

[Shri Balwant Singh Ramoowalia ]

12.21 hrs.

wheat yield in Punjab and Haryana has gone down by 25 per cent this year. 40 people have died and thousands of houses have been destroyed in various parts of Bihar due to the heavy rain during the past one week. Losses to orchardists and farmers will run in several crores of rupees. The havoc caused to the cash crop is bound to affect badly the economy of the farmers and the States. Over 5,000 farmers of Amritsar District and the same number in Sangrur had held a rally demanding immediate relief. It is a national calamity. So, I request the Union Government that it should rush to the rescue of these helpless farmers, and an immediate relief of Rs. 20 crores to each State should be granted. The NAFED should be directed to arrange to maintain the supply of vegetables in city areas so that consumers do not suffer due to short supply of vegetables which have been destroyed by rains and hailstorm.

**(ix) Need to supply adequate power from central power plants to meet the shortage of power in Andhra Pradesh**

SHRI SRIHARI RAO (Rajahmundry): There is acute shortage of power in Andhra Pradesh. Against the requirement of 46 MU per day, Andhra Pradesh is in a position to provide about 37 MU on its own which means a shortage of about 20% of the energy requirement. This has forced a power cut on about 3100 HT consumers. There is no adequate drinking water available to the urban as well as the rural poor people. The cattle and agriculture are suffering because of power shortage. The State is not getting its share of power from Central power plants like Neyveli, Kalpakam and Ramagundam. I request the Central Government to give Andhra Pradesh its due share of power from the central power plants as is being given to other States.

**DISCUSSION RE: INDO-US RELATIONS-  
Contd.**

[English]

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: We now take up further discussion under rule 193. Shri Syed Shahabuddin to continue his speech.

SHRI SYED SHAHABUDDIN (Kishanganj): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, I was yesterday placing before you the characteristic of the geopolitical domain where I said there are no good guys and no bad guys. Sir I would like to add that there are no eternal purists or ascetics and there are no compulsive rapists neither are there any eternal virgins or damsels in distress. And, therefore, when we look at the world scene, we must try to visualise in the broad framework of our policy what our reaction to a particular power in a particular situation ought to be. Sir, I would like to say that we have to deal with the big powers; we cannot wish them away, they are there. But, in the context of the present day world where we speak of juridical equality of States and we also sometimes speak of the moral dimension of power, the fact is that super powers have world wide interests. They have global involvements, they have their own concerns. And their technique ranges from gun-boat diplomacy to peacefully maximising their areas of influence and check-mating whom they consider to be their global adversaries. Now in this game and to this extent, every super power is an imperial power. I am not deliberately using the world 'imperialist power'. Every super power wishes to broaden and widen its area of influence. Now, US is one such power. Sir, I would like to state that I do not think that we have any basic or permanent conflicts with the United States. We have differences. And we shall have differences. I am aware of the time when USA wanted India to be subservient in the name of democracy versus dictatorship under the slogan of free enterprise versus regimentation, freedom versus slavery and all that.

But that issue was long ago decided. They know and the world knows that we cannot be anybody's satellite, we cannot be the running dogs of anybody's imperialism, we cannot be a vassal state and we cannot be a Banana republic. But we cannot as well be a pawn in the international game of any other power.

I think we have got to take into account in our calculations what is USA's strategic interests and objectives in this part of the world that we live in where we are a regional power. As I can understand it, USA desires that South Asia must be strategically independent, that is to say, it should not lapse into a condition of dependence upon any global adversary. This is the broad picture. They don't wish, I don't think they have the means even to invade us or to enslave us. We are a regional power and we are a developing state. We have certain interests in our relations with USA. We need technology facilities for higher education, access to the USA market—we have a positive balance of trade with them. We want sometimes raw materials of strategic significance which are available either in USA or from USA controlled sources. We have interest in development finance state either bilaterally or multi-laterally and indeed need an environment of peace both regionally and globally in the sub-continent and in the Indian Ocean, so that we can progress and march forward.

Now there is an inherent lack of symmetry between the concern of a super power and the concern of a regional power. Therefore, there is an inbuilt incompatibility. And as I said, difference will arise. But differences need not necessarily be serious enough always to lead to an irrevocable situation.

Today what we are discussing is not really Indo-US relations. Indo-US relations today provide only a back-drop for a discussion of our relations with our immediate neighbours, particularly Pakistan.

Our concern therefore, which we are expressing in a broad dimension, is really an index of the failure of our neighbourhood policy, of our diplomacy towards our neighbours in the region of strategic importance to us.

We are the centre to this part of the world. We are crucial to the future of South Asia. We have a legitimate interest in keeping the region free from all sorts of foreign intervention and foreign interference. We have a legitimate interest in our status as a regional power not only being recognised by outsiders; but also by our neighbours. We are interested and we are concerned with regional peace and security in South Asia as an area of peace and cooperation and friendship and in the Indian Ocean as a zone of peace. But we also recognise that we cannot unilaterally impose the Monroe Doctrine on this area. In any case, the days of Monroe Doctrine are passed. We have to have the trust and the confidence of all the States of South Asia, all of whom together cannot be equated to us either in power or development in the global or the regional dimension.

Incidentally, when I said we are the central power, I am conscious of the fact that we are the only State in the South Asia who have common border with each of its neighbours. No other State in South Asia is in the same situation. Now, if we are not in a position to force any other State in South Asia to accept our view of things, it is inevitable that these neighbouring States will seek external linkages. They try to forge alliances in their national interest as they set it if they perceive a threat or if there is mutual suspicion. Therefore, I am very much concerned about the relative failure of our policy in our neighbourhood.

We have a legitimate worry about the U.S. supply of sophisticated weapons to Pakistan which has been continuing since 1954 and which has assumed ominous dimensions today and which has gone to the point of supply of high performance aircrafts, these surveillance and perhaps offensive weapon systems called AWACS.

[Shri Syed Shahabuddin]

We are also equally worried about the USA which talks so much about the NPT taking a soft line on Pakistan's nuclear quest as evidenced by the recent waiver of the Symington amendment. These are our legitimate concerns and must cause us worry. We know we have no means of pressurising the U.S. and appeals will not do because in International diplomacy there is no such thing as philanthropy or compassion. USA is pursuing its own interest. So is Pakistan. At this given moment in time and space there is an element of convergence between them. How do we deal with this situation? I feel that this USA-Pakistan equation has grown over a period of time and we must realise that the rulers of Pakistan in their own way were neither fools nor naive. We cannot simply denounce them as lackies of U.S. Imperialism or CIA agents. They are also patriotic in their own way. They also wish to preserve the national interests of their country. That is why while participating in the debate the other day I said the broad purpose of diplomacy should be that wherever there is a conflict of interests we must try to harmonise and reduce the area of conflict.

Now for USA on the one hand Pakistan is a front-line State—one of the 19 countries in the area of responsibility of the Central Command. I do not know whether Pakistan accepts this status. But for them Afghanistan is crucial. Afghanistan is the key to the situation because they look upon Afghanistan as the only State outside the perimeter, the cordon sanitar that they drew in 1945, which has in a way been taken over or we can say subjected to intervention by the USSR since 1945. Now for Pakistan on the other hand US is a guarantee against the super-power presence next door. It also sees the US presence or alliance as an insurance against what it considers to be an Indian threat. It also uses or in a way blackmails U.S. presence in order to cover up its quest of nuclear parity with India.

Now I come to this proposition. USA and USSR's policy towards this sub-continent

and similarly Pakistan and India's policy towards the super-powers are not really symmetrically related in this part of the world. USA's policy towards Pakistan becomes USSR oriented and Pakistan's policy towards USA becomes India oriented. US policy towards India becomes USSR oriented and India's policy towards USA becomes Pakistan oriented.

Sir, yesterday some of our colleagues spoke about America's obsession. I dare say every nation has its obsession. I am afraid, I must say, that Pakistan's obsession with India and our obsession with Pakistan is equally disturbing and I do not understand why our policy makers cannot get beyond this framework or breakthrough this framework and try to establish a new equation in the sub-continent.

Therefore, Sir, if Indo-U.S. relations are to be mended we as diplomats must recognise there are limits to the manoeuvrability of every power. USA cannot pressurise us to the point that we come a satellite of the USSR. USSR cannot ditch us to the extent that we become dependent on the USA. Similarly India should not pressurise Pakistan to the point that Pakistan feels safety in linkages with outside. Pakistan should not force us into a situation where we become party to an arms race or nuclear arms race in the sub-continent.

I beg to disagree with my learned colleague, Prof. Swell, on the point that the only option today is the nuclear option. I think that is the language of despair. In any case a nuclear option, assuming that USA is the adversary, provides no defence against the United States or any super power or even against China. So, what are we talking about it? Therefore, instead of taking a jump, we must make yet another sincere effort at improving our bilateral relations with Pakistan.

We must try to exert all the influence that we have, exercise all the influence that we can command to de-escalate the situation in Afghanistan and restore the neutrality of Afghanistan. We

must, therefore, break through this barrier of suspicion and distrust. We must adopt effective confidence-building measures. We must adopt the technique of building bridges of understanding.

We must try to persuade Pakistan and harmonise our security perception that any threat to this sub-continent falls equally on all states in the sub-continent, that no state can escape the consequences or can escape or can evade the historic responsibility for the defence of the sub-continent. Therefore, we shall not permit **this sub-continent—our South Asia—to be a battle-ground between super powers**. Even today it is not yet too late. We must try to revive the idea of a joint defence of the sub-continent. We must try to develop a code of mutual conduct in which we do not give support, encouragement or heart to the forces of disruption working on either side of the border. We must engage in a serious dialogue for disengagement and, of course, extend the area of cooperation, even to the field of nuclear capability. We should certainly apply the principles of non-alignment in the formulation of a policy towards the super powers. That essential principle we must remember that **friendship and relationship with any State shall not be at the cost of our relations with another State.**

Above all, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I would like that we should not suffer from a persecution complex. We should not develop, as Prof. Swell said yesterday, a siege mentality. We should not have developed a fear psychosis, we should not think that everybody is against us, that everybody is out to destroy us, that everybody is out to destabilise us. We are capable of taking care of ourselves. Unless we eschew fear, unless we develop confidence and with that self-confidence tackle our neighbours in a joint effort, in a joint endeavour to develop this area of peace, I am afraid, South Asia is doomed.

Weapons, even nuclear weapons will provide no answer. AWACS or counter-AWACS will provide no answer. Missiles or

anti-missiles will provide no answer to the long-term destiny of this sub-continent.

AN HON. MEMBER: Why don't you advise Pakistan about that?

SHRI SYED SHAHABUDDIN: I am also advising Pakistan. Therefore, I would say that we should live and behave as a great nation that we are that we have been and that we shall ever be. Thank you very much.

[*Translation*]

SHRI ZAINUL BASHER (Ghazipur): Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, just before me, the hon. Member, Shri Shahabuddin was speaking and I was listening to his diplomatic speech very carefully and was trying to understand it. On the one hand he was advising India that it should not have nuclear option and should not acquire any aircraft to match AWACS aircrafts and on the other hand, he was not giving any advice to Pakistan and U.S.A against sophisticated arms supply to Pakistan.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, India is a peace loving country and wants that there should be peace with neighbours so that the expenditure to be incurred on armed forces may be utilised on development. But on the other hand, it has always been the endeavour of Pakistan to amass powerful weapons and use them against India. Many a time it has happened that Pakistan has piled dangerous weapons and has used them against India. I think this thing did not occur to Shri Shahabuddin.

[*English*]

SHRI SYED SHAHABUDDIN: Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, I must clarify. I have argued as much against AWACS as ...(*Interruptions*). I think certain ideas are being attributed to me.

SHRI ZAINUL BASHER: Whatever the hon. Member has said is on record and

[Shri Zainul Basher]

everybody has heard it and it can be seen.  
(*Interruptions*).

[*Translation*]

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE  
MINISTRY OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS  
(SHRI K. NATWAR SINGH): You have  
come to Lok Sabha now. Forget about the  
Rajya Sabha...(*Interruptions*)....

SHRI SYED SHAHABUDDIN: When  
have I said that Pakistan should acquire  
AWACS and we should not? I said that  
Pakistan should not acquire AWACS...  
(*Interruptions*)....

SHRI ZAINUL BASHER: You have said  
that we should not acquire AWACS. Pakis-  
tan may or may not acquire AWACS, about  
this you have not said that...(*Interrup-  
tions*).... I have already said that you have  
been a diplomat. I have tried to grasp your  
speech as much I could. Other hon.  
Members too have understood...  
(*Interruptions*)....

[*English*]

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Let him say  
whatever he wants to say.

[*Translation*]

SHRI SYED SHAHABUDDIN: You may  
express your own views.

SHRI ZAINUL BASHER: I can say  
something of your speech.

SHRI SYED SHAHABUDDIN: You can-  
not wrongly interpret my speech....  
(*Interruptions*).....

SHRI ZAINUL BASHER: I am saying  
whatever you have said.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, such arms have  
always been amassed by Pakistan and  
have been used against India. We are dis-  
cussing here the relationship between  
India and the USA. Except political rela-  
tions, we have improved our relations with

USA in the field of culture, education, trade  
and technology and nothing has hap-  
pened which might have deteriorated our  
relationship. But USA from the very begin-  
ning has been working in a planned way in  
the matter of its foreign policy and under  
its schemes of things, Pakistan is included.  
There are many other countries of the  
world which are included in this scheme.  
In our region Pakistan is included in this  
scheme and USA is using Pakistan as its  
pawn. The intention behind the arms  
supply to Pakistan is to 'gherao' Soviet  
Union, which is called encirclement. It  
wants to encircle Soviet Union militarily  
and otherwise also. China is also included  
in this scheme. Both countries have  
exchanged weapons with each other. Iran  
was also a part of the scheme earlier but in  
Iran the situation has now completely  
changed because the rule of Shah is no  
more there. This is an axis to encircle  
Soviet Union. Under this scheme, USA has  
been supplying arms to Pakistan contin-  
uously and knows that these arms can also  
be used against India. India had refused  
much earlier to join this scheme and USA  
knows fully well that India will never  
be a part in this scheme. That is why, Sir,  
it has been supplying arms to Pakistan. Not  
only this, we have been getting such indi-  
cations that US military pressure in Pakis-  
tan is also increasing. US military  
personnels are coming to Pakistan and  
conducting joint exercises. The reconssa-  
ince aircrafts of U.S.A. have been using  
Pakistan's aerodromes for the last many  
years. Similarly, U.S. fighter ships  
equipped with atomic weapons have been  
continuously using Pakistani ports. A  
proposal is under consideration to bring  
some pilots of U.S. Air Force on lease basis  
to Pakistan to operate AWACS aircrafts.  
Now the matter is not limited to arms  
supply alone but USA is gradually estab-  
lishing its military base in Pakistan. There-  
fore, the alliance of USA and Pakistan is  
very significant and we have to keep eye on  
it. USA says that these arms will be used by  
Pakistan against Afghanistan but USA  
knows and we also know that it is not true.  
It is a diplomacy that some reply has to be  
given to our doubts. Recently, there were

reports in the newspapers. Shri Natwar Singh also went there. It was asked that if **Russian forces are withdrawn from Afghanistan, will USA stop its arms supply to Pakistan?** So far I know they did not give any such assurance. On the contrary there is suggestion that they will continue their arms supply to Pakistan. Therefore, the relations between India and USA in this regard are very clear and whatever diplomatic activities, we may take up, there will be no change in the relationship between USA and Pakistan. There is only one way out and it is to pay special attention to our relationship with Pakistan. Just now hon. Syed Shahabuddin has also said that special emphasis has to be accorded to Indo-Pak relations but I want to add that it is not possible to normalise our relation with Pakistan as long as the present military regime is in power because they will never stop acquiring arms and Pakistan is gradually converting itself into a U.S. military base. The history of Pakistan shows that whenever it has been under military rule, it has acquired dangerous weapons from U.S.A., Saudi Arabia, Iran and other countries and by raising the bogey of Indian **attack, it has provoked its people and diverted their attention from other problems. Whenever there has been any popular movement and whenever the people have struggled to establish democratic Government in Pakistan, the military regime has always raised the bogey of Indian attack and acquired more arms from U.S.A on that pretext. When Gen. Ayub Khan was the President, the same thing happened and the situation was similar, under Gen. Yahyah Khan also. The same is happening even today. Therefore, to expect that we can protect the sub-continent from the mad race of acquiring weapons by negotiating with Pakistan is to my mind just impossible. We will have to wait till democratic rule in Pakistan is restored. The people of Pakistan are agitating for the restoration of democracy. I think that the agitation will be successful and a democratic Government will take over there.**

During discussion on Demands for External Affairs I had stated then also that

when Mr. Bhutto was the Foreign Minister in the military regime, he used to speak of a 1000-years war with India, but when he became the Prime Minister of a democratically elected Government, he spoke differently, and during that period Indo-Pak relations were at its best. Such cordial relations had never existed before or thereafter. The Simla Agreement was also possible only during that period because it **had a democratic Government and a democratically elected Prime Minister. Until a popular Government is in power in Pakistan, we cannot expect Indo-Pak relations to improve.**

Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, I have always been saying and I will reiterate again today that India should support the democratic forces in Pakistan. But our Government says that it is the internal matter of that country. We also agree with it. But the people of India share a special bond with the people of Pakistan. Indian and Pakistan have been separated as two nations recently but the peoples of the two countries are one. It is not right to divide us. The people of India and Pakistan share a rare relationship, which can be found in not more than one or two countries in the world.

Today, the people of Pakistan are rising **against their military rulers. During this period, it is our duty to help our brethren in that country. We should help the people of Pakistan in their struggle to overthrow the military Government. When the military regime is replaced by a democratically elected Government, our friendship will be revived and efforts will be made to improve our relationship. The popular Government will reconsider the policy of acquiring dangerous arms from the United States and whether it should allow itself to become a military base of that country. However, as long as there is military rule in Pakistan we should not harbour any hope of goodwill from that country.**

Gen. Zia-ul-Haq may pose to be a very amiable person, and although he may come with the apparent aim of watching

[Shri Zainul Basher]

the cricket match, his actual intention is to perpetuate military dictatorship and stay in power. To accomplish this end he thinks it is essential to create anti-India feelings among the people of his country and to create the bogey of Indian aggression. On this pretext he can seek U.S. assistance and acquire dangerous weapons and allow that country to station its army there by propagating that India wants to annihilate Pakistan. India never had nor will ever have any such design. The Indian leaders had voluntarily accepted the creation of Pakistan. It recognised its existence without any outside pressure. Neither our leaders nor our people ever had any intention of putting an end to the existence of Pakistan. We consider those people our brothers and want that they should live in peace and happiness. Our cultural and linguistic links and our feelings of friendship and fraternity are not new. We want that we should move ahead together, make progress through cooperation and assist each other in achieving prosperity. This has always been the intention of India. Whenever the military had taken over in Pakistan, an atmosphere of hatred for that country has been created in our people and the military had toppled the democratically elected Government whenever the latter had made efforts to establish good relations with India. When Liyaqat Ali Khan was the Prime Minister of Pakistan, which was very long ago, he had tried to normalise the relations with India and had adopted the policy of cooperation but he was assassinated. You are aware that Z. A. Bhutto had made efforts to normalise Indo-Pak relations but he was hanged to death. I want to tell that in spite of our best efforts in diplomacy we will not be able to stop U.S. from supplying arms to Pakistan or Pakistan from acquiring arms from U.S.A. We will have to become self-reliant to counter any threat from them. We have to make our own arrangements to combat any attack from across the border or from any other country.

I want to say that there should not be any more delay in developing the nuclear bomb. Pakistan has the bomb. Whether we shall use it or not is a totally different matter. But the very fact of their having developed the nuclear bomb is having adverse psychological effects on the people and the armed forces of our country, which is not desirable. Our relationship with China is also not cordial and it too possesses the atom bomb. But we have not yet gone for it. It naturally demoralises the people and the armed forces of our country. We, therefore, cannot afford to delay any longer. We should declare that we are going in for the atom bomb and we should make efforts to develop it. I know that we have the capability for it. Hence, we should now have a clear policy in this regard. We should remain prepared for it. However, as regards the stability of our relation with Pakistan, it will be possible only when there is a democratically elected Government in that country. The people there are carrying out a struggle to establish a representative Government and they are getting every moral support from the Indian people in this regard. The Government of India should also support the popular movement. With these words I conclude and thank you.

\*DR. S. JAGATHRAKSHAKAN (Chinglepet): Hon. Deputy Speaker, Sir, India is one of the biggest democracies in the world. America, which is territorially larger than us, is also a democratic nation. Americans are wedded to democratic ideals and traditions, as we Indians are, but with lesser fervour. Many of our Constitutional provisions and economic policies, if not the same, have at least a semblance of those of the Americans. There is near unanimity between these two democratic giants as far as nurturing of the democratic ideals is concerned.

Despite these similarities, the Americans overtly and covertly assist Pakistan which is an avowed enemy of India. Americans supply military ware worth millions and mil-

---

\*The speech was originally delivered in Tamil.

lions of dollars to Pakistan. Pakistan is a nation opposed to democratic ideals and peoples' free will. It is ruled by a military leader in a seemingly democratic attire. We are, therefore, unable to decipher why the biggest democracy on this earth should provide military assistance to such a country.

Sir, America proclaims itself as our friend. However, its actions are contrary to this. It is providing arms assistance to a military Govt. opposed to us. While our Hon. Prime Minister Shri Rajiv Gandhi has announced in many international fora that India would not make an atom bomb, Pakistan is simply two screws away from the making of an atom bomb. Americans are aware of this but they continue to supply modern electronic equipments like AWACS to Pakistan. The supply of these electronic equipments has been cleared by the American Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

[English]

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Dr Jagathrakshakan, you can continue after the lunch-break. We now adjourn for lunch, and will re-assemble at 2 p.m.

13.01 hrs.

*The Lok Sabha adjourned for Lunch till Fourteen of the Clock.*

*The Lok Sabha re-assembled after lunch at four minutes past Fourteen of the Clock.*

[MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER in the Chair]

DISCUSSION RE: INDO-U.S.  
RELATIONS—Contd.

[English]

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Mr. S. Jagathrakshakan.

You may continue your speech now.

[Translation]

\*DR. S. JAGATHRAKSHAKAN: Sir, Kennedy and Nehru were the two outstanding Statesmen who sowed the seeds for stronger and closer Indo-American ties. The friendship founded by them has started tottering in the recent times.

Sir, when we think of Pandit Nehru, we are immediately reminded of a full bloom rose; Gandhiji reminds us of austerity and simplicity. The great English Statesman Churchill brings us the memory of his famous pipe and Hitler, his funny moustache. But when we think of America, it comes to our mind, the nuclear bomb and its accompanying catastrophe. Sir, the value of American dollar may be soaring high in all parts of this mundane world but the values of the Americans themselves, their life and ethos, are plummeting to bottom. Gone are the glorious days of the Americans. Not a single heart in this world goes out to the Americans for they lack humanitarian concern in their international dealings. In this connection let me cite an anecdote. A school teacher asked her pupil which country in the whole world he liked the most. The boy replied that he liked Vietnam. An amazed teacher further queried the boy whether he did not like America which was a super power and which landed first on the moon. The boy gave a superb reply that the Americans who ventured on moon yonder could not gain an inch of land in Vietnam. He, therefore, liked the strongland of Vietnam. This is the kind of dissatisfaction and disillusionment with Americans all over the world.

Sir, newspaper reports say that a pact has been signed by the Americans with Pakistan for supply of F.7 war planes worth Rs. 650 crores. So far Pakistan has

\* The Speech was originally delivered in Tamil.

[Dr. S. Jagathrakshakan]

received military assistance from America worth Rs. 2127 crores. Pakistan is being armed to the teeth. These sophisticated acquisitions have a target. I am pained to note that the Americans aid and abet Pakistan in aiming at the target, no doubt, that is India.

It is also paining to note that the American Senate Foreign Relations Committee have reduced the amount of development assistance provided to India from 5 m. dollars to 3.5 m. dollars. This axing is intriguing. This is an ominous drift in the American attitude towards us. In this connection, let me also submit that the Americans are the root-cause of all genocidal acts of Sri Lankan Govt. on innocent Tamils.

Sir, military strategists believe that the III world war may break out in Indian Ocean becoming a base of super powers. I fear that may come true.

Sir, the Pakistanis are openly supporting the State Terrorism in Sri Lanka. They have even assured the Sri Lankan Govt. that they would provide all possible assistance in exterminating the Tamils. They also support subversive activities in Punjab. They train extremists and give asylum to them.

We must, therefore, awaken and take up the challenges. We can brook no delay. We must prove to the world that we are second to none. We must, hence, without any second thought, make nuclear bomb. There should be no reconsideration of the matter.

Sir, the atrocities of Sri Lankan Govt. on the Tamils are increasing day by day. Super powers are involved in this. Talking peace to these nations is not going to be of any help. You cannot preach ahimsa to a butcher. You must speak from a position of strength. I, therefore, urge upon the Govt. to arrive at an early decision on the ethnic issue in Sri Lanka. With these words, I conclude.

[English]

SHRIMATI GEETA MUKHERJEE (Panskura): Sir, I thank our colleague Shri Saifuddin Chowdhary for bringing this motion, which is of importance to debate here for re-assessment of the situation. For me, it is not a re-assessment, it is a re-assertion of the experiences and this should be borne in mind while facing this threat.

Now I will recall the visit of our young Prime Minister to the United States of America, 23 months back, with great euphoria. Actually, lot of talks were there in regard to sharing the perceptions of the two great democracies and lot of attempts were made for impressing the America, organising the Festival of India by spending a lot of money. There was an atmosphere that our Government is really expecting that there will be some great change in the American's attitude towards India. But, Sir, I must say that leopard does not change its colour, that is the maxim that should have been understood. In my opinion, Government of India's deficiency is in that and probably many on the other side are also aware of it. After the visit what transpired everybody knows. I do not have much time and my other colleagues spoken earlier have mentioned.

I will quickly mention the following events of all these euphoria. F-16 to Pakistan; Heavy tank; heavy Howitzer, Harpoon Missiles; Laser Guided Copper head Artillery; AWACS; E-2 C planes; Resumption of Electronic Intelligence Monitoring and 4001 million dollar military aid waiving Symington Amendment and even actually allowing Pakistan to go nuclear and then pressuring India to sign the NPT. These are briefly counted as the resultants we have from out of the sharing the perceptions of the two great democracies.

Sir, It is a common knowledge and many of the speakers have also mentioned that all these big weapons and big

military aid to Pakistan, though they are given in the name of countering the so-called Soviet activities in Afghanistan, can be used and will be used when time comes against India. This is very clear. Therefore, we should be clear about what we expect out of the American imperialism once and for all and act accordingly.

Now, Sir, I will go back to the past a little. Our first Prime Minister went to the United States of America in Oct. 1949. While addressing the House of Representatives and Senate, he, Pandit Nehru, and mind you that trip was described as voyage of discovery, had said:

"I hope that the great democracy of the United States of America will, I feel sure, understand and appreciate our approach to like problems."

That was his hope. After coming back and after finding what was happening there, he gave a description in the same year 1949:

"They had gone all-out to welcome me. But they expected something more than gratitude and goodwill and what more I could supply them?"

They expected something more than gratitude and goodwill and wanted him to supply something which he could not. What he could not supply is very obvious from the incidents that followed.

America is doing all these things because of its global strategy of world domination. From that strategy of world domination it decides how it will behave with others. It is with this very strategy that it first tried that India also be brought into the so-called Asia defence which they wanted. In Phillipine there was a conference in 1951 where they wanted Asian security to take place.

India objected to it and did not go in for that. Pakistan went in for that. After that they made it very clear as to how they will behave towards these two countries.

Following this, then in 1951. Trueman said about Pakistan:

"Already progressive and powerful and an important factor in giving stability to the near East."

Then Pakistan joined CENTO AND SEATO. On the question of Kashmir how have they behaved? With the same global strategy they are behaving on the question of Kashmir. Despite all our attempts they backed Pakistan. All these are common knowledge. But there are also lessons to be drawn. The question is whether all this was fortuitous. No. This is part of the global strategy of US imperialism. That is why, they went on doing these things. Whenever we differed with them and on many occasions we had to differ with them, they were very clear in their way of behaviour.

It is not only that these things had happened in Pandit Nehru's time. We recollect the fact that when Lal Bahadur Shastri mildly criticised America's bombing on Vietnam, his invitation to the United States was unceremoniously cancelled. Therefore, these things happened during Nehru and Shastri's times.

About Madam Indira Gandhi they were not at all well disposed of with that lady. They called her a tough lady. They, of course, called Pandit Nehru as Asiatic schemer and all that.

But what happened afterwards? In both Indo-Pak wars, with whom they sided? With Pakistan. Then also in the latter Indo-Pak war which we fought in 1972 Mr. Jack Anderson made public the text of a memo on the meeting of the National Security Committee of American Senate. There he made it public that Washington had planned for active intervention in the Indo-Pak war. Active intervention in whose favour? In American global strategy's

[Shrimati Geeta Mukherjee]

favour through Pakistan. So, they wanted to actively intervene. Fortunately many other things happened and that active intervention could be prevented. I need not recall again the Bangladesh war. It is not the non-violence policy alone which prevented the volatile situation. So far as I remember, the American warship was followed closely by Soviet warship and that had very tangible effect. Not only that, in 1965 Indo-Pak war also the American imperialists cut down the oil supply and the supply of spare parts etc. to India. So, on all important occasions this has been the behaviour of the American imperialist government, whether they are so-called somewhat liberal or whether they are big hawks like Reagan. This is the general experience that we are having. This happened in the military sphere. In the economic sphere also the position is nothing very different. I will come to the recent things later. I am reminded of PL-480. We know that in the garb of PL-480 how they went on pressurising who is to be elected, who is not to be elected and so on and so forth. Even among the ruling party candidates, CIA spent a lot of money for defeating certain people. So, it is not a question of Communists only, the same thing happened even among the ruling party. Therefore, in all the fields—military, economic and political—this is the conspiracy on behalf of the American imperialists in their global interests, as they understand it. Their policy has been dominating in all the fields and that is the crux of the matter. No amount of smiling faces, no amount of sharing perceptions, as far as India is concerned, with that other democracy will help us. We have to be tough. There is no other alternative... (*Interruptions*).

AN HON. MEMBER: Joint perceptions, common perceptions.

SHRIMATI GEETA MUKHERJEE: Common perceptions, etc. have been torpedoed but, at the same time, some in that corner and some in this corner may be having an illusion about the real nature of American imperialists policies. I repeat

that they should get out of it in the interest of India, in the interest of world peace, in the interest of our independent development, and that is on the agenda, nothing less, nothing more. This is my first submission.

This is in the sphere of military. What about the economic sphere? Probably, Rajiv Gandhi Ji thought that in sharing perceptions, let us go to them not only for 21st century hightech and in other spheres, but also in military sphere. Some attempt was made in that respect and everybody knows with what effect. With the hope that they will be liberal, we liberalised our own policies—economic policies, import liberalisation in the name of hightech, running for super computers in the name of environment studies, and now it seems that the super computer will have to be manned by American personnel. In so many other earlier policies, if not lock, stock and barrel, but in the earlier policies, there was some tilt here and there. Some effort believing that there are some 'openings' can be made, though without any positive results. But on the other hand the results are contrary to our interests as I have already brought out in the beginning, that is, about the recent action of arming of Pakistan. As far as our behaviour with Pakistan is concerned, many questions have arisen. I agree with the idea that surely Pakistan is our neighbour and surely we try to improve our relation with Pakistan in every possible way. But I am sure about one thing and I agree with the hon. Member, Shri Zainul Basher. Shri Shahabuddin raised a point that the Pakistani rulers are also patriots. I agree that there are millions of patriots in Pakistan. But I can't agree that that patriotic idea is being reflected by the military dictatorship of Pakistan, who are acting as enemies of the Pakistan people. With the Pakistan people we have to establish much greater relation. That should be one of the important factors in our diplomacy. That I agree. As far as the question of nuclear option is concerned, what does America want to say on this? They have already given them the

bomb. But they want us to sign the Nuclear Proliferation Treaty. They want Pakistan to be prepared for the first strike. Now, how do we meet it? Some friends have mentioned that we should go in for nuclear weapon. But I think we will have to think many times before we do that because our economy is not in a position to bear all that. It is naturally so. Now, I think military solution cannot be found to this question. It is known the world over that the great peace movement that is being built up in our country and in the neighbouring region has to be backed up for Asian security. The new move that we are supposed to take has to be taken vigorously in the teeth of the objection of the United States of America without any fear and with great diplomatic understanding. That, I think, would be the answer, nuclear option is not the answer. But America has her own interest and wants us that we do not go in for nuclear option. Her intention is very clear. I have no illusion about that. But I have a different perception. If this is the military side at the moment, what about the economic side? What about the sharing perceptions? Between the two great democracies, what is the common perception? Unless you have a common perception, there cannot be peace.

We have recognised Kampuchia, they are against it. We have recognised Sahara Arab Democratic Republic, they are against it. We are for assisting ANC and effective embargo against South African Government, they are against it. We are for assisting PLO, but they are against it. We are for assisting Nicaragua, but they are against it. On all these questions, they have sent Aide memoir in one or other way to our Government to denounce our action. So, in the political scene, all our perceptions are really different because our interests are different. So, different interests follow different perceptions. It is no use of trying to put these two together and say we have common perception.

Therefore, Sir, I would say that some friends may feel that more diplomatic

approach to America might have brought better results. I say, 'No'. Failure of diplomacy of the Government is that they err on the wrong side when they think that America will change its policy. Failure of diplomacy, if and when it occurs, is an inadequate attempt to mobilise the friendly people.

Sir, let me remind you here that all the liberalisation in the import policy and inviting the multinationals did not help at all. You speak of destabilisation. Will not these agencies of multinationals act as destabilizers? What is the experience with ITT in Chile, which is a multinational corporation, which took part in throwing our Allende? When you are bringing the same ITT again for collaboration in telecommunication here, you are simply inviting the destabilizing forces to invade our country. But I am always aware of the conspiracy of destabilization. It very much exists in our country. But as far as you are concerned, when charges of corruption come against the Government, only then you remember destabilization. What happens throughout the month? What happens throughout the year? What happens year after year? Why don't you really, seriously educate the people throughout the year about the imperialist plot instead of 'sharing perceptions' between the two democracies, instead of 'equidistance' from Super Powers? I accuse you, you don't call a spade a spade. Don't name the American Administration to be the main villain of the world piece. That would enable you to win the diplomatic battle.

Sir, I would also like to remind you that in the economic field also what have we 'gained' in this period? World Bank credit and IDA quota, IMF conditionalities forcing us to go in for commercial loans in the international market, strengthening the wall of protection, blocking Indian import, then on top of everything the super-computer with American personnel to run it. Therefore, Sir, I would appeal to the Government to take a totally objective and historically proved path India's benefit and for the benefit of the world peace against

**[Shrimati Geeta Mukherjee]**

the American imperialists. Don't run to America with sweet smile, either for arms or for super-computers. We are to be non-aligned and in that non-alignment itself it is implied that you call the imperialists as imperialists. Otherwise that non-alignment will not mean anything. We should fortify friendship with all the people of the world and fortify our relationship with the USSR. Try to establish better relations in the region through various diplomatic initiatives. About economic policies, give up your new fangled ideas of liberalisation and running to America for the so-called hi-tec. Fight consistently for a new economic world order.

Sir, I also support the idea mooted by my friend, Mr. Saifuddin Chowdhary that the Resolution condemning the American imperialist policy in its global context which is totally against the interests of our country be adopted by the Parliament. Let us once again clearly declare that we cannot be cowed down. We are not enamoured with the various idea of 'sharing our perceptions', we should call a spade a spade. Let our Parliament lead the crusade by passing such a Resolution.

SHRI BRAJAMOHAN MOHANTY (Puri): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, I am happy that nobody has been that desperate to advise the House to snap our diplomatic relations with the United States of America. Mr. Chowdhary has advised that we have to be hard with the U.S.A. I am not advising. But I am only to place before the House the assessment that Mr. Gorbachev has given in India when Mr. Gorbachev came here. In the Press Conference, people asked him about supplying arms to Pakistan by U.S. and what is his reaction. The reply is very eloquent. For your consumption, Mr. Chowdhary, I am placing it here. (*Interruptions.*) I have consumed it. I have successfully consumed it. You have only half-digested it; you have to digest it fully. There the international crisis is being generated in the communist movement.

The question was asked about the reac-

tion of Mr. Gorbachev to the militarisation of Pakistan by United States. Mr. Gorbachev replied:

"We all—the Soviet Union, India and Pakistan—are neighbours. And I think, neighbours should always live in peace and help one another to build their relations in a spirit of understanding."

We should know the implications.

He further says:

"We stand for good, hearty relations with the Pakistani people and approaches should be worked out to achieve such relations. Other ways lead to unpredictable consequences and we should all remember this. I think, this fully applies to the Pakistani Government."

What does it mean? Some people read it and give a different meaning. Some people say, "U.S.S.R. has changed its attitude towards Pakistan. Now U.S.S.R. will not be that pro-India or it will be pro-Pakistan." But I read a positive gesture that is reflected in the statement. The gesture is to limit the areas of confrontation. The gesture is to strengthen the offensive action for peace. The gesture is, we should have to cultivate the limited areas where we both of us agree. This is the positive aspect of the statement. I do not read in the other way, namely it means, it is more pro-Pakistan than India. I do not mean, if India and Pakistan will be in conflict, the U.S.S.R. will be either neutral or support Pakistan or will not support India. That way, I do not read the statement. The total approach is this. In that background, we have to analyse this. He has distinguished the relationship with the people of Pakistan and that of the Government of Pakistan. I always advise the Government and Mr. Chowdhary knows it that we should cultivate friendship with the people of Pakistan. About the Government of Pakistan itself, leadership of the Government, you can imagine one aspect from SEATO to NAM

that has been adopted by Pakistan. There is a great change from SEATO, being a member of the military bloc to coming to NAM. I also agree that it is not observing the norms of Non-Aligned Movement. But that is another aspect. But the positive and broad aspect remains that it has come to NAM. It is a great success of India's foreign policy. One hon. Member pointed out that India has not been able to keep the Super-powers away. My submission would be, is it not true that India's foreign policy has yielded success to a great extent? It may not be a total success. Why should super-powers oblige India? But the fact remains that even now Pakistan is negotiating weaponry not to defend herself against India but it is negotiating to defend against the Super-power, Soviet Russia. Nobody in the world will believe that India would ever commit aggression against Pakistan.

That is why, I would submit, is it not India which has asked its non-aligned nations to keep the super-powers away from the Indian Ocean.

SHRI NARAYAN CHOUBEY (Midnapore): Keep off US imperialism.

SHRI BRAJAMOHAN MOHANTY: I am coming to US imperialism. The word 'Chaturvedi' has been, in common parlance, changed to Choubey! This is the position. Mr. Saifuddin Chowdhary said that we shall be more harsh towards America. You say America because he has enumerated some action in certain situation, some reactions of the United States of America in certain situations. That has been quite adverse to us but still we have to cultivate our relationship with the people of America. You have to cultivate friendship and cordiality within the limited sphere where we agree. There are broad differences. Have we ever obliged the United States and compromised our policies on account of influence or pressure of United States in any area? (*Interruptions*) In the voting pattern of United Nations Organisation, in which vital issue where our basic policies

are involved, have we compromised with the United States of America? So far as the non-alignment issue, our economic North-South dialogue, our new information order and other things are concerned, on which issue have we conceded and compromised? Nowhere.

The United States of America has made it a point that whichever country helps it in the UNO, it will get more aid and assistance. Am I wrong? Naturally, there is no question of compromise. It was the same, the limited area, where we can cooperate, where we can inter-act, where we can exchange our idea and where we can cultivate our friendly relationship. That is why, I have to say we have to analyse the United States of America. In the United States of America, there are people who are more anti-Soviet than the Government itself. The day when the confirmation of nomination of Ambassador to Pakistan came to Senate, that day a particular Senator categorically stated that "extremists are more anti-Soviet than Indian Government." So we support them. And not only that. It has been alleged that military exercises on the border of Pakistan are only to suppress the Sikhs. I would like the External Affairs Minister to enlighten the House whether any efforts to counter this type of propaganda and to educate the people of United States of America have been made. I do not say that Senator is total America. There are certain people who are putting pressure, who are influencing the American policy against India.

I would point out that the extremists in Sarbat Khalsa on November 2, 1986 inside the Golden Temple, in one of their resolutions, praised Mr. William Lippam, Mr. G.B. Champi and Mr. Don Bruttom because they supported extremists in India. There are the features we have to keep in mind. I do not say that these Senators totally represent American opinion. These things should be kept in mind. My submission is that this total picture must be analysed by the Government of India.

There is another thing. So far as the

[Shri Brajamohan Mohanty]

United States of America is concerned, we should have, as everybody agrees, to cultivate good relationship with the people of America. The Constitution of America is a great Constitution. It is one of the greatest Constitutions of the world. The human freedom has been enshrined in it. It inspires te entire humanity. We have seen how Steinbeck was burnt in that country, who was a great poet and who had written *The Grapes of Wrath* in that country. Then, *Uncle Tom's cabin* was also written in that country. So, we should not alienate those people. But, all the same we must guard against it. We should know where we have to agree with them and where we have to disagree with them. There is one thing. Wherever the Indian relationship comes into conflict with the United States of America and the global policy, the global policy will prevail and not the Indian interests will prevail. That is the aspect.

Now, I would like to come to the question of AWACS. A lot of talk is going on about the AWACS. What is the difficulty involved there. They are cent percent agreeable to give it to Pakistan. But the problem is that Pakistan has neither got the mechanism for maintenance nor the personnel to manage it. So, the American personnel must come to educate them in order to maintain them and also to man the AWACS at the initial stages. There arises the problem. Now, what will be the reaction of the Soviet Union in that case. No doubt, they are obliging India without taking a prompt decision in this regard. That will also create some legal complications—I mean the U.S. assistance to Pakistan in respect of AWACS. That means, under the War Powers Act, when the war is going on in any region—may be for example Afghanistan or Pakistan although there is no war at present but still it is a very tense region—the American personnel cannot be deputed. So, this statute stands in their way. Also, the relationship between the US and the USSR stands in the way. Therefore, we have to examine all these points considering the merit of the case, and not that we analyse the issues in isolation.

I have to come to another aspect of the matter. Shri Chowdhary has praised it from one angle of the situation and not the total picture. I am placing before him and before this House as to what is the role of China. Dr. Paul *Leventhil* indicates—he is the President of the Nuclear Control Institute of Washington.....

SHRI SAIFUDDIN CHOWDHARY  
(Katwa): It is not debate on Indo-China.

SHRI BRAJAMOHAN MOHANTY: It is not about Indo-China in particular but about the total picture. Nobody has conceived of any American policy without taking into account the question of Pakistan and China. The point is that we are fighting out the total communism. Irrespective of all the overt acts committed by the Government of China, we still stand for friendship with China. We stand for friendship in the areas where we agree. Coming to the point, Dr. Paul *Lerenthil*, President of the Nuclear Control Institute of Washington says that China has transferred nuclear weapons design information to Pakistan. This has also been confirmed by the BBC. This is one aspect of the matter. We cannot ignore this fact. Perhaps, the entire international situation would have been different, not only in this region but all over the world, had China played a positive role in the movement for peace. I would like that Mr. Chowdhary and his friends should also equally advise China and they should frame the policy accordingly. I am placing one thing from the Pentagon paper: In a reference to the Peoples Republic of China, the Pentagon report says that as compared to other communist countries, China has been placed on an extremely favourable footing for the purpose of receiving high technology exports from the Western Countries and from Japan. Now, how are you advising us?.....

(Interruptions)

SHRI SAIFUDDIN CHOWDHARY  
(Katwa): May I add another point?

(Interruptions)

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Mr. Chowdhary, please leave it.

SHRI SAIFUDDIN CHOWDHARY: Are you yielding?

SHRI BRAJAMOHAN MOHANTY: I am not yielding. My time is up...

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: He is not yielding...

SHRI SAIFUDDIN CHOWDHARY: You can take my time...

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Your time is fixed. When your time comes you speak. Now, you please take your seat....

*(Interruptions)*

SHRI SAIFUDDIN CHOWDHARY: There is another opinion growing in U.S.A. that U.S.A. tried to use China for their benefit but now they find that China is using the U.S.A. for its benefit ....

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: He has not yielded. Please sit down....

*(Interruptions)*

SHRI BRAJAMOHAN MOHANTY: Please listen to me. The total atmosphere will change, the day China is actively brought into the framework of peace movement of the world. The socialist countries are now divided ... *(Interruptions)* My submission would be that you friends should work actively to bring China into the framework of peace movement.

I shall now come to another aspect. I come to the success of our foreign policy. Do you know of the episode which happened in the UNO? That is, a Sikh Group failed to get the U.N. Recognition. 'Sikh Commonwealth', an organization or association, wanted recognition by the UNO. Do you know what happened? All the countries of the world opposed it. Sri Lanka, Cyprus, France, Cuba, Malawi, Bulgaria—all spoke against the applica-

tion by the 'Sikh Commonwealth' while the Soviet Union and the United States joined in condemning it. Pakistan and other members chose not to speak at all. None supported the application. This is also a positive feature of the Indian foreign policy. On how many issues the USA and the Soviet Union have joined together to take a common stand? We should not forget that. That is a positive aspect.

All the same, I would request the External Affairs Minister to do one thing. Very active steps should be taken to educate the public opinion in the USA to isolate the Pakistan propaganda mechanism. So far as Pakistan is concerned, so far as their relationship with the USA and their being armed by the USA is concerned, I know there are many people in Pakistan itself, there is a voice, there is an opinion inside Pakistan itself, against this alignment. I know, ultimately it will ruin Pakistan because there are diversities—regional diversity, language diversity, cultural diversity, and so on. Ultimately, this will never pay Pakistan. Still the Pakistan ruling clique is going to that extent, although openly they do not say that they have aligned themselves with the USA. For them, how far have the USA gone They have managed to have a section of the Opposition leadership subdued so that the military regime can continue. I am sure, the day real democracy comes in Pakistan, the stand of Pakistan is bound to change and Indo-Pakistan friendship will be assured.

SHRI VIR SEN (Khurja): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, in the diplomatic language, of course, we have to be diplomatic and 'diplomacy' means double meaning and double dealing. When the Americans talk of friendship with India, of course, they are talking diplomatically. Everybody knows that, since the time of Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru when he decided that India would not be aligned either with America or with Russia, since then, of course, America has taken it as antagonistic. Its attitude has always been antagonistic. That is the reason, why America has always been against

[Shri Vir Sen]

it. Their policy, from the very beginning, has been to subdue India, to bring India to fall in line with them. This has always been the effort. That is why they have always been helping Pakistan.

Well, the American policy, as the policy of all big powers, is to fight by proxy. They do not fight directly by gun shells. That is why, when they are antagonistic—I think this will be a mild word, if we use belligerent that would be proper. So they are exercising their belligerency not directly but through Pakistan. That is why they have

been arming Pakistan to the teeth. We have been objecting since 1977 that all the arms that have been supplied to Pakistan are only to be used against India, they have been seeing ghost of Russian interference. From the very beginning they have been doing it. Even today when it is the question of arming Pakistan, they say there is a great fear from Russia through Afghanistan. Now, I think, Russians also know it, the Pakistanis also know it, the Americans also know it that Pakistan can never fight against Russia.

14.56 hrs.

[SHRI VAKKOM PURUSHOTHAMAN *in the Chair*]

It has not the power to fight. But still the argument and the plea is that the arms are being supplied to Pakistan only not against India but to be used against Afghanistan. I think, this is the policy everybody knows. But we diplomatically do not say that America is belligerently against us. This is also diplomacy. I think we cannot say it.

SHRI SAIFUDDIN CHOWDHARY: We keep our people also under diplomatic ignorance.

SHRI VIR SEN: We all know what is reality. Now I think America has been playing the game of war-monger throughout the world, not only against India but throughout the world. You know why they are doing this. Firstly, they want the total

domination of the whole world, complete domination of the whole world. And whenever you talk, whenever you hear about diplomatic officers and Government speaking about world affairs, they will say, wherever our interests are in question we will act according to our interests. Recently also in some Committee an officer of the Administration had said that our interests are supreme wherever there may be the question. One of the most important interests I think is selling of arms. They are producing arms and they want to sell their arms. And this is why they want the belligerency and the war phobia to be kept alive throughout the world. This is what they are doing through very many methods. CIA is one of them. Everywhere where the Government are not in line with the American policy they are trying to topple it, topple by helping, by resurgence, by supplying them arms. This is what they have been doing. You see, they are considered to be one of the greatest democracies in the world. They are supposed to help democracy. But instead of helping democracies they are helping dictatorship throughout the world. They are helping dictatorship. I would like to say this is hypocritical democracy. They are hypocrites in supporting democracies and if they believe in democracy, they would not have come to help the military regime in Pakistan and elsewhere also. At the same time wherever there are countries in which some interests differ, they are helping the people of both the sides to fight so that the war may continue and their arms are sold continuously.

15.00 hrs.

This is the case with Israel. Israel is a small country, but they are arming it to such an extent that they are able to beat Egypt and other countries and try to keep the war open. In the same way even Iran gate affair has cropped up. They have helped Iran also to keep up their fight with Iraq. This is the way they want the whole world to be fighting so that their arms may be sold. They keep up the war psychosis and it is through this method that they are

supporting the new imperialist policy or neo-colonialism. They want their goods to be sold and at the same time always they are objecting that protectionism is coming in their way. America is one of the richest nations. They are also exercising protectionism so that a developing nation would not come up. As I have made it clear, war is one of their methods through which they want to bring down the independent nations.

Our friends on the other side have been raising again and again the question of common perspective. I would like to say—whether we have differences with America or with any other country—our differences cannot be total differences. There can be some limit for the differences and there can be some points where we may agree and we may have common perspective. There is no question of harping too much upon common perspective. We may agree on some points and we may disagree on other points. With America also we may have some issues on which we have common perspective.

Our friend Shri Shahabuddin was talking about obsession. He said that we are obsessed with USA and at the same time with Pakistan.

PROF MADHU DANDAVATE (Rajapur) He also said that Pakistan also is obsessed with India.

SHRI VIR SEN Of course he was saying that. But about this obsession, I would say that we should not adopt a policy of a pigeon—when a cat is coming, it is supposed that the pigeon closes its eyes and thinks that the danger does not exist. In the same way Shri Shahabuddin would like us to believe in the way of pigeon that there is no danger. When Pakistan is arming itself with nuclear weapons, we cannot close our eyes and we cannot think that the danger does not exist. We will have to prepare ourselves to match our strength with

nuclear weapons. It would be very wrong if we think that even if Pakistan makes a bomb and attacks us, we should not. The Government has already indicated that our options are open and it is because of this declaration that Pakistan has offered to give an opportunity of inspection. So far they have never come up with the idea that India should also come and inspect their nuclear preparations. Only this declaration has made this effect upon them and they are willing to share joint inspection. I think, when we make a bomb and adopt the nuclear option, I am sure they will shun the idea of creating or manufacturing it.

The only option to deter Pakistan from manufacturing bomb is to manufacture a bomb ourselves. Our friends may say it will be a costly affair but, I think, when the question of defence of the country is concerned or when our national integrity territorial integrity and sovereignty is in question then, of course, we have to spend to keep our country independent and sovereign.

It was also stated that we should try to improve our relations with USA and also Pakistan. How can we do it? There is only one method, namely, if we fall in line with the American thought and we agree with them that we join their bloc. Then, of course, we would be able to get as much help or perhaps more help from America than Pakistan is getting. But are we going to surrender our judgement and independent policy only to woo their favour? I think the Government of India will not agree and no member either on this side of the House or on that side will agree to this proposition. We have to keep our policies independent and we have to keep our sovereignty intact. We cannot surrender any part of it.

In the same way I would say about Pakistan. How can we have friendly relations with Pakistan the leaders of which have said we will be having thousands of years of war with India. We cannot ignore this psychology. So we have to prepare ourselves to fight for thousand years if the

[Shri Vir Sen]

chance comes. If we have to appease Pakistan then the first question is the question of Kashmir. They say that two-nation theory should be accepted and Kashmir which is a Muslim majority area should be given to Pakistan. If we agree to this perhaps we can think Pakistan may become friendly. But are we going to accept this theory? We rejected it before Independence. We rejected it after Independence and we reject it even today. So Pakistan is not going to be appeased by offering Kashmir on a platter. Kashmir is a part of India. It has been part of India and it shall remain part of India even if Pakistan raises this issue in hundreds of forums.

Sir, now the point is what is the answer to this problem? I have tried to understand the problem. I will refer to the American history itself. There was a time when the Latin American States had become independent and from Spain and France there was a fear that they would come forward and attack and subjugate the Latin Americans and establish their rule. At that time some leaders of America and particularly Mr. Monroe, who was the President at that time came with a doctrine called 'Monroe doctrine'. I would like to say that America at that time declared that if any European country wants to interfere in the independent States of Latin America or States near America then America will consider it as a dangerous thing to peace and safety. Now I would like to read only two small passages from Monroe doctrine:

"The political system of the allied powers is essentially different from that of America and we should consider any attempt on their part to extend their system to any portion of this hemisphere as dangerous to our peace and safety."

I think, this, of course, is the point which we should also declare that America or any other country would try to have influence on the sub-continent, that is, India, Pakistan, Nepal, Bhutan, Burma, Sri Lanka and Bangla Desh. These are the areas where

we should declare that if any foreign power tries to interfere in this part of the world, then we are there to protest all this thing. I would like to say that even in military terms, we should offer an umbrella for all these states. We should declare that if any foreign power comes and interferes and tries to establish its influence there, then we will come there and we will oppose.

Sir, another extract I would like to read:

"The American continents, by the free and independent condition which they have assumed and maintain, are henceforth not to be considered as subjects for future colonisation by any European powers."

I think these two extracts are sufficient to settle the problem with the American policy also. I think America should also be warned that if they try to interfere in the affairs of these independent countries, then India will come forward and protect their interests and protect them with military also. This will give some sort of satisfaction or consolation to Pakistan also. I hope in that case only when we declare that, the differences between Pakistan and India will come to an end.

SHRI DINESH GOSWAMI (Guwahati):  
MR. Chairman, Sir, all sections of the House, irrespective of party affiliations, have expressed concern and worry in the arming of Pakistan by United States. Members have expressed their anger, anguish, dismay in the United States' approach to India vis-a-vis that of Pakistan. But I believe that in the matter of international relationship for a mature country like India, we cannot formulate our policies either on anger or anguish or dismay. It must be based on a clear perception of the present global position in terms of international relationship.

Right from the time of Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, India had tried to be friendly with America because the fact remains that America is one of the strongest democra-

cies of the world. We are one of the largest democracy. But unfortunately the relationship has not matured to the desired extent. The reason is not far to seek. The basic reason is that perceptions of America and perceptions of India virtually on all important global issues are different, whether it is on the question of apartheid in South America, whether on the question of inalienable rights of the Palestinian people, on the issue of colonialism and neo-colonialism, on the issue of economic philosophy because we believe in a philosophy which is a socialist philosophy. The Americans believe in a free economy. We believe in strong relationship with socialist countries. The administration of the United States is always suspicious of those countries which maintain good relationship with socialist countries. We differ on the approach of the new economic order.

The American Government and the Administration are trying various ways of protectionism. We stand for disarmament and development. And if the United Nations resolutions are any guide, the United States virtually has voted against all resolutions on which the majority of the countries of the world have voted in terms of development and disarmament. Therefore, it is no wonder that our relationship has not been in a manner in which we would have liked it to be. Let us also not forget that the United States foreign policy does not contemplate relationship between nations based on equality and trust. Our relationship with Soviet Union is a relationship based on equality, based on trust. Even in the Indo-Soviet foreign treaty, which was criticised so much by the U.S. mutual respect, mutual trust, mutual dependence and also pursuance of each others policies independently has been maintained. But the United States believes that every nation must be pliable nation which can be moved or modulated in accordance with its economic or Security considerations. Therefore, the United States from the very beginning have

become suspicious of us. In fact, initially the Dulles doctrine was that the non-alignment was an unethical movement, but today they have changed the pharascology not because they have any faith in the non-alignment, but because the United States have found that this movement has grown in strength and, therefore, they have tried to penetrate this movement by bringing in the movement some of their own friendly countries. The United States also does not agree to any relationship, by a developing country as I said, with any socialist country, but, our principle is that the relationship between our country and another country cannot and must not be at the cost of any relationship with any other country.

The other point is that the United States depends for their domestic Government sustenance heavily on the military industrial complex. No administration in the United States probably can hope, no President can probably aspire to win a battle of presidency if he antagonizes the military industrial complex. The U.S. policy is that there must be constant mistrust in the world and suspicion particularly in the developing nations so that arms can be pumped into these nations. We have seen for ourselves the situation in this sub-continent. We have seen how U.S. has pumped arms in Pakistan with the result that we are also compelled to go for production and purchase of arms though it is detrimental to our growth. We have seen that some of our neighbour countries are spending more in terms of per capita than even the per capita expenditure of United States on defence.

The United States foreign policy also, to some extent, is guided by the personal whim and fancies and predilections of its Presidents. I do not know, but the reports say that so far as Nixon is concerned, some of his public pronouncement on foreign policy was completely contradictory to the private opinions that he had and the policies that he pursued regarding Vietnam, regarding Laos, regarding the then Cambodia as the public position that he took

[Shri Dinesh Goswami]

greatly differed. In the difficult year of 1971 he tried to befriend Yahya Khan because he thought that he could be used as a plank for United States relationship with China. In the Bangladesh war when public hue and cry was raised on the atrocities of unfortunate people in East Pakistan, the United States foreign policy makers made some public pronouncements, but did the opposite otherwise. In fact, I do not know, because I find it difficult to believe Hershman, but Hershman wrote in the book and some comments were made against Morarji Desai, Nixon made a private entry into the foreign policy that the U.S. should not in any way do anything which may harm Yahya Khan.

We have seen the duplicity of the United States foreign policy in Chile, we have seen it in Iran, in Latin America and the Middle-East and the same policy is pursued by Reagan today.

Now, what should we do? I am not of the view that we should not try to cultivate friendship with the United States. Every country would like to cultivate friendship with any other country though we must be fully conscious of those geo-political considerations and also must not lose sight of the factors which dominate the relationship between the United States and India.

We must be conscious and we must be cautious of the fact that at no point of time we can really hope to have real friendship with United States because our perceptions on global issue differ very materially. I believe that we must not bend backward to placate the United States and the reason is, Sir, that if history of the last 10 or 20 years is taken as a guide then friends of United States have suffered more than its enemies; whether it is the recent Marcos' regime, whether it was Yahya Khan in Pakistan, or Shah of Iran, were all friends and they thought that United States in the moment of peril would come to their rescue. But Yahya Khan has lost Pakistan; Shah of Iran has to flee Iran, to leave his own country. Marcos has taken asylum in some other country.

SHRI G.G. SWELL: Now, I think Marcos is in the U.S.A.

SHRI DINESH GOSWAMI: I believe friendship with United States has become more damaging to the countries and even to the individual leaders than enmities with the United States. What I am trying to point out is that I am not saying that we do not want friendship with United States but equally I believe that we should not bend backwards to be friends with U.S.

Some Members have said that we should try to educate United States people regarding its foreign policy of this subcontinent. I do not know whether we are capable of educating the United States public opinion because United States own media is so strong and in matters of foreign policy the Government influence the media so much that I do not think we will be able to educate anyone. But, I believe even in the Bangladesh war we maintained a constant diplomatic relationship with congressmen and those who do not see eye to eye with United States foreign policy. I believe we should maintain constant touch because there are a large number of congressmen who do not really follow the United States official line of foreign policy. There are people in United States with different shades of opinion and I believe a diplomatic and constant touch should be maintained with them. Our own publicity media in the United States should be improved. But our perception should never be diluted.

Our relationship with socialist countries should be strengthened. It is already strong and it should be further strengthened. Our concept of self-reliance must be diluted under any circumstances. Let us not forget in the initial years when we were trying to build up the industrial infrastructure in this country, neither America nor Great Britain, nor France came to help us and it is the socialist country, the Soviet Union which came to help us in the matter of steel plant. At that time, had the socialist country not come to our help, the strong industrial and the infrastructure that we

have today would not have been there. And if today we feel confident, in spite of the fact that so much of arms are pumping into Pakistan, it is because that we feel that we will be able to meet any threat because of this strong industrial and agricultural infrastructure that we have been able to build up in this country.

Sir, I am in agreement that our relations with our immediate neighbours should be improved. The Speaker who preceded me spoke on Munro doctrine and if I have not understood him wrong, he said that we should follow similar doctrine in this sub-continent. I am totally opposed to this idea. In fact, the greatest difficulty that India faces today in its relationship with its neighbours is that our neighbours are mistrustful for us because of our own size and development. Therefore, we must not show any big brother attitude and that is the view point I expressed while initiating the discussion on SAARC that we must try to build up our friendship with our neighbour on cordiality and mutual trust. Any impression that we give to our neighbours that we are so strong and that in the moment of crisis we will stand up and defend them against any aggression, that will be counter productive and will add to their suspicion. Therefore, the Munro doctrine, in whatever form we try to put here, will not only be counter-productive but extremely dangerous.

I believe that we must improve our relations. I am not one to say that India should never go nuclear come what may. We must keep our options open.

But the danger is there that if we go nuclear just because Pakistan goes nuclear and if we go nuclear, other neighbouring countries may try to go nuclear and in this way, to a great extent America will achieve what it is trying to achieve. One of their main purposes in arms race is not only to develop their military-industrial complex, but also to see that the developing nations are unable to use their resources for purposes of development by

spending more on arms. Because, if we spend more for purposes of arms, then the country remains poor and poor countries and their instability are ultimately the right situations to be exploited by the colonial powers. (*Interruptions*) I am not saying that we should not go nuclear. But before any decision is taken on the nuclear issue all options must be considered very carefully. We should try to create a situation in this country, in which mutual trust and friendship can be cultivated among the neighbouring nations. Here, SAARC has to play a great role. I feel SAARC stands on the cross roads today. We have said a lot about SAARC. SAARC cannot succeed without healthy relations between India and Pakistan. And initiative for this relationship must continue to come from India. I believe that we should try to cultivate that relationship with our neighbouring countries. If we can really develop relationship, on the basis of confidence, then that will be the greater challenge to the machinations of the United States.

Therefore, Sir, to conclude I will say that we must be fully conscious of the political compulsions—our own political compulsions and our own perceptions and we should not think in terms that in the near future our friendship or our relationship with the United States will improve a great deal. We must formulate our policies within the basis of this limitation and we must continue to be more friendly with the socialist countries and we must pursue the policy of self-reliance. Any dilution of that principle will only help the imperialist forces.

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS (SHRI K. NATWAR SINGH): Sir, first of all, I would like to respectfully compliment **Shri Saifuddin Chowdhary** for initiating this debate and asking for discussion on this important subject of relations between the United States and India.

I am also grateful to Shri Bhagat, Shri Swell, Shri Zainul Basher, Shrimati Geeta

[Shri K. Natwar Singh]

Mukherjee, Shri Mohanty, Shri Jagathrakshakan, Shri Goswami and many others, who have participated in this debate. The standard of the debate, if I may say so, has been high and I would like to pay tribute to all these members. I shall, during the course of my reply, take up the various points that have been mentioned by the hon. members. And Sir, with your permission...

SHRI V.S. KRISHNA IYER: You were saying something like Janata. Shri Shahabuddin spoke on behalf of the Janata Party.

SHRI K. NATWAR SINGH: I will come to Shri Shahabuddin Mahashay. I am sorry if I forgot to mention his name.

Sir, the discussion has been very wide-ranging. Now, it is possible for us to go back to pre-independence days, to 1947, and take a view of our relations with the United States from that time. We confine ourselves to the immediate past, present and the immediate future as we see it. Hon. members who have spoken, have taken both the routes. Some have gone right back. Shrimati Geeta Mukherjee quoted Pandit Nehru. I have got Panditji's speech here with me and I also intend to quote from it, though in a different context.

As regards our relations with the United States, if we have to take an overall and balanced view, then as Shri Goswami said, **it is the way of diplomacy, to reduce the areas of conflict and increase the areas of agreement to reduce tension.** This is what we have learnt from the days of Pandit Nehru. That is why he went on his great voyage of discovery to America in 1949.

Looking at it from the immediate vantage point of view, we have to analyse what United States' policy towards India is. I say this with some hesitations. But none of the hon. Members who spoke has referred to a **speech made on the 29th April by the Under Secretary of State for Political**

**Affairs, Michael H. Armacost at the Asia Society.** The subject of it was "United States and South-Asia ties". I shall, Sir, before I refer to the observations made by hon. Members, like to read out a few relevant portions, because this is very pertinent and to discuss our relations with the United States without referring to his speech would be, to my mind, somewhat unrealistic.

PROF. N.G. RANGA (Guntur): Whose speech?

SHRI K. NATWAR SINGH: This is the speech of Mr. Armacost, who is the Under Secretary of State for Political Affairs of the United States.

PROF. N.G. RANGA: Did you meet him?

SHRI K. NATWAR SINGH: Yes, I did meet him recently. I shall also refer to my visit to the United States. Several Members have mentioned regarding my visit and have asked me, why I had gone to Washington. This is a fair question. This was answered some days ago by the External Affairs Minister. I would only like to ask the Hon. Members to consider my visit to the United States, in keeping with the mature conduct of diplomacy. While diplomacy will not produce instant salvation, it is the only instrument which is available to sovereign States for talking to each other. There are other alternatives available, but they are not peaceful. I had not gone to Washington to ask for favours because to ask for favours means to surrender one's independence I had gone to convey our feelings respectfully to our American friends and to tell them that it is not possible to make good news out of bad practice. I conveyed the strong feelings of the Government, of this House and the 780 million people of India, over the continued supply of sophisticated arms to Pakistan beyond that country's defence requirements and how this was likely to put strain on our bilateral relations which we value very much and which are multifaceted.

United States is our largest trading partner. More than half a million people of Indian origin, are living in the United States **they are doing extremely well. It is a great compliment to America that so many of our people want to go there. We have many collaborations with them. A large number of students go there. Regarding science and technology, following the Prime Minister's visit in 1985, which is a landmark in our relationship, new avenues were opened. This aspect of our relationship, we value and we want to further promote, deepen, strengthen and widen it.**

Then, there is other aspect which relates to supply of arms to Pakistan. If I had not gone, then Members of this House would have said, what the Government of India is doing about this. So, it is our duty, as a responsible Government to go and explain to them and tell them, what the feeling of 780 million people of India and do so politely, in a diplomatic manner and also in a frank manner this I did.

During my visit, I had the privilege to be received by the Vice-President, Mr. George Bush. I had useful meetings with the Secretary of State Mr. George Shultze, Secretary of Defence, Mr. Casper Weinberger, National Security Adviser, Mr. Frank Carlucci and my opposite member in the State Department Mr. John Whitehead. I had also met a number of Senators and Congressmen, academicians and members of the Indian community.

I am deeply grateful for the courtesy shown to me, by the U.S. Administration and the senior leaders and officials of the United States Government.

Now, Sir, referring to the speech of Mr. Armacost, he says and I quote:

"Yet this scope of our involvement, the relative emphasis given to security versus economic concerns and the priority accorded to particular countries within the regions have varied with changes and international circumstances

and in the rhythm of American politics."

"In the rhythm of American politics" - "Continuity has not always been our strong point as we have sought to balance our regional interests in South and South West Asia, with our global concerns about the expansion of Soviet power."

The Reagan Administration has attempted to forge closer relations simultaneously with both India and Pakistan. What are the goals? The goals are: "Restore Afghanistan's independence, avert a nuclear arms race in the sub-continent, encourage a reduction of tension between India and Pakistan." This is an amazing assertion.

"Encourage a reduction in tension between Pakistan and India" - how is this to be done? I will come to it later. Let me complete this. - Then it says: "Stem the drug trade, forge international cooperation against terrorism". Here we fully agree with them. They are cooperating with us. I would like to place on record that the cooperation of the United States Government has been useful to us. Then there is a reference to "...preserve national integrity in the face of separatist demands." We fully share this. Then there is "... support moves towards democracy and regional and economic cooperation, including the impressive stride by South Asian Association for Regional Cooperation."

There are two things with which we, in this House are concerned. The first is supply of arms to Pakistan. What has led to the tension that has grown in this region? In 1981 when I was the Ambassador of India to Pakistan, the first instalment of massive military and economic aid on this scale was announced; and at that time, we had conveyed our fears to the United States, and our concerns—no doubt, our people are concerned—because we want normal, good neighbourly, friendly relations with Pakistan. That is why in 1972 **Shrimati Indira Gandhi signed the Simla Agreement.** There was no compulsion for us to do so; but we signed it, because she

[Shri K. Natwar Singh]

took a long-term view; she had a vision of good Indo-Pak. relations. But we said that if this kind of arms were brought into Pakistan, then inevitably we must have a feeling in India, a compulsion in India, because our people would like to know what Government of India is doing, to meet this challenge. So, \$3.2 billion were allocated to them for 1981-87, and the argument given then was that this was for meeting the threat in Afghanistan.

Now, on this issue also, I would like to read out something....

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA (Basirhat):  
What is that threat?

SHRI K. NATWAR SINGH: The threat was Soviet presence in Afghanistan. That was the reason given for the arms aid to Pakistan. (*Interruptions*)

This is what Mr. Armacost says.

"India continues to be concerned that Pakistan intends to use U.S. arms to strengthen its position against India. Our defence cooperation with Pakistan is designed to modernize its conventional defence capabilities, in the light of Soviet pressures in Afghanistan."

I would like to repeat the words... "in the light of Soviet pressures in Afghanistan.", because if there is a settlement in Afghanistan, even then, this will continue because it is now said: 'in the light of Soviet pressures in Afghanistan.'" This is a new introduction in the phraseology, that has been used for the first time, as far as I am aware. (*Interruptions*)

Even then the idea is that these arms are being used for Afghanistan. The House knows, and the hon. Members know that these arms have not been used against Afghanistan. The new package which is \$4.02 billion of which 647 million dollars will

be given each year, and the supply of AWACS or any other airborne system, I am not going into details of the talks because they are confidential. But, broadly speaking, I had mentioned this thing and asked them to please tell us about this. *The Time* magazine says that they have got a bomb. Dr. Khan who is responsible for this says that they have got a bomb. The United States Government says no. I will quote from Mr. Armacost's speech. He says as follows:

"The Regan Administration certified to the Congress last October its judgment that Pakistan does not possess a nuclear device. Despite recent press stories, we have not changed the assessment."

This was repeated to me, I said, for us, the words given by the scientists in Pakistan naturally carry weight with our People. In fact, the Minister has already spoken on the subject. I will not speak. Then I said, all right, now what about the amount that you are giving -4.2 billion dollars over the next five years plus this sophisticated weaponry that is being given—the army, the navy and the airforce I put this to our Pak friends. I said, in 1971, after the creation of Bangladesh, the defence requirements of Pakistan and the defence responsibility of Pakistan were reduced by 50 per cent; you were no longer responsible for the defence of Bangladesh. Should not the defence budget of Pakistan be reduced by 50 per cent? Should not the army of Pakistan be reduced by 50 per cent; similarly the Air Force and the Navy. But this did not happen. The budget of Pakistan has gone on increasing. The army has been doubled; the air force nearly 2 1/2 times; similarly the navy. Knowing our past experience and past history, we cannot ignore this. As a neighbour, we wish them well, we want a strong Pakistan. So, I said, give me some assurance that in the absence of a settlement with Afghanistan, these weapons will not be used against us or if there is a settlement with Afghanistan then allocations will be revised - we hope there will be because the Afghanistan Government

announced a time table; there is a talk going on in Geneva between Pakistan and Afghanistan under the auspices of a representative of the Secretary-General of the United Nations - if there is no settlement, then where will these arms be used? We have known from the past experience that they would be used against us which will directly affect our security. Now it is being said that it is being done because of Soviet pressure. How do we define this pressure? So, we have now this clear authoritative statement. I do not want to take time of the House on the many other Points on which the speech is available and can be seen.

But what I want to say is that the United States Government has been telling us that India and Pakistan should sit down together across the table and discuss the nuclear question. Now we have said repeatedly that this nuclear question is not a bilateral question; it is not a regional question; it is a global question. How can they possibly look at important world issues and matters which govern vital interests solely from the narrow focus of the Indo-Pakistan relations? This is not a bilateral matter. (*Interruptions*). It is not only short-sighted but also dangerous to treat it as such, it has to be taken as a global question. I have said this in the United States. The Prime Minister said this. The Six-nations, five-continental appeal has been made on this basis that nuclear question is a global question. Even an accident like Chernobyl shows that this is not confined to any one country. So, we look at this from the global context. I took up this matter, both of the arms and the nuclear programme of Pakistan when I was in the United States, with the distinguished leaders I had met. This is the bone of contention, and yet the speech by a senior representative of the United States states that their endeavour is to ease tension in the sub-continent! Now, when this kind of armour is coming into Pakistan, to our neighbour, I do not see how tensions will not increase. I said this to the representative of the United States that there are large number of people in India who have feelings of friendship and goodwill towards

the United States but even they are going to ask, if you going to arm them the way you are, then India's defence budget surely must go up, which means our developmental programmes must suffer. That is what they are asking, they are questioning your judgment.

And, the thesis propounded in the speech is that they are trying to reduce tensions here. How? But we cannot share the perception because the security environment has been adversely affected and very seriously and gravely affected by the kind of military aid that Pakistan is receiving from the United States, in spite of what we have said, in spite of the past history of this particular policy posture of the United States because in the pursuit of the short term strategic aims, the United States if I may respectfully, may say so, is defeating the very objective that she claims that she stands for, namely, peace and stability in the Indian Sub-continent. If this kind of armament is going to be inducted in the way it is, then the only response is to curtail developmental expenditure, The economic programmes are going to suffer, the Seventh Five Year Plan gets a set back, and if this is the objective then even the people who are friendly towards U.S.A. will question whether this is not an abdication of political judgment.

The Afghanistan events took place in 1979. Aid to Pakistan started in the fifties and I will quote from a speech of Pandit Nehru. Panditji in a speech he made in this House on the 13th of March, 1959 said:

"Spokesmen of the Pakistan Government have on various occasions stated their objective in entering into a defence military pacts and alliances is to strengthen Pakistan against India. We have repeatedly pointed this out and emphasized that the U.S. defence aid to Pakistan encourages the Pakistan authorities in their aggressiveness and increases tension and conflict between India and Pakistan."

[Shri K. Natwar Singh]

Now these words uttered by a very great man, so many years ago, 28 years ago, hold true today.

All that I said was, "Please use your very considerable influence on Pakistan and tell them to have relations of cordiality and cooperation with India and not confrontation. We want good will and friendship with Pakistan. We do not want any conflict with them and Pakistan by itself would pose no threat to us." I think it is Shri Vir Sen, who said it, and I am merely repeating what he said, 'If it comes to that they fight by proxy'. Tension is caused by induction of these arms. That is why the armaments that are being given have adversely affected the security environment and thus we are rightly concerned with it. All this is going to impose a severe burden on the Indian people. We are ready to meet any situation. We are a country which cannot be bought, bullied or brow-beaten. If a situation arises, we will face it. We do not want to have tension or any kind of friction with any country. As I said, we deeply value our friendship with United States of America and that is why I had gone there and explained to them. They have taken note of it. What will they do? We will see, because in the few days the allocations will be made.

Now, Sir, there are two ways of looking at this. There is a famous Mexican poet Mr. Octavia Paz, who said that the Mayas had two ways of measuring time - one is short term and the another is long term. We are looking at the long term. I think, Members have said about the various military alliances and military pacts with United States, will not in this part of the country yield fruitful results. Sri Goswamiji has referred to the pacts and military alliances that have made and the international ground related with other military alliances which are not defined atleast in this part of the world. French historians have made a distinction between the long duration and short duration in historical process. We are taking a long term view of it. We are hoping that

United States will have second thoughts. My erstwhile colleague Sri Shahabuddin made some critical remarks about our foreign policy. Smt. Indira Gandhi had defined our foreign policy and I would like to quote, which is a very very telling quotation.

"India's foreign policy is a projection of the values which we have cherished through the centuries as well as on current concerns. We are not tied to the traditional concepts of a foreign policy designed to safeguard overseas possessions, investments, the carving out of spheres of influence of the erection of cordons ... We are not interested in exporting ideologies.

Our first concern has been to prevent any erosion of our independence. Therefore we could not be camp followers of any power, however rich or strong. We had equal interest in the maintenance and safeguarding of international peace as an essential condition of India's economic, social and political development....

These are the parameters of our foreign policy and from the days of Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, I must say this with some pride for myself having been connected with the Ministry for over 31 years. We are the only major country which has made no U turns in the foreign policy on basic points. Here, I will quote concrete example. From the year 1949 to 1972, the United States of America said that a country called Peoples Republic of China does not exist and we said that it does.

800 to 900 million people are living there In 1962 when there was the border conflicts, the delegation of India at UNO voted for the Peoples Republic of China joining the United Nations as a matter of principle and not as a matter of expediency.

Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru laid down the

framework, the parameters of our foreign policy in 1947 although his thinking on this began in 1927. It is a great tribute to his foresight and to his vision. Even at the time of a change in the Government at the centre in 1977 our foreign policy could not be altered because there is no other foreign policy which this country can follow. That is why, today we are respected regardless of what some Members have said that our voice is not heard, that we have problems with our neighbours. All large countries have problems with their neighbours. We can choose our friends, but we cannot choose our geography. And geography is the mother of diplomacy. We have to look at this in this way. We are committed in the SAARC and other organisations to have friendliest relations with all our neighbours. And India's voice has been raised at the United Nations, in the Commonwealth, Non-aligned Movement, at SAARC and at other organisations for peace, development and disarmament. In these areas also some of the countries of the west have not supported us. It is not our fault. Here is a document called the Delhi Declaration. It is a unique document signed by the Prime Minister of India and the General Secretary of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. It is a historic document which strengthens the forces of peace. So, we are not a nation which wants conflict with our neighbours. Neither are we acting as bullies. You can see the example of Sri Lanka. We are using the maximum amount of restraint in the situation there because we would like to be helpful. We do not want anybody's territory. We have no expansionist design. But if our territorial integrity and our independence are adversely affected, naturally we will react to it as a country. We are not to be pushed around. We are not a client state. We are an independent country. We follow an independent foreign policy.

Before Coming to various points raised by hon. Members I wanted to make a general survey of our relationship with the United States which, once again I must emphasise, is of very great importance to

us. They are a super power and we would like to have even closer and friendlier relations with them in all areas. In certain areas our differences continue. These differences are known to them. We do not share their perception with regard to the security environment. Here I must say that if the security environment is deteriorated the blame cannot be laid on us. It has to be laid somewhere else.

Mr. Saifuddin has referred to the weaponry that is being given to Pakistan as unsuitable to Pakistan in relation to Afghanistan. We know that the equipment being given to the Navy and the Army, cannot be of much use there.

Mr. Swell has asked whether AWACS are offensive or defensive. The Defence Ministry would be in a better position to tell you that. But as a layman I can say that AAW system will be of very marginal utility in the terrain of Pakistan-Afghanistan border in the north. It will, however, have the capacity to look deep into Indian territory. Shri Swell has asked whether AWACS is an offensive weapon system or not. A simple answer to that is yes. It is not lethal in the sense that it does not carry weapons but it is offensive because it has control, command, communications and intelligence functions which can direct and facilitate offensive operations. And its range is very very considerable.

SHRI G.G. SWELL: Are AWACS equipped with equipment to shoot laser beams and immobilise an aircraft at a longer distance?

SHRI K. NATWAR SINGH: I am not competent to comment on that. But I will certainly pass on this to my colleagues in the Ministry of Defence and they will certainly look into that.

The other point he made was about NPT. Our position on NPT remains that we consider it as a discriminatory treaty. We have shown maximum restraint from 1974 to this day by having a peaceful nuclear

programme for our PNE. But we will not be railroaded or pushed into signing the NPT which is discriminating.

Shri B.R. Bhagat, who is not here, made an impassioned speech about Indo-U.S. relations and he said that Indo-U.S. relations have gone to pieces and referred to some of the global obsessions of United States.

**16.00 hrs.**

[SHRI VENKATA RATNAM *in the Chair*]

I am not saying for a moment that the US-India relations have gone to pieces. On the contrary, in many areas they have been strengthened. In some areas we have had set backs. But about global obsession - Mr. Armacost in his own statement has said, which I read out, about the role that the U.S.A. played and their global strategic planning. Bhagatji had also referred to the use of arms by Pakistan in the several wars that we have had with them and that these arms had been supplied by the United States, and there was no guarantee that this will not happen once again. He had also referred to the theory of the containment of communism which the earlier Administrations of United States had followed. He had referred to some remarks made by Dr. Galbrith and to the role that the Non-Aligned Movement is playing and also to the nuclear programme. He shared our view that the nuclear question between India and Pakistan was not a bilateral matter and could not be looked at as such. Again, he referred to the security environment to which I have spoken at some length earlier on.

Then, Mr. Ramaiah said we should have a balanced thinking on United States-India relations. Yes, we should indeed have a mature, healthy, friendly relationship with the United States which we have had in so many areas. Here we are concerned with the security environment. He has said that there should be more people to people contacts with the United States. There are. Only next week the Indo-US Business Council will be meeting. The various sub-commissions are meeting. A large number

of delegations come from United States to India. I have the list of visitors who have come. A large number of people go from here to the United States - many go for education, many go for cultural reasons many go to give lectures. There is exchange of newspapers, literature books. These are the areas where... (*Interruptions*).

PROF. N.G. RANGA: Festival of India also.

SHRI K. NATWAR SINGH: I am very grateful to you for reminding me about the Festival of India. Regardless of what some people say it was a very major event in our relationship.

When I was in Washington, at least 3-4 Senators and Congressmen said to me that but for the Festival of India, their knowledge about India would have remained totally out of date. I am not saying this, they said this to me that they had no idea how to discover India. They had certain pre-conceived notions of what India was, and these pre-conceived notions are a hangover from the past. They said they could see the culture, the heritage, the civilisation of India, also modern India, what India is doing. It was a good thing for the people to see.

Dr. Swell, I have already referred to you and I always greatly value what you say and what Bhagat Ji says about the matters because you have got some experience as an Ambassador of India. You understand these problems. You made a deep study of them. I think what you have said about the geo-strategic view that the United States has taken after the fall of Iran is very pertinent. This again is short-term. We are long-distance runners. We have been around for 5,000 years. So, that short-term view which you referred to and in their own wisdom the U.S. policy advisers have taken this particular point of view but it impinges on their relations with us and on this whole region. Therefore, I am grateful to you for having made this particular point. You also referred to the nuclear programme and to AWACS. With much of what you say, we agree, Government agrees.

A number of other Members said that I had gone to United States and got a blank I have told the House why I had gone It is a part of a mature, conduct of foreign policy I had not gone to get a certificate from them or to buy anything, I had gone to tell them what the feelings of this House were and of this Government were This is a part of the duty and responsibility of any Government We cannot sit back here and do nothing about it Diplomacy is intricate there are no instant solutions

Even very modest progress in today's international affairs is worthy of profound respect, because there is very little room for manoeuvrability for the super powers in regard to the foreign policy So it is not a question of drawing a blank Shri Bhagat used this term I do not know what he meant

SHRI SYED SHAHABUDDIN Did you summon the U.S. Ambassador to the foreign office before you went

SHRI K. NATWAR SINGH Yes as a matter of fact he was to see me today at 3 O'clock also I postponed my meeting with him But I met him before I went before I left What I said in the House, I mentioned to them also (*Interruptions*) I met the Chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee I met Mr. Moynihan and several other Congressmen

Now Shri Shahabuddin spoke about the continuity in our foreign policy I have just mentioned that for the past 40 years there has been this unique continuity in India's foreign policy The guidelines and framework were laid down by Pandit Nehru We may have made slight changes here and there but the broad framework has remained For the 20 years of your life, you were the part of that framework and I am glad to say that you keep up your interest in foreign affairs because it is always good to hear from you, even when sometimes I disagree with you, with great reluctance, because you and I have worked together in rough time

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE It is inter-departmental debate

SHRI K. NATWAR SINGH Well, I would say he is a good man fallen among well, I won't use a name (*Interruptions*)

[*Translation*]

Then Shri Zainul Basher, referred to our relation with Pakistan

[*Translation*]

With due respect I want to inform him that we are conversant with the views expressed by him We also expect that in future he will support our policy with the same emphasis

SHRI ZAINUL BASHER Are you merely conversant with them or do you also agree with them?

SHRI K. NATWAR SINGH We also agree with them

[*English*]

About Shrimati Geeta Mukherjee's remarks I have already referred to her remarks and the quotations that she gave from Panditji's speech But now she had said that the global strategy of the United States of America was to grab India with evil eyes I explained the reasons, the way they look at the part of the world She made a reference to US policy on Kashmir, on Vietnam and PL 480 These are things known to the House, to the hon. Members She also referred to the NPT and said that there were no common perceptions at all between the United States of America and India Well, I have said that there are many areas in which we work on bilateral basis and they are our largest trading partners There are about 2000 collaborations with the Americans

Shri Mohanty's speech again is very valid He referred to Mr. Gorbachov's speech in Delhi when asked a particular

[Shri K. Natwar Singh]

question on this matter that we are discussing here. You have said, Sir, that we should do something about public relations in the United States. The Government of India is doing what it can. As you know, the media functions in a particular manner but if you have any suggestions, we will be most grateful to have them from you, Sir,

Mr. Vir Senji drew a historical analysis from Panditji's time of the United States relations with India or with Pakistan and others. These relations, in his judgment, had been antagonistic to our security concern. By and large the views expressed by the hon. Members coincide with what you have said that the sale of arms must necessarily increase the tension in this area, an arms race will increase our expenditure. We share all these apprehensions that you have expressed. You also referred to the relations with some other countries, but it is beyond the scope of the debate and I would not like to touch upon them.

Finally, Shri Goswami as usual....

SHRI VIR SEN: Any views about Monroe Doctrine?

SHRI K. NATWAR SINGH: I would not like to comment on the Monroe Doctrine because — I think Mr. Goswami also said that he was opposed to it — on of the reasons why I am not responding to it is, having been a professional diplomat I am totally against making 'instant foreign policy.' 'Instant foreign policy' has its perils and I have been too long in the game not to know its perils. But if you like, I will discuss it with you later. But I would not like to give any response to your proposal here.

Finally, Mr. Goswami has said that we should certainly make efforts to have relations with as many countries as possible and certainly with a country like the United States, but he has also been critical of what has been happening with regard to the supply of arms and defence equipment to Pakistan.

Finally, I would just like to say that Mr. Goswami mentioned that we were having some kind of Big Brotherly attitude to our neighbours. I would like to assure him that this is not the case at all. On the contrary our foreign policy since the days of Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru had been friendship and goodwill towards all except for racism and apartheid.

Before I conclude, Sir, may I once again thank the hon. Members — the twelve Members who spoke on this vital subject which concerns all of us, all Members of the House, all sections of House because it deals with the security environment in this part, and I would like to finally thank the hon. Members for giving such a patient hearing. Thank you, Sir.

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA: From your speech it seems that you don't feel any danger of destabilisation.

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE: That is only due to Prime Minister-President controversy.

SHRI K. NATWAR SINGH: I am a very disciplined person Sir, I have confined myself to the subject of the debate

SHRI SAIFUDDIN CHOWDHARY: But you are a Member of the Council of Ministers.

PROF. N.G. RANGA: Sir, May I say...

*(Interruptions)*

SHRI SAIFUDDIN CHOWDHARY: I very much referred to destabilisation. If supply of AWACS and other activities of USA are not destabilising India, then let them have AWACS. Why are you so worried about it?

SHRI K. NATWAR SINGH: Destabilise what?

SHRI SAIFUDDIN CHOWDHARY: Everything our policies, our non-alignment and all that you have said.

*(Interruptions)*

SHRI K. NATWAR SINGH: May I very respectfully say, Sir, that I have said that the induction of arms in this part is putting a very severe strain on our relations.

SHRI SAIFUDDIN CHOWDHARY: That is not all. Their involvement in the conspiracy to destabilise India including the encouragement to Khalistani movement requires pointed exposition.

SHRI K. NATWAR SINGH: We are dealing with Indo-US relations and I have confined myself to that subject alone. Now, if you want to bring in other subjects, you are welcome to do so at some other time.

SHRI SAIFUDDIN CHOWDHARY: It is very much part of this subject. It is very much relevant.

*(Interruptions)*

PROF. N.G. RANGA: The hon. Minister has mentioned prominently the constructive role that India has been playing, and succeeded in establishing SAARC and creating a fund also for the developmental purposes in our neighbouring countries.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are you seeking any clarification?

PROF. N.G. RANGA: Have you prominently drawn their attention to the initiative that we have taken and the dynamic role that we have been playing in bringing about understanding among our neighbouring countries through the SAARC?

SHRI K. NATWAR SINGH: Yes, Sir. I have done so.

SHRI SYED SHAHBUDDIN: Has the Under Secretary of State for Political Affairs offered any bait in his speech to lure us to signing Non Proliferation Treaty? That is hanging heavy on their mind.

SHRI K. NATWAR SINGH: I could perhaps read out the speech on the NPT. This is what he says on the Indo-Pakistani

Nuclear Tensions:

"Nuclear proliferation in the sub-continent is a matter of both regional and international significance. Both India and Pakistan possess impressive scientific technical capabilities in the field of nuclear technology. Both have strong incentives to develop civil nuclear power programmes: neither has signed the nuclear NPT, and both have un safeguarded facilities."

Further on, he said something. But I do not want to misquote him. But I cannot get hold of the particular quotation. But you can have a look.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Let it not be a long discussion.

SHRI ATISH CHANDRA SINHA: I would like to know whether this 4.2 billion dollars aid is a sort of aid or loan? Is it soft loan or hard loan? *(Interruptions)*

SHRI K. NATWAR SINGH: Your Centre of gravity is good enough. Why do you worry about destabilisation?

Under the Six-year Assistance Package that was agreed to between U.S.A. and Pakistan in 1981, out of 3.2 billion dollars, roughly, half of it relates to direct military components. Now, the latest package for the period 1987 to 1993, the U.S. Administration has presented for Congressional consideration a further aid package of 4.02 billion dollars. This aid package, like the previous one, has a substantial component 43% of military assistance and envisages the supply of hard defence technology to Pakistan.

*(Interruptions)*

MR. CHAIRMAN: Next item.

*(Interruptions)*

SHRI K. NATWAR SINGH: I have the details. But I think, this discussion is over.