principle. Therefore, this issue of non-violence is completely irrelevant to this discussion. The question of principle does not arise.

Finally, there is an argument that we are not frightened. Our Prime Minister has indicated that in one or two of his remarks. He said that no country can frighten India by military strength or atom bombs. I wish it were true. I wish we could put our hands on our hearts here and say that none of us care if all of us are obliterated by nuclear bombs, all our dear and near ones and everything that we stand for—our way of life, our civilisation, culture and everything—were to be destroyed. At least I am not that brane.

An Hon. Member: Nor am I.

Shri M. R. Masani: Being a normal human being I am very much frightened that millions of our people can be obliterated by a bomb dropped by people in Peking who have shown the most callous disregard for everyone else's happiness, security and well being. To me, therefore, it seems that this statement that we are not frightened by the atom bomb is not a correct one. *Mysindia* of November 8, from Bangalore says—quoting this statement:

"In form it is a statement of fact, and as a statement of fact it is false. The fact is that China's military strength does frighten India, and the atom bomb explosion three weeks ago greatly increased India's fear. Moreover it is quite rational for India to be afraid."

Then it goes on to say:

"We confess that every time we read in our daily paper a statement by some person in authority that India is not frightened by atom bombs, a cold shiver runs down our back. For the statement is blatantly false, and is intensely demoralising. It is demoralising not only to the civilian population, but more especially to the armed forces."

I wish I could agree with the Prime Minister that it is "childish", as he called it, for the leaders in Peking to think that they could frighten and spread their influence in Asia by nuclear strength. Unfortunately, I think, they are quite right, that people in Asia, as elsewhere, are frightened of mass collective destruction. There is nothing to be ashamed of in wanting our people and our country to survive happily and freely. There is nothing to be ashamed of being frightened at millions of human beings being destroyed and butchered. So it is not they who are childish, I think it is childish of us if we do not face facts, that they have tremendous power against us at their disposal, power to intimidate us, power to destroy us.

It is not without significance in this context that the policy of doing nothing and appealing to world opinion is also the policy that is accepted by both wings of the Communist Party in India—the Moscow Wing and the Peking Wing. Surely, that support coming from those two quarters and their affiliation with Peking and Moscow should make us consider whether we as patriots, we as nationalists, we as lovers of the people of our country can chime in with that line. We must think again.

This line leads to conceding hegemony to Communist China in Asia. It leads to our sinking gradually into a satellite status of either Moscow or Peking. It would amount, if pursued—

I hope it will be abandoned under the pressure of public opinion and Parliament—to the abandonment of the Union Government's very first duty to defend the country's frontiers, its sovereignty and its people. Therefore, I for one cannot go along with the Government in saying that appeal to the world conference is all that is called for and we neither need to make the bomb nor do we need take somebody else's bomb to defend us.

That brings me to the second alternative that is before us, and that is to make the bomb or as somebody has quite aptly described it, "to keep up with the Joneses across the Himalayas". Keeping up with the Joneses is sometimes possible, sometimes it is not, and we should consider whether it is possible in this particular case. First of all, what would be the purpose of making the atom bomb? We should be clear about that.

An Hon. Member: Deterrent.

Shri M. R. Masani: I find that there is a great amount of confusion about it. Would the objective to make atom bomb be to retaliate? would it be to drop a bomb on Peking after Delhi is destroyed? My hon. friend here has given the right answer. He says, no, that would not be the objective, the objective would be to have a deterrent. It would be to stop the Chinese from dropping a bomb on us. Therefore, our bomb cannot be a retaliatory bomb but a deterrent bomb. If that is so, let us consider whether it is feasible for us to undertake it.

First of all, can we afford the cost? The hon. Prime Minister has given a figure at Guntur saying that making one atom bomb would cost Rs. 40 crores to Rs. 50 crores. I am quite prepared, in the absence of any technical knowledge, he has very much better information—to accept this.

The Prime Minister and Minister of Atomic Energy (Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri): I replied in the morning.....

Shri M. R. Masani: If it was not correctly reported, I am sorry. I relied

on Press reports. I am glad to have the Prime Minister's correction. Perhaps, when he replies to the debate he will tell us what it would cost because no official figure has yet been given. I was quoting from newspaper reports from Guntur. I beg the hon. Prime Minister's pardon.

Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri: I said that in the morning in the question hour.

Shri M. R. Masani: I am sorry. An American expert, Christopher Hohenhemser, estimates that the cost of capital investment on militarily significant nuclear programme for us would be Rs. 25 crores with an annual operating cost of Rs. 10 crores. The U.S. Atomic Energy Commission has given another estimate—I am only mentioning a few; I do not know which is right—that we can establish enough plutonium production to manufacture one crude bomb at a cost of Rs. 25 crores. Then somebody else has estimated that the cost of establishing a diffusion plant for the separation of Uranium 235 involves a capital cost of Rs. 500 crores and an equal amount of Rs. 500 crores for running the plant, which means Rs. 1,000 crores.

The other day, four or five days back, the French Cabinet accepted a military budget, defence budget, largely for nuclear purposes, because, as we know, they are trying to go forward with the process of making their own bomb. That budget runs to 16,000 million French francs or, let us say, roughly Rs. 1,600 crores for the coming year plus an equal amount, another Rs. 1,600 crores on the air arm, for developing the Mirage 4 so that the bomb could be delivered to its target. These two total Rs. 3,200 crores for one year for France, about three-quarters of the entire outlay of our proposed Fourth Plan per year. So, only one-fourth of the Plan would be left for other purposes; three-fourths would be eaten up by our endeavours, if we work to put ourselves in the position of France.

[Shri M. R. Masani]

Then, the cost of the bomb is not the only thing; the cost of delivery is as expensive, as the French budget points out. The vital Chinese targets are 2,500 miles away, targets like Peking, Shanghai and the Manchurian industrial complex, comparable to our Bihar-Bengal-Orissa industrial complex, is even farther. We would, therefore, require an entire supersonic jet air force to deliver the bomb, to make it a real deterrent. On the other hand, our own targets like Delhi, U.P. Bihar and Bengal are only 300 miles away from the Chinese Communist bases in Tibet. So, any old conventional bomber which gets through our lines of defence can drop the bomb and blow up millions of people. Therefore, they do not need any supersonic air force. As the atomic race develops, we can imagine what astronomical figures such budgets would involve us in and what would be their effect on our economy, what would be their effect on the life of our people.

Marshal Chen Yi boasted that the Chinese must have their atom bomb even if they had to go without pants. In the brutal, heartless dictatorship over the Chinese people such as he exercises, he might get away with it. But can any democratic government, whatever the party, hope to survive in a democracy if it asks the people to do without food and clothing so that the wretched bomb may be made? We certainly cannot follow Marshal Chen Yi's parable any further.

What would be the consequence? The controversy over heavy industries, agriculture and consumer goods would immediately come to an end, because we would have no money either for agriculture, or consumer goods or heavy industries. All schemes for development under the Fourth Plan would have to be scrapped because three-fourths of the Plan would be

consumed by defence. All the projects will be starved impartially so that the nuclear monster may be fed. Famine and misery would stalk the land and there would be vast economic discontent and people would revolt against starvation imposed on them.

And who would be the biggest beneficiaries of that discontent? The Peking Fifth-Column in this country. Therefore, I can conceive of no more scientific, no more thorough method of playing Peking's game to perfection than to enter into this mad competition with them in making the bomb.

Shri S. M. Banerjee: Get it from America.

Shri M. R. Masani: It is not only the cost and logistics that are coming in the way. Our psychology also comes in the way. To exercise deterrence the enemy must know that you are prepared to drop the bomb first. Can any one believe that led by our present pacific Prime Minister, or anyone else who is likely to replace him, any Government in this country is going to drop the atomic bomb first before they drop their bomb on us? The Chinese Communists are men of that kind. We are not people of that kind. This is always the advantage that the wicked have over the good. Therefore, even if we had the bomb, they would know that we would not strike first, that they would be the ones to strike first. Therefore, the whole idea of deterrence would be defeated by our very pacific and decent instinct. At the very least, we would have to develop a ten-to-one superiority over the Chinese to be able to strike terror into their heart, to put the fear of God into Mao Tse-tung. I think the House will agree that this target of ten-to-one nuclear superiority and the readiness to drop the bomb first is something which are not economically or politically or psychologically within our reach. We simply cannot do it.

Therefore, if I may say so, with all respect, the case against our making the bomb is not a moral or pseudo-moral one. The case against making the bomb is a practical one of basic national interest, of what is good for this country, for its very survival. I am pitching it as low as that. I do not appeal to non-violence or Mahatma Gandhi in this context. I say we should not make an attempt to make the bomb because we cannot make it an effective deterrent.

That brings me to the third choice. The third choice is to accept the principle of inter-dependence, to admit that we are living in a world where none of us can stand entirely on our own, that "no man is an island," as John Donne has said, "He is part of the main". If no man is an island no country can be independent which means that we are living in one world. We talk of One World. When statesmen send messages of greetings they give expression to that very laudable objective. How about striving for one world for a change? How about moulding our policies in that direction instead of making platonic statements? That is why I urge that the only answer to the Chinese bomb is the acceptance of the principle of interdependence in nuclear affairs.

Today, thereafter two major nuclear powers who can exercise that deterrence on our behalf—one is the United States and the other is the Soviet Union. Let us certainly invite both of them to enter into an agreement with us, separately or jointly, to guarantee to protect us from nuclear attack in case such an attack is made against us. Let us do so if we like, not by ourselves; let us do it with other free countries, the freedom-loving countries of Asia like Iran, Malaysia, Philippines, Thailand and Japan, and tell these Governments: we want you to let the world know that if anyone threatens to drop the bomb in any of these countries you will see to it that

it is prevented from doing so by the first strike. If both of them agree, let us welcome it.

I myself confess that I do not think that the Soviet Union would ever agree to it. Even Mr. Khrushchev would have turned down such a suggestion. Mr. Harriman has disclosed that some time ago he had put forward before Mr. Khrushchev the idea that the United States and the USSR should form a nuclear bloc against Communist China but that this was very coldly turned down by Mr. Khrushchev. Today with the new Government trying hard to make friends with Peking we may be sure of not getting a very positive answer. But I think it would be right to ask both these powers to give us this assurance. If one of them turns it down and the other gives it, we should go ahead and accept that protection. There is no reason why we should give a vote to either of these powers in regard to the protection of our people and their lives.

Today, if there is any one deterrent available, certainly it is the deterrent of the United States, a deterrent that has in fact—whether we like it or not, protected our sovereignty and the sovereignty of the other free countries of Asia and Europe during the last twenty years since the Second World War. If it were not for that deterrent, Stalin would have over-run the whole of Europe and Mao Tse-tung the whole of Asia. In this context, the Prime Minister has been quoted—I hope correctly this time; he will correct me if it is a wrong report—as saying in Guntur in reference to the suggestion that I am now making that "we must maintain our independence and sovereignty," the implication being that, if we accept the guarantee of a nuclear deterrent on our behalf, we would in some subtle way be mortgaging our independence and sovereignty. I entirely agree with him that nothing

[Shri M. R. Masani]

should be done that may mortgage our sovereignty or independence. On that there can be no question. But I say that today no country can guarantee its sovereignty and independence unless it has the good sense to pool its security and independence in collective security with the other free countries of the world. We are living in a world where independence of the old type is outmoded and has no reality. It is a myth.

14 hrs.

The British Labour Party has decided to scrap its own nuclear deterrent which the Conservatives had installed. They call it a myth and they propose to negotiate again for the American deterrent, the American umbrella, to cover the United Kingdom. Does this mean that Mr. Harold Wilson is going to surrender the independence and sovereignty of Britain to America? Perhaps our Prime Minister would be good enough to put this poser to him when he meets him in London in the next few days. How does Mr. Harold Wilson, by no means pro-American—if there is any politician in the Labour Party who is anti-American, he is one of them—reconcile the maintenance of his country's sovereignty and freedom from America by going and freedom "Please give us the umbrella again: our predecessors made a mistake"?

The new Japanese Prime Minister, Mr. Sato, on 11th November made a policy statement. He said two things: Japan will not make the bomb but Japan will accept US nuclear-provided submarines in Japanese ports under the Japan-US mutual security treaty. Does this mean that, because he accepts the American nuclear umbrella, he is going to sell out the independence of Japan or make it a subject country of America?

I hope, therefore, that this line of thought will not be pursued any more.

There is no connection between giving up our independence and security and accepting the deterrent. It is the other way. If we do not accept the nuclear deterrent, we are in fact exposing ourselves to a situation where gradually our security and independence will be eroded, whether we want it or not.

Some people have said: Why ask for an American assurance openly? Do we not already have it? Let us be Machiavellian! Let us pretend that we shall not ask for it but we know and they know that they will always come to our rescue! They say, "Has not President Johnson said so?" Let us carefully read President Johnson's very interesting and encouraging statement of 18th October. President Lyndon Johnson said:—

"Nations that do not seek nuclear weapons can be sure that, if they need US support against the threat of nuclear blackmail, they will have it."

Please mark the words carefully. There is an 'if'. It is a conditional offer. It is an invitation to anyone who feels like it to go and say so, to get up and say, "Yes, I want your support because I am exposed to nuclear blackmail." In that event, President Johnson says that the United States is pledged to guarantee freedom from nuclear attack by giving the protection of their own superior nuclear force.

Therefore, it is quite clear that to rely on that offer and read something more in it than there is would be misleading and unfair both to ourselves and to the person who made the offer. It is not enough to leave the offer in the air. We have to come forward and accept it. It is not enough if we shout after being attacked, "Please come and help us", as we did the last time and ask the United States to drop a bomb on Peking because, as we agreed earlier, what we want is to deter an attack and not to retaliate. We want the US to

act as a deterrent so that no bomb is ever dropped on us and we want to do it without destroying the economic life, the hopes and dreams of our people and without putting ourselves in a mad attempt to compete with China. That is the way to do it. That is the way to give defence and protection to our people and independence and, at the same time, without any cost to ourselves.

On whose mind must a deterrent work? We may know that the Americans will come to help us. The Americans may know it. Let us say that we privately settle that with them. But that is not good enough. It is the mind of the person who is to be deterred that counts. It is the man in Peking with his finger on the trigger who must know that before his bomb can drop on us he will be destroyed. That is the deterrent. That can only be done by a public agreement, publicly announced. There is no other way to do it. Hence, the absolute necessity for the survival and protection of Northern India is an open Mutual Security arrangement entered into with the United States and, if possible, with the Soviet Government.

Finally, it is said: Would not this be contrary to non-alignment? As the House knows, we on these Benches do not accept non-alignment. We have said since 1960, two years before the Chinese military attack, that non-alignment has lost all meaning in the context of aggression against us by a major Communist power. But let us leave that alone. Let us for the moment all agree that we do not want to abandon non-alignment as a policy. I say that even those who agree with non-alignment, even those who hold non-alignment dear should have no difficulty at all in inviting a nuclear deterrent for the protection of our people against a nuclear attack.

Non-alignment when first worked out meant that we had to be neutral between Russia and America and the two groups. What relevance has that

concept got when we are in the line of fire, when we are attacked? If non-alignment meant not to ask for help from other countries then Pandit Nehru, our Prime Minister, betrayed non-alignment in October 1962.

Shri Ansar Harvani (Bisauli): Question.

Shri M. R. Masani: It is not I who is saying so.

Shri Ranga: Then he asked for freedom and help?

Shri M. R. Masani: Surely, my hon. friend knows that I am saying exactly the reverse. I am arguing that Pandit Nehru did not abandon non-alignment. I am arguing that what he did was patriotic, was in the interest of this country and was consistent with non-alignment. He made an appeal to all the free countries of the world to come to our assistance and he said that this was consistent with non-alignment. My hon. friend need not be that impatient. I am supporting Pandit Nehru's stand.

Shri Bhagwat Jha Azad (Bhagalpur): It is a healthy sign.

Shri M. R. Masani: I am saying that if anyone today argues that to ask for the nuclear deterrent would be to abandon non-alignment, he would be condemning Pandit Nehru. Anyone, who today says that the line I have suggested before the House today is not consistent with non-alignment, will have to argue not only against me but also against the action publicly taken by Prime Minister Nehru in 1962 as a betrayal of non-alignment.

Therefore let us abide by the view of the man who invented non-alignment for us such as it was. Let us say that he had the right to ask for assistance at the conventional weapons level. Our present Government has an equal right consistent with non-

[Shri M. R. Masani]

alignment to ask for intervention at the nuclear level for the same purpose.

Or, is it going to be suggested that you can ask for help only after you are destroyed and not before? Is that the logic of non-alignment—that you must be half-destroyed, that your country must be half in ruins before you can ask for help and that you must not ask for it in advance? Surely, that is not a wise policy for any country or government to follow. An ounce of prevention is worth a ton of cure. That applies to nuclear bombs also. So, those who think that non-alignment will be sacrificed are making a mistake. Non-alignment and accepting the American nuclear deterrent have no relevance to each other whatsoever. What I am suggesting is perfectly consistent with a hundred per cent acceptance of non-alignment.

I conclude, therefore, by summarising what, I think, this country needs. I think what it needs is to turn away from the barren path that has led us to the isolation and humiliation in which we find ourselves, where neither Zanzibar nor Burma or Ceylon shows the slightest respect for us or what we want. We have to turn away from that path by learning to recognise and distinguish between friends and enemies. We have to learn to stand up to our enemies boldly. We have to learn to link arms with our friends. We have to learn to follow a good-neighbour policy with our immediate neighbours without appeasing or surrendering anything. We have to learn to be self-reliant in regard to conventional weapons and to be good world citizens in regard to the nuclear deterrent.

Mr. Speaker: Shri Hanumanthaiya.

Shri Bade (Khargone): I have given a substitute motion. I may be allowed to move it.

Mr. Speaker: He will have his time.

Shri Nath Pai: He wants to move an amendment.

Mr. Speaker: Why did he choose to be absent at the crucial moment?

Shri Bade: I thought the speech will continue for some more time. I may be allowed to move it now.

Mr. Speaker: I will allow that also.

Shri Frank Anthony (Nominated-Anglo Indians): May we know how long this debate will continue?

Mr. Speaker: It is for 2 days.

Shri Nath Pai: 2 days may not make much meaning in view of the fact that very often a lot of time is consumed, on very important matters, but which do not bear on the debate. So, are you setting apart 10 hours for this?

Mr. Speaker: The Business Advisory Committee fixed 2 days for this and that was approved here in the House. Whether we want to spend 2 days or want to spend 10 hours or 12 hours, that is for us to decide.

Shri Bade: 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, regrets that the Government of India has failed to reorientate its attitude and postures in regard to foreign policy to meet the demand of the situation and in particular this House regrets—

(a) that the Government of India has failed to appreciate the serious threat to India's security due to Chinese successful entry into the Nuclear Club and also the immense psychological impact Chinese achievement has made on Asian and African countries;

(b) that in an undue haste to settle the issue of Indian settlers in Ceylon with the Ceylonese Government, the Government of India has entered into an agreement which seriously undermined the interest and future of these Indian settlers;

(c) that by its continued readiness to talk on Kashmir issue with Pakistan in spite of the fact that Pakistan has no *locus standi* whatsoever with respect to Kashmir, the Government of India has been guilty of continuing the state of indecision and uncertainty in the state which is being fully exploited by anti-national and subversive elements;

(d) that the Government of India failed miserably to mobilise the opinion of Asian and African countries gathered at Cairo Conference against Chinese aggression in India; and

(e) that despite the lapse of over two years since the massive Chinese aggression of 1962, the Government has taken no steps whatsoever to liberate lost territory and thus redeem the sacred pledge given by this Parliament to the nation in the year 1962." (4)

14.13 hrs.

[SHRI THIRUMALA RAO in the Chair]

Shri Hanumanthaiya (Bangalore City): Mr. Chairman, Sir, the hon. Minister for External Affairs began his speech by telling us that there have been very many important events that have taken place on the international scene. He mentioned, in particular, the changes that have taken place in U.S.A. and U.K. He reassured us that so far as the policies of those two countries are concerned, there would be no change in spite of there being change of Governments and change of leadership. In U.K., the change has been such that a different

party altogether with a different political ideology, different policies and programmes, has come into office. In U.S.S.R., a very heart-rending personnel change has taken place. In spite of these changes, the foreign policy of those two countries continues to be the same. Whether it is a communist country or a democratic country, it is an accepted fact that the foreign policy in most essentials is the same for every political party in those countries. How edifying it could be for us to practise the same grand example!

I was particularly pained to see so much interference when the Minister of External Affairs was speaking. The hon. leader of the Swatantra Party is an exponent of what is called non-interference. He does not want Government to interfere in the day-to-day affairs of the people. He wants the least interference from Government in our economic and other structures. I thought such a votary of non-interference would practise that non-interference in his personal approach in parliamentary life. We listen to Mr. Masani, the brilliant speaker of this House as well as the Swatantra Party, with great attention and respect. And I hope his Party will think over and next time it will accord the same respect to the Congress Party spokesmen and its Ministers. If he really wants our foreign policies to be so shaped as to safeguard the independence of our country, this is the first contribution he ought to make. Our External Affairs Minister is a very polite, suave and argumentative sort of person. I hardly find one sentence or one word in his speech which could irritate anybody. Even on personal grounds, I hope hon. Members of the Swatantra Party will set a very high example so far as parliamentary debate is concerned.

It is facts and figures that weigh with the Congress Party. It is the argument, the patriotic sentiment, behind those facts and figures which weigh with the Congress Party. Mere interference, I think, will produce the

[Shri Hanumanthaiya]

opposite effect though we are exercising a great deal of restraint in the matters of retaliation.

Mr. Masani, who made out a very good case, almost a perfect case, from his point of view; rather overdid in one or two respects. He took a phrase used by the Prime Minister; he took a statement made by the Minister of Information and Broadcasting. He said that the Prime Minister made a statement that we need not be frightened and he produced the supporting argument of the Minister of Information and Broadcasting. The first and foremost thing that we Congressmen have learnt under the leadership of Gandhiji, likewise Mr. Masani, is not to fear. To fear is the worst sin. If you do not have fear, there is nothing else in the world to make you afraid. It is fear complex which Gandhiji removed from our psychological atmosphere and made even the dust that lay under the feet of invaders, the docile Indian people, for centuries, rise as an atom bomb against imperialism and colonialism and even capitalism. This courage is the native quality of the Congressmen. When the Prime Minister says that we need not be afraid of China, it is in this true spirit of Gandhian courage. Maybe, people have not followed it up with proper arguments. It is therefore, that out of context it looks like a statement of bravado. But if you look at the historical background and the grand fight we have waged for the freedom of the country, you will find that this phrase 'not to be afraid' is the phrase which inherently made this country independent. It is the phrase that inherently makes this country to continue to be independent.

Why are we afraid of China? After all, it has produced a crude bomb. Even to have produced a crude bomb does not amount to destruction of India or destruction of any other nuclear power. Some of us have habits of magnifying the danger to such an extent that we make ourselves

cowards. Even under the most turbulent circumstances, if we maintain our head, if we maintain our courage, we can face the odds. It is in that spirit that we have to face this problem.

The other day, I was looking into some statistics. What is the strength of the army of China? I am told on good authority that it has a regular army of about 25 lakhs of men and an additional 15 lakhs as reserve in the army, police and otherwise. All told, it has got an army of about 40 lakhs. Its weaponry causes not much anxiety so far as we are concerned. It is all discarded old model, either of Western powers or of the Soviet Russia. The experts have judged that this weaponry is mostly of World War II type. Even if they manufacture some atom bombs, for another decade or so, I am sure, it will be impossible for them to deliver it to any part of the world as effectively as U.S.A. or the Soviet Union could. And the industrial complex that we have in India, which we have developed during the last decade and a half, is in no way inferior to that of China. We have a habit of, as I said, exaggerating the importance, the strength and the influence of our opponent. That may be for some political purpose. But, if actually, the number of industries, the industrial complex, and the economic growth are properly assessed by an impartial observer both of China and of India, India will take the first place and not China. Here, we have schools and colleges and universities, full of young men and women who are well versed in scientific subjects. Besides, there are, at least in the neighbourhood of 10,000 students who have been studying in Europe and America these scientific subjects. If all this scientific talent is harnessed, I assure you that we need not be different, and we shall be able to produce as good weapons, automatic and otherwise, as China could. It is only our peaceful approach to problems, our anxiety to worship at the

feet of the *daridranarayan*, as Gandhi-ji said, our anxiety to ameliorate the condition of the poor, that has restrained our anxiety to strengthen our defences, so far. But now the time has come.

The explosion of the atomic bomb by China is a big alarm warning. In the days of World War II, whenever there was an indication of enemy aircraft, there used to be sirens sounded. We have to take this Chinese atom bomb explosion as a kind of siren which warns of the danger. Fortunately for us, the hon. Minister of External Affairs, who, for the first time, is contacting personally foreign Ministers of neighbouring and other countries and Heads of States will be able to sound opinion all over the world. I am sure he has the ability to sound opinion in an effective manner, not merely for the sake of guaranteeing the independence of India and her territorial integrity but also to maintain world peace. I am very happy that he is going to Soviet Russia. More than all other factors, the Prime Minister of our country is going to U.K. He will have opportunities of discussing these problems which affect world peace and progress, with the Prime Minister of U.K. We have to remember that we are still in the Commonwealth.

I was not in India at the time when the Chinese attack took place in 1962. It was world news. I was in London at that time. The amount of sympathy that was shown by the Queen of England, by the Prime Minister of England and by Members of Parliament from all parties was such that if you re-read those speeches, they would be inspiring words of comfort and encouragement. On that day I felt that it was indeed worth the while being a member of the Commonwealth. These Commonwealth statesmen have again and again said that they are not going to allow India to be enslaved by any country, either by China or by any other country. That spirit of the Commonwealth and that spirit of common defence are

there, though we may not have stated it in terms of treaties and in terms of alliances. What Shri M. R. Masani wants is, according to me, so far as the Commonwealth is concerned, already there in spirit, if not in letter.

It is not as if even today China non-chalantly can drop an atom bomb on any of our towns. In the first place, she has not got the equipment, she has not got the scientific equipment such as the electronic equipment, radar and various other things needed for the purpose. Merely because an atom bomb is produced and there is an old-fashioned plane, it does not follow that it is enough to conquer a country through the use of atom bomb.

The position today is that we have to think and think very deeply. China has become the biggest menace. I agree with Shri M. R. Masani that China is not going to bow to public opinion, either of the neighbouring countries or of the world. I shall give only two instances. As regards the Colombo proposals, although those Powers have been persuading China to accept the proposals for the last so many months, China has never cared to listen to them. On the other hand, China is riding the high horse by saying that the Colombo Powers are not negotiating powers, and they are not arbitrating between them and India. China is treating even these Colombo Powers with scant courtesy.

Secondly, there is the atom bomb explosion by China and this attempt of theirs is not going to be deterred by public opinion expressed either in the UNO or anywhere else in any conference. They are so determined that public opinion is the factor that does not count with them. Their ideological interest and their patriotic fanaticism are the only factors that count with them. They know very well that human memory, just as we say public memory, is very short. All of us were very much excited and blamed the U.S.A. when they conducted a series of test explosions under the sea, over the sea and on land. We said that these people were poisoning

[Shri Hanumanthaiya]

the atmosphere of the world. We cried that they might be cursed. But we have now forgotten that, and we want their protection. When Soviet Russia did the same thing, there was a similar uprise of odium against Soviet Russia also. When France did it, world opinion was so upset that world opinion blamed France, and so was the case in regard to U.K. when they manufactured a few bombs and exploded them in the South Sea regions. But today in the context of the Chinese having an atom bomb in their hands, all this odium that we had exhibited has passed out of memory, and we now think that either the U.S.A. or the Soviet Union will be able to protect India and the world. Knowing the history of these explosions, if any of us thinks that we can make the public opinion of the world united against the Chinese so far as the atom bomb and its manufacture is concerned, I would only plead that such a thing is not going to happen. The history is there, and the psychology is also there, and the Chinese are a determined set of people. I am using the word 'determined' in its bad sense. China today has no friends in the real sense of the term. America is on a war path against China. Soviet Russia is a bitter opponent of China even today in spite of the change of regime in Soviet Russia. All the democratic countries of the world are opposed to her. Even the neighbouring South-East-Asian countries outwardly, because of the fear of the size of China, may pay lip-sympathy so far as their friendship with China is concerned. But in their real heart of hearts, I know that they do not like China. In spite of the world as a whole standing against her, China does not mind standing alone and doing whatever she pleases. It is with this determined set of people that we have to deal. For that we should have equal determination. We should have a determination which the world will assess as capable of downgrading or nullifying the determination of the Chinese. That deter-

mination is to determine a deterrent to the ideology, to the methods and to the aggressive policies of China.

How to do it is not for me to say. The Prime Minister and the Minister of External Affairs, I believe and I am sure, are as patriotic and as wise as anyone of us either on this side of the House or on the other side. They have come to their respective charges newly. They are receptive to public opinion. As they say in the Gandhian sense, they have the humility to borrow from others or, as it is said, make their own the opinions found in other quarters and which appear to be sound. I am sure they have not the vanity of saying "what I say is the best, what I say alone is the truth". Their international contacts and the conferences and confabulations which they will have will, I am sure, give them a good appraisal of world trends and world forces. And in a few months' time I am sure they will be able to evolve a policy which will give us a guarantee against all aggression, nuclear or otherwise.

Dr. M. S. Aney: Sir, we have listened to a very sober statement on foreign affairs from the hon. Minister covering almost the entire ground of foreign affairs. I do not want to go over the other points, because I am sure that there are many other Members who would like to deal with them. For example, the new situation created on account of the change of government in Russia, that is a very important point so far as we are concerned. Similarly, the change that has taken place in the government of England, that has also got a bearing, not so much in the direction of foreign affairs as it is likely to have repercussions in the field over our economic position and economic development on account of that. Then there are other matters. For example, the new danger which we apprehend to grow and about which we have some great apprehension is that China has not only remained silent as regards

nuclear matters, has not only remained aloof from joining the disarmament movements but has taken an active step of creating an atom bomb and exploding it also. This is also a new situation. All these matters have been touched by him.

But I am mainly concerned in dealing with the situation as regards Ceylon affairs. My main reason for this is that I was concerned with this External Affairs Department in the old Viceregal regime also, and then as a Representative of the Government of India I had to be in Ceylon looking after the relations of the Indians, of the domiciled Indians who were there.

In regard to this matter I have been frequently asking in this House formally and informally as to whether, when the question as regards the position of the Indians in Ceylon is concerned, the Government of India really takes care to know as to what is the opinion of the Indians who are in Ceylon, whether they want to remain there or not.

Sir, Indians in Ceylon are of two kinds. There are some who have been sent there as labourers. They have been there for several generations. They were more or less sent as indentured labourers in those days. And there were others who had gone there as merchants and have built great commercial business houses. The total population of Indians there, at least in those days from 1943 to 1947, I can say, was of the tune of 7 lakhs—Indian population in the plantation labour colony. And there were about more than 2 lakhs of people who were engaged in other business. Besides that, there are other persons also.

What I want to urge before this Government is this. Whatever economic prosperity Ceylon has attained in the last fifty years, a considerable share of that prosperity is due to the work done by these Indian labourers who were there and on whose labour

the plantations, the rubber plantation and tea plantation, have grown and come to this present prosperous position. This fact is admitted by them. Secondly, even if anybody moves in the streets of Colombo he will find that in the Colombo market, considerable business or trade and commerce is done by the Indians and they occupy a very great and eminent position.

Now, since the movement for becoming independent of foreign domination had come into existence in Ceylon also—it was a very healthy one, no doubt—gradually the ideas began to grow there, Ceylon for Ceylonese. That idea has cropped up there. And much of the difficulty that we now find is due to this idea having taken up a purely racial and colour form. The Ceylonese people think as regards all these non-Ceylonese who have been there—of course they could not touch the Europeans who were there, they did not touch them and the others also—but as regards the Indians who are there, among whom there are both Hindus and Mohammedans, on account of their existence they feel that when Ceylon became independent it would not be purely in the interests of the Ceylonese so long as this element is there. That is the main idea behind this.

In this connection I want to bring one fact to the notice of the hon. Minister. All these persons who have been sent as labourers were not sent without any understanding between the Government of India and the Government of Ceylon. That is the main point which I want to urge. If we look into the correspondence which took place in those days, which I happened to look into, we would find that there was a series of correspondence between the Government of Madras and the Government of India on the one side and the Government of Ceylon on the other. It was at that time the British Government; Ceylon was dependency as India was. That correspondence clearly shows that these labourers who were taken were given to understand that they could

[Dr. M. S. Aney]

live there—they generally used to go for a certain term—that they could live there, on the condition that they could leave after the term was over if they liked, and if they did not do that they would be treated in the same way as the Ceylonese citizens would be treated. This is very clearly stated there. And if they want to come back it will be according to their option. Coming back was optional, but if they remained there the understanding was that they should be what the Ceylonese would be in their own country. That is the position. The whole correspondence leaves no doubt on this point.

But when I was there for some four years from 1943, and even before I went there I was here Member in charge of Commonwealth Relations in the Government of India, for the first time I heard a voice coming at that time. Ceylon was not independent. But this movement for independence was there. And even there there was considerable sacrifice in the fight for independence by the Ceylonese and Indians in Ceylon along with them. It was heard for the first time that all those agreements, understandings or implications, whatever they were, that were made on behalf of the people of India or the Government of India by the Government of England were not binding on them and they were not bound to observe them. They have repudiated all those things. That is the position. I have been urging that whatever new Government came into being as the successor Government, successor to the British Government that existed here, either in India or in Ceylon, should honour those commitments, and so far as the rights of the Ceylon Indians are concerned, they should be in accordance with those agreements. But the Ceylon people's idea is different. Their idea is to repudiate all that and try to see that as large a number of those Ceylon Indians are sent back to India as possible. This tussle has been going on for a number of years. The hon. Member is right in saying that.

With a view to give the quietus to any further misunderstanding on this point, it was decided at that time to stop further recruitment of Indians for employment in Ceylon. If I am not mistaken, it was in the year 1938 or thereabouts that we took a decision that further recruitment of Indians for labour in Ceylon must be stopped. There was also a movement, a feeling against indentured labour, that our people were being taken as indentured labour and made to remain there in that condition. We did not want that; we did not want the civilised world to form the impression that Indians could be had as coolies to work anywhere. Old Congressmen will remember that we have been passing resolutions on the question of indentured labour frequently. So recruitment of indentured labour was stopped.

By the time I went there, the position was this. The labourers who were there were labourers who were not sent after 1938; they were those who had gone there before 1938 or 1940. A Commission was appointed by the British Government in Ceylon for the purpose of framing a constitution. That Commission went into this question also. At that time, the Ceylon Indians put their case before the Commission. They urged that those who had been born in Ceylon, and those whose parents had been born in Ceylon or have been living in Ceylon should all be naturalised. They tried to press this demand before the Commission. Here I would like to tell hon. Members that that Commission was boycotted by the Ceylonese. Though they had boycotted it formally, they were keeping in touch with the members of the Commission.

The stand taken by the Ceylonese was that in relation to these matters, the understanding or agreement that had been arrived at in regard to Indian labour, should not be taken into account by the Commission or the Ceylon Government and they

should be at liberty to take any action concerning immigration of those from outside. At that time, a deputation was led by the Ceylon Indians to England to put their case and protect their interests. The Ceylon Indian Congress was there and there was Shri Thondaman and Shri Aziz. There were also some other Indians like Shri H. M. Desai and so on. These persons urged that those Indian labourers who had been recruited and were in Ceylon should be treated in the new order as Ceylonese just as they have been enjoying that status at present. As regards those who had come after that period, it may be left to the Government to decide their status. That was the position they took.

But unfortunately, when the law was passed, the Government of India in its own way stumbled and nothing was done. Late lamented Sir Girja Shankar Bajpai was sent there to negotiate with them. He negotiated an agreement. That agreement was ultimately not accepted by the Government of India. In that unproductive agreement an understanding was arrived that the Ceylon Indians should be allowed to remain there, but certain professions should be barred to them. It was a kind of restriction which they wanted to put upon the right of the Indians there as regards their profession. We thought even that restriction unnecessary and unjust and withheld our consent.

My hon. friend said that in arriving at the present agreement, the Ceylon Indians were consulted. I want to know at what stage their opinion was taken into account, whether this agreement was informally discussed with them, with the members of the Ceylon Indian Congress. If so, did the Government of India accept their viewpoint and suggestions? In my opinion, the acceptance by Government of the position of these persons as 'stateless' is a departure from the policy which the Government of India has been pursuing with regard to this matter, till the late Prime Minister, Shri Jawaharlal

Nehru had been at the helm of affairs. In this House, he said more than once that the Ceylon Government wants to treat these persons as 'stateless'. But that was not the position of the Government of India.

Then the Ceylonese Government passed a Naturalisation Act for naturalising foreigners there. Under that Act, they called for applications from Ceylon Indians. But they dismissed almost 90 per cent of the applications and only 10 per cent were accepted as naturalised citizens of Ceylon. In that way, the problem of 'stateless' persons of Indian origin has come into existence. So these people were required to apply because of the new law and when they did, their applications were dismissed. In this way, the problem of 'stateless' persons arose. All these matters are recorded in the reports and other documents pertaining to this issue. Unfortunately, today we find in the new settlement that we have reconciled ourselves to the position of Stateless persons of Indian origin, and we do not know what will be the fate of two lakh persons who are now left out and, who do not come into account at all. Five lakhs have been accepted by us for repatriation, and three lakhs by them as citizens; two lakhs more have been left out, what is their fate, I do not know.

Not only that. Even the three lakhs they have accepted are being dealt with by them in a discriminatory manner. I want the hon. Minister of External Affairs to see that no two kinds of citizenship are created there and, that those who remain are not considered second-class citizens. I hope he will not say that it is their internal matter and that he cannot intervene in that.

I most earnestly request my hon. friend on this point. He should try to ascertain the opinion of the people of Indian origin who are still there in Ceylon and taking their advice on this point, try to espouse their cause, so

[Dr. M. S. Aney]

that, whatever little we may have gained, at least they are not considered second-rate citizens.

In regard to this agreement, you talk of humanism. It may be all right, but of all the departments in the Government of India, or any government in the world, the Foreign department is the one where the primary consideration of the Minister must be the interests of the country, no humanism comes in there. Humanism comes in in matters of welfare of our own people, or the people of the world, but so far as the interests of the country are concerned, it is a primary consideration, and if the Foreign Minister ignores that primary consideration, I do not know what difficulties we will find ourselves in.

I only appeal to the Minister that in regard to those who have been now left to the mercy of the Ceylon Government, he should see that they are not made second-rate citizens, that they are treated in a manner befitting a civilised Government. The Ceylon Government should not be allowed to discriminate against those whom we have allowed to remain in their charge.

Shri Bhagwat Jha Azad: Since we dispersed last, there have been many important international developments that concern us in this country. We have seen the change in the Soviet hierarchy. Assurances have been given to us and our Government that there will be no change in their policy. We welcome the assurance.

We have seen that the Labour Party, headed by Mr. Wilson, has come to power in the United Kingdom. It is a good sign, and we welcome that Government.

Similarly, we have seen the presidential elections results in the United States and we are glad that Mr. Johnson has been elected, as against Mr. Goldwater. We welcome him and we hope that the path opened up by

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru of having a bridge between Moscow and Washington will be allowed to develop and strengthen more and more every day.

We have seen that our Prime Minister made his first contacts, and very good contacts, in the Cairo Conference, and that our Foreign Minister tried there to gain the friendship of the Afro-Asian countries.

But the most important thing that concerns us and the world is the explosion of an atom bomb by the Chinese. There is a lot of opinion in this world and this country on this. We have seen that the Chinese have belied the most expert knowledge of the United States in this matter. They were expecting that the Chinese would be able to explode the bomb only after two years, but it has come that much earlier. They were thinking that it was of plutonium only, but now it is assessed that they have been able to isolate Uranium 235 from Uranium 238. It should also be noted that their targets in India are only 300 miles away, whereas our targets in China are 2,000 miles away.

At the AICC conference in Guntur, I moved an amendment, which runs as follows, to the foreign policy resolution:

"That this AICC reserves the right that in case the sovereignty, integrity and independence of India are challenged by foreign aggression, the country will use nuclear power for the defence of the country."

There was a lot of cry in the country over it, from friends and foes alike, that we were asking for the manufacture of the atom bomb, and I was subjected to critical questions by friends of the left, right and middle.

Let me make it very clear at the outset that I fully support the policy of non-alignment of the Government of India, and the search for peace, enunciated by our late Prime Minis-

ter, Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru. Let it not be asked: how can these friends who were so close to that policy, change overnight? We have not changed overnight. We have been with the Prime Minister from the beginning when he propounded this policy, when many of these who are talking now were not even seen. When things were otherwise, we were standing stoutly behind the Prime Minister.

I want to remind the House that at one time the Indian Cabinet, the interim Government, used to think of reducing the strength of the army, and that was supported by war experts like Lord Wavell and Lord Mountbatten, but a time came when gradually we had to strengthen the army. We do not want our army to attack anybody, but we have to see that there are hostile neighbours on our frontiers. Therefore, even in the thick of *Hindi Chini bhai bhai*, when on one side there was a demand for ceiling on our defence expenditure, we had to stand firm, and after the Chinese attack, we had to come out in a very big way and stand behind our late Prime Minister when he was alive.

Today it is said by experts like Mr. Menon that this nuclear weapon is not a weapon of war, it is not a deterrent, it is a weapon of mass annihilation. We have been given this dose day in and day out by our learned friends. We know that it is a weapon of mass annihilation, but we would like to know from our friends in Parliament, from our countrymen and from all concerned, whether, because it is a weapon of mass annihilation, we should sit tight and allow our enemy to have this weapon of mass annihilation, and if, God forbid, this country is attacked with this weapon, we should lie down saying we are followers of peace, and have a mass annihilation of this country?

I make only one amendment and that is this. We are wedded to peace, no doubt. We have never had any big

army to attack anybody, we do not want nuclear weapons, nor conventional weapons, to snatch the liberty and freedom of any country, but let the Foreign Minister of this country say boldly that, determined as we are for peace and non-alignment, we are equally determined, if an aggressor challenges our sovereignty, to use nuclear power for the defence of the country. Is that a crime?

15 hrs.

We are for peace, but peace for whom?—peace for the people of this country, peace for the people of the world. If it becomes a question of our being completely annihilated from earth and history, certainly this country, this Parliament, is called upon to say to the world, that it is not a case that even in that case we will not go in for the atom bomb. We did not go in for that; we have never done it in the past. We are wedded to peace. When this challenge to our sovereignty and our very existence came, then we did go for it and in a big way. Since China has an atom bomb it has got a tremendous booster in the Afro-Asian countries. It can speak from the position of strength. Secondly with the bomb in his pocket, Mao can go about browbeating the smaller Asian and African countries in the world. China can talk from a position of strength. We say that it is the legal claim of China to be present in the United Nations. The big powers in the world understand only the position of demonstration of military strength. China can now demonstrate its strength. You will see in that case, India may be relegated to a position in the background even in Asia. We are told repeatedly by those who say that we should not go for it that it will be a great loss of prestige for India and India will not be in a position to cash in on the tremendous support that it has in the Comity of Nations, especially in Asia and Africa. They say that we cannot go for the luxury of an atom bomb, In the past also we did not raise a big Army, neither a con-

[Shri Bhagwat Jha Azad]

ventional army nor supersonics. Today our Defence Minister is going to Washington, Moscow and London. The point is that we have not joined any bloc against the other nor do we intend joining any bloc in the future. The fact remains that the big powers did not understand our reasoning. They were not prepared to allow China to sit in the United Nations. Let our Government press hard so that China, which is the spoilt child of the Comity of Nations, may come into the United Nations and behave and be persuaded to understand reason. On the one hand this nation is not allowed to sit in the U.N. and on the other it is called upon to sign the test ban treaty. Is there any reason? Then we are told that India should not manufacture atom bomb.

Mr. Chairman: Has our country reversed its policy of supporting Chinese admission to the United Nations?

Shri Bhagwat Jha Azad: No; I am only emphasising that our country's reasoning was not heeded to from the beginning. I am only saying this. There are other nations in the world which have got stockpiles of weapons and say that China should not sit in the UN; on the other hand they say that China should sign the test ban treaty and we are told: please do not prepare atom bomb as we are there to look after you. China is like a spoilt child thrown in the streets by the parents and asked to do what it likes; it should be made to come back and sit at the table along with the others and made to hear reason. My argument is that the Government of India should along with the other nations of the world persuade the big powers to allow China to sit in the UN. If not, China will go on exploding bombs. In such a situation, what are we to do? I can do no better than quote article IV of the Nuclear Test Ban Treaty:

"Each party shall in exercising its national sovereignty have the

right to withdraw from the treaty if it decides that extraordinary events, related to the subject matter of this treaty, have jeopardized the supreme interests of its country. It shall give notice of such withdrawal to all other Parties to the Treaty three months in advance."

That is to say, even those nations who had signed the treaty can withdraw in some extraordinary event. What can be that extraordinary circumstance? If China is denied a seat in UN it will go on stockpiling atom bombs and it will jeopardise the sovereignty of this country. For whom is she making the bomb? For Russia, United States, Viet Nam, Burma, Ceylon? For none of them. China is manufacturing the atom bomb, firstly to boost itself in the Afro-Asian countries and to browbeat them and the second and most important reason is India. China knows that in spite of a small initial reverse in the NEFA border, they cannot beat India by the normal Army and its enemy No. 1 in the political and economic field is India, and if at all this bomb will be used, it will be used against India. We have read this statement of our Defence Minister from London:

"The Indian people knew very well that the use of a nuclear weapon would not be a local affair and escalate into a global war and India could count on the support of very powerful friends."

Let this be stated clearly that because of the presumption that India can rely upon other friends in case of a nuclear war, they count this as a factor for the defence of India. Who are those friends! USSR? It cannot be. So the logic of Mr. Masani will stand: let us give up non-alignment and have the nuclear umbrella of the United States. That is what we should be prepared for if you do not see the signs on the wall. What is a global war? China will attack India. If America comes to our help, it will attack China. So, this part of Asia will

be the testing ground for the devastating nuclear weapons such as atom, hydrogen and cobalt bombs. A global war does not mean that the United States will go after the USSR or the USSR will go after the United States. They will not attack each other for our sake. A global war means that it will be located in Asia, in the plains of India and in the plateau of Tibet or Peking. If our friends can take delight in saying this, let them state it quite clearly. I ask, Mr. Chairman, why during the time of Mr. Nehru himself, we wanted supersonics and automatic rifles? Are they not more dangerous and more devastating than the more conventional weapons? Is it not a fact that after the Emergency we are spending Rs. 500 crores on the Defence Budget? Is it not bringing misery to our countrymen? But we have had to do it because we cannot take for granted our territorial integrity and sovereignty. In this morning's papers, the Prime Minister is reported to have stated that India believes in peace and ahimsa but ahimsa did not mean cowardice or Weakness. Shri Shastri said that India would be able to promote peace—I request you and the House to mark these words:

“..India would be able to promote peace only if it could tell the enemy that ‘we are capable of replying’.”

I want only this much. India should be in a position to reply to the enemies, and they will understand peace only when we are in a position to reply to them, namely, that you can maintain the peace with all the might, but if it is forced, it can destroy, it can retaliate and it can take action. Therefore, let the Government say that the Defence Minister's statement that friends will come for help is not because of the question of a defence base or that the nuclear umbrella of the United States Government will be used. Let it be said, to support the Prime Minister's policy, that India needs a strong army: a strong army does not mean only the conventional

army of some eight to 10 lakhs of men; it needs a powerful air force for which the Defence Minister has been going between Washington, Moscow and London to have the supersonics. It means that much more atomic bullets and much more improved armies which can match the enemy's fire power, both in the air, on the ground and underground. That is what we have asked for. Therefore, I say that let our Government say, determined as we are for peace and non-alignment, that we are equally determined that if we are forced, if our sovereignty is attacked, we shall go all out to use nuclear power for the defence of our country.

I will take a couple of minutes more to devote to two important issues: one is the relations with Pakistan in regard to Kashmir and the other is Nagaland. About Kashmir, this morning our Foreign Minister made a statement that the violations of the cease-fire lines have increased on the part of Pakistan. We know when our great Prime Minister was very kind to go and meet Gen. Ayub Khan in his own home, the latter was saying, “India is a country of mean fellows.” Pakistan does not believe in reason. Let that be put aside, and I do not want to discuss that aspect. But let Pakistan be told that there is nothing on which we are going to compromise about Kashmir. Kashmir is part of India. Everybody is saying it; A.B.C—all Government bulletins recently published and everybody—they all say that Kashmir is part of India. But why give this corner, this disillusionment or belief—whatever it may be—to Pakistan that there is some corner for adjustment? Why that unanimous call by the House that article 370 of the Constitution should be abrogated is not being heard? It is always used as a weapon against us whoever goes as Prime Minister of Jammu and Kashmir. The first one was arrested for 10 years. He has been bobbling of other things. The other is a corrupt man! Is he going to be in jail for about 10 years? Another gentleman, according to some, Mr. Sadiq said previously that art. 370

[Shri Bhagwat Jha Azad]

must be abrogated immediately, but when he has come to power, he has been saying that there must be a panel of jurists to see about it. It is our stand that this is jeopardising the full integration of Kashmir with India. Already there were chances of full integration of Kashmir with India. On the one side, Mr. Abdullah is saying that as we all Congressmen have fought for freedom but we have failed also. So he was fighting for it. He had faith; he shall succeed. He is saying this—Kashmir is like the case of NEFA—but DIR does not apply to these enemies. He is a traitor who wants to accede a part of our country, whereas those who shout for India are behind the prison bars. Let there be an attempt to rectify things. One may be corrupt, I can understand. But that corrupt man is an Indian and let a chance be given that that gentleman is out and proves his innocence like other Indians.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. Member must finish his speech now.

Shri Bhagwat Jha Azad: I suggest to the Government that article 370 must be abrogated and the most irresponsible utterings like the "freezing of Kashmir" by the self-styled leaders in this country should not be allowed to continue.

The next and the last point is about Nagaland. Even the other day, it was stated in the House that it is part of our internal affairs and that the Ministry of External Affairs should not deal with it and that either the Home Minister or the Prime Minister should deal with it. Since serious things have developed, I will give a few comments on it. This Michael Scott has proved or he has already proved that he is an emissary of Phizo. This Michael Scott has absolutely affronted the dignity and sovereignty of this country. We are told he has contradicted his statement. I want my friends to read between the lines. What has he contradicted and how has he contradicted? He has never said it in so

many words. He has only said that probably what he has said has been misquoted. Let this Michael Scott be expelled from this country—another member of the Peace Commission. Some of them have been saying that the Constitution should be amended, that it is too rigid; that Parliament is intolerant. I ask you, can any gentleman in this country say that Parliament is intolerant? Is that the word that Shri Jaya Prakash Narayan can use? How could he use that word? So, let the Government clearly say that this Peace Mission can only resume its talk provided that the fundamental thing—no talk of sovereignty and no talk of amendment of the Constitution—is kept in mind.

There is only one thing. The Nagas may be permitted to suggest how far, under the autonomy given now, they could get some relaxation. I hope that in the light of the things we are saying everywhere, our Government will be firm and strong in dealing with these matters—the Nagas on the east, with Pakistan, and on the north with the Chinese.

Shri Nath Pai: Mr. Speaker, Sir, it will not perhaps be inappropriate to quote from a leading author as to what is likely to happen for foreign affairs in all countries. It is not, however, the speech delivered by my predecessor Shri Bhagwat Jha Azad, that has prompted me to quote this. Mr. Grayson Kirk has this to say in his article entitled World Perspectives:

"In all countries foreign affairs are likely to become the object of more emotionalism and irrationality than domestic questions. This is the heritage of history viewed through the lens of nationalism. And today the task of looking outward upon the world with calm objectivity and realism becomes doubly difficult because ours is a world so different from that of even our immediate forebears that neither national experi-

ence nor the clichés of political leaders offer easy guidance to the puzzled but conscientious citizen."

I will be guarding myself against the dangers he has pointed out.

Since the House debated international affairs in the last session, some events have taken place and I think we owe it to ourselves that we try to evaluate, though not all of them, at least some of them. I join—because this occasion will be very limited,—my joining the Minister of External Affairs in what I have to say—in extending a welcome to the new Prime Minister of the United Kingdom for a very simple reason that he has tried to live up to what a socialist, as a socialist, he had been trying to preach. Within 24 hours of his assumption of power, he cancelled the joint manoeuvre with France's Spain which the Royal Navy was about to carry out. It was a tribute to a socialist who had fallen as a result of resisting the coming into power of Gen. Franco—with the same expedition and courage he put a ban on the supply of arms to South Africa and told Ian Smith that the talk of independence is a subterfuge, that putting the yoke on the African majority in Rhodesia will not be countenanced. I hope that this promise which he has held, of fostering freedom and peace, will be fulfilled as he so readily promised in his book "Purpose and Politics."

Another change in a country which we should take note of is the rejection—a categorical and firm rejection by the people of the United States of the forces of intolerance, of adventurism in international sphere, which,—my mind shudders to think—if it had received the mandate in the hands of the American people, I am afraid, would have caused perhaps untold hazards if not immediate misery to the world. I therefore join the Minister in saying that we rejoice that the forces of restraint and reason have triumphed in the election of Mr. Johnson. There has been a change with

which India is concerned in the Soviet Union. I should have liked to say that the people there had a say in the changes as these two peoples had a say in their changes. It will not do for us to take shelter that this is an internal change and so we shall refrain from saying something. I think the Government of India will be put on trial by the one single criterion—the kind of courage and fearlessness it brings to bear while offering judgments on major world issues. I think, it was the Government of India which taught the people of India to look upon Mr. Khrushchev as a dependable ally and a friend, a man who tried to rectify the more glaring and nefarious features of what came to be regarded as Stalinism, who took his courage in his palm and at the 20th Congress exposed what was known to all excepting to the communist world and their deluded friends. This man stood for certain principles, all of which we would not have perhaps agreed to. But by and large Mr. Khrushchev cast his weight for the forces of peace. By and large, he stood for co-existence, realising the tremendous danger which the Soviet Union, having fought so heroically to defend her freedom, had gone through at the hands of the Nazi hordes. Such a friend has gone and there is not one word from any Indian spokesman to call him even a friend. I am reminded of what Mark Anthony had to say when Caesar was so brutally stabbed: "None so low as to do him honour." I do not compare the two. But at least we could say what the communist allies of today's Moscow's rulers in Paris and Rome have the courage to say.

We disagreed with Mr. Khrushchev. I had tremendous disagreements; I know he was not very much aware of them. But nonetheless, I do not think that the new rulers of Russia will be respecting Mr. Shastri's team if they will be automatically reacting to what has happened in Moscow in this way, that as soon as Moscow has pulled down Mr. Khrushchev's picture and

[Shri Nath Pai]

removed his books, we also will forget what the Parliament and the country were told. The essential plank of foreign policy which the new Foreign Minister should always bear in mind is this. They are not 5, 15 or 20 principles. It is fearlessness in articulating, unholding and advocating what we regard to be true. There is no substitute for courage and fearlessness in the realm of foreign policy.

I know Mr. Minoo Masani has embarrassed Mr. Kosygin by the support he has extended to him. Already we are told that the seats of the new leaders are not quite firm. I hope that Mr. Minoo Masani inadvertently, by his advocating and saying what a good man Mr. Kosygin is as industrial manager, has not added to the hazards which the newly entrenched leadership is facing.

When a change takes place in a country, it is not up to us to go on saying that they continue their friendship for us. We should have enough self-respect and self-confidence. I think one Soviet Minister recently told the Indian Ambassador, "Mr. Ambassador, don't forget that you are a nation of 400 million." I ask, why this overwhelming eagerness almost smacking of some kind of timidity asking "Are you going to be friendly?" We need Soviet friendship and I think the Soviet Union needs our friendship. Let all the foreign policy-makers know that just as we need friends, just as we require the goodwill of all other nations also require the goodwill and friendship of 440 million Indians. But this fact is very easily forgotten and we go on bended knees asking "Are you going to continue the policy of friendship?" We are the first to tell ourselves like whistling in the wood, that the Soviet Union has not changed its policy, even before Moscow assures us. It was the duty of the new leaders to tell India that "our policy towards you will continue in spite of the internal changes in the Soviet

Union." Rather than wait for that, we jump up and tell that they continue to be friendly. Underlying this kind of thing is something smacking of pusillanimity and timidity. I think in the long run that is not likely to make people respect us very much.

There was the Cairo conference. Mr. Shastri, though normally a man of understatement and modesty, has claimed this as a unique achievement. I know this was his first foray in international affairs and naturally he should feel like that; it is understandable enough. I for one will not accept exaggerated claims of achievement.

I think Mr. Shastri and his new colleague have perhaps shown a realistic understanding that the immediate sphere of our activity should be our neighbours, and rather than surrender to the temptation of being in the limelight, we should try to go on cultivating our immediate neighbours. To the extent this is symbolised by their visits to Colombo, their attention to Burma and Kathmandu, I welcome this. But when it comes to Cairo, it is a different story. We are told that it was a great achievement for India. Was it? It will depend upon what we mean. This Government has become obsessed with issuing communiques. The larger the number of communiques it signs, the greater it thinks its achievements in the field of international affairs are. Somehow they have persuaded themselves that they must sign communiques and these communiques make the pages of India's history. We know, if only we look at these communiques, how one communique disagrees very little from another communique. They are the same and only the signatories are different. They do not add to the sum total of India's prestige and influence in the world. Of course, they need to be signed and they should go on to be signed. But do not regard them as the criterion of India's achievement.

I do not know if the Prime Minister is going to intervene or it is only his colleague, Shri Swaran Singh, who will be trying to reply.

An Hon. Member: Why trying to reply?

Shri Nath Pai: I wish him well, but I do not get satisfaction from his reply.

Mr. Chairman: The concerned Minister will reply.

Shri Nath Pai: It is customary for the Prime Minister to reply, though this is not casting any kind of doubts on Shri Swaran Singh's ability to reply.

Mr. Chairman: The former Prime Minister was holding both the portfolios and so he was replying.

Shri Nath Pai: So far as Cairo conference is concerned, this was the first State visit of the new Prime Minister of India and naturally he signed a communique with President Nasser. President Nasser, we were told, was the only Head of a friendly State who offered to condemn the Chinese aggression in October, 1962 when China committed aggression against India for the first time in a massive way. But we do not find any kind of reference to this fact of aggression by China in this communique. But Mr. Shastri, of course, could be persuaded to condemn Israel. Even the *quid pro quo* of international relationship will not be asked by us. Why? If the UAR regards Israel as her enemy, is it not true that the late Prime Minister said that China will be India's greatest problem for the next thousand years? If Mr. Shastri goes abroad, will he be forgetting the major problem with which his generation, our generation and the coming generations will be confronted, namely, the problem of Chinese threat to India and to the security of the whole of South-east Asia? What is the use of joining into issuing platitudes completely ignoring the problems with which this country is

faced? There is not a mention about the Chinese aggression, but only condemnation of Israel is there. I think this is how we fritter away the likely goodwill we can create for ourselves.

May I cite an example to show how low we can fall in our craving for getting friendship? There was an episode which happened when Parliament was not in session and the whole country learnt about it with a sense of disgust and aversion, when we were told that on the soil of India the ambassador of a certain country took the liberty to object to an Indian being present because that Indian happened to be somebody—how people are learning to take us for granted. I take off my hat to those Indians who were present and said that this would not be tolerated. This is an example of how we can be taken for granted and pushed around. In Cairo there was a chance for *quid pro quo*. I would not like to join in the condemnation of a country which has not done any harm to me. But I think we could have certainly persuaded President Nasser in this matter. The new Prime Minister of India goes there for the first time and in the communique which was jointly issued, there is no mention of the problems that India is concerned with, 10, 15 or 20 principles—there are *samhitas* in India in which all the principles that man's mind can think of had been adumbrated and embodied. How do these *samhitas* help us? We do not want authors of new *samhitas* in the field of international affairs. We want those who will appreciate the basic minimum of India's national interests and courageously and fearlessly try to pursue them even at the risk of getting the odium of being condemned as Indian nationalists. Such stuff alone will be giving us strength. Such stuff alone will be giving us the wherewithal with which we are to fight a difficult world.

Then there was the conference. Shri Shastri, I think, adumbrated correctly the proposal that the Chinese should receive a delegation. There was oppo-

[Shri Nath Pai]

sition and it was promptly dropped. How serious are we about the things we say! If the suggestion for sending a delegation was a serious one, why did not the Foreign Minister insist on it? Why did he not say that he had not gone there to sign some platitudes but to see that peace was maintained in Asia? Why did he not say that he had not gone there to barter away the legitimate interests of his motherland and he would like to seek harmony and to remove clash or conflict between the interests of his motherland and those of his neighbours? He ought to have said that it was his motherland which was the victim and that he was there to defend her. Why did he not insist that this delegation should be sent? They opposed. In self-respect he should have told the Chairman that he was withdrawing from the conference. That they will never say. Whether we are humiliated, humbled or whether we win or not, they will never say that, if only they can sign and be a signatory to one more meaningless, platitudinous communicate when we will be hanging on in the hope that something good may come. I think this is how the world measures us in this matter.

I will leave Cairo for the moment. I would ask Shri Swaran Singh to sit down and dispassionately and clamly, as an Indian patriot, think about what is happening to us in Africa. I had the honour of being associated with some leaders of African freedom. I would like, with the House here, to share our joy in the emergence of Africa as a free continent, when shackles are being broken one after another in Africa of western dominance and hegemony and one after another the African people are taking their place. I rejoice in it. But when I see that in parts of that continent my compatriots will be thrown out, humiliated and humbled and there is only this meek kind of protest from this Government, the serious question that comes is about the success of the foreign policy.

I tried to raise the Zanzibar question this morning. He also tried to give a reply. The motion was not admitted. It was a serious question. Because we did not join a procession, the Indians were asked to close down their legitimate activity. If there is something against the interest of the country where they are carrying on their legitimate activity, they will have the courage of saying that they have no place there. They clearly insisted on the activity being carried on by Indians to be stopped, to be terminated, to be brought to an end for the offence that the Indians did not join a particular procession. This kind of liberty can be taken with Indian citizens who have done honest jobs in some of the countries, because howsoever small or new a country may be they have taken a measure of the guts of the Indian Government and particularly the foreign Ministry of India.

Mr. Chairman, on a par with all this is this new agreement with Ceylon. I quite understand the eagerness of Shri Swaran Singh to exaggerate every move and every step that he takes in the realm of international affairs as if it were a landmark in the realm of our international affairs, as if it were a hallmark of diplomatic achievement. But we would not be so easily persuaded. This agreement, inasmuch as it symbolises an effort on the part of the Government of India to solve these long-standing problems with our neighbours, I welcome it. This effort must be continued and pressed further, because we want to ensure that our immediate neighbours are good neighbours and possibly dependable allies and friends in the event of danger to their security or our security. So the legitimate price that can be paid is something which, though reluctantly sometimes, I shall be agreeable to paying. It will be acceptable to me. But here they should ask the author of the Colombo proposals, the Prime Minister of Ceylon, what is the sanctity of these proposals when after going from here she puts a totally dif-

ferent interpretation on these proposals? The Indians are to be reduced to the status of second-class citizenship. Shri Swaran Singh said: "How can we compel a sovereign nation to do what we like?" You were a party. These people were never allowed to sit as equals. You cannot treat lakhs of people as chattels which can be used to suit the convenience of mighty nations. There are six lakhs or eight lakhs of people who are concerned. They were not made equal partners in these negotiations. You consulted them. Under their protest you went on with this agreement. I would have been agreeable to accept at least this. But what is happening? The whole process of integration and assimilation of Indians will be gravely jeopardised if the Ceylonese Government goes on with its threat to keep them on a different list. Let us say in all humility to Ceylon and all our neighbouring nations that we joined in Cairo and we joined in Algiers in condemning the western colour bars, and rightly so. Let there not be this small, minor Asian version of this brown apartheid. White apartheid in South Africa is bad enough. Let there not be this kind of imitations of apartheid, people of Indian origin being reduced to the status of second-class citizens. I cherish the friendship of Ceylon, as I said, as much as with all our neighbours. But we cannot barter away these basic principles because it will be a dangerous precedent. If Indians in one country after hundred years can be thrown out and reduced to the position of second-class citizens, that dangerous precedent may be followed in many parts of the world. Mauritius may tomorrow come, Madagascar may come tomorrow, British New Guinea may come and we do not know where this will end. So we will have to take a line. Whereas respecting the sovereignty of all our neighbours, respecting their legitimate interests and asking those people of Indian origin who want to be citizens there to see that their basic loyalty must be to the country of their adoption, nonetheless, none shall be puni-

shed in this world just because his fore-fathers were Indians. When shall we have this much of courage to say that it shall not be a crime? We saw that it was a crime to be a Jew and it was a crime to be something else. But now it is becoming almost a fashion to treat as a crime to be a man of Indian blood. Shall not we raise our voice and say that it shall not be a crime to be born of Indian origin?

Mr. Chairman, I will say a word about Pakistan. We heard the gruesome, grim story of this growing depredation first from the Defence Minister in the last session and during this session from his deputy. I do not know if these new bold adventures committed by General Ayub's men are as a diversion because he is hard pressed for his survival by a lady and since his success against her is a little dubious he is creating this artificial success against, of course, the only field where everybody turns when he is in need for success, when he is in difficulty in the world—the Indian frontier. So beautifully has this Government defended this frontier. When China is in difficulty it goes to Ladakh and NEFA. When Ayub is in difficulty in Karachi he goes to Ladakh and Kashmir—Baramulla.

I endorse the Prime Minister's statements that it will be our endeavour to seek rapprochement with Pakistan, but not at the cost of our self-respect or legitimate interests, not at the cost of bartering away what was India's on the 15th August 1947, and Pakistan will have to be warned—I know this may be ridiculed as chauvinism as I am now going to make the most important aspects of my submission for the day—that we are always ready to be friends with them as with the rest of our neighbours, but if friendship is to be extorted from us by asking chunks of Indian territory, if we are to connive at all the depredations and daily humiliations in the vain hope of one day being called friends, we shall not pay this price. I think this has

[Shri Nath Pai]

also to be made abundantly clear just as we reiterate our determination to seek rapprochement with them.

Sir, I am tempted, but I am in a divided mind to speak about Nagaland, not because of the provocations of my hon. friend, Shri Bhagwat Jha Azad, but because I want to register my moral protest (*Interruption*). My protest is a moral one against the continuance of Nagaland to be handled by the External Affairs Ministry. What the people of Nagaland had asked for when they asked to be handled by the External Affairs Ministry was that their welfare should be looked after by Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru. I do not think they said that in every Foreign Minister they had the same trust as they had in him. It was therefore, time, as they listened to our counsel and advice in Goa and it was transferred from the External Affairs Ministry to the Home Ministry, that Nagaland should have been transferred. It gives legitimate ground and scope for mischief, misunderstanding and distortion. It is only a part which is not assimilated in the country that continues to be handled by the foreign ministry. You give substance to the Naga mischief-makers by continuing this part of our country to be handled by the Ministry of External Affairs. I should only say one thing because that would require, according to me a separate debate, that any proposal which will mean even in a remote sense the dismemberment of this country shall not be accepted by us. We have had enough of this vivisection, dismemberment. Seek any rapprochement with any people in any part of the country provided it is within the four corners of this motherland, provided they continue as loyal citizens of this country. As such, they can claim all rights; beyond that nobody shall have the right to go.

Now I come to the perhaps most important development that has taken place since the House debated foreign affairs, the explosion by China of her

atomic device. Mr. Chairman, I had vainly sought to raise this matter on the floor of this House on the 3rd of October.

Mr. Chairman: How long will he continue?

Shri Nath Pai: Another ten minutes.

Mr. Chairman: When he says ten minutes, I will see he means it.

Shri Nath Pai: This question of the Chinese atom bomb I had tried to raise on the floor of the House on the 3rd. First, the Government were taken by surprise. They said: what are we to do? The first reaction of the hon. Minister, Shri Nanda, was that he shrugged his shoulders, which is his normal reaction to any emergency and he asked: what are we to do? I had to speak for forty minutes, supported by many Members of the Congress, the ruling party, that we need a statement from the Government and, in the end, the Speaker had to compel them to make a statement. They were taken by surprise and, as usual, events overtook them. And when the events came, what was the reply? It was very interesting:

"...and our own monitoring stations are certain to be able to fairly precisely know the approximate strength of the explosion and also its location in China."

There have been press reports about this incident, yet not a considered statement assuring Parliament, assuring the nation that we know that China is determined and is going ahead with her preparations for blowing her first warhead and this government is determined that we do not become a victim to the Chinese accretion of new strength. Far from that. Here is the piece,

"While what happens in this field in a neighbouring country like China is a matter of great concern to us, the indications are

that the exploding of a nuclear device does not of itself give cause for anxiety in the near future."

Now, the first sentence says there is concern, the next sentence contradicts it by saying that there is no need for it. How ill the Government thinks about major issues that confront us very vitally is elaborated by this statement. They have to be cajoled, coaxed and coerced into making a statement. Voluntarily, as in other countries, they do not come forth with statements. It was within 24 hours of the Soviet explosion of the first atom bomb that President Truman called the leaders of the Congress, I mean the American Congress, took them into confidence and told them that the Soviet Union has carried out its explosion. Within a few hours he was facing the people. I have still been waiting to know what has happened to the much-wanted and talked about monitoring system of Shri Nanda, now of Shri Y. B. Chavan, to detect these things. I think it is still waiting for the atomic explosion to come! We have not heard anything about it. Is it functioning? That is one aspect. Of course, we are used to this kind of standard from Government.

Now, what is happening since then is a cause for alarm. Instead of making a very dispassionate and calm assessment of the Chinese possession of this dangerous, deadly weapon, we have been indulging once again in sentimental platitudes, confusing the whole issue and unnecessarily dragging Mahatma Gandhi, Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru and, for a good measure, Lord Buddha and Samrat Asoka also. I would like to ask them: have they tried to sit down and assess what exactly are the Chinese up to?

It will be my submission to Shri Swaran Singh, to his colleagues who make the foreign policies and the House as a whole, is that the explosion by China in defiance of the treaty at Moscow—to which it was not a signatory, I know very well—in defiance of world opinion was not a freak,

was not just blowing by an erratic child of a cracker, as stated by Shri Bhagwat Jha Azad, but it was the culmination of a certain process which she has laid down for herself. We have to think of it, judge it, evaluate it against the background of Chinese overall strategy, long-term policy, long-range objectives in the whole of Asia and in the world as a whole.

May I point out that Marshal Chen Yi, the Foreign Minister of China, has stated this? "I would rather prefer to go hungry and without shows and naked rather than forego my right to make a bomb. I would rather make the bomb and go hungry and naked than stand naked in the realm of my defence". This is by Marshal Chen Yi. I will quote another Marshal who makes their policies, Marshal Adeen—"The objective in a war is primarily to annihilate the enemy". They are not producing this as a toy, as a prestige symbol; they want it as an instrument for fulfilling the long-term goals and aims of their policy. And what is that policy? Once again it has become necessary to remind them that Chinese nationalism, Chinese chauvinism and Chinese expansionism is the bedrock of her foreign policy.

Shri Masani unnecessarily tried to bring in doctrinaire and ideological considerations in the discussion. I would like to tell him that if there be any sphere of human activity where ideological considerations count the least, it is the sphere of international affairs; here national affairs count. When somebody asked Lord Palmerston whether he was treating Turkey as a permanent ally, he promptly turned back and said: England does not have a permanent ally; England does not have a permanent enemy; England has only permanent interests. This is the bedrock of foreign policy. The Chinese have never been shy in adumbrating that policy.

[Shri Nath Pai]

Though I have quoted once, may I have your indulgence to quote one book again? May I add that it is a very fine book written by an Indian? Very few books are written in this country on our own problems, barring economic problems, on the major problems of foreign affairs and defence. It is the tragedy of our university life that we have to depend on foreign sources. This is an exception, a good book written by an Indian author. I am quoting from *China's Foreign Policy* by Vidya Prakash Dutt:

"In all their actions the Chinese leaders are goaded by a relentless drive for power status for China. China must be the equal of the United States and the Soviet Union and Great Britain. It must possess the authority that belongs to a Great Power. If there are some who do not believe so, they shall be made to believe it. If some Great Power is not ready to treat China as an equally Great Power, then it must be taught a lesson and made to do so. No sacrifice is too great, no effort too costly to achieve this status. Of all the present leaders of China, Mao Tse-tung is the one most deeply steeped in the Chinese tradition, and the most conscious of China's power status."

How deeply have we made a long-term assessment of China, not a hand to mouth, begging kind of attitude of China? Once again I remind what Jawaharlal Nehru has said, the major thing that should worry us, that should concern us profoundly—I wish he had carried it out in his life time—is the emergence of China. Why? Here is an example.

"The Chinese believed that they were literally situated in the centre of the world."

It is called Chin, because it is the meaning of Chin in the Chinese language—

"called their country the Middle Kingdom and their emperor the Son of Heaven. The first map published in China and prepared by Jeusit Missionary Mateo Ricci in the 17th century put China in the centre in deference to Chinese sentiments."

This is their conception of China, whether it is ruled by Chiang Kai-shek or Mao Tse-tung, that China shall be the centre of influence, if not of the world, at least of the whole of Asia, not South East Asia and all that. This is the government which has come in possession of this deadly weapon. What shall be our reaction?

Shri Masani has tried to create a Martin's fork for this House. He has tried to put the House in the horns of a dilemma by saying, either you be intimidated by China because of her possession or alternatively you take the American Umbrella.

In the first place it is his assumption that if only we ask then we will get it from the Americans based on experience. If Shri Minoo Masani is so sure that we can get from the United States the weapon which we need, I would rather like to go and persuade them to give us the F-104 fighters which they declined to give us because Pakistan objected to the giving of this weapon; if he is so sure of it, why not have the 130 transport planes which we badly needed and which the Americans would not give us because Pakistan objected to it? If the Government is facile enough in deceiving itself, Shri Minoo Masani, I do not think, is less facile in the way he can deceive himself or delude himself that we have only to ask and we will get it. I am tempted to quote a very rustic proverb but I shall resist the temptation. Even if we ask and perhaps compromise ourselves, there is no guarantee that we shall get it.

China, let us persuade ourselves, will be using the atom bomb for blackmailing India, Burma and all the Asian nations. One example of it,

it has already provided. Not a single Asian nation came forth condemning China. China is already reaping a dangerous harvest of her game that not a single voice of protest was raised. Even the so-called Peace Conference, which the late Prime Minister, Jawaharlal Nehru, had sarcastically referred to as a body which you can join if you want a free trip, only deplored it. There was no condemnation. Meeting on the soil of India these gentlemen deplored it; they did not condemn it unequivocally. It needed to be condemned, as we condemned, as our late Prime Minister condemned all those who built atomic weapons. But they deplore it and join China's explosion with that of France which was carried on before the treaty was signed.

This kind of frightening, this kind of hypnotising by the show of her strength is the first thing. What shall India do? Everybody, every Indian leader who can part his lips gets up and says, "We shall not produce an atom bomb". This is supposed to be a threat to China. This is supposed to be a manifestation of some heroism and statesmanship. The whole world will be browbeaten by this proclamation! I am reminded of one thing. When we were citing the examples of Chinese intrusions in our country. Pandit Nehru heroically said in the face of Chinese aggression. "We will negotiate, negotiate, negotiate".

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

Shri Nath Pai: I will be concluding soon, I will not be taxing your patience at all.

I am reminded of this. Perhaps he thought that this heroic proclamation namely, that we will negotiate, was somehow going to strike terror in the hearts of the rulers of Peking. Nothing whatever happened and we had to go through the humiliation of a defeat. I am afraid, Shri Shastri should think about this. What is the

heroism in this? The correct policy for this country would have been this. We should have told, of course, as he tried to say that we shall not be browbeaten, frightened, cowed down by China, by her crude atomic device—and it is not as crude as we were told—but we retain to ourselves the freedom to use all legitimate means—and what is legitimate shall be decided by this country and its Parliament—to defend our security and our freedom. This has never been told but an assurance is given to China and Shri Minoo Masani precisely uses this. He frightens the House and the country by giving staggering, astronomical figures of the expenditure. Why quote French authorities when we have Indian authorities?

I have already been ridiculed in some columns of some newspapers as the man who wants the bomb. I am not doing any such thing; but I am refusing to be dragged into this kind of an amalgam of sentimentality and misconceived loyalty to Gandhi's ideals and give up my right as a citizen of this country to defend my motherland. This is my sovereign, unalienable right.

Shri Masani talks of the price. I want to be free; so, I must pay the price. India alone shall have to shoulder the responsibility and the burden of defending herself. This cannot be transferred. This is not something that can be delegated. How can we depend on others? What guarantee is there that tomorrow the United States will not reach an agreement with China as if one day did with the Soviet Union? We should not be dependent. This again is a fallacy of which not he alone is guilty but this Government also is likely to be guilty. Defence is something because freedom is something which cannot be left to the tender mercy of others.

Mr. Chairman: He should try to conclude now.

Shri Nath Pai: I am concluding.

An Hon. Member: The House is interested in his speech.

Mr. Chairman: There are other hon. Members also. You cannot ask me to encroach on thier time.

Shri Nath Pai: I will not ask that.

Mr. Chairman: I understand many hon. Members are anxious to speak.

Shri Nath Pai: I am concluding Mr. Chairman.

Shri Bhabha, the Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, said two sentences which needed more attention by us, courageous attention. Let us not shirk our responsibility and let us not take shelter behind the pious hopes of peace in the world because the world is made of a different stuff. We will have to face the hard facts. This temptation to be a Gandhi and the Prime Minister at the same time must be resisted by all those who want to ascend the throne of India. It is enough to produce one Gandhi in a century and the rest will have to carry on courageously the job of defending this country even if it temporarily involves some kind of an odium. It does not cost Rs. 16 crores or some astronomical figure of crores of rupees as this to build the weapons. Shri Bhabha tells us that it costs Rs. 17 lakhs to produce one million ton TNT. He further told us that the only deterrent to an enemy who is in possession of an atomic weapon is the possession, not to annihilate China, not to bomb Peking, Shanghai or Lhasa but only to warn China that we are not so helpless as she may think us to be. It is only to prevent the rules of China and to assure our neighbours that India is not helpless. We shall have to give up shouting. Whether we produce or not, I would like to have a separate debate on that, but I hope the House will not be carried away by this sentimentalism of being loyal to Ahimsa but to the greater duty we owe to ourselves to try, to remain a free and sovereign people.

Shri Harish Chandra Mathur (Ja-lore): Mr. Chairman, this House has developed the practice of discussing

foreign affairs almost every session, but the discussion this year is very significant. It is not the usual discussion but is in the context of certain very significant events which have taken place during the last few months. During the last two months events of such importance and significance have taken place on the world horizon that this country or any other country cannot afford to miss and analyse the impact and implication of these on the world horizon as well as in the context of the country concerned itself. Of course, we very much welcome what has happened as a result of elections in the USA. The people of that country have given an unequivocal direction to the Government there and have indicated to the world at large that they want to act with restraint, that they do not favour extremism and that we can rely on some sane policies which will avoid confrontation. It will continue to work and make every endeavour and effort for easing tension in the world. That we very much welcome.

We again welcome the results of elections in the UK though I do not think that it makes very great difference so far as international affairs are concerned. As a matter of fact, I was rather intrigued to find certain observations made by the Prime Minister that in most vital matters the policy of the UK and this country is almost identical. I wonder what the Prime Minister had in mind when he made these observations. We feel a little intrigued. I would rather like the hon. Prime Minister to take this House into confidence and make the position clear because it has been my definite conclusion and understanding that Britain had always played a part which had been absolutely partisan to Pakistan which is one of our problems. As a matter of fact, only the other day when there was a discussion in the UN, we found that it was the UK's representative who had gone out of his way to malign India and to give extra support to Pakistan. I do not understand how he can say that on vital matters we and the UK think on identical terms.

My hon. friend, Shri Nath Pai, paid an eloquent tribute to the present Government of the UK because not only it is a socialist government but, I hope, he had some inkling or—I do not know whether he had any—indication that this Government would follow a little different policy, and would be fair and would support India's reasonable and very justified case in this matter. Of course, I know that some of the representatives of the Labour Party who had been out to this country as also to Pakistan had spoken in a very outspoken manner so far as Kashmir was concerned, but we have no indication so far as the Government as such is concerned.

We also understand that our Prime Minister is paying a visit to U. K. while the Parliament is in session. It must be under certain very emergent circumstances. I can conceive of a Prime Minister absenting from his own great country when the Parliament is in session only in the context of a certain emergency. I would like the hon. Prime Minister to explain to this House what that emergency is which is taking him to U. K.

I would further like him to clear the position which I had earlier referred to regarding the question of our agreement with the U. K. Government, our policies on vital matters being identical. Here is the case of Aden. I do not know if we think on the same terms as the U. K. Government thinks so far as the affairs of Aden are concerned. I think we differ very greatly.

Now, let me pass on to problems which are very much in our mind and which concern us very intimately. I will first dispose of Pakistan.

An Hon. Member: Dispose of Pakistan?

Shri Harish Chandra Mathur: I think we will have to do that and, I think, it is very clear to me that it is now time that we do a little bit of hard and clear thinking on this subject and make it absolutely clear to Pakistan that we mean business. Ever since 1947-48, it has been our effort and endeavour to develop very friendly relations with Pakistan, not only to develop friendly and neighbourly relations but to go a little bit out of our way to adjust our affairs with Pakistan. At the instance of Mahatma Gandhi, this country diverted Rs. 50 crores to Pakistan which was not very much justified because what was due to this country from Pakistan during all these 17 years has not been settled and not a pie has come.

16.03 hrs.

[SHRI SONAVANE in the Chair]

Again, we went out of our way in regard to water treaty. At the cost of our country, we had to settle that with Pakistan and gave them the necessary water which would enable them to develop agriculture on their side. I do not understand, if she is not satisfied with these things where we have gone out of our way, how is the ball in our court. We have seen from the statements made from time to time—we know what has happened at all the negotiation tables—that Pakistan is just trying to bully us and take advantage of our very soft attitude because of our anxiety to come to terms with them.

Shri Kapur Singh: Soft-headedness.

Shri Harish Chandra Mathur: I would not call it soft-headedness; it is soft-heartedness. If he says it is soft-heartedness, then I will possibly agree with my friend.

What is there to be negotiated about Kashmir? I have never been able to understand all that we have to say about Kashmir. It is only here that I am in agreement with our ex-Defence Minister that the only thing that we have to talk with Pakistan in regard to Kashmir is for it to return the territory occupied by it. There is nothing else to be talked about. Is

[Shri Harish Chandra Mathur]

Pakistan anxious to talk about the return of that territory? Is it what we are trying to do? Nobody in this country feels the anxiety of Pakistan to do that. Therefore, I do not see why should we not make it absolutely clear once and for all because it creates confusion in this country, it creates a lot of uncertainty in Kashmir and it only baffles and, as a matter of fact, embarrasses our friends who want to be on our side. We are not taking an absolutely clear attitude in this matter. Is it not a fact that in the Jammu and Kashmir Assembly, we have hundred seats and out of these hundred seats, 75 seats are covered by Jammu and Kashmir which is at present being administered by the present Government of Jammu and Kashmir and the 25 seats which are vacant pertain to the area which is under the occupation of Pakistan? You must remember what the ex-President and the leaders of the occupied Pakistan who have now spoken on this subject said regarding Pakistan's attitude of bullying and torture which is being perpetuated in that part on this particular issue. Therefore, I think, it is time that this Government makes its standpoint clear because the mind of the people is very much exercised about it. When we talk about abrogation of article 370 of the Constitution which has by and large been demonstrated by the full support from all sections of this House, let us understand the feelings of the representatives of this country and the Government should adopt a clear attitude in this matter.

I will now deal with the next point which is exercising the mind of most of us today in the context of the explosion of an atomic bomb by China. I do not know whether it is an atomic bomb; possibly it is a hydrogen bomb as has been given out in certain press reports. I am not speaking out of any panic or fear. I do not suggest to the Government that we should be frightened into any decisions. I do not suggest to the Government that we should play in a trap which has been

laid for us by China. But it would be equally foolish and suicidal, almost ostrich-like, not to take cognizance, not to take notice, of what has happened and the impact and implications which it has on our country and in the world at large. Even America which is such a powerful country feels exercised about it and there have been more discussions and confabulations at the highest level. The immediate reaction which I see is that even the Secretary of State for U.S.A. said, "Now, we will have to include China; we would have to request China to the top table for a discussion on this matter of disarmament" My friend who preceded me spoke on this subject very eloquently and I would not like to repeat all that he has said in this context. But I wish that we take into consideration certain salient points.

Our Government says that it is the will and the determination of the people which is more important than atomic and hydrogen bomb. Well, I do not know about it; we may be an exception in this world and we may develop such a will and determination. At least, I do not see that leadership in this country, at present, which will galvanise this country to that sort of spirit and to that sort of strong will which will resist atomic bombs and hydrogen bombs. I would like to be realistic and want to point out this to our Government. I do not know whether there is any country which will claim a more determined will and which will contain a greater will and greater nationalism than what Japan had. Japan was considered on this side of the world to be one of the foremost countries where nationalism, patriotism, the will and the determination of the people was almost supreme which was to be emulated by others. What happened during the last War? What happened to the will and the determination of the people of Japan when Hiroshima had the atomic explosion? Let us understand it. Let us understand the implications of it. Let our Government explain it to the

people and to the world and let those leaders—there is a greater responsibility on U.S.A. and U.S.S.R.—who are very anxious to see that there is no proliferation and that other countries do not come into the Atomic Club tell us what is their plan or scheme in this regard how they are going to give a greater respectability to those countries which are in a position to manufacture and make atomic bombs and who are desisting from doing so what is their place in international parleys.

I would like to know whether these Powers will put India and the other countries at the same table. For instance, Canada is one such country, and India is another country, which everyone accepts is in a position to manufacture atom bombs. I would like to know whether these Powers would give India and Canada the same place which they are now giving to China because she has just exploded an atom bomb.

As regards our endeavour and effort, there is no doubt about it, and for one year or two years, we may go and make all-out efforts to see that this race for atom bombs and hydrogen bombs is not there, and that these countries give up the manufacture of nuclear devices. But I have not the ghost of a hope that China will ever accede to such a thing.

I wish to remind this House, particularly in the context of our history, what had happened to India all the time. From the very beginning, there was chivalry in this country, and, there was bravery in this country but it was only the superiority of the weapons which the invaders brought, which humiliated this country. First we had the spears and arrows; then came the guns; then came bigger guns and canons. And we know what happened in 1962 when China invaded India. We were expounding the same thing then which we are expounding today in the context of the atom bomb that we have not got the foreign exchange, we have not got the wherewithal, and we cannot do

it and so on. At that time we could not spend even Rs. 50 crores of foreign exchange in order to be able to equip our Army to meet the Chinese aggression. If we had spent about Rs. 100 crores during the last five years to equip our Army, India would not have suffered that humiliation which she suffered because of our unpreparedness and because of our having been lulled into this sort of attitude that all was well and nothing was to be worried about. So, let us not repeat those mistakes again.

There is also another repercussion that will flow from that. If India is going to be attacked, then what is going to be its effect on the smaller nations round about? The question between India and China is whether communism is going to triumph or whether democracy is going to triumph. Communism wants to use all ways, methods and means to brow-beat and demoralise the countries in this region and to have them in its lap. That is exactly what is happening from day to day, step by step, and this atom bomb explosion is only a major step in that direction. Let us understand that clearly.

Some of our friends say that we can rely upon the USA. I would ask how we can rely upon the USA? If the USSR tells the USA tomorrow that "Please hold your hands off this fight between China and India; if you come in in any way, we shall have also to come in the picture". Will the USA be prepared for an atomic and hydrogen bomb warfare with the USSR for our sake? What is there to assure us that the USA will come to our aid?

Now, I would say a word about the Moscow treaty. I was really very much intrigued about one thing. The present rulers of Moscow tell us that they are following the same policy as before, but only the other day in Bangkok Mr. Nikolayev Ferubin, the Soviet Deputy Foreign Minister praised the Chinese explosion of a nuclear device as a great achievement. Instead of condemning it, was he not going away from the Moscow treaty, when

[Shri Harish Chandra Mathur]

he gives an all-out praise to China. And yet, are we to be lulled into this sort of feeling that nothing is going to happen?

It is in this context, therefore, that I wish to ask the Prime Minister what use there is if we raise this issue in the United Nations. When this issue is raised in the UN, France is definitely going to oppose it. And we have already the indication in the speech of the Soviet Deputy Foreign Minister that Russia also is not likely to support us but is likely to oppose us. So, we are creating more troubles and more problems for ourselves by raising this issue in the UN.

In conclusion I would just say one word. There is no other morality; our moral duty is the security of this country, the dignity of this country, the honour of this country and the safety of this country. Everything else will have to be subjugated to that. Our policies have to be designed and fashioned for that purpose.

I am really surprised to find that our ex-Defence Minister accused Dr. Bhabha for having said something, for having let out some information about these atomic explosions and the cost they involve. I do not know what Dr. Bhabha has done to merit that. In doing what he did, he was perfectly well within his right. I wish to emphasise this on the floor of this House. What did he do? It was not Dr. Bhabha who made this estimate. It was an estimate which was made at an international conference by USA and others who had come there. Dr. Bhabha merely quoted them, repeated them. What is much more significant and which has relevance is this. I will just read a para from that.

"In the third international conference on the peaceful uses of atomic energy organised by the United Nations—mind you, the

United Nations—

"At Geneva in September this year there was a paper by the US on the peaceful uses of atomic explosion for excavation, for water diversion, irrigation or flood control, for construction of canals, harbours, for blasting passes through mountains for highways and rail-roads and for several other peaceful uses....

It was a paper prepared by the USA—

"the cost of nuclear explosives was given. A 10-kilo-ton explosion (that is, 10,000 tons TNT) would cost about Rs. 17.5 lakhs.....

Shri Ranga: That is provided you have the factory.

Shri Harish Chandra Mathur: I will meet that point.

"On the other hand, at current prices of TNT, 2 million tons of it would cost some Rs. 150 crores. Making use of that explosive in any event is totally impossible. This shows that atomic explosives are more than twenty times cheaper and thermo-nuclear explosives are more than 500 times cheaper than conventional explosives".

It is the cost which I am stating—

"Thus on the basis of these figures given in the paper I have quoted, a stockpile of some 50 atomic bombs would cost under Rs. 10 crores and a stockpile of 50 2-megaton hydrogen bombs would cost something of the order of Rs. 15 crores.

"These expenditures are small compared with the military budgets of many countries. We may therefore well have to reckon with a number of countries possessing nuclear weapons within the next five or ten years."

That is the cost structure. It is such that numerous countries can possess it. If numerous countries can possess it,

it would not be impossible for this country. Therefore, let us not give a wrong impression in the country. Let us make things absolutely clear as to where we stand. It is certainly our desire, it is certainly our endeavour, to work for peace, for peaceful settlement of disputes but we have got to take into consideration these hard facts.

Then it was not as Shri Nath Pai said, that we were anxious to go and find out as to what the attitude of the new Government in USSR is. The new Government itself—it was not that we were asking them and we were just shaking in our shoes—came out with an assurance. We very much appreciated Mr. Khrushchev's policy. This country has paid him tributes. Here I do wish to pay a tribute to Mr. Khrushchev for having rendered yeoman service in the international sphere. He worked hard for relaxation of international tensions. He had rendered such a service which has set a different pace in the entire international moral scene. Mr. Kennedy appreciated it, the USA appreciated it. We do appreciate it.

But we do not know what is going to happen. With very great respect, we believe what the new Government in the USSR says. We will watch them and will be very grateful and happy to see that they pursue those very policies.

Shri Frank Anthony: I propose to confine my observations to the Chinese explosion of a nuclear device and the grave, even critical, implications for India.

While this explosion need not be an occasion for counsels of panic, equally I feel that it should not be an occasion for counsels of complacency and above all, for counsels of dangerous illusion.

I am one of those who feel that the NEFA debacle was due to the fact that the Government of India insisted on living in a world of wild illusion. I have it on fairly good authority that

a former Chief of Army Staff went to the late Prime Minister and told him, several years ago, that it was imperative that India must have automatic and semi-automatic weapons. The Prime Minister is supposed to have asked him: "How much will it cost?" The answer was: "Between Rs. 50 and Rs. 100 crores." The Prime Minister at first said nothing. Then he smirked, and then he almost shouted at him and told him that if we had to fight we would fight with spirit, and we would fight with lathis. That was the reason for the NEFA debacle.

And if the NEFA debacle has taught us anything, if it should have taught us anything, it is this, that in this day and age, it is not only arrant, it is dangerous nonsense, to talk of fighting with lathis; it is dangerous nonsense, to talk of fighting with .303 rifles; it will be dangerous nonsense to talk of fighting with automatic and semi-automatic weapons in the next one or two years.

Shri Joachim Alva: It is an uncorroborated statement attributed to the former Prime Minister.

Shri Frank Anthony: This hon. Member has developed this perverse habit of interrupting unnecessarily.

I feel that, with the Chinese explosion, we are faced relatively with the same kind of opposition that was posed for us by that former Chief of Army Staff. What is going to happen? Are we to stand still and allow events in this nuclear age to overtake us, as they overtook us in the NEFA debacle? What is going to happen to most of the weapons we are producing today? In a year or two, in another Chinese confrontation with China armed only with atomic artillery, what will happen? The weapons we are producing today with such phrenetic energy will be utterly obsolete; whole battalions of our army armed with what you are producing today, will face mass slaughter, utter decimation. Let us understand that.

[Shri Frank Anthony]

I say this also that we have now accepted this position that what China has exploded was not a crude plutonium bomb. Expert opinion has now agreed that the fission material used—I am not a scientist, but I am a layman who understands some things—was not even Uranium 235, that the fission material used was of an extremely advanced type, that it was not an atom bomb that it has exploded, it was a hydrogen bomb. We are told that France, after spending hundreds of crores on atomic research, has not been able to produce a bomb with Uranium 235. China is several steps ahead of that.

Shri Nambiar: It was Uranium 235, that was the report, which is superior.

Shri Frank Anthony: It was not Uranium 235. Why should there be these interruptions?

China is alleged to have used Uranium 237, which is supposed to have a much higher quality, or more fine quality of fission material. Uranium 235 is now a fairly sort of backward form of Uranium.

Shri Nambiar: It is superior.

Shri Frank Anthony: Today, another report has it, a fairly authoritative report, that China is building a vast gaseous diffusion plant, in order to separate this Uranium, in order to mass produce nuclear weapons. I am not concerned so much with that; I am concerned with the further report that China today is concentrating on short range rockets and missiles. For whose benefit? Obviously for the benefit of India. Short range rockets and missiles are not going to be used, or they will not be usable, against distant countries like America and Britain. Short range rockets and missiles, armed with nuclear warheads, can only be meant for the special benefit of India. Let us take notice of it.

We also know this, that China has not many, but she has between 10 and

15 TU-4 planes. They have a combat radius of not less than 2,000 miles. She has a Russian-supplied fleet of 150 to 400 Ilyushin-28s, with a combat radius of about 700 miles. Unfortunately, the infamous betrayal in Tibet has come home to roost. Even with the subsonic Ilyushin planes, all our major cities, major industrial targets, major industrial centres and aerodromes are within easy flying range from the Chinese Tibetan bases which we virtually handed over to them. What I am even more concerned about is this. Apart from the short-range rockets, the latest reports say that China is concentrating on producing shells with atomic warheads. What is it meant for? Let us remember this. Today atomic artillery shells with atomic warheads are being classified as conventional weapons and their use by China in border conflicts with us like in NEFA will not precipitate a world conflagration. They will be deemed to be using conventional weapons. What will happen? What is the good of building up an army of a million men with automatic and semi-automatic weapons? What is the good of building up an army of ten million men with automatic and semi-automatic weapons? In the face of a small Chinese Army equipped with atomic artillery one million Indian soldiers with all the courage in the world will be sitting ducks. The NEFA debacle will be a picnic compared to what might happen within the next six months or one year. That is what I am really afraid of. When I warned the late Prime Minister about what was going to happen in NEFA, I said that it was the soft underbelly, he ridiculed me in this House that I had become a neurotic conjuring up visions of Indian soldiers' heads rolling in NEFA. I say this today. It is not a fad; it is a fact. What is the answer? I am not one of those who believe in uninformed hysteria; I am not one of those who support the ranting braggadocio of some Opposition Members. I say this; I am also inclined to accept the mildewed mantras

that have become the stock-in-trade in the policy of the Government of India today. What I feel is this. I am aware of the difficulties we are faced with, I am aware of the fact that India is a signatory to the partial nuclear test ban treaty. I am aware that the cost of producing an atom bomb or a hydrogen bomb may be utterly crippling, I do not know of the cost. Shri Shastri said that it was 40 or Rs. 50 crores. I do not know whether it was the same report which my hon. friend read just now in which Dr. Bhabha stated that you could have a stock-pile of about 50 atom bombs for 21 million dollars, equivalent to about Rs. 10 crores. I am aware of the fact that with almost a thousand crores of defence expenditure, the economic back of the country is breaking; that it is this defence expenditure that has contributed largely to the run-away inflation to the astronomical rise in food prices; I am aware of all that. I am aware also that it is perhaps part of Chinese strategy deliberately to stampede us into undertaking impossible defence burdens so that we may falter on the economic front, because of that there may be shortages of food and run-away inflation and frustration creating all the conditions under which the communists in this country will thrive, create chaos and subversion.....

Shri Nambiar: Stock argument, repeated several times.

Shri Frank Anthony: But how true; they never lose their validity. That is shown by how sensitively my friend reacts to the truth.

Shri Nambiar: Communists do not want calamity to thrive; communists can thrive on their own.

Shri Frank Anthony: What then is the alternative? Do we sit back in the face of this real danger today and indulge, I regret to say, as we are indulging, in periodic exercises in futility, preaching philosophy, condemning these explosions, trying to persuade the other nations of the world not to join the nuclear club.

My hon. friend the Minister of External Affairs referred with great clang, probably justified, to all the principles for which he was not prepared to stigmatise *Panchsheel*. I use the word "stigmatise", because there is a certain stigma after the Chinese subscribed to it. Has he told us how many of those nationals gathered at the Cairo Conference, how many of them condemned the Chinese explosion? India, I think UAR and I think the President of Ghana; all the other so-called non-aligned nations—their silence was not only significant but it was eloquent. Which of the nations at the Cairo Conference condemned the Chinese explosion? To my way of thinking there were two reasons: the first is the psychological reason. I do not agree with Shri Masani; we know that it is the psychology of colour, that it is the resentment against the abrogation of superiority by the White nations which runs like the powerful motive through all their thinking and even their policy-making, and it is that psychology of colour which, in the first place, perhaps created a secret sense of satisfaction, psychological satisfaction, among the coloured nations of Asia, Africa and even of Latin America, that here was the answer of a coloured nation to the nuclear monopoly of the White nations. It was a psychological, secret satisfaction. The second reason was that these other nations, unlike us, are more practical; they realised the utter futility of philosophising in this nuclear age. I do not know, but I read the accounts in fairly well-informed journals, that even the UAR, with the help of Nazi scientists, are on the verge of exploding a nuclear device; they have already developed a bomb into which they can load radio-active cobalt. One of the things which I read recently was this; that West Germany has devised an absolutely revolutionary break-through for extracting the radium isotope. It means this: I believe it is so revolutionary that if it becomes general knowledge the smallest nations of the world will be able to produce

[Shri Frank Anthony]

sophisticated nuclear weapons at a comparatively negligible cost. In the face of this, does any responsible person believe that India's preaching or the preachings of other well-intentioned countries will prevent more and more nations from joining this nuclear club? France yesterday, China today, the UAR and Japan tomorrow, Ghana the day after tomorrow, and the feet-dragging, Ahimsa-preaching India, the day after day after tomorrow—much too late. That is what is going to happen tomorrow. Let us face the reality; because we refused to face the realities we went through the unmitigated humiliation of NEFA. And this time it would not be humiliation; it will be something that will defy description.

As I say, what do we do? What is the answer? The answer is not an easy one. It will mean for us an agonising reappraisal. I feel within the limits of my very limited knowledge that perhaps we should not enter the race for producing the atomic or a hydrogen bomb because of the cost and also because of the inability to deliver it. There is no point in having an atomic bomb or a hydrogen bomb; how will we deliver it? We have not got even subsonic-ilyushins. While our major cities are within easy range of the Tibetan bases, we have no planes to deliver anything to the Chinese industrial centres or the main cities. Because of that I feel that it would be unwise to enter the race for producing an atom bomb or a hydrogen bomb. There is this vague feeling, there is this assurance which is not expressed, that if the Chinese attack us the democracies will come to our aid. I hope so, but that may or may not happen.

So far as the deploying of nuclear weapons is concerned, my knowledge is this: that even the USA cannot go to the aid of a country unless it has treaty arrangements and that treaty has to be approved by the Senate or ratified by the Senate. There is no treaty arrangement. So, even if

China chooses to unload an atom bomb or a hydrogen bomb on us there is no guaranteeing in that even America would or could come to our help. The only answer to a massive attack is the answer which Mr. Masani referred to in his own way. When I was in London recently, I met some Members of the Labour Party who are now in the Government. They have always been, and quite rightly, against having their own independent nuclear deterrent. Even for Britain, a fairly wealthy country, they say, to have an independent nuclear deterrent, the cost of it would be crippling. So, they have decided that the only alternative is collective security. But for us, with all our distortions of non-alignment our pathological aversions and misinterpretations, collective security means the abandonment of sovereignty. 'We would rather remain defenceless than affirm our sovereignty by entering into some kind of collective security arrangement with other sovereign, equally independent countries. As if Britain is going to abandon its sovereignty by entering into an arrangement of collective security.'

Even assuming that we break way from the inhibitions of these *mantrams* of the past and we are prepared to enter into some system of collective security, my real fear is this that we will not address ourselves to the immediate need. The immediate need today in my humble thinking is that we must pursue from today, from tomorrow, the development of nuclear technology and know-how. Let us assume that the present leaders of China, for one reason or another, do not unload an atom bomb on us; they may be afraid that it will cause a world conflagration. But they are going ahead with preparing these conventional weapons with nuclear warheads. That is going to happen in the case of the next confrontation?

I am not prepared to agree with the romantic assessments made by the Members of the Government, such as

Mr. Chagla, that we can produce an atom bomb within a year, within a month or two I do not think we have the resources, apart from the treaty arrangements. I do not think under the treaty arrangements that we have with the Canadians in regard to the Tarapore and Ranapratapsagar, Nuclear Stations that we can use the nuclear power there for defence purposes. In any case, I do not think we would be able to produce more than two crude plutonium bombs in the next 18 months. I do not know what the cost is going to be. Nobody seems to be able to tell us. Let us assume that the cost of pursuing nuclear technology and know-how is going to be Rs. 200 to Rs. 300 crores. Immediately they would say, where do we find it? This is where I say there must be an integration—because ultimately the decisions will have to be political—there must be an integration between our foreign policy and our defence policy. There must be now an immediate radical rethinking of our defence planning. What is the point of spending Rs. 1000 crores? What is the point of having an army of 1 million men? What is the point of having 20 and 6 more ordnance factories? Can't we cut back our defence expenditure almost immediately Rs. 200 or Rs. 300 crores? Would it not be much more effective to have an army of half a million men equipped with the tremendous firepower that the nuclear weapons will give them; instead of uselessly expanding our army to a million men and having all these ordnance factories?

I know there will be resistance. In the first place, there will be resistance by vested interests, from our Generals. They may not want their army to be cut down. There will be resistance from certain regional, chauvinistic, provincial *satraps*. Maharashtra, with its tremendous history of tribalism, will not want their factories to go from Chanda and Ambagheri. The south may not want it the proposed factory not to

be established in Tiruchirapalli. It will have to be a political decision, a decision informed not only by vision, but a decision informed by courage. We will have now to rethink completely and replan our whole defence expenditure.

I will finish with this. I would congratulate the Prime Minister. I feel that better late than never, he has initiated a policy of friendship instead of this old attitude of living in a sort of grandiose isolation. That would not help us. We did not have any friends anywhere. When it came to the crunch, who were our friends? Did we have any friends, among the people around us, among any of the nations at the Cairo Conference? No. Fortunately today the Prime Minister has initiated a long-overdue policy of seeking friends. We can have them. There is Afghanistan. Our relations with Afghanistan are cordial. Let us strengthen them. I think our relations with Nepal have improved. I am also prepared humbly to endorse the Indo-Ceylon agreement provided Ceylon does not resile from certain obvious implications on that. Today, we cannot afford to go round continuing not having friends, continuing creating enemies on our borders.

Our major confrontation, our only confrontation, a confrontation which means life or death for this country, is China. And it is a confrontation which is going to remain with us almost permanently as long as China has her present leaders, committed avowedly to policies of political brigandage. Sir, may I say this to the hon. Minister for Foreign Affairs? Let us have closer ties with countries like Malaysia. Let us have closer ties with Japan. We know that Japan has tremendous industrial capacity and she has a tremendous military potential. I believe, working closely with these Asian neighbours, especially with Japan, we can contain this menace of Chinese neo-imperialism armed with this nuclear terror.

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : सभापति महोदय, मैं आप से पहली ब्रज तो यह

[डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया]

करूंगा कि अगर ऊपर अर्धवार वालों के लिए अनुवाद का इन्तजाम हो जाए, तो अच्छा हो, क्योंकि फिर इस से गलतफहमियां ज्यादा न हो पायेंगी।

एक माननीय सदस्य : वे समझ लेते हैं।

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : वे खुद चाहते हैं कि ऐसा हो।

मुझे हमेशा एक बात अखरती रही है कि दुनिया में हिन्दुस्तान की सरकार सब से कम इज्जत सरकार क्यों है। देश तो भूखा और रोगी है ही, लेकिन इस सरकार का शब्द दुनिया में कोई मूल्य नहीं रखता और शायद इधर दस पंद्रह बरस में दुनिया भर में ऐसी कोई सरकार नहीं रही है, जिस ने अपनी इतनी जमीन खोई, जितनी हिन्दुस्तान ने। इज्जत गई, जमीन गई, कोई चीज हाथ नहीं लगी, तो आखिर इस सब का कारण क्या है? और कबो कबो तो मुझे ऐसा लगता है कि हम लोग सरकार की टीका करते वक्त कोई जड़ की बात नहीं पकड़ पाते कि कहां पर खराबी है।

मेरी राय में सब से बड़ी खराबी यह है कि इस सरकार की घोषणाओं का कोई मूल्य ही नहीं रह गया है। जब यह कुछ कहती है, तो इस के दिमाग में भी शायद उत कहुने के लिए कोई आस्था या भक्ति नहीं रहती। विपरीत घोषणायें भी कर दिया करते हैं। जैसे चीन के मामले में इस सरकार की एक घोषणा यह है—और वह तो लोक-सभा का बहुत बड़ा संकल्प भी है—कि अपनी सब जमीन पाये बिना चीन से नहीं बैठेंगे। सरकार के मंत्री बार-बार कह भी दिया करते हैं कि बिना इज्जत के और बिना अपनी सरजमीं वापस पाए चीन से कोई समझौता नहीं होगा। एक तरफ यह घोषणा है और दूसरी तरफ जब कभी बचने की थोड़ी बहुत भी जरूरत होती है,

तो घोषणा हो जाती है कि शान्ति के लिए तो आखिर कुछ लेना-देना पड़ता ही है, समझौते में लेना-देना वाजिबी हो जाता है।

सब से पहले तो मैं कहना चाहता हूं कि चीन के साथ समझौते में लेना तो कोई होगा नहीं—लेने का सवाल ही नहीं उठता, देना ही होगा। लेकिन इस तरह की बात बोल कर के यह सरकार संसार भर में अपना वचन निल्लज बना देती है। कोई इस पर विश्वास नहीं करता। क्या लोक-सभा के उस संकल्प का कोई मतलब है कि हिन्दुस्तान की पूरी जमीन वापस लिए बिना हिन्दुस्तानी चुप नहीं बैठेंगे? अगर उस का मतलब नहीं रह जाता है, तो कोई देश क्यों विश्वास करेगा हिन्दुस्तान पर, उस की किसी घोषणा पर?

न सिर्फ बाकी दुनिया के लोग हिन्दुस्तान पर विश्वास खो चुके हैं, लेकिन खुद हिन्दुस्तानी दिमाग सरकार के कारनामों के कारण बेईमान बनता चला जा रहा है। इस दिमाग के अन्दर विपरीत घोषणायें रखी हुई हैं। अगर मान लो, कभी कोई ऐसी जरूरत पड़ जाये कि समझौता करना हो, तो झट से कह देंगे कि हम ने समझौते की बात कही थी और अगर लड़ना पड़ जाये, तो झट से कह देंगे कि हम ने इज्जत की बात कही थी। इन विपरीत घोषणाओं के दिमाग में रहने के कारण दिमाग बेईमान बन गया है।

इसलिए मैं समझता हूं कि जो बुनियादी रोग इस देश और इस सरकार को लगा है, वह यह है कि इस की घोषणाओं का कोई मूल्य नहीं है, इस की जीभ का कोई मूल्य नहीं है, इस पर कोई विश्वास नहीं करता, यहां की जनता इस की बातों पर कोई आस्था नहीं रखती। आप जानते हैं

कि दो जीभ वाला जानवर कितना खतरनाक हुआ करता है। सारा संसार उस से डरता है। न सिर्फ संसार के लोग उस पर विश्वास नहीं करते, बल्कि सब कोई उस पर डंडा या बरछा लिए हुए खड़े रहते हैं कि किसी तरह इस का मुंह कुचल दिया जाये। यह मैं आप को हिन्दुस्तान की विदेशनीति का सब से पहला, बड़ा और बुनियादी रोग बता रहा हूँ।

अगर आप जरा अपने पड़ोसियों की तरफ देखेंगे, तो यह साफ़ जाहिर हो जायेगा। नेपाल, भूटान, सिक्किम, ये जितने भी इलाके हैं, ये हमारे देश के या अंग हैं या पड़ोसी हैं। इस वक्त मैं इस प्रश्न में नहीं जाता हूँ कि कौन स्वतंत्र है और कौन परतंत्र है, क्योंकि यह बहुत छोटा सवाल है। वहाँ पर सारी जनता के मन में हिन्दुस्तान के प्रति न तो कोई आदर्श का विचार है, न कोई और विचार है, न कहीं कोई और स्वार्थ है। उन को खाली एक ही लालच है कि किसी तरह से हिन्दुस्तान से पैसा बसूलो। मैंने यहां तक सुना है कि भूटान की एक लोक सभा जैसी बना दी गई है और वहाँ पर एक साहब हैं, जिन का नाम है शेरीन दोरजी, जोकि राजा के सम्बन्धी हैं। उन का पेशा ही यह हो गया है कि हिन्दुस्तान को एक दो गाली और दे दो, तो हिन्दुस्तान से कुछ और ज्यादा पैसा मिल जायेगा यहां के काम-काज के लिए, यहां का सब काम-काज चलाने के लिए। यह सरकार चाहती है कि पैसे के आधार पर अपने ही अंगों को या अपने पड़ोसियों को खरीद लिया जाये—आदर्श के आधार पर नहीं, या किसी विचार के आधार पर नहीं। सच पूछिए, तो खुद हमारे हिन्दुस्तान का जो सीमान्त अंग है, अगर उस के ऊपर किये जाने वाले खर्च को देखें, तो ताज्जुब होता है कि कितना खर्च किया जाता है काश्मीर पर, सिक्किम पर और उर्वशीयम् पर। नागा प्रदेश की बात तो मैं नहीं करता। हो सकता है कि इस में कुछ खर्चा पलटनी होता है, लेकिन

काफ़ी खर्चा वहाँ जनता को खरीदने के लिए होता है।

मैं बार-बार यह कहना चाहूंगा कि यह सरकार आदर्श-विहीन, आदर्श-शून्य हो चुकी है और उस का सब से बड़ा प्रमाण अभी मुझे मिला कुछ ही दिनों पहले कि अक्सार्ड सड़क के बारे में लगातार इस सरकार ने झूठ बोल कर हिन्दुस्तान की जनता को संतोष दिलाना चाहा। अक्सार्ड सड़क के एक एक गज के बनते वक्त इस सरकार को पूरा पता था कि वह सड़क बन रही है। मैं इतना ही चाहूंगा कि गंगटोक में हिन्दुस्तान की सरकार का जो प्रतिनिधि था, उस ने 1951, 1952, 1953 और 1954 में जो रिपोर्टें भेजीं, वे छाप दी जायें। उन रिपोर्टों से साफ़ पता चल जायेगा कि सरकार को सब कुछ पता था। जब इन रिपोर्टों के बावजूद यह सरकार कहती है कि उसे पता नहीं था, चीन ने उसे धोखा दिया, तो सारी दुनिया कहती है कि यह सरकार तो बिल्कुल झूठ बोल रही है, इस के बाद उस पर क्या भरोसा किया जाये।

इसीलिए मैं आप से कहना चाहूंगा कि चीनी बम पर जितनी भी बहस हो रही है, वह कुछ बेमतलब सी हो जाती है। मैं ने यहां पर बहुत कुछ खर्च के बारे में सुना। कोई तीस लाख कहता है, कोई चालीस करोड़ कहता है। जो मैं ने थोड़ा बहुत सुना है और जो अणु बम के कारखाने को दूर से मैंने एक बार देखा था, उस से मुझे याद पड़ता है कि अमरीका के अणु बम के कारखाने पर चौदह अरब रुपये की पूंजी खर्च हुई थी। यह कीई मजाक है? यह तो ऐसा ही है कि कह दें कि एक मोटर-गाड़ी पंद्रह हजार रुपये में मिल सकती है। हां, एक मोटर-गाड़ी पंद्रह हजार रुपये में मिल सकती है, लेकिन मोटर-गाड़ी के कारखाने पर पचास, साठ या सत्तर करोड़ रुपया खर्च हुआ करता है। आज-कल अणु बम को ले कर जितनी भी बहस हो रही है, मैं समझता हूँ कि वह बहुत

[डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया]

ही नाकाफ्री है, धोखा देने वाली है, झूठी है। असल में बताया जाये कि अणु बम को बनाने के लिए खर्चा कितना होता है। उस के अलावा यह भी बताया जाये कि जो मशीन, कल-पुञ्जे उद्योगीकरण हैं, क्या हिन्दुस्तान अठारह महीने छोड़ दो, अठारह बरस में भी उन को बना सकता है। आखिर भूल नहीं जाना चाहिये कि यह वही हिन्दुस्तान है, जिस ने सूरज का चूल्हा बनाने के लिए चार बरस का वक्त खराब किया और बाद में वह नहीं बन पाया। यहां के वैज्ञानिक कोई चीज अच्छी तरह से नहीं किया करते हैं। सूरज की किरणों में से कुछ उन्हें तत्व निकालना चाहिये था उन्होंने गर्मी में से निकालना शुरू कर दिया और इस कारण से सारी दुनिया के वैज्ञानिक हिन्दुस्तान के वैज्ञानिकों पर हंस रहे हैं। अगर इनको कुछ करना था तो सूरज की किरणों से न कि सूरज की गर्मी से। सूरज की गर्मी में कुछ नहीं है। जब विज्ञान की, औद्योगीकरण की और सब की ऐसी हालत है तो अणु बम की ऐसी चर्चा बेमतलब हो जाया करती है। असल में चर्चा कुछ और होनी चाहिये।

कहां दुश्मन है हिन्दुस्तान का औद्योगीकरण? कहां है हमारी संकल्प शक्ति? हमारी जमीन इतनी छिन गई लेकिन अभी तक भी हिन्दुस्तान की सरकार का दिल मजबूत नहीं हो पाया है, उस में संकल्प की मजबूती नहीं आ पाई है। पूरा दलदल पड़ा हुआ है। कहां हम कह रहे हैं कि हम चीन के साथ कोई सम्बन्ध नहीं रखना चाहते। चीन ने हमारे देश के हिस्से को हड़प लिया है। मैं नहीं कहता हूँ कि चीन पर आप हमला कर दो। वह बेवकूफी होगी इस वक्त के हालात में। जब आपने सतरह बरस में हिन्दुस्तान को नपुंसक बना कर रख दिया है तो कोई आदमी यह कहे कि चीन पर हमला कर दो तो वह पागलपन होगा। इतना जबर्दस्त हमला होने के बाद और हमारी जमीन हम से छिन जाने

के बाद हम लोग जिस शान्ति के साथ बैठे हुए हैं, चीन के साथ जितने भी सम्बन्ध रखे हुए हैं और चीन की पैरवी करते रहते हैं संयुक्त राष्ट्र में, उससे मुझे कहना पड़ता है कि अणु बम क्या खाक, पत्थर आप बनायेंगे और अगर अणु बम बना भी दिया तो चीन वाला इधर उधर से प्रेम या डंडे की बात जरा हिला देगा तो अणु बम भी उनको सौंप दिया करोगे। संकल्प शक्ति सब से बड़ी चीज है, मन की शक्ति सब से बड़ी चीज है। चीन के साथ किसी तरह का सम्बन्ध नहीं रहना चाहिये। चीन की पैरवी बन्द हो जानी चाहिये जो संयुक्त राष्ट्र में आप किया करते हैं। चीन को भी समझना चाहिये कि इस आधुनिक युग का वह राक्षस बन गया है। जिस तरह से आज से बीस तीस बरस पहले उस संसार का राक्षस हितलर और जर्मनी बन गया था, उसी तरह से आज इस संसार का कोई राक्षस है तो वह चीन बन गया है। उस राक्षस के स्वरूप को आपको समझना चाहिये। राक्षस कुछ सफेद होता है, कुछ काला होता है। हमारी बदनसीबी है कि इस राक्षस का हम को काला स्वरूप ही देखने को मिला है। लेकिन जब हम उसके काले स्वरूप को देखें तो हमें भूल नहीं जाना चाहिये कि इसका वह सफेद स्वरूप भी है जिस का अभी एंथनी साहब ने जिक्र किया है, जिसको उन्होंने अभी आपके सामने रखा है। हम भूल जाया करते हैं समझने में कि चीन आज दो अरब रंगीन लोगों का प्रवक्ता बन गया है। एक अरब सफेद मुंह वालों के खिलाफ। हिन्दुस्तान ने अब तक इस चीज को समझा नहीं है या समझ लिया है तो उसके पास कोई तरीका नहीं है, कोई आदर्श नहीं है। सरकार नहीं जानती है कि आज की दुनिया कैसी है। अगर सरकार को चीन का मुकाबला करना है तो वह ट्रांसमिटर इधर उधर प्रचार या ऐसी बेंसी छोटी सी चीजों से नहीं हो सकता है। जड़ को पकड़ना पड़ेगा आपको। आज की दुनिया में जितना माल एक हिन्दुस्तानी

एक घंटे में पैदा करता है, उतना माल चीनी 40 मिनट में पैदा करता है, रूसी 7 मिनट में और अमरीकी केवल 3 मिनट में पैदा कर लेता है। यह उत्पत्ति की साम्राज्यशाही संसार के सामने है। जब तक उत्पत्ति की साम्राज्यशाही को ले कर हिन्दुस्तान की विदेश नीति कोई चिन्त और कोई उपाय नहीं रखती है, तब तक चीन से वह कभी भी अफ्रीका और एशिया और दक्षिण अमरीका के इलाकों में मुकाबला नहीं कर सकेगी। इस राक्षस के इस उजले स्वरूप को हमें जानना चाहिये। मैं कहा करता हूँ पिछली दुनिया के स्वरूप को बताते हुए, हिटलर को बताते हुए कि अगर हिन्दुस्तान ने आजादी पाई है तो किन दो व्यक्तियों के कारण। एक व्यक्ति अच्छा था, अच्छा आदमी वह था और दूसरा व्यक्ति बुरा आदमी था। लेकिन इससे इन्कार नहीं किया जा सकता कि उस समय की दुनिया में इस एक अच्छे ने और एक बुरे ने मिल करके इतनी उथलपुथल पैदा कर दी कि पुराना ढांचा खत्म हुआ और नया ढांचा आया : उसी तरह से आज चीन बुरा होते हुए, उसके नेता बुरे होते हुए भी, उसके नेताओं और उसकी सरकार ने हमारे देश के ऊपर हमला कर देने के बाद भी आज मौजूदा दुनिया के ढांचे को उथलना पुथलना शुरू किया है, उसे हमें समझना चाहिये। अगर हम चीन का मुकाबला करना चाहते हैं तो फिर इस उत्पत्ति की साम्राज्यशाही के खिलाफ हमें उठना है।

इसके अलावा और भी बातें हैं। लोग जमींदारी की बात करते हैं। दुनिया भर में जमींदारी है। आज कुछ इलाके हैं गोरों के, जैसे साईबेरिया है, कैलिफोर्निया है। इन इलाकों में एक मील के ऊपर मुश्किल से एक आदमी दो आदमी पांच आदमी, दस आदमी रहते हैं और हिन्दुस्तान जैसे इलाके में एक मील के ऊपर तीन सौ, चार सौ, पांच सौ आदमी रहते हैं। अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय जमींदारी के बारे में भी कोई न कोई बात हिन्दुस्तान को रखनी और निकालनी पड़ेगी। यह तो मैंने सिलसिले के तौर पर कह दिया है। लेकिन अगर हम को चीन का मुकाबला करना

है तो इन सब बातों पर ध्यान देना होगा।

अणुबम बनाना, न बनाना एक गौण बात है। जब मीका आएगा, तब फंसला हों जाएगा। अभी तो खाली यह है कि क्या अणुबम बनाने के लिए जो दो चीजें जरूरी हैं, वे क्या हिन्दुस्तान की सरकार के पास हैं। एक चीज है यह कि हिन्दुस्तान का औद्योगिककरण काफी होना चाहिये। आज के औद्योगिककरण को देखते हुए हिन्दुस्तान 18 महीने में तो क्या 18 बरस में भी अणुबम नहीं बना सकता है और दूसरी चीज है, मन की शक्ति, संकल्प-शक्ति जो आज हिन्दुस्तान की सरकार में बिल्कुल नदारद है। हिन्दुस्तान की सरकार दल दल बन गई है, उसमें कोई खूटा नहीं रह गया है। ये दो चीजें हैं जो हमारे सामने आनी चाहियें।

औद्योगिककरण कहाँ है? मैंने अक्सर सवाल उठाया है कि सरकारी मंत्री कोई भी यह तो बताये कि हिन्दुस्तान पिछले 14-15 बरस में आज की दुनिया में औद्योगिककरण के हिसाब से कितने नम्बर पर है। जब अंग्रेज यहां थे, हम को लूट रहे थे, चूस रहे थे, तब हिन्दुस्तान का नम्बर दुनिया में आठवां था। आज 17 बरस की मेहनत के बाद इतने कहने के मुताबिक लगातार उन्नति के बाद भी, दुनिया में हिन्दुस्तान का स्तर कौन सा है, किस नम्बर पर वह आता है, इस पर गौर किया जाए। इसको मैं खुद नहीं बताऊंगा। मैं यह चुनौती इस सरकार के सामने हमेशा के लिए रख देता हूँ कि क्या कभी यह बतायेगी कि 17 बरस की आपकी पसीने वाली मेहनत के बाद हिन्दुस्तान की दुनिया में औद्योगिक स्तर कौन सा है। मैं कह दूँ कि 17 बरस पहले वह आठवां था जबकि अंग्रेज हमें लूट रहे थे। अब कितना है? अजीब हालत होती है जब अणुबम की बात कही जाती है। तब कहते हैं कि हम तो अहिंसा के पथ पर हैं, हम तो देश का औद्योगिककरण कर रहे हैं, जनता को उठाने की कोशिश कर रहे हैं। जब जनता को उठाने की बात होती है तब कह देते हैं कि क्या करें, हमारे ऊपर लगातार हमले होते हैं, इसलिए हमारा सारा पंसा

[डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया]

रण नीति में और रक्षा करने में खर्च हो जाता है। ऐसी बातों के सबब से ही हिन्दुस्तान का मन बिल्कुल बन नहीं पा रहा है। मन हमारा कहीं टिकना चाहिये।

विदेश मंत्री के भाषण को मैंने सुना है, प्रधान मंत्री के भाषणों को भी मैं सुनता रहा हूँ। इनके भाषण में कहीं कोई एक हरफ भी ऐसा नहीं था, अक्षर तक नहीं था, वर्ण-माला का कोई अक्षर ऐसा नहीं था जिससे दिल और दिमाग को कहीं कोई उठान मिले। खाली ऐसा मालूम होता था जैसे कोई स्कूल का विद्यार्थी—वह भी कालेज वाला नहीं—स्कूल वाला विद्यार्थी कुछ चीजों को गिनता चला जा रहा हो। कुछ इधर उधर का विश्लेषण कर रहा हो। उस में कोई सृजनात्मक चीज नहीं थी, कोई उठाने वाली, निर्माण करने वाली, नई दिशा में जाने वाली चीज नहीं थी। मुझे तो बड़ा आश्चर्य हुआ जब प्रधान मंत्री ने बड़े ताव से अणु बम के बारे में कहा कि सरकार नीति बनाया करती है। सरकार क्या नीति बनायेगी? यह सरकार इस लायक नहीं रह गई है कि नीति बनाये। इसकी घोषणाओं का कोई मूल्य नहीं रह गया है। जब यह बात करती है तो बिल्कुल उलटी सीधी, ऐसी जिसका वस्तुस्थिति से कोई सम्बन्ध नहीं रहा करता है, जिस का कोई तात्पर्य नहीं हुआ करता है। आप अच्छी तरह से जानते हैं कि इस सरकार ने एक तरफ तो समाजवाद की, सामाजिक न्याय की घोषणा कर रखी है, और दूसरी तरफ मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि आज दुनिया भर के लोग हिन्दुस्तान भर के लोग जानते हैं सरकार के जो बड़े मंत्री हैं,—छोटे मंत्रियों की मैं इस वक्त बात नहीं करना चाहता—उन में से एक भी ऐसा नहीं है जिस ने इन घोषणाओं के विपरीत काम न किया हो। जब ऐसी हालत रहती है तो इन घोषणाओं का क्या मतलब रह जाता है।

इसी तरह से थोड़ा सा मैं रूस के बारे में कह देना चाहता हूँ। इसके बारे में बहुत

कुछ कहा गया है। वहाँ पर जो परिवर्तन हुए हैं, उनके बारे में बहुत कुछ कहा गया है और यह भी कहा गया है कि उनके कारण हिन्दुस्तान के प्रति रूसी नीति में कोई तबदीली नहीं होगी। मैं यह जानना चाहता हूँ कि क्या रूस के कभी किसी मंत्री ने कोई बयान किसी ठोस मामले में दिया है, काश्मीर के मामले में दिया है, चीन के मामले में दिया है या मदद के मामले में दिया है? वैसे बयान जैसे वे दिया करते हैं, वैसे मदद जैसी वे दिया करते हैं, उसका कोई मतलब नहीं रह जाता है उस मदद का मैं देख चुका हूँ। रूस और अमरीका दोनों की मदद को मैं देख चुका हूँ। रूस वाले मिग हवाई जहाज बना रहे हैं। पिछले दो तीन बरस से कुछ नहीं बन पाया है यहाँ पर जब चह्माण साहब से पूछा जाता है तो वह इधर उधर का जवाब दे दिया करते हैं। रूस और अमरीका में मदद के मामले में कोई होड़ नहीं है। मैं होड़ देखना चाहता हूँ दोनों देशों में। कोई मदद नहीं मिल रही है, न रूस और न अमरीका से।

एक और बुनियादी बात मैं आपके सामने रखना चाहता हूँ। यह क्रान्तिकारी देश है, आप कहते हैं कि आपकी सरकार क्रान्तिकारी सरकार है। मुझे इस मामले में भी रूस और अमरीका का नमूना आपके सामने रखना पड़ रहा है क्योंकि हिन्दुस्तान आज इतना मशहूर नहीं है अपने किसी भी गुण के लिए।

17 hrs.

[MR. SPEAKER in the Chair]

अब क्रान्तिकारिता का आप नमूना देखिये। ये सरकारी लोग पिछले 17 बरस से घर में रहे हैं अमरीकी, बाहर रहे हैं रूसी, घर में अमरीकी, बाहर रूसी। अमरीकी आधुनिकता की नकल इन्होंने हिन्दुस्तान की खेती, कारखानों के ढांचे आदि में करनी चाही है। अमरीकी खपत। तो घर के अन्दर अमरीकी नकल और बाहर रूस के साथ रहने की कोशिश। सोचा कि शायद रूस के साथ सम्पर्क हो जाने से, उस के छू देने से कुछ क्रान्तिकारिता आ जायेगी। मैंने

इसे पहले भी सम्पर्क या स्पर्ष क्रान्तिकारिता कहा था । जब आदमी में असल में क्रान्तिकारिता नहीं रहती है तो किसी दूसरे क्रान्तिकारी को, जिसे वह क्रान्तिकारी समझता है, छू देने से समझता है कि उस के गुण मेरे अन्दर चले आयेंगे, जिस तरह से किसी पुराने जमाने में शिव महाराज के लिए को छू देने से हिन्दू सोचते थे कि उन के कुछ गुण मेरे अन्दर आ जायेंगे । यह स्पर्ष क्रान्तिकारिता सरकार की रही है । पिछले सत्तरह वर्षों से, मैं यह आरोप लगाना चाहता हूँ, यह सरकार बिल्कुल क्रान्तिकारी नहीं रही है, यह सरकार दलदल में फंसी रही है, उस ने देश को कतई नहीं उठाया है क्योंकि घर के अन्दर वह अमरीकी और बाहर रूसी रही है । अगर क्रान्तिकारी बनना है देशी मामले में और परदेशी मामले में, तो मैं कहना चाहता हूँ, हमें घर के अन्दर रूसी बनना पड़ेगा और बाहर अमरीकी बनना पड़ेगा । हम अपने बेटी कारखानों के ढाँचे को बदलें और जो खर्च बड़े लोगों की विलासिता और ऐयाशी में हो जाता है उस पर रोक लगा कर पूँजी जमा करें और अपने कारखानों को चलायें, औद्योगीकरण को चलायें । घर के अन्दर हम रूसी क्रान्तिकारिता अपनायें । जब मैं यह शब्द इस्तेमाल करता हूँ तो मेरा यह मतलब नहीं कि हम आतंक का रास्ता इस्तेमाल करें, लोगों को मारें पीटें, धमकायें, उन की जानें ले लें, वह हिस्सा जो रूस ने किया उस को मैं अलग करता हूँ, लेकिन रूस के अन्दर जो आर्थिक क्रान्तिकारिता आई, जिस क्रान्तिकारिता को शायद उस ने गलत रास्ते पर ले जाना चाहा, उस को छोड़ कर, हमें आर्थिक क्रान्ति अपने देश में लानी पड़ेगी, और विदेशी मामलों में हम को ज्यादातर अमरीका के साथ जाना पड़ेगा, क्योंकि चीन है आधुनिक युग का राक्षस, और मैं जानता हूँ कि जितने भी और देश हैं, उन की नीतियों में कुछ अस्थिरता है, कुछ हीलडोल है, वह कुछ उधर उधर हो जायेंगे, लेकिन जहाँ तक

अमरीका का मामला है, विदेशी नीति के मामले में उस को जनतंत्र का थोड़ा बहुत आधार रखना ही पड़ेगा । इसलिए ही सकता है कि अमरीका की बहुत सी बातों को मैं पसन्द नहीं करता, अगर मेरे हाथ में कुछ भी हो तो मैं विदेशी नीति को ऐस चलाना चाहूँगा कि शायद अगर आप अल्जीरिया के मामले को लें या समझ लें कि क्यूबा के मामले में, मैं अमरीका की मुखालिफत न करूँ, मैं चुप रह जाऊँगा, लेकिन अमरीका का साथ हंगिज नहीं दूँगा । जब मैं कहता हूँ कि अमरीका के साथ अपनी विदेश नीति को थोड़े बहुत जोड़ने की कोशिश करनी चाहिये तो मेरा यह मतलब नहीं है कि अमरीका की सब बातों में मैं हाँ कर दूँ, मैं उस का हिमायती बन जाऊँ, बल्कि सिर्फ इतना कि हम को हिन्दुस्तान के अपने हितों की रक्षा करने के लिए और सारे संसार में जनतंत्र वगैरह और शान्ति की रक्षा करने के लिए बाहर के मामलों में ज्यादातर अमरीकी सरकार का साथ देना पड़ेगा और भीतर अपने कारखानों वगैरह में नये नये ढाँचे में हम को रूसी तत्व ज्यादा इस्तेमाल करना पड़ेगा । अगर इस क्रान्तिकारिता को हम अपनाते हैं तो शायद अपनी विदेश नीति को हम कुछ सुधार पायेंगे ।

अध्यक्ष महोदय, असल में जब आप नहीं आये थे तब मैं यह अर्ज कर रहा था कि किस तरह से यह सरकार किसी भी आदर्श के मामले में बिल्कुल निकम्मी हो चुकी है क्योंकि उन की घोषणाओं का कोई मतलब नहीं रह गया है । संसार के लोग उन पर विश्वास करते ही नहीं हैं । उस की घोषणाओं में और उस की कृति में अन्तर हो गया है । इसी चीज को मैं ने अलग अलग मिसालें दे कर यहाँ रखने की कोशिश की है । जब तक इस हिन्दुस्तान की सरकार को विदेश नीति के आदर्श का कोई पाया नहीं मिलता है तब तक आप की यह विदेश नीति चल नहीं पायेगी । मिसाल के लिये मैं कहूँ

[डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया]

कि जब माननीय विदेश मंत्री काहिरा जा रहे थे तो मैं ने उन से अर्ज किया था कि वह दक्षिण अफ्रीका के मामले को काहिरा में जरूर उठाने की कोशिश करें। तब उन्होंने ने कहा कि वह उग्र रूप से उठाने की कोशिश करेंगे। यह सही है कि वहां दक्षिण अफ्रीका का जिक्र आया है, लेकिन वह जिक्र तो हर हालत में आ ही जाता। अगर हिन्दुस्तान की सरकार ने काहिरा सम्मेलन में दक्षिण अफ्रीका के मामले को उग्र रूप से उठाया होता तब पता चलता कि चीन के मुकाबले में यह भी कोई सरकार सामने आई है।

इसी तरह से अगर विदेश नीति के मामले में हिन्दुस्तान की सरकार अगुआई नहीं करती, खाली कह देती है कि लोग अणु बम वगैरह फोड़ने के बारे कोशिश करें कि वह बन्द कर दिये जायें या हम शान्ति करवाने की कोशिश करें, तो मैं अर्ज करूंगा कि शान्ति इस तरह से नहीं हुआ करती। घोषणा आप दे दिया करते हैं कि हम एकतरफा निरस्त्रीकरण करेंगे, दूसरी तरफ आप घोषणा दे देते हैं कि हम सम्पूर्ण निरस्त्रीकरण करेंगे, तीसरी तरफ आप घोषणा दे देते हैं कि हम सब तरह के हथियार इकट्ठा करेंगे, जैसेकि ऐसे हवाई जहाज जो आवाज से भी तेज चलते हैं, इस तरह की विपरीत घोषणाओं का नतीजा यह होता है कि हिन्दुस्तान की सरकार का दिमाग और हिन्दुस्तान की जनता का दिमाग बेईमान बनता चला जा रहा है। इस में कोई टोक नहीं है, दलदल में कोई खूँटा नहीं है। जब तक यह चलता रहेगा तब तक हम बेकार यह बहस चलाते रहेंगे, यह शायद यहां पर तीसरी या चौथी बहस है, इस का कोई नतीजा नहीं निकलता, किसी नीति में परिवर्तन नहीं होता, कोई अच्छी चीज सामने नहीं आती।

सरकार कह दिया करती है कि नेपाल

का रिश्ता हमारे साथ सुधर रहा है। मेरे पास आदमी आये हैं, उन्होंने बतलाया कि नेपाल की सड़कों के ऊपर पानी के नल पड़े हुए हैं पिछले दो सालों से। उन के ऊपर लिखा है "आई० ए० एम०" यानी "इंडियन एड मिशन" और वह दो साल से पड़े हुए हैं। काठमांडू की सारी जनता कह रही है कि देखो यह हिन्दुस्तान की सरकार काठमांडू को पानी पिलाना चाहती थी, वह पानी भी नहीं पिला पाई। जहां भी आप चले जायें वहां हिन्दुस्तान की सरकार की इज्जत खत्म होती चली जा रही है।

Mr. Speaker: If hon. Members agree, we might sit half an hour more because we took half an hour in the morning for miscellaneous work, so that 10 hours might be available by tomorrow evening.

An hon. Member: No.

Some hon. Members: One hour.

Mr. Speaker: All right.

Shri Namblar: Then we should not have the same fate as the other day when the Food Corporations Bill could not be proceeded with for want of quorum.

Mr. Speaker: If that happens, then Members shall not have the right to ask for extension of time.

Shri Shinkre: It happened the day before yesterday.

Mr. Speaker: I remember it.

Shri Vidya Charan Shukla (Mahasamund): I would come straightway to the most glaring problem in international developments we are facing today. The Chinese nuclear explosion definitely took us by surprise. But the nation did not expect that the Government would act or react to it in such a hurry and in such unthoughtful manner.

When the news was broken, the matter was raised in the House. As is well known, the Home Minister and no other Minister of Government were ready with any information or reaction. But suddenly we were surprised that the Prime Minister began to say practically at every meeting he addressed after the Chinese nuclear explosion that we shall never make the bomb, we will never make it. This seemed to be a reaction of injured martyrdom, a feeling, an attempt to rouse the pity of the world on us, that in spite of our mortal enemy China making a bomb and exploding it, still we are so peaceful and so peace-loving that, in spite of that mortal danger, we shall never attempt to make a bomb like that.

This is surprising. I would submit very humbly that the Government should give a little consideration of this matter. Let them think deeply and deliberately about it; let weeks, months pass. Then let them come out with a well-considered opinion. They should not react in a huff to this most important problem we are faced with in a century.

We read the other day that Indonesia announced that they are going to have a nuclear weapon of their own next year. It is not surprising because I believe that the Chinese bomb will circulate; it will not only circulate in the smaller countries of Asia, but it will encircle us. Today it is Indonesia, tomorrow it may be Burma, the day after it may be Pakistan. What is the considered opinion of the Government in case Pakistan also gets this nuclear device in the coming three or four years? What are we going to do? Are we going to sit on our haunches and just pray to God that they may never use it on us? After all, this is a well-considered scientific opinion that within the next ten years it will be possible even for small nations to possess this bomb, and once it is possessed by the smaller powers, it will become inevitable for us, sooner or later, to go in for it.

We have been claiming, and there is a resolution of this House, that we shall take the territory that has been forcibly occupied by China. Can we conceive of an armed action against China without our having equal nuclear power to take back our territory? Can we march our forces on Aksai-chin or NEFA, whatever small area of it has been left out,—our armed forces are not there, although the Chinese have vacated it—or can we ever violate the terms of the unilateral cease-fire that the Chinese have imposed on us without possessing equal force, equal armed strength? The whole resolution of this House, and all the resolutions made in the country, will be a mockery unless we have the forces to implement them, and I believe with the rest of the House, and with the rest of the country I dare say, that unless we have the wherewithal of implementing what we say, we will be making fools of ourselves, and nothing else, in our own eyes as well as in the eyes of the world.

As was mentioned a little earlier there is an article in the Test Ban Treaty that by giving three months notice, we can withdraw our signature from it. We can do so in order to preserve our sovereignty and the integrity of our territory. There is nothing that debars us from doing so, and I really wonder why this Government is only harping on purely ideological propositions which have no relevance to the realities of today. I am quite sure that if the late Prime Minister was alive today, this kind of hurried declaration of our resolution not to make the atomic bomb would not have been made like this. He would have thought about it, there would have been a lot of consultations at the technical and the political level, and then only a decision would have been taken.

I asked a question of the Prime Minister today, and he told me in answer that the Cabinet of the Indian Government has not yet taken a decision whether to make the bomb or not. I wonder why the Prime Minis-

[Shri Vidya Charan Shukla]

ter, without taking a Cabinet decision, has taken upon himself to declare in India and abroad that India shall never manufacture an atomic bomb.

The entire context of our defence strategy and our foreign diplomacy has changed, with the Chinese nation becoming a nuclear power. One of the corner stones of our foreign policy is non-alignment. Does the Government seriously believe that we can remain non-aligned in the face of the Chinese atomic bomb? It will be stupid to my mind to assume that China and Russia will always be at loggerheads. Sooner or later, being communist powers, they are going to become friends at least in international strategy and international diplomacy; if not today, after two years; if not after two years, after five years; and if the Chinese and Russians are even basically friendly, then in case there is any threat from China, any menace from China, wittingly or unwittingly we will have to depend on the deterrent nuclear power of the Western countries. And this unconsciously will drive us to align ourselves, whether we call it non-alignment or anything else; for all practical purposes we shall be aligned with the Western powers, and that will be a very sad day for us, because the political and the diplomatic independence in international affairs that we have been preserving for us in a very cherished manner will be lost by this unthoughtful decision of not making a bomb of our own for ourselves.

It is also true that we are wedded to the policy of peace. But there must be some means of preserving peace. If this argument is carried to its logical conclusion, it may mean that our Army comes in the way of maintaining peace.

श्री बड़े : शान्ति और शक्ति साथ साथ जाती है ।

Shri Vidya Charan Shukla: Army is only for defensive purposes; it is a

deterrent. Still if the Army is coming in the way of maintaining peace, if there are border clashes and things like that, are we going to get rid of our Army also? I feel that no serious attention has been given to this problem by the Government; they are trying to maintain an old policy in radically changed circumstances.

Possession of nuclear weapon by China will also drastically affect our relations with the neighbours and South-east Asian countries; not only will our neighbours not agree to what we stand for but they will also go into the military influence of the Chinese Republic. This is as plain as the Sun and does not require any logic or argument. The smaller neighbours that surround us will definitely look to the stronger party and not to the weakening.

Mr. Bhabha the Chairman of our Atomic Energy Commission must be congratulated for the very outspoken manner in which he put the entire problem before the country; he has given a completely new twist to the whole thing. There have been very uncharitable criticism against him although he did not put the matter in a political level; he mentioned it scientifically and economically as to what the matter was as far as the production of the atomic bomb was concerned. I suggest that the Government must immediately take steps to constitute a high level committee of scientists as well as political leaders to consider the whole question in a dispassionate and detached manner and consider that report. This can be done in a month; it need not take six months or a year.

The second point I would refer to is the role of civil servants in our diplomacy. The running civil servants in the EA Ministry have most of the time brought a bad name to our diplomacy. I am afraid that the things that began in 1950-51 with the resolution of the Security Council on Kash-

mir are still continuing. The latest example is the conduct of the civil servants in the Cairo Conference. I concede that the civil servants are very competent, very able and very experienced and all that; still they do not have the political background that is necessary to give the national content to their approach to international problems. We made ourselves extremely unpopular in the African circles by remaining neutral on whether Mr. Tsombe should be allowed to participate in the conference or not. It might have been legally correct to remain neutral about it. Was it politically correct? A political decision could not be taken because the Foreign Minister was busy in a dinner and the Prime Minister was busy elsewhere and one of the civilians had to represent our country in the committee which was considering this matter and he could not get into contact either with the Foreign Minister or the Prime Minister for instructions. So, he took his own decision to remain neutral in the matter. The same thing has been felt about these people in the UN delegations, who go there as representatives of the people of this country. The role of civil servants in diplomacy has to be reduced to an appreciable extent. I am glad that our Prime Minister made this declaration a few months back, immediately after he took over as Prime Minister and I hope he will implement it sooner or later.

I should like to say a few words about Nagaland and then conclude. It is really unfortunate that the State of Nagaland has to be considered in the External Affairs debate. It not only gives the edge to the demand of the Nagas for complete independence but it also creates a tremendous amount of confusion in the world circles about this problem of Nagaland.

Shri Swaran Singh: Anyway, we need not consider them because we are considering the international situation; we are not considering the Ministry's demands or any such thing.

Shri Vidya Charan Shukla: This has been mentioned and no objection was taken.

Shri Swaran Singh: I have not said a word about Nagaland in my speech.

Shri Vidya Charan Shukla: What I say is, the Government must take it out of the purview of the External Affairs Ministry and put it under the Home Ministry.

Another point is about the Commonwealth. We have been very shabbily treated by the British Government. The latest example is our international flight on Air India from Delhi to London via Moscow. Whereas the British Government allowed the Pakistan International Airways to pick up passengers from Moscow and carry them to London, the British Government did not allow Air India to pick up any passengers from Moscow and carry them to London. They said this violates this rule or that rule and this has resulted in a discrimination between India and Pakistan in this manner. We could give lots of examples. Although there is some improvement after the Labour Government came into power, still, I think the basic concept of the Commonwealth is against our sovereignty and against our nationhood. I would suggest to the Government to seriously consider whether it is proper for us to remain in the Commonwealth or not.

I have also tabled a substitute motion endorsing the policy of the Government of India.

Mr. Speaker: Shri Dubey. I will be calling next Shri Brajeshwar Prasad and then Shri Shinkre.

श्री रा० वि० बुढे (बीजापुर उत्तर) :

अध्यक्ष महोदय, डा० ल० हिया साहब अभी जब यहाँ पर तक्ररीर कर रहे थे उसे मैं ने सुना और फूड डिबेट पर भी जब वे बोले थे तो उस को भी मैं ने सुना था और मुझे उन्हें सुन कर ऐसा लगता है कि कभी-कभी वे इस

[श्री रा० गि० दुवे]

तरह को फ़िज़ासकी हाउस के सामने रखते हैं जिस से देख पड़ता है कि वह एक डैसपैरेट और ऐनारकेस्ट व्यूज रखते हैं।

हमारी नुक़्ताचीनी की जाती है कि हम पड़ोती राष्ट्रों से सम्बन्ध नहीं रखते और यह नहीं करते और वह नहीं करते। लेकिन मैं उन नुक़्ताचीनी करने वालों को यह बतलाना चाहता हूँ कि सरदार स्वर्ण सिंह ने विदेश मंत्री होते ही अगर कुछ किया है तो पहला कदम यह उठाया है कि वह बरमा गये, सोजान गये और काठमांडू गये और वहाँ के राष्ट्रों, वैयक्तिक मित्रता के संघ स्थापित किये। इतना ही नहीं, लेकिन जो सवाल इस राष्ट्र के आगे पिछले 15-20 साल से थे उन सबालों को हल करने के मार्ग में उन्होंने सक्रिय कदम उठाये। अब यह तो नहीं हो सकता है कि सोजान के इंडियन नेशनल्स को प्रायत्न हाथ में लेते ही कल ही वह हल हो जायेंगे। इस तरह की उम्मीद बांधना तो उचित नहीं है। लेकिन यह हकीकत है कि सरदार स्वर्ण सिंह ने वह सवाल हल करने के मार्ग में कोशिश की। इसी तरीके से बरमा में अपने जो इंडियन नेशनल्स हैं उन के एंड्रेस का जो मामला है वह भी उन्होंने हल किया। इस तरह से हम देखते हैं कि चाहे वह बर्मी लोग हों, चाहे सोलोनी लोग हैं, उन लोगों के साथ अच्छे सम्बन्ध बढ़ाने की दिशा में कदम उठाये गये। अब यह भी खूब रही कि अगर उन देशों के साथ मैत्रीपूर्ण सम्बन्ध स्थापित करने का प्रयत्न किया जाता है तो हमारे लिए यह कहा जाता है कि हम वोक ऐटोच्यूड लेते हैं। अब मेरी समझ में यह नहीं आता कि हमारे यह मित्र चाहते क्या हैं? मित्रता और लड़ाई यह दोनों कैसे साथ-साथ चल सकती हैं? कमी सरकार की वीकास के लिए उसे क्रिटिज़ाइड किया जाता है। अब अगर बार-बार सरकार के लिए यह कहा जाय कि वह फर्मनेस शो करे, एक फर्म पालिसी अख़्तियार करे तो उस तथ्याकथित

बीकनैस का असर जनता के दिल में होता है जोकि डिजायरेबल नहीं है।

चाइना के बारे में आज हाउस ने काफ़ी ध्यान दिया है लेकिन मुझे लगता है और जो मैं ने डा० लोहिया, श्री नाथ पाई, फ्रैंक एन्थोनी और मसानी साहब के भाषण सुने तो मुझे उन के चाइनीज और अणु बम के बारे में कंस्ट्रिक्टरी व्यूज जान पड़े। उन के भाषणों को सुन कर मैं तो इस नतीजे पर ही पहुँच कि आज गवर्नमेंट ने जो पालिसी अख़्तियार की है वह एक सही पालिसी है। मसानी साहब यह कबूल करते हैं कि अगर भारत अणु बम की रेस में शामिल होता है तो उस का इतना खर्चा बढ़ जायेगा कि देश के आर्थिक ढाँचे पर उसका बहुत अंतरहोग। और उस के परिणामस्वरूप हम लोग तबाह हो जायेंगे। यह बात भी सही है कि चीन चाहता है कि हम भी न्यूक्लियर रेस में शामिल हो जायें ताकि हमारी एकोनामिक प्राबलम्स और अधिक बढ़ती चली जायें और उस तरह कम्युनिस्ट पार्टी उस का लाभ उठाये। लेकिन श्री नाथ पाई ने कहा कि यह कैसे हो सकता है कि हम न्यूक्लियर अम्बरैला के लिए इंग्लैंड और अमरीका पर आश्रित हो जायें। हम इसके लिए अमरीका और इंग्लैंड पर भरोसा नहीं कर सकते कि उन से हमें न्यूक्लियर अम्बरैला मिलेगा ही और उन्होंने कहा कि भारत को इस बारे में स्वयं अपने पैरों पर खड़ा होना चाहिए और उन्होंने यह मांग की कि हम अपनी अणु शक्ति स्वयं बनायें और बढ़ायें। लेकिन अगर हम उस दिशा में सोचें भी और अपनी अणु शक्ति बढ़ाना भी चाहें तो यह कोई मामूली चीज नहीं है। जाहिर है कि अगर हमें न्यूक्लियर मामलों में परफ़ैक्टनैस लानी है तो हमें अपना सारा बजट इसी मद में डालना होगा जोकि हमारे देश के लिए हितप्रद और मुनासिब बात नहीं होगी। आज यह बात किस से छिपी है कि हमारा देश एक गरीब देश है? जूस, ई-अवस्त के महीनों में

मैं अपने जिले में गया था, देहातों में मैं घूमा था तो मैं ने लोगों को दो-दो और तीन-तीन दिन का भूखा पाया था। क्या ऐसे हालात में रह कर हम अणुशक्ति बनाने के वास्ते अपना सारा बजट उधर डालना एफोर्ड कर सकते हैं? वह रास्ता तो जरूर देश को तबाह करने का रास्ता हो जायेगा। मैं चाहता हूँ कि अपने देश की और उस की आजादी की हर क्रीमत पर रक्षा की जाय लेकिन इस के साथ ही हम यह भी समझते हैं और बुनियादी तौर से चाहते हैं कि तमाम विश्व में शान्ति और परस्पर सहयोग का वातावरण विद्यमान हो और उस विश्व शांति के लिए भारत आज भी अपना योग दे रहा है। लेकिन अगर दुनिया अणुबम आदि के रास्ते पर चलती है, विश्व में अशान्ति फैलती है और उस हालत में अगर अणु बम की लड़ाई होती है तो सारी दुनिया तबाह हो जाती है। अगर हम दरअसल संसार में शान्ति चाहते हैं जोकि हकीकत है और न्युक्लियर टैस्ट बैंन ट्रीटी करते हैं लेकिन दूसरी तरफ़ अगर हम यह अणु बम बनाना शुरू कर देते हैं तो यह कंट्रिक्टरी चीज होगी। बुनियादी तौर से उस हालत में हमें अपनी पालिसी चेंज करनी होगी। एक और हम अणु बम बनाने की बात करें और दूसरी और हम यह घोषणा करें कि हम दुनिया में सर्वत्र शांति चाहते हैं तो वह चोज़ नहीं रहेगी। अगर हम धबरा कर न्युक्लियर रेस में जायेंगे और यह घोषणा कर के उसमें शामिल हों कि हम उस का इस्तेमाल साइंटिफिक परपजेज के लिए और दूसरे क्यूरी के डेवलपमेंट के कामों के ललिए ही करेंगे तो फिर उस का इस्तेमाल डिस्ट्रक्टिव परपजेज के लिए होने में कितना टाइम लगता है? वह डिस्ट्रक्टिव परपजेज के लिए भी इस्तेमाल में आ सकती है।

श्री फ्रैंक एन्थोनी ने वेस्ट जर्मनी के डिफेंस वेपल्स का जिक्र करते हुए अपने वहां के हथियारों में जो सुधार की मांग की वह बात उनकी अनुचित नहीं है और आवश्यक

सुधार हम वेस्ट जर्मनी के हथियारों को मद्दे-नजर रखते हुए कर सकते हैं।

जहां तक हमारी नौन एलाइनमेंट ही पालिसी का सवाल है मैं समझता हूँ कि हमारी पालिसी बिल्कुल सही है और हमें उसे कायम रखना चाहिए। अभी शास्त्री जी कैअरो गये थे। मुझे खुशी है क्योंकि जब कार्मैनबेल्य प्राइम मिनिस्टरजें कान्फ्रेंस हुई थी वह उस वक्त बीमार थे और वह वहां नहीं पहुंच पाये थे। यहां हाउस में भारत सरकार की इस बारे में आलोचना की गई कि अफ्रीका और एशिया के अन्य राष्ट्रों से हमने सम्बन्ध नहीं रखा, मित्रता का सम्बन्ध नहीं रखा, और यह कि हमारे बारे में उन्हें जानकारी नहीं है। मुझे शास्त्री जी के वहां कैअरो कान्फ्रेंस में जाने से बड़ी खुशी हुई। एफ्रो एशियन कंट्रीज हमसे अच्छी तरह प्रभावित हुए। शास्त्री जी के जरिए उन्होंने हमारे देश और जनता को अच्छी तरह से जाना-पहचाना। वहां उनका अच्छा असर रहा। जब कैअरो कान्फ्रेंस खत्म हो रही थी तो उन्होंने हिन्दुस्तान को इज्जत दी और यह तय किया कि गया कि श्री लाल बहादुर शास्त्री कनक्लूडिंग थैक्स करें। उन्होंने वहां पर पंचशील के सिद्धान्त को मान्यता दिलाई। चीन को वहां पर आइसोलेट कर दिया। इस तरह से मैं समझता हूँ कि शास्त्री जी के वहां जाने से हमें पीजीटिव ऐचीवमेंट्स हुए हैं। लेकिन अगर हम डा० लोहिया की तरह से हर एक मौके पर हिन्दुस्तान को डिग्रेड करने की बात करेंगे तो उससे कोई फायदा नहीं होगा उलटे नुकसान ही होगा।

डा० लोहिया जब देखो तब मौका बमौका क्रांति लाने की बात कह दिया करते हैं। अब यह क्रांति की उनकी बात आऊट आफ कंटैक्ट हॉती है। वह कोई जादू के जोर से एकदम से नहीं आ जायेगी; उसके लिए धीरे धीरे हमें एक निश्चित सिद्धान्त को लेकर

[श्री रा० गि० दुबे]

बढ़ा होगा। क्रांति के लाने के लिए पेशंस भी हमें चाहिए। अगर इस तरह से आये दिन हम क्रांति लाने की बात किया करेंगे तो उससे कुछ नहीं बनेगा।

यूनाइटेड किंगडम में लेबर गवर्नमेंट पावर में आई है तो हमारे लिए वह भी ठीक ही है। अब लेबर रहे या वहां कंजर-वेटिव पार्टी पावर में रहे, हमारे बारे में उनका रुख बदला नहीं है और हमें उसी तरह से उनसे बराबर मदद मिल रही है। अलबत्ता एक बारे में लेबर गवर्नमेंट के आने से बिलकम चेंज अवश्य हुआ है और वह यह कि कंजर-वेटिव गवर्नमेंट की अफ्रीका को जो मदद करने की एक पालिसी चलती थी उस बारे में उन्होंने एक सूधार का कदम उठाया और उसके कारण हमारी रेस हैट्रेड के खिलाफ जो एक आन्दोलन चलता है उसे मदद मिलती है।

अब जहां तक रूस में सत्ता में चेंज का सवाल है यह सही है कि श्री ह्यूशेव का प्रधान मंत्री के पद से वहां पर अपदस्थ किया जाना यह उनका एक आन्तरिक मामला है। मैं इससे तो इन्कार नहीं करता कि वहां के प्रधान मंत्री ह्यूशेव रहें, श्री ब्रेजनेव रहें या कोसीजन रहें; यह उनका अपना आन्तरिक मामला है लेकिन इतना जरूर है कि आठ साल तक जो व्यक्ति उनके वहां प्रधान मंत्री बना रहा और उसकी सब पालिसियों को स्वीकार करते हुए, उसके पंचशील के सिद्धान्त को स्वीकार करते हुए अगर आप उस व्यक्ति को एकदम से अनर्स रोमोनियसली निकाल दें तो उसका एक अच्छा असर दुनिया पर नहीं पड़ता है। आखिर को जब कोई प्राइम मिनिस्टर बनता है तो उसके सामने भी कुछ ओबजेक्टिव होता है और वह इस दृष्टि से पालिसी चलाता है कि उसे देश में और देश के बाहर ऐप्रीसियेशन मिलेगा। लेकिन अगर जिस तरह से स्टालिन चले गये,

ह्यूशेव उसी तरह से चले गये और चार, छः साल के अन्दर-अन्दर श्री ब्रेजनेव और कोसीजन भी चले जायें तो फिर दुनिया के सामने कम्युनिज्म क्या आदर्श पेश कर सकेगा? अगर इस तरह से चलता है तो फिर कम्युनिज्म कोई खास तारीफ़ की बात नहीं हुई और उस हालत में कम्युनिज्म रहे, सोशलिज्म रहे या और कोई इज्म क्यों न रहे; वह कोई मायने नहीं रखती है।

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : ह्यूशेव तो ब्रेजनेव से अच्छा था।

श्री रा० गि० दुबे : मैं भी मानता हूँ और कम्युनिस्ट पार्टी भी मानती है कि ह्यूशेव की पालिसी अच्छी थी।

श्री जानसन यू० एस० ए० के प्रेजिडेंट बने, यह बड़ी अच्छी बात है। अगर श्री गोल्डवाटर वहां के प्रेजिडेंट बन जाते, तो रेशियल हेट्रेड को बढ़ाते। जी फ्रंसिज्म की पालिसी थी, वही उनकी भी पालिसी होती। दुनिया की शान्ति की दृष्टि से श्री जानसन के चुनाव का बड़ा महत्व है।

आज अगर संसार में पीस को कहीं खतरा है, तो वह चीन की तरफ से है। कायरो कांफ्रेंस में चीन के नये साम्राज्यवाद की तरफ संसार का ध्यान दिलाया जाना चाहिए था। आज चीन शान्ति में विश्वास नहीं करता है। माओ-त्से-तुंग का यह सिद्धान्त है कि वायलेंस और इनसरेक्शन के द्वारा कम्युनिज्म को बढ़ाना चाहिये। रूस ने इस सिद्धान्त को त्याग कर शान्ति का मार्ग अपना लिया है। यह सही है कि हमको चीन के डेंजर को रोकने के लिए सही कदम उठाना चाहिए, लेकिन उसका मतलब यह नहीं है कि हम न्युक्लियर रेस में शामिल हो जायें। आज दुनिया में शान्ति को चीन की तरफ से बहुत बड़ा खतरा है। इसलिए हमको संसार में एरिया आफ पीस को बढ़ाने का प्रयत्न करना चाहिए।

इन शब्दों के साथ मैं आपको धन्यवाद देता हूँ ।

Shri Brajeshwar Prasad (Gaya): Mr. Speaker, Sir, I am opposed to the suggestion that India should enter into any security arrangements with the United States of America.

America cannot attack China if in the event of the outbreak of hostilities between India and China, Russia were to tell America that any American attack on China would entail a nuclear war between Russia and America. President De Gaulle does not believe, though France is a member of the NATO, that America is bound to attack Russia if Russia attacks France. America is not a deterrent to China.

Comrade Mao is prepared to sacrifice 300 million Chinese at the altar of Chinese Communism. A military alliance between America and India would lead to the resurrection of the Sino-Soviet Pact. The United States of America will withdraw from the Rimlands if the Sino-Soviet Pact is resurrected. Sino-Soviet hegemony will be established over the Rimlands if this comes to pass.

Russia prevents China from attacking India. China cannot be allowed to conquer India. If India is conquered, the whole of the Afro-Asian sector of the Rimlands will pass within the sphere of Chinese hegemony. Russia will be driven out of the Heartland if China is allowed to conquer India and the Afro-Asian sector of the Rimlands.

The Chinese nuclear blast and the changes in the Kremlin cannot alter the international situation in any significant manner. It does not lie in the power of the leaders of Russia and America, not to speak of other States which have for all practical purposes lost the power to pursue any foreign policy, to run counter to each other.

The thermo-nuclear stalemate binds Russia and America together in a bond of unbreakable unity. They cannot wage war against each other. They have to cooperate with each other, if they cannot wage war against each other. Neither Russia nor America can come to terms with China, for China will be liquidated if it comes to terms with either. There cannot be any political settlement on Chinese terms either between China and Russia or between China and the United States of America. If a political settlement is arrived at between China and Russia on Russia's terms, a political settlement will be arrived at between Russia and America on terms advantageous to the former. But if a political settlement is arrived at between China and America on American terms, a political settlement between Russia and America will be arrived at on terms advantageous to America. A political settlement between Russia and America is inevitable, on the basis of the division of the Afro-Asian sector of the Rimlands in general and of China in particular into two spheres of influence, Russian and American. There cannot be any political settlement, either between China and Russia, or between China and America on Chinese terms, because China stands for the establishment of hegemony over Siberia, Russian Turkistan, the continental and peninsular regions of Asia bordering the Pacific Ocean, large parts of India Asia, Africa and the New world in general and the United States in particular. Russia and America would be wiped out if these objectives are achieved. Russia lacks the power to facilitate the establishment of Chinese hegemony over territories which are not Russian; America bars the way. America lacks the power to facilitate the establishment of Chinese hegemony over territories which are not American; Russia bars the way. China has laid claims over 7 lakh sq. miles of Russian territory in the Heartland. This has barred the way to the resurrection of the Sino-Soviet pact.

[Shri Brajeshwar Prasad]

China is the Yellow peril. It is a common threat to both Russia and America, nay, the whole world. It can never become a thermo-nuclear power of the stature of Russia or America. No Chinese Government can feed 700 million persons out of its own internal resources. If China is to liquidate Russian hegemony over Eastern Europe, how can Russia and China become friendly to each other?

A political settlement between India and Pakistan would weaken the military position of both *vis-a-vis* China. China can conquer the whole of the Indian sub-continent if both Russia and America remain neutral in the event of the outbreak of hostilities. Russia will have either to remain neutral or to join hands with China, if India and Pakistan come together. The United States of America may withdraw from the Rimlands if the Sino-Soviet Pact is resurrected.

It is not in the interests of the United States of America to goad India to come to terms with Pakistan. The conditions precedent to a political settlement between India and Pakistan are political settlements between Russia and America and between Pakistan and Russia. The conditions precedent to a military alliance between India and America, as suggested surreptitiously by Shri Masani, are military alliances between Russia and America and between India and Russia. Any political settlement between India and Pakistan, under the present circumstances, is bound to be an anti-Russian move. The conditions precedent to a political settlement between India and Pakistan are the withdrawal of Pakistan from the SEATO and the CENTO, the abrogation of the Sino-Pakistan Pact and the abandonment of all Pan-Islamic designs to the full satisfaction of Russia and India.

Pakistan is the pasture land of the bear that walks like a man. Do not, for heaven's sake, provoke Russia by coming to terms with Pakistan. Any political settlement between India and Pakistan would accentuate the differences between Russia and America. Would India play such a reactionary part on the stage of international politics?

The aim of Chinese foreign policy is to accentuate the differences between Russia and America. China wants India to do the same. Conflicts which are not resolved often weaken both the parties to the conflict. Even if no war breaks out between Russia and America, both will be weakened if their differences are not resolved. China may emerge as the greatest and the strongest power in the world, if both Russia and America are weakened by internal conflicts.

India should never strengthen the hands of China and Pakistan by coming to terms with them. The world will be divided into three spheres of influence—Chinese, Pan-Islamic and European—if Russia and America are weakened and China emerges as the strongest power in the world.

The solution of the Kashmir problem is either the division of India into two spheres of influence—Chinese and Pan-Islamic—or the establishment of Russian hegemony over Pakistan, Tibet, Sinkiang, Inner Mongolia, Manchuria and North China and of American hegemony over South China and the continental and peninsular regions of Asia bordering the Pacific Ocean.

श्री हुकम चन्द कछवाय (देवास) :

25 माननीय सदस्यों के सामने इस महत्व के विषय पर बहस चलेगी क्या ?

अध्यक्ष महोदय : इनको खत्म कर लेने दीजिये, फिर मैं आपकी बात सुनूंगा।

श्री ब्रजेश्वर प्रसाद : क्या कहा, मैं नहीं समझा।

The problems of international politics are the problems of Asia and Africa. No conflict amongst the states in the New World has led or can lead to the out-break of a global war. American hegemony prevails over the New World. Now, it does not lie in the power of England, France and West Germany to wage war either against Russia or amongst themselves. The NATO acts as a brake upon both Russia and the states of Western Europe. The Warsaw Pact acts as a brake upon the NATO powers. No world war can break out as a result of conflict amongst European States. The division of Europe in general and of Germany in particular has shifted the centre of gravity to the Afro-Asian sector of the Rimlands. By acts of commission and omission, Russia will facilitate the establishment of American hegemony over the continental and peninsular regions of Asia bordering the Pacific Ocean and by acts of commission and omission, America will facilitate the establishment of Russian hegemony over Turkey, Iran, Pakistan and other regions which I have mentioned just now.

The Foreign Minister has been congratulated for having begun a new chapter in international relations by starting negotiations with the neighbouring countries of India. So far, so good. But I do not think that the achievement of the goal of Afro-Asian unity is either possible or desirable. The concept of Afro-Asian unity means either the consolidation of friendship amongst the Afro-Asian states or the integration of all the Afro-Asian states into one political unit. Neither the one nor the other is either possible or desirable. Friendship is not possible because all states are enemies of one another by virtue of the imperatives of power politics in a world of anarchy. All states and not merely Afro-Asian states would become friendly to one another if the goal of disarmament which is the next stage in political evolution is

achieved. Co-existence does not mean only Afro-Asian unity. The condition precedent to the implementation of the doctrine of co-existence is the achievement of the goal of world disarmament. Co-existence does not mean the maintenance of the *status quo* Co-existence, under the present circumstances, means co-existence between Russia and America only. The integration of all the Afro-Asian states into one political unit connotes the withdrawal not only of England, France, Portugal and the U.S.A. from the Afro-Asian sector of the Rimlands, but also of the U.S.S.R. from the Heartland.

The withdrawal of England, France and Portugal from the Afro-Asian sector of the Rimlands would strengthen the forces of democracy within the framework of the bipolar world. The withdrawal of the U.S.A. from the Afro-Asian sector of the Rimlands and of the U.S.S.R. from the Heartland, if it leads to the integration of all the Afro-Asian states into one political unit which is highly improbable, would lead to the integration of either the whole of Europe from Great Britain to the Ural mountains or of Europe and the New World into one political unit.

Mr. Speaker: He should conclude now.

Shri Brajeshwar Prasad: Just two or three sentences more.

The United States of America would play the role of a balancer, if Europe is integrated into one political unit. The U.S.A. is playing, more or less, the same role today. The integration of all the Afro-Asian states into one political unit would not augment the power position of the black and the coloured races in any way, if Europe is integrated into one political unit and the U.S.A. plays the role of a balancer.

The Afro-Asian states would be the weakest autonomous centre of power. The Afro-Asian states would become a satellite state of the Atlantic state

[Shri Brajeshwar Prasad]

if the whole of Europe is integrated with the U.S.A. British, French and German hegemony may be established over Eastern Europe and Russia within the framework of a United States of Europe and our large parts of Asia, Africa and the New World in general and the U.S.A. in particular; Pan-Islamic hegemony may be established not only over the Caucasus, Central Asia and large parts of India, but over the whole region extending from Morocco to Indonesia, and Chinese hegemony may be established over Siberia, the continental and peninsular regions of Asia bordering the Pacific Ocean and over large parts of India, Asia, Africa and the New World in general and the U.S.A. in particular if in pursuance of the goal of Afro-Asian unity Russia and America are driven out of the Heartland and the Rimlands.

The withdrawal of the U.S.A. from the Afro-Asian sector of the Rimlands may lead to the integration of the Afro-Asian sector of the Rimlands with the Heartland.

Mr. Speaker: Now, the whole world has been covered!

Shri Brajeshwar Prasad: The withdrawal of the U.S.A. from the Afro-Asian sector of the Rimlands and of the U.S.S.R. from the Heartland may lead to the outbreak of chaos and anarchy throughout the Heartland and the Afro-Asian sector of the Rimlands. The leaders of the African continent stand for the development of an African personality and not for the integration of all the Afro-Asian states into one political unit.

Mr. Speaker: Shri Shinkre.

श्री तुलशी दास जाधव (नांदेड़) : इनके भाषण से हिन्दुस्तान को क्या करना है, यह स्पष्ट नहीं हुआ है और न ही इन्होंने इसके बारे में कुछ बताया है।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : आप इनके पास बैठ जायें, आपको यह अलहदा बता दूँगे।

श्री ब्रजेश्वर प्रसाद : हम बता चुके हैं, जनाब।

Shri Shinkre: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I thank you very much for having allowed me to participate in this important discussion on international situation....

श्री हुकम चन्द कल्लवाय : यह बहुत महत्व का विषय है और हाउस में कोरम नहीं है। इस पर इस तरह से बहस चलती रहे, इसको मैं अच्छा नहीं समझता हूँ। इस बारे में मैं आपसे व्यवस्था चाहता हूँ।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : व्यवस्था क्या हो सकती है ? आपका यह हुकम है। आप नहीं चाहते हैं तो बन्द करनी होगी।

The hon. Member may continue tomorrow. Now, the House stands adjourned to meet again tomorrow at 11 O'Clock.

17.50 hrs.

The Lok Sabha then adjourned till Eleven of the Clock on Tuesday, November 24, 1964/Agrahayana 3, 1886 (Saka).