

[Shri Cumbum N. Natarajan]

difficult to be handled by the planters, the use of 'Bay 5072-70%' is easily understood by the planters.

In the interest of earning valuable foreign exchange through the export of cardamom, in the interest of sustaining the livelihood of 80,000 workers and in the interest of thousands of planters, the Government should allow the import of this chemical 'Bay 5072-70%' to the Cardamom Planters' Association, Bodinayakanur, Tamilnadu or to the Cardamom Board for distribution to the planters for exterminating this dreaded disease, Azhukal, which will destroy all plantations.

(ix) DEMAND FOR CHANGING THE NAME OF THE MARATHWADA UNIVERSITY TO DR. AMBEDKAR MARATHWADA UNIVERSITY

श्री राम विलास पासवान (हाजीपुर) :

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, बहुत ही दुख की बात है कि सदन में बार-बार मांग करने के बाद भी महाराष्ट्र के मराठवाड़ा विश्वविद्यालय का नाम बदल कर डा० अम्बेडकर मराठवाड़ा विश्वविद्यालय नहीं रखा गया है, जबकि 1978 में ही महाराष्ट्र असेम्बली ने सर्व-सम्मति से प्रस्ताव पास किया था कि उसका नाम डा० अम्बेडकर मराठवाड़ा यूनिवर्सिटी रखा जाए। डा० अम्बेडकर हिन्दुस्तान के करोड़ों अनुसूचित जाति, पिछड़े दलित एवं शोषित लोगों के नेता एवं प्रेरणा-स्रोत हैं। इन समुदायों का भावनात्मक सम्बन्ध डा० अम्बेडकर से जुड़ा हुआ है। ऐसी स्थिति में अभी तक मराठवाड़ा यूनिवर्सिटी का नामान्तरण न करना करोड़ों शोषित पीड़ित के मन को चोट पहुंचाना है। विश्वविद्यालय का नाम बदल देने से कोई फ़र्क नहीं पड़ता, लेकिन एक बार निर्णय ले लिए जाने के बाद नामान्तरण न करना इस बात का द्योतक है कि सरकार की नीयत दलित समुदायों के प्रति क्या है। क्या अभी

श्री डा० अम्बेडकर जैसे महापुरुष का नाम हिन्दुस्तान के गले के नीचे नहीं उतर सकता, यह मेरे जैसे लोग सोचने के लिए विवश हो जाते हैं। यह कोई एक राज्य का मामला नहीं रह गया है। ग्राम शोषित पीड़ित समुदाय के मन में इस बात को लेकर आक्रोश है।

अतः केन्द्र सरकार से मांग है कि केन्द्र सरकार राज्य सरकार को निर्देश दे कि वह महाराष्ट्र विधान सभा के निर्णय का आदर करते हुए शीघ्र ही मराठवाड़ा विश्वविद्यालय के नाम में संशोधन कर के डा० अम्बेडकर मराठवाड़ा विश्वविद्यालय करे।

15.35 hrs

MOTION RE. INTERNATIONAL SITUATION AND POLICY OF GOVERNMENT OF INDIA IN RELATION THERETO—Contd.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Now the House will take up further consideration of the following motion moved by Shri P. V. Narasimha Rao on the 18th September, 1981, namely:—

“That this House do consider the present international situation and the policy of the Government of India in relation thereto.”

Shri Satyasadhan Chakraborty was on his legs. He may continue.

SHRI SATYASADHAN CHAKRABORTY (Calcutta South): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, I continue my speech and tell the Members that I emphasise the point that to-day we are faced with a grave problem. The problem is that the war clouds are gathering over the world and the danger of nuclear war is real in the world to-day.

Now, Sir, the House will agree with me that we require peace not only in

India but we require it all over the world. Without peace there can be no development. It is a question of survival of the human race. It is most important for us in India because without the atmosphere of peace, we cannot have economic development. But, peace is in danger because of some recent developments in the Imperialist world. The United States of America now is openly talking of limited nuclear war and they are preparing for this war. They are trying to hoodwink the people by saying that limited war will remain confined to a particular region. But, this type of modern war cannot remain so, every nuclear war, by its very nature, cannot remain confined to a particular region. It will engulf the whole world in one conflagration and ultimately lead to the destruction of human race. Now, the question is: What is the reason for this war hysteria or for this war propaganda? What is the reason for this whipping up of armaments race? There are people who argue that war is in the blood of men. It is because of the jingoistic psychology that the wars are produced. Sir, I will like to quote from the "Father of the American neutron bomb". He says:

"All people are monsters." His daughter, who was present then, asked: "then are you a monster, too?" Yes, I am," he answered, and added that "war is in man's very nature." Here is a striking example of human-hating psychology."

This type of hate psychology is propagated by the people who have developed neutron bomb which is dangerous because it is capable of exterminating the human-civilization. But, is it true that war is in the human blood? No. The reason why is there war—we must go into the material conditions of the people. The root causes of war are in the economic system itself. I can quote it from Mrs. Gandhi's speech which she delivered at Cancun. She said:

"We are told that the world economy is in a bad shape, that even

the most prosperous of nations have inflation and unemployment, and suffer from recessionary conditions and a slowing down of growth."

"Half a century ago, industrialised nations found themselves in somewhat similar predicament. Their attempt to solve these problems by inward-looking policies and through Protectionism, preferential blocks, currency depreciation and similar devices plunged the world in the worst-ever depression, culminating in World War-II."

What were the reasons for world War II- It was due to the cut-throat competition among these developed industrialised nations. Their policy was: "Beggar thy neighbour for thy own survival." So, it was the competition of the imperialist world and their attempts to exploit the whole world and establish their own monopoly, which plunged the World into the Second World War.

Similar conditions are prevailing today. These imperialist countries are facing severe economic crisis and they are facing economic stagnation.

In order to understand the depth of the crisis, I would like to quote certain figures. I am quoting the Growth Rate of the Aggregate Production of Commodities and Services: Percentage of the Capitalist Countries: The Annual Average for developed capitalist countries for 1961—73 was 5.0 per cent. In 1973—79 it was 2.3 per cent. In 1980 it is 1.5 per cent. Now they are facing massive unemployment. In the United States of America, roughly, 8 to 9 million people are unemployed. In England, 3 million people are unemployed. You will find that in all developed industrialised capitalist countries there is widespread unemployment and stagnation. What is the way out? According to them the way out is more and more dependence on Armaments, and preparing for war.

[Shri Satyasadhan Chakraborty]

If you look at the American Budget, you will find this: Their spending on War preparations has reached almost astronomical figures. There is a powerful military industrial complex in the U.S.A. They are preparing for war because for them war is not terrible, but, it is profitable. That is why they are preparing for war. This is the way in which they want to steady their economy and maintain their economic strength. That is the basic reason why we today find that there are such War preparations. And to bluff the people what are they saying? They are saying that this War will only remain confined to a particular region. They are now destabilising the *detente* which was arrived at after painstaking negotiations.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, there is some sort of rough parity between the NATO powers and the Warsaw powers.

The USA is trying to unilaterally break this *detente*. They are openly saying that they want to create conditions from which they can talk to the Socialist world. They are openly propagating that they talk from positions of strength so that they can dictate terms. They want military superiority so that they can impose their opinions on the other parts of the world.

So, Sir, this is the situation. It is the internal economic crisis of capitalism, it is the stagnation in the Imperialist World,.... which is leading them to preparations for war, which is compelling them to break the *detente* and which is pushing the world to the brink of war and desperately they are saying that they are for brinkmanship, they are for massive retaliation and they are for retention of vital interests even at the cost of war. Sir, you will be astonished to know what Mr. Haig the American leader has said. They say about the war and peace. In one of the interviews Mr. Alexander Haig had said

that there were other things which were more important than peace. Peace is not important, according to them, but the other things are important. Now, what are those other things? On 31st January 1981, Mr. Alexander Haig had said in one of his interviews as—

"I will say that today the main threat and preoccupation in the free world' is the eruption of international terrorism and associated cases of unlawful interference, the so called national liberation wars".

Openly the American administration is saying this. What is the international terrorism? It is the national liberation wars. When the people are fighting for freedom in El Salvador, it is international terrorism? In Angola, when the people are fighting for independence, it is international terrorism. When the people of the Afro-Asian countries are the natural resources of their own countries, it is international terrorism. Now, the United States want to fight it, prepare for war and crush the freedom fighters under the military jackboot. That is the policy being adopted by the United States of America.

I would again quote what Mr. Haig said in his interview on 11th March, 1981.

"Western industrialised societies are largely dependent on the oil resources of the Middle East region and a threat to access to that oil would constitute a grave threat to the vital national interest. This must be dealt with, and that does not exclude the use of force if that is necessary."

Who is speaking this? Mr. Haig, the responsible man, a responsible man who is charged with the policy decision and its execution. What are the vital interests of the United States of America? The Americans are interested in the oil well of the Middle East and access to it. So the oil wells do not belong to the Middle East countries where they are existing. But they belong to the United States of

America. If they are threatened because of the policy pursued by that Government—the mineral resources and other resources they have in their country—the United States is openly brandishing sword, the sword of nuclear weapons and is saying we will use force; it is a threat to our vital interest. And for that, they are prepared to go to war and if it is nuclear war, never mind because war is in the blood of men and men are monsters. So, Sir, this is almost the Hitlerite ideology of killing people, destroying the various peoples under the Sun. Here they said that the vital interest of the United States of America is most important. On 28th April, 1981, Mr. Casper Weinberger the leading Northern American statesman and the diplomat said like this:

"Many of the resources that we need for energy and many essential strategic minerals are found thousands of miles from our shores... If we are to safeguard our access, and the access of the free world to these resources, we must increase our military and naval strength."

This is the real nature of the free world. The free world must have access to the resources lying thousands of miles away from their shores. This is the reason why there is war preparation; this is the reason why the imperialists, the NATO powers and the United States of America are preparing for war and bringing different regions of the world into its orbit. That is the situation and that is what the imperialists are trying to do, and for that they are trying to destabilise the regions with the purpose of creating trouble in these areas. If this is the international scenario, if there is the danger of war, the whipping up of arm race, refusal to sign SALT-II agreement, and all initiatives taken to send medium-range missiles in Europe, how does India find itself in this situation?

We are decidedly for peace, because without peace, we cannot survive and there can be no economic

development. But then how do we find ourselves? Today we find that we are surrounded by some hostile States and this is precisely the work of the United States of America. The policy of the United States of America is to create an area of crisis in the southern region and that is why they are drawing Pakistan into their strategic consensus: they are arming Pakistan to the teeth. And what does Pakistan say? Pakistan says that this is for their defence. In this connection, I would only like to refer to one paper and what has been stated there. This is a study by the International Institute for Strategic Studies, Military Balance Report, 1980-81. In this study, it has been demonstrated beyond doubt that some sort of rough parity, military parity exists between India and Pakistan. There is no question of any superiority. Why is it that Pakistan is trying to have sophisticated weapons, sophisticated military hardware from the United States including F-16s? Is it for its own defence? I do not mind; Pakistan has a right to its defence, but it is not doing that. What does the Pakistan say; and what does the United States say? They say that it is to counteract the potential attack from the Soviet Union, which according to them, is expansionist and it is because of the situation existing in Afghanistan. But is it true? Responding to fears of a Soviet response to the arms shipments, Mr. Agha Shahi—he was answering certain questions of politicians and journalists—said:

"This fear in your mind about the danger of an attack by the Soviet Union should be allayed. And the Soviets have categorically assured us, and this has been stated by Brezhnev a number of times, that we should not take into account this possibility. Any other attack, well this is precisely the reason why we want to get the arms quickly."

What is this 'any other attack? Isn't it a fact that Pakistan is a proxy, it is the United States, which is behind

[Shri Satyasadhan Chakrabarty]

it and it is the policy of United States—destabilisation—that is behind it? Sir, actually this has brought the cold war to our door-step. This is going to escalate the arms competition, arms race and this is a positive danger for the whole region.

Sir, what is being done in Bangladesh? The pro-American forces have consolidated and the negotiations are going on that there should be a base near Chittagong for the Americans. Already Sri Lanka has offered its Naval Base for its use to the Americans.

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE (New Delhi): That is not correct.

SHRI SATYASADHAN CHAKRABORTY: That is the condition. Whatever they say. No one will say openly, because all these black-deeds are done in dark, not in open day light.

Now, Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, that is the condition. How is India responding to such a situation? Yes, on certain issues we are taking correct stand. But we are always vacillating. Our policy is also policy of vacillation. Now we talk of military danger, war preparations, but then we talk of super-power rivalry. We talk of preparations and then we clothe our whole idea in the kid glove of super-power rivalry. Is that a fact or not? Are we not actually putting the war-mongers and the defenders in the same status? Why is it that we are balancing? We should not balance. We must be bold enough from our own experience—who is doing what, who is endangering world peace, who is preparing for war and we must state it boldly that it is the socialist world headed by the Soviet Union which is genuinely trying to have some sort of an understanding, detente, peace and lasting peace. We should not actually try to equate and say super-power rivalry and thereby deceive ourselves, de-

ceive our people and deceive the peoples of the world.

Sir, there is a North-South dialogue. Mrs. Gandhi goes and says we are very poor and you are practising protectionism; let there be cooperation. What cooperation? It is by exploiting us that they prosper. I can quote figures, how the third world countries are incurring debt after debt and how we are compelled to increase our exports, not for our economic development, but to pay for the debts and the debt servicing. And the multi-nationals are plundering these third-world countries. We are inviting the multi-nationals, we are allowing them to plunder our economy; we are taking the IMF Loan and then we are bending our knees and roaring like a lion that we shall stand on our own legs. Are we strengthening our legs? Is our economic policy conducive to our self-reliance, because the non-aligned policy totally depends upon economic self-reliance. By mortgaging our economy to the imperialist countries, can we expect to have a real non-aligned policy—a policy which is enemy of none, a policy which really emanates from the interests of the Indian people, a policy which is against imperialism and colonialism? We cannot do it. The proof of it is Delhi Non-aligned Foreign Ministers' Conference. I will ask you to go through the Document. What did we discuss there? We were compelled to discuss things which were mostly dictated by the friends of the Americans. We could not mention Diego Garcia because the Americans would be angry. We were very soft. What did we discuss in Melbourne, in the Commonwealth Conference? Kampuchea, Afghanistan. We cannot discuss the Indian Ocean, we cannot discuss what the imperialists are doing, because of our economic weakness, because of our vacillation. We forget that our non-alignment is primarily a policy of anti-colonialism and anti-imperialism of any form or any colour. That is the situation we are facing to-day.

13 hrs.

Before I end, I would tell the Government: 'Yes; there is a danger. The United States and other countries of the West, imperialist countries, want to de-stabilize our country. They are helping the secessionist forces. They are helping the obscurantist forces in our country. They are trying to see that we do not stand on our own legs, economically. But what measures are you taking to fight it?'

In India, the ruling party is allying with secessionist forces. Instead of giving a clarion call to the people saying that this is the hour of crisis, and that people should unite for the defence of the country, for the independence of the country since there is a grave danger of war and the imperialists have a design to disintegrate and de-stabilize—what are you doing? You are just trying to enslave our people by the Essential Services Maintenance Act. You are trying to mortgage our economy by going to the IMF. You are trying to strengthen the forces of de-stabilization by more and more contracts with the multi-nationals to plunder our country. Where is self-reliance? If you are not economically strong, if you are not economically self-reliant, if you are depending on the Western countries in your trade, your technical know-how and in your imported technology, you can sermonize on this non-alignment and all that; but you cannot play an effective role in the comity of nations.

That is where the present ruling party has landed the country. They are blowing hot and cold. They are talking of the North exploiting the South; and then they are bending their knees, going to pray: 'Give us help.' What is this? Does this increase our prestige? They are talking of Super-Power rivalry, almost shielding partially the aggressor, the adventurer, the war-monger, the chauvinist, the people who are trying to plunge the world into a conflagration by

which there will be the extermination of the whole human race.

That is why I would urge upon the Government to realize the situation, to see the danger of war, to see the danger of imperialist intervention and to understand how, when the whole imperialist economy is plunged into a crisis, they are spending billions of dollars for war preparations—because these are the merchants of death. They use the people as cannon fodder. In the Vietnam war, they experimented with biological and chemical warfare. Now they want to experiment with neutron bomb, either in Europe or in the third world countries. I would ask the Government to be bold enough to say that we are against it. Not only that; they should prepare the people and give a lead to them and say that there should be some sort of a movement against these war preparations. The Indian Government, as a non-aligned nation, should give a lead to the peace-loving peoples of the world, along with the socialist countries, against these war preparations, and against this war hysteria, against this whipping up of the arms race. Also, internally, Government should follow a policy of self-reliance; and necessary institutional and social changes should be brought about, so that we can stand on our legs, we don't go to Washington and London with a begging bowl and say: "Give us aid, give us dollar, give us this and that," and then roar in the international arena saying: "We are non-aligned, we are free, we stand on our own legs." Please don't do these things. Give up your policy of vacillation. The people of India are ready to undergo any amount of sacrifice when it is a question of defending our country, of fighting for our independence and self-reliance. These are the questions that are there. I am sure that the people of India will be ready to undergo any amount of sacrifice for fighting imperialism, for fighting the dangers of war. With these words I conclude.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Mr. Madhavrao Scindia.

SHRI G. M. BANATWALLA: (Ponnani): A good Marxist speech. (*Interruptions*)

SHRI SATYASADHAN CHAKRABORTY: Not at all Islamic. For Islamic speeches I depend on him.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: He is a Marxist. You cannot expect anything else from him.

(*Interruptions*)

SHRI SATYASADHAN CHAKRABORTY: If you do not mind, for his information I can give another quotation from Aga Shahi. (*Interruptions*)

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: No, no.

SHRI SATYASADHAN CHAKRABORTY: If he provokes me, I will say. Aga Shahi says... (*Interruptions*) He has taken the responsibility for Indian Muslims also. (*Interruptions*)

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: He took another three minutes.

SHRI MADHAVRAO SCINDIA (Guna): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, we are living in grave times; times full of tension and uncertainty. We have reached a stage in human history when the world is tormented by discord and disunity, and in spite of this vast human family sharing a common concern for the fate of the world, ironically, the inventiveness of man is still being transformed into a potential threat, rather than nurtured as a hope for the survival and progress of humanity.

Fierce competition amongst the Great Powers is developing and is intensified by the continuous additions to their nuclear arsenals, as my colleague, my friend, just now mentioned, the development of weapons like the neutron bomb, is ominous, for it means the formulation of a dangerous new doctrine which has the effect of lowering the threshold of nuclear

conflict and projecting a nuclear war as limitable, winnable, and therefore, acceptable. It was Albert Einstein who said, "in the next but one, people will be fighting with bows and arrows" indicating the catastrophic consequences of a nuclear conflict. With concepts like limited nuclear war and terms like tactical nuclear weapons, being freely bandied about, Europe is haunted by the spectre of a nuclear exchange on their densely populated territories. President Reagan in his customary candour, has expressed the view that a mere nuclear exchange in Europe would not necessarily unleash the American strategic arsenal against the Soviets. It is widely accepted that the Kremlin also holds the view that a general strategic nuclear war between Moscow and Washington as the result of an escalation from a localised or theatre nuclear conflict would only occur if Soviet cities were involved or destroyed. It seems that it is not merely the nuclear armouries of the super powers that match, but more sinister still, their nuclear war doctrines seem to match too! India, as a prominent member of the developing or the third world must continue its efforts to activate world pressure on the Super Powers. For this, a co-ordination with the present disarmament movement gathering momentum in Europe could shatter the precarious balance of traditional blocs and alliances to their very foundations. We could then direct this potent combination against super-power interference in our part of the world and in support of the United Nations declaration of the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace.

In addition to the horrifying nuclear race and simplistic limited nuclear war theories, the unrestricted sale of conventional arms by great powers to sensitive regions in Asia and Africa are converting them into cockpits of tension. In this context, the US decision to supply sophisticated war planes to Pakistan far beyond and unrelated to their genuine

defence needs can only be condemned. It has raised the armaments threshold qualitatively and introduced a new element in the region. Prof. Chakraborty has already enumerated the justification that the United States has put forward, namely, that it is necessary to guarantee the security of Pakistan against the Soviet threat from Afghanistan, and secondly, that Pakistan now features prominently in their strategic Southern arc of crisis to contain the Soviet Union and also provides the future possibility of bases or emergency facilities for the Rapid Development Force. Buckley has also stated that "Pakistan is of extreme importance to the security of Persian Gulf, in which we have most immediately direct self-interest." But can Pakistan ever dream of holding the Soviets at bay if the occasion ever arises? There are fewer illusions in Islamabad than there are in Washington about the military and political efficacy of them directly taking on the Soviets or even of deterring them in any serious manner. Besides, the arms being supplied are of no use in mountainous terrain. At the strategic level, there is ample evidence that the Islamabad military leadership understands that the weapons from the United States are not for defence against Afghanistan or the Soviets but against India? Mr. Agha Shahi's statement gives substantial evidence of this. The three wars between the two countries have amply demonstrated that on the part of Pakistan, the dividing line between defence preparedness and offensive intentions is extremely thin. The re-arming of Pakistan can only encourage adventurist tendencies to carry out a first strike against India.

On innumerable occasions, successive regimes in Pakistan have resorted to the traditional bogey of India's aggressive intentions. Knowledgeable public opinion in both countries understands the disastrous consequences to their respective economies in the aftermath of war. India, as our hon. Foreign Minister has stated on seve-

ral occasions, has a stake, has a vested interest, in a strong and stable Pakistan. A weak Pakistan can create new problems for us. Such developments could culminate in entirely new friction points emerging. A weak Pakistan would bring us, in a *de facto* way, much closer to a very real hot spot in international affairs. Which country could remain relaxed in a situation where in a *de-facto* form we are next to an international hot spot? Surely, enlightened public opinion in Pakistan will understand this.

This high powered weaponry has placed India under the gun. And it is astonishing to see senior leaders like Morarji Desai, Mr. Jagjivan Ram and my young ebullient friend, Dr. Swamy joining in a chorus saying that Pakistan is too small to pose any real threat to our country. Maybe domestic political discords are proving more powerful than even considerations of national security.

The Pakistan President has cast doubts on the acceptability of the line of control in Kashmir and has tried to internationalise the issue. This is totally against the Simla spirit. He has, in fact, attempted to throw the Simla spirit to the winds. It is against this backdrop that we must view the so called 'no-war pact' offer by General Zia, who had only eight months ago, declared that 'a no war pact would not be worth the paper it might be written on'. It was a statesman-like attitude which brought about the Simla agreement and in its very spirit, it represents the formalisation of a 'no-war' understanding. I must congratulate the Minister of External Affairs on the lucid and expansive statement he made in Parliament recently, clearly expressing India's positive attitude towards such an offer, on the basis that 'it constitutes an acceptance for the first time, of India's offer of a 'no war' pact which has stood intact since 1949 and as further amplification of the Simla agreement.' So we must not only ensure a continuous implementation of

[Shri Madhavrao Scindia]

this agreement but we must keep on trying to perpetuate its very spirit.

As far as the American attitude is concerned, it can only be called destructive. Is the US not harming its own interests in the sub-continent by pursuing a policy which in Selig Harrison's words is 'a monumental, self-defeating blunder', and will only succeed in 'fanning the flames of anti-americanism' in both countries. We will never forget that the Soviets came to our aid in 1971 and that geo-strategic considerations would necessitate that normally we should have a warm and cordial relationship with them. They have helped us time and again in so many spheres. But, Sir, let the world know that we are nobody's proxy and if any imbalance is created, the fault will lie fairly and squarely at the White House doorstep. India is engaged in a titanic battle—a battle which over-rides all other considerations—the battle against poverty. Are the Americans helping us win this battle? Can we overlook the way the Americans have threatened our power production entirely for peaceful use by fouling up Tarapur? Can we overlook the negative attitude the Americans have displayed on the IMF loan, a loan which would help us tide over difficulties created by developments outside our control like soaring oil prices? Can we overlook the fact that in the case of Pakistan the Symington Amendment has been waived to enable continuity of arms supplies? Can we overlook the manner in which the Americans are feverishly re-arming Pakistan? If Washington, instead, displayed a constructive attitude, and extended to us the hand of cooperation, I am sure that it would receive in return the warm hand of friendship that epitomises the traditional Indian attitude of non-violence.

Surely, even China pre-occupied with its economic priorities, and with Taiwan looming large, cannot accept with equanimity, the entry of external

forces and influences in the region. We all welcome the initiatives taken by the two countries and earnestly hope that China will understand the importance of peaceful relations between us, in the Asian context and the resultant benefits that will accrue to our two political societies.

As far as Afghanistan is concerned, India has consistently expressed her disapproval of interference by all outside forces in any country. But realities point to a political solution in Afghanistan, which can only emerge in an atmosphere of trust and confidence, based on an understanding of all global, regional and national aspects. It is in the interests of the Great Powers that they encourage such an atmosphere. Otherwise, they will only succeed in pushing the planet grimly to the ultimate war amongst nations, a war in which they too will be overcome.

As far as global security is concerned, it can no longer be conceived in military terms alone. Economic security in terms of access to raw materials and energy resources, as well as in terms of distribution of the world's wealth, have become leading issues of international affairs.

Ten years after the launching of the programme of the New International Economic Order, the growing differences between the developed and developing countries, and the poverty of the latter, have reached a stage of extreme seriousness. Never before in the history of mankind has the under-developed world been subjected to such a degree of exploitation, economic stranglehold and poverty, where for some countries even aspiring for a subsistence economy is a far away dream.

Statistics reveal that 6 per cent of the world's population consume 40 percent of all basic commodities produced and that the difference in income between countries at either end of the development scale is 1:200. The

developed countries comprise only 25 per cent of the world's population, but possess 83 per cent of the world's GNP, consume 75 per cent of all energy produced, consume 70 per cent of the grain produced; own 90 per cent of the world's industries, own 95 per cent of all technological resources, use 89 per cent of the world's education expenditure and for every one dollar increase in per capita GNP in the under-developed world, there is a projected 20 dollar increase in the developed world. According to the FAO estimates, in the next 20 years one out of every four inhabitants in the under-developed world will go hungry. In the medical field the ratio of doctors to inhabitants in the developed world is 1:500, while in the under-developed world it is 1:10,000 10,000.

The present situation in the under-developed world, where by the year 2,000 A.D. four out of every five of the world's inhabitants will live as follows: under-nourished and hungry according to FAO 570 million, illiterate adults 800 million, totally lacking medical care 1.5 billion having an annual income of under \$90 1.3 billion, under 60 years of life expectancy 1.7 billion, living in unfit housing one billion, children not attending schools 250 million and unemployed 1.1 billion.

Are these not staggering figures—are they not soul-stirring? Can this state of affairs continue without a horrendous explosion? Unless the twin principles of universal disarmament and the fact that this is an era of economic inter-dependence, are accepted by the developed countries, world peace, and through progress, will remain in extreme jeopardy. There will be no solution to the tensions, the contradictions, the political conflicts that perturb and threaten international relations till the new economic order is established in a spirit of a grand partnership based on the acceptance of the principle of inter-dependence.

In this context the efforts made at Cancun signal the birth of a new awareness and indicate the acceptance of the need for a dialogue between the North and South, and acknowledge the necessity to infuse it with a sense of urgency. As our Prime Minister has aptly said, "Cancun signifies, if not a leap forward, certainly a step forward." It broke new ground. India must continue to work for a meaningful implementation in matters like transfer of resources, restructuring of the world monetary and economic system, and the transfer of technology.

The Cancun attitude of a Western Europe looking for new markets is especially significant and it is indicative of a nexus that is developing between Europe and the countries of Asia, which is highly desirable and which will lead to a greater understanding of world forces. Mrs. Gandhi's very successful European tour has highlighted this importance and we must continue to give this importance to the promotion of a closer understanding with that continent.

Very recently I had the privilege of representing my country at an International Conference in Cuba. What I experienced there was to me a matter of pride. The status and prestige that India enjoys today on the international scene is phenomenal and I can only attribute this to the fact that like her father, Mrs. Gandhi is a leader who has wide acceptability and respect not only in our country alone, but internationally too. Her personality coupled with the potentials India holds in the economic field and from the time of Gandhi and Nehru the moral values that we represent in the world make for an exciting and exhilarating combination in the quest for world peace. But, for this we must first set our own house in order. There are elements in this country who are working on a premediated plan encouraged by outside powers to create fragmentation in this country. But

[Shri Madhavrao Scindia]

today everything is at stake. We must work in a grand exercise of constructive cooperation and remove pessimism and negativeness and replace it with optimism and positiveness.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Please conclude.

SHRI MADHAVRAO SCINDIA: I will conclude now.

For the first time in human society man is confronted by these domestic concerns. It would be no exaggeration to say that we are living at a time when everything we hold dear, everything our predecessors struggled for and dreamt of, and which we dream of now, is at stake, is threatened and is in danger.

India's diplomatic skill is on trial. It has to protect the country's security interest in an extremely complex and difficult environment and at the same time preserve its credibility as a non-aligned nation. Never before has its own interest coincided so completely with the cause of peace and non-alignment.

We are spectators, actors and participants in a unique moment in history. It is this generation which has been called upon to decide for itself whether man will emerge victorious or crumble down in one explosive orgy of universal destruction. In spite of the complexity of the situation, I feel sure that under the leadership of Mrs. Gandhi and with our foreign policy under the guidance of Mr. Narasimha Rao, we will succeed in achieving national and international success, and finally attain that ultimate and glorious triumph that is surely our tryst with destiny.

SHRI CHANDRAJIT YADAV (Azamgarh): Sir, I think that today

the world peace is in real danger. The survival of human race is in danger. What the human being has been able to achieve in the field of art, culture, science and technology and in its own progress, seems to be today confronted with total destruction. It is a great tragedy of history that the human knowledge in science and technology is also being used today for the destruction of human race. Today, the weapons, the rockets, the bombs and the other methods of war which we see, were unheard of in human history. Today, if those countries in the world which are in the possession of all these weapons really decide to use them, then what we call in our country, the real *pralaya*, destruction of human race will be there. Nothing else will survive.

I think that today the entire people all over the world who love themselves, the achievements of humanity, who love their children, who love their creations and who want to build a society, better society, a peaceful society for themselves, are greatly concerned with whatever is going on today on the world scene. Everybody knows that there are countries which are spending a maximum amount of their resources, even at the cost of their common people for the manufacture of most sophisticated weapons. Why is this situation happening today? This question is being asked and in my opinion, the simple answer for this question is that there are still forces which believe in imperialism and colonialism and want to subjugate the human race. Those forces have not been eliminated through there has been a powerful liberation movement, a new awakening in the common people all over the world. Except one or two countries, the entire world today is politically liberated and there are free countries. But there are many limitations, namely, limitation of poverty, limitation of resources, limitation of

knowledge in science and technology and the limitations which the history has imposed on them. For centuries they were being exploited by these forces. The exploiters were able to exploit the sources of these countries and, therefore, more than three fourth of the world, even today, remains backward and underdeveloped. Now, they are making efforts to build a better society for themselves but those forces which still believe in political and economic subjugation, which still believe in their own domination—which is in real sense, does not allow other people, in future term be liberated are creating this kind of situation.

It is a well-known fact that the United States of America and the Soviet Union are the two big powers and what we all the Super Powers. But do we blame both the powers equally? Are both the powers equally responsible for this situation, threatening the world peace? Any person who has a little sense of honesty and a proper sense of judgement will agree that the Soviet Union during the last many years have been making efforts after efforts through the General Assembly of the United Nations Organisation, through the world conferences, through the European conferences and the present leader of the Soviet Union, the Communist Party the President of the Soviet Union, Mr. Brezhnev, has taken not one, not two, but several initiatives even for total disarmament. They have made it known to the whole world that they will be the first, if other countries in possession of lethal weapons also agree for total disarmament. But we have seen that the United States of America, though apparently talking of peace, expressing concern for peace, has failed in its human duty.

The United States of America still believes in the philosophy of imperialism; still believes in the philosophy of colonialism. And that is the main cause of danger to world peace to-

day. I would put the blame squarely on the present administration of the United States of America, Mr. Reagan. After his coming to power, not only the world peace is being threatened, but, as I said in the beginning, the survival of the entire human race is being threatened today.

What is he doing? While talking of peace, he is manufacturing neutron bombs. What kind of neutron bombs? The American administration calls it a neat and clean bomb. Why do they call it a neat and clean bomb? They call it a neat and clean bomb because, if the bomb is dropped on a school, the school building remains in fact; it will not be destroyed. But the beautiful innocent children will die. Therefore, it is a neat and clean bomb because it will not create garbage. If it is dropped on a factory, the toiling workers, the honest workers, will die. But the factory, the bricks the stones and the cement will remain in fact. What an inhuman approach!

I had once the occasion to speak in Boston, on the land of the great American people. I said there, what a fall, that the country which has produced Abraham Lincoln, the country which has produced Roosevelt—the country which has produced great musicians, scientists and artists, now the leaders of that country, the leaders of that administration, have manufactured the neutron bomb and call it a neat and clean bomb.

I know that the Soviet Union and many other countries, even India for that reason, are strengthening their defence in a situation where we are really faced against the wall. The situation is being created like that in which one power goes on manufacturing most dangerous weapons with a wrong philosophy, a philosophy of imperialism, a philosophy of slavery, a philosophy of colonialism. We are seeing how the American weapons have been used how American administration has been used and how American resources

[Shri Chandrajit Yadav]

have been used. If there is no other power which can counter balance the American preparation for the war, then there would have been again a set-back in the whole process of liberation of the world. Perhaps, most of the countries would have been practically again enslaved, if not politically, economically and, ultimately, politically also.

Therefore, I would say that it is high time that we must educate our people. We need mass education; we need to create a world public opinion. We know that besides Government, ultimately, it is the world public opinion which matters. Therefore, we will not be performing our duty even national or international, if we go on creating a confusion that this is all between the Super Powers and we are going like an arbitrator. It is a totally wrong approach, it is a totally wrong attitude. It is high time, when the world is facing this kind of a war, when the situation is getting serious everybody, that we must tell the truth to our people and to the whole world.

I hope that our Government will keep this in mind. I would now clarify whether Government of India has played its role properly or it has failed.

I have been hearing criticism in this country during the last two or three months that the Indian Prime Minister and the Indian Foreign Minister have been going round the world, and attending Conferences when here the country is suffering from abject, poverty, unemployment and from so many crises at home. Then, what was the use of Prime Minister or Foreign Minister going all over the world and preaching lessons? I think that those who are criticising from this point of view do not understand the world situation.

India is not a small country. India is a big country, with great people. India and Indian people know how to play their role, whatever is hap-

pening today. We are one of the most oldest civilisations on the earth. The people of the world look towards India for guidance. People of the world looked towards India when Vietnam was being attacked and Indian people gave their support and India stood by the people of Vietnam. When the Arab countries are being attacked by Israelis, the Arab world looked to India for help and support.

(Interruptions)

Therefore, I am saying that people of the world look towards India for help and guidance. The people of Africa will never forget that it was from Indian soil that a man born here by name Mahatma Gandhi was the first who went and raised his voice in the darkness of Africa when they were fighting for a new life. That was the contribution of India. Therefore, to attack this, to criticise this policy, I think, is not only to undermine the role of India but also not to understand the whole complicated world situation.

I would like to say that India should play its role more and more effectively. India is the main author of Panch Sheel which we gave to the world immediately after becoming independent. India is a country which has made a valuable contribution to the movement of non-alignment and India's voice, in spite of our poverty, is being heard. We know that we are still a poor country. We have so many problems at home. But Indian voice is being listened to all over the world because India has 68 crores of people who also play their role in international affairs.

I should say that I was one of those who was disappointed during the last 4 or 5 years. India's role was not as effective as it should have been. It was very unfortunate that during the Janata party rule, India's role in international affairs was totally diminished and India was not playing its role at all. But Indian has again revived with a greater vigour, with a greater understanding, with a greater sense of urgency and I must say the Prime Minister's

visit to Cuncun or Melbourne and European visit has again brought India very much on the scene and India's contribution has been appreciated all the world over. I would like that the Prime Minister and the Foreign Minister must play this role. I would like to congratulate them. Today when the world is in real danger, when the world peace is being threatened, though India may be sometimes isolated, the voice of reason, the voice of truth, prevails in the world. May be a time comes when ours will be an isolated voice, a single voice and people may not listen. But what we are saying, I think, is in the interest of world peace and in the interest of the human race.

I would very much like that the House should have passed a unanimous resolution to oppose the decision taken to manufacture neutron bomb; this needs to be condemned, especially at a time when the world public opinion is anxious for peace, at a time when millions and millions of people in all European countries—after the Second World War, it is for the first time this is happening—are coming in the streets and are raising their voices. Who are they? They are women, they are young people, they are children, they are workers, they are peasants, they are intellectuals; all sections of the society are voicing their concern about the wrong and totally destructive policy of the present U.S. Administration where they say that they can perhaps fight a limited nuclear war in Europe. Perhaps the Soviet Union and America think that they can save themselves. But it cannot be a limited war. The Soviet leadership has rightly said that there cannot be a limited war; once a nuclear war is unleashed, it cannot be a limited war; it will destroy not only Europe but the total human race. Therefore, I think that it is time that we did not equate these Super Powers in the name of Super Powers. We must say who is right and and who is wrong.

Many things have been said about the Soviet army on the land of Afghanistan. We know that it is an unfortunate thing. It would have been better if the Soviet Army had withdrawn. But what was the situation? The Americans were coming all the way and were trying to intervene and interfere on the border of the Soviet Union; the Americans were coming all the way and were establishing their nuclear base in the Indian Ocean. Is the Soviet Union not justified in taking all precautionary measures to defend its own border? Today why are we concerned about our border if Pakistan is being armed by the U.S.A., if the U.S.A. is arming Pakistan to the teeth, if they are giving them the most sophisticated things, the latest fighters and other weapons; I do not know what they are going to give from their armoury, but they have decided to give everything relaxing all rules and regulations, giving all concessions. Is Pakistan going to face the Soviet Union? What has Mr. Zia-ul-Haq said: "There is no danger for the Soviet Union; we cannot fight the Soviet Union; we cannot imagine a war against the Soviet Union". Then against whom? It is all against India. It is a part of the global strategy of America, and I am sorry to say that the present rulers of Pakistan have fallen into the trap of the American global strategy to create this kind of a situation. Therefore, it is the patriotic duty of this Government to take every measure and every step to safeguard our sovereignty, to safeguard our border. I am sorry to say that, in this country, we listen to certain voices blaming the Government of India, the Prime Minister of India, for creating a situation against Pakistan. Has India, at any time after Independence, attacked any country? Has India, in the whole history, attacked any country? Therefore, to put the whole thing in a wrong perspective for certain political gains would be undermining our patriotic duty; I think, it is a thing which the people of this country will

[Shri Chandrajit Yadav]

riot excuse. The people of this country understand the seriousness of the situation. I will say that one important factor today is that the common people are getting more conscious, awakened, and therefore, people are raising their voices against these dangers. The world public opinion is an important factor. Therefore, I would request the Foreign Minister to see that all those organisations, meetings and conferences which are taking initiative against armaments, which are taking initiative for peace, which are taking initiative to strengthen the forces of non-alignment, are encouraged. Conditions should be created where they could play their important role.

In this context I would say that an effort has been made to normalise our relations with China. Everybody in this country would like that India and China, the two biggest countries of the world and neighbours, live in an atmosphere of cordiality, brotherhood and friendship. Unfortunately, the leadership of China was responsible for this kind of situation, this situation which was created between India and China. It was they who attacked us. It was they who went on calling us the running dogs of imperialism. It is they who went on blaming our leadership in not understanding them properly. But now some initiatives have been taken and I think we welcome those initiatives and we would like that our relationship should be improved. But the only thing I would say is that unfortunately even the present leadership of China, the way they are reacting on the world situation and trying to support imperialist powers as against those countries whose independence is being threatened, trying to support the Americans when they try to establish military bases in different parts of the globe, I think, this is against the opinion of all peace-loving peoples of the world. Even the Chinese people, I am sure, would in the heart of

their hearts not like this—the Chinese Government's attitude towards the imperialist powers against whom they have fought—they have a great history and they were also victims of the imperialist powers. I am sure the Chinese people also will raise their voice and the present leadership of China will see that the entire community all over the world, the newly developing countries, the newly liberated countries they all feel concerned when China extends its hand to the U.S. administration when they are creating a world war situation. I hope they will also learn lessons from the history and they will improve the situation.

Another thing I will say and I will conclude my speech. India should make special efforts, in my opinion. Efforts are being made but I say it needs special effort to improve our relations with all the neighbouring countries. There are powers who are trying to create bad blood between India and its neighbours. We know if Pakistan to-day have a popular government—the people of Pakistan are not to be blamed—those who come in contact with the people of Pakistan know that they have a great urge that the people of Pakistan and the people of India should live like brothers and sisters because still millions of people who are in India have their kith and kin in Pakistan and millions of people who are in Pakistan have their kith and kin in India. Therefore, these efforts from our side with understanding and I would say, even with toleration should continue. But, at the same time, we should not show any kind of complacency. But I will request the Foreign Minister that in the matter of the no-war pact initiative from Pakistan—they call initiative, but you rightly said that it is India's initiative and not Pakistan's initiative—they have somehow created some kind of confusion and there is a confusion in the whole world and it needs effective campaigning. Our point of view should be

properly conveyed to other countries and peoples of the world how Pakistan is really playing an international gimmick, that it is not a serious proposition and that it is only to put India on the wrong side. All that needs a special effort.

The last point I would say is that to-day the international relationship to a great extent is based on our economic strength. Trade and commerce, the economic strength of the country and the science and technological strength of a country is playing a very important role in today's world. Many of the countries who have full faith in non-alignment, who have full faith in peaceful co-existence and who want to help the forces of peace, to-day, because of their poverty and backwardness in science and technology and in many other areas, are tempted to play a role which is not in keeping with their own aspirations. I request our government also take a note of this factor. Sir, more than 50 per cent of our people remain poor. We read in papers of to-day that in the Human Rights Conference, one gentleman from another country made a pertinent observation I should say. He said that we are talking of human rights. What is the human right so long as 55 per cent of the people in India remain poor? He said that he had not seen this kind of poverty either in China or in any Latin American country. We must create this condition here. So long as social disability continues, we will go on aggravating this situation. So long as we are going to the other countries for aid, there will always be a danger. Perhaps, I will not say that we will compromise our policies and our national dignity. Maybe we may like to keep quiet for certain reasons; we may not be assertive or we may not put forward our point of view very strongly. That will be a dangerous thing and it will not be in keeping with our national dignity and our national aspirations.

Therefore, I would say that in spite of our differences on many socio-economic

policies at home I will say that the role the Government of India is playing to-day in the international scene, the role which the Government of India is playing to-day for strengthening of the world peace and also the role which the Government of India is playing to find solutions for the most complicated problems between countries and between regions deserves complements. It deserves the congratulations. Not only that. It also deserves the national support to-day.

With these words, I say that the Government of India will be able to play a greater role and more admirable role so that the people of India, like the people all over the world, can live in peace.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Shri Eduardo Faleiro.

SHRI EDUARDO FALEIRO (Marmugao): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, all the previous speakers have pointed out one thing which Mr. Chandrajit Yadav referred to as the deterioration of peace and deterioration of global environment all over as a result of super-power confrontation. Of course, there will be difference of opinion between me or between the people of this side and the other sections of the House and among themselves as to who is to blame for what. There should be peace. I emphasise on this. I do not think that debating on who is to be blamed for the present situation is an important thing really. Another most important thing which I would like to point out here to-day is the question of deteriorating security environment around this country. It has come so close to us and it has become so intense that it is not merely a question for the politicians or for academicians to debate, but this concerns every single man or woman, every single citizen of this country. It has come so close to us it has become so serious and so important to us in India, particularly, from the security point of view. The

[Shri Eduardo Faleiro]

economy of the country is also affected. It is most important for the people of this country and for every single citizen of this country to understand the implications of what is going on. We may well begin by saying that what is happening in our neighbourhood and the very serious situation in which we find to-day is as a result of what has been mentioned here, namely, arms-buildup in Pakistan by the supply of arms, particularly, by the American Administration, to Pakistan. The most sophisticated types of weapons are being bought by Pakistan. F-16 aircraft have been introduced in Pakistan. F-16 aircraft had been given to Israel and South Korea and Pakistan is the third non-NATO country to get this aircraft. With F-16 Israel bombed the Iraqi installations. That is a fact. Now, Sir, these arms which are being given to the neighbouring country have effected seriously our safety and security. Our Foreign Minister has made it very clear that Pakistan as any other Government is entitled to have sufficient arms for its defence. That is also what actually every right thinking people of the country will feel. But the question is: Are these arms meant for the defence of Pakistan? Defence against whom? Against threat from Afghanistan? Against the Soviet threat? Or against India? Sir, there have recently been hearings in American Senate Sub-Committees regarding the supply of Arms to Pakistan. What has transpired at these hearings is interesting. According to the American sources, which were quoted there, the present level of Soviet Forces in Afghanistan is about 85,000 people. It has remained at this level for quite some time in spite of the fact that neither the Barbak Karmal's regime nor the Soviets have been able to contain the guerilla activity. The gureilla activity is actually stepping up. But the level of Soviet Forces in Afghanistan has remained stable, has remained stationary. These people have not been even put down the guerillas. As has

been quoted before the Defenc Sub-Committee of the American Senate, there is not at all any possibility, any strategic viability, that these forces may be used to attack Pakistan. And, Sir, it has been mentioned again and again how these types of armaments are not armaments suited against the Afghan terrain and therefore it remains very clear to everybody and everybody must understand it very clearly that these armaments, if they are to be used, and they are meant to be used,—can be used only in the way and in the manner and against the country against which all the previous arms supply to Pakistan has been used—and that is, India.

14 hrs.

It has been mentioned before the Senate Sub committees that of all the deployment of Pakistani forces at present there are estimated to be only two divisions on the Afghan Border while 14 Divisions of the Pakistani army are there, and continue to be there, on the Indian border.

So, this is the qualitative difference in the level of armaments that has been introduced in Pakistan. We should consider whether they may or may not be used against India; but we know the type of polity that prevails in Pakistan. Pakistan Government is a Government of Military dictatorship which lacks political legitimacy altogether. And we know that military dictatorships are prone to such tendencies whether it is in Pakistan or anywhere else. In Pakistan, history has shown this very clearly whether it is Pakistan or any-one else, they are prone to indulge in such adventurist military operations and then they are not going to bother about the results. And they will just take the chance. And therefore, Sir, the fear in this country is this: The fear in all the sections of the House is this which Government must take note of,—and take strong note of.

We have always talked of Peace. It is rational. Any other thing would be lunacy, that a developing country

should talk of war or talk of waging war. But, whilst talking of peace, we must also understand our duty. The rulers and the people who govern must understand their duty towards the people they govern, to safeguard their integrity, to safeguard the integrity of this country.

Sir, we have never in the past started a war. But we have been found wanting in at least one occasion, wanting in alertness; and we have even been accused of complacency, of being caught napping, whilst the enemy attacked us and attacked us with disastrous results.

Therefore, Sir, this military build-up in Pakistan must be taken very serious note of by the Government.

Well, it is not only Pakistan, though Pakistan concerns us very much, but it is the whole of the Indian Ocean which concern us. The UNO has passed a Resolution for keeping the Indian Ocean a zone of peace. But then there is this military build-up of the super powers and other powers: the British are there; the French navy is there; Germans are there; even the Australians have joined it now. All of these make the Indian Ocean a zone of war. Actually it is a zone of war. And we see, Sir, that even small tiny republics are not immune from these deadly attacks of super-powers confrontation. We came to know some days back of the hijacking of an Air India plane in tiny Seychelles. What was actually the situation? The situation was that there was an attempted coup to overthrow President Renee, who, it was felt, was not inclined towards certain interests in the West.

Now, President Renee had overthought to be inclined otherwise and we saw the white mercenaries coming in and trying to keep the tiny Republic under control. What is more serious is this: when the mercenaries went back to the South Africa what did the South African

Government do? In this regard all conventions against high jacking which are required to be taken with utmost seriousness were not followed and instead of giving a stiff punishment to the hijackers, it just released most of the hijackers and even the names of the hijackers were not announced. South Africa is the last bastion of the crude, gross, inhuman, uncivilised manner of colonialism. It is a colonial government as far as the majority of its population is concerned and colonialism of the most cruel type. Apartheid is something by which the human mind took a turn to a monstrous device. Several Resolutions on Namibia are still not implemented. Namibia is still not free. More than that South Africa has been continuously attacking the neighbouring country of Angola which has recently got independence.

Now, India has played a prominent role not only in the Council of Namibia, but everywhere on this issue. It has been in the forefront of liberation movements, particularly in Africa. So, I would request the Government to continue assisting the SWAMPO, to continue assisting the people in Angola not only with moral support but with financial support, as is being done at present, stepping up financial support to the extent possible. I would also like to draw the attention of the House to the tragic conditions, to the very unfortunate situation that prevails in one of the non-aligned countries, that is Cyprus. Cyprus has all along been with India and as Indonesia, and Egypt and it is one of the founder members of the non-aligned movement. President Makarios along with Pandit Nehru, Preshident Nasser and President Sukarno was one of the founding fathers of the movement. But what be fell Cyprus in 1974? Turkey invaded Cyprus with massive military forces and took over about 40 per cent of its territory. It caused tremendous human sufferings. About two hundred thousand Greek Cypriots had to evacuate the land and go to the Southern part of the

[Shri Eduardo Faleiro]

country. The economy was disrupted and in spite of the United Nations Resolutions which required that the Turkish forces should vacate from Cyprus, the Turkish forces are still there. India is one of the 5 countries which constitutes the Contact Group and has always been in the forefront of the movement. It has always supported the United Nations Resolutions on this issue. I would call upon the Government and also call upon this House to be alert about what is happening to Cyprus so that normalcy comes back to that country and a strong government is established that can maintain the integrity of that country and a proportional representation for both the communities—Great Cypriots and Turkish Cypriots—is given. The United Nations Resolutions have got to be implemented and this House must be aware of the UN resolutions and in this regard the necessary will should be generated at the international level so that the Turkish aggression is vacated and the people of Cyprus are allowed once again to live in peace.

Colonialism in its form of political domination is practically over. But colonialism substantially will not be over unless the economic relationship which was created during the colonial days and which are really the reason why colonialism came about, is also uprooted and removed. The colonies were there mainly and mostly for the purpose of providing cheap raw materials to them and were markets for their finished goods. What change has taken place in the last 30 or 40 years since the colonisation began? There is hardly any. The same international order which was created during the colonial days, which created gross inequalities and favoured a few privileged countries, detrimental to the international world, continues.

I must say that the first speaker who spoke today is not correct when he said that our Prime Minister went to Cancun and said that we were poor and the South and the

North should all cooperate. That is not in the Prime Minister's speech? I do not know from where he got that. What the Prime Minister actually said was that we had made tremendous strides, we had achieved what we called in our part of the world 'green revolution' that we might not need much help, but there were many other countries, which need international help. What the Prime Minister projected is the image of this country as the upholder of not merely its national and economic interests, but that of all the weak and less privileged, of all those who cannot defend themselves, who are not given a place under the Sun which they deserve. And that is the great achievement of the visits of the Prime Minister to Nairobi, Melbourne, Cancun and elsewhere.

In spite of our differences in this House on many issues, we are all unanimous on one thing, and that is the magnificent role that this Government is playing in international affairs. I do not think that this House at all doubts the towering personality that the Prime Minister projects in the comity of nations.

The Cancun summit provided, as has been quoted here, merely a step; but a step is better than not moving at all. One cannot hope much on the North-South dialogue from all indications, but taking an attitude of confrontation, as the first speaker wanted us to have, is not going to help anybody. Of course, everybody agrees that the North and South must cooperate; if any good is to come it will come by cooperation and will not come by confrontation, but the cooperation has to be from a position of strength. It is, therefore important that all the developing countries should come together.

People now speak of Third World Trade Unionism. It is in fact necessary that the Governments of the developing countries, in spite of their having political and economic hurdles in their way—of course the problems are different, because they

are having different systems and different regimes—should all come together and put up a united front against the developed countries. They would thus increase their bargaining position and increase their ability to get justice and bring about a just and equitable international order.

I would like to make a strong plea for pursuing the path which the Government has been pursuing, namely collective self-reliance. It is important that the developing countries exchange among themselves their capital resources, their technology, their raw materials and help each other and at the same time build up a common front, a common ground, and try to overcome their differences so that they are in a better and stronger position to achieve what they deserve and what is due to them.

Now, a word about the tremendous impact that the recent foreign visits of the Prime Minister and the Foreign Minister had.

SHRI HARIKESH BAHADUR: I am sorry to say that there is no quorum in the House when such an important issue is being discussed.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: We have been sitting during the lunch hour also. Generally, the quorum issue is not raised during lunch hour.

SHRI RAM JETHMALANI: It is the hang-over of lunch; it is 2.15 p.m.

SHRI HARIKESH BAHADUR: When such an important debate is taking place, there should be quorum.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: There is no quorum in the House. Let the bell be rung.....Now there is quorum, Shri Eduardo Faleiro may continue.

SHRI EDUARDO FALEIRO: Well, Sir, I was speaking on the importance of the visits of the Prime Minister. I had been some time back in Manila

for instance. And the visit of our Prime Minister was the first visit that any Prime Minister or V.V.I.P. from India ever made to the Philippines. The impact of it, I was told, within a month after the visit, has been tremendous. It was not the Media only, TV and the Radio which were full in the morning and in the evening of the coverage on her visit. The President and Mrs. Marcos went out of the way to receive her. The common citizen there was for the first time aware of India and the important role it has and the friendship and affection that India has got for all the countries in that area. They are our neighbours and we share a common culture to a very large extent.

Sir, we have all painted a grim outlook of the present situation, but then one always likes to see and one always believes that all clouds have a silver lining and we see the silver lining today all over the world. Even in militarist countries we find people talking of peace, working for peace, moving for peace. In Bonn, recently there was an unprecedented demonstration for peace, for disarmament and it was led by no less a person than Mr. Willy Brandt, Chairman of the Ruling Party. It is a fortunate coincidence that the same person actually chaired the Report of the Committee on the development of North-South dialogue. This shows how inextricable both the issues are. And in a small out of the way city like Amsterdam a rather hawkish and conservative—there was a big demonstration of thousands and thousands, and, ten thousands of people talking about peace, shouting for peace, moving for peace, protesting against the build up of nuclear weapons and increased confrontation between the two powers. So this is the silver lining and one hopes that with people of goodwill, of this calibre, the people of goodwill that we have in our own government, in several other governments both in the East and the West, ultimately the clouds will dissolve,

[Shri Eduardo Faleiro]

disappear and the rainbow of peace and prosperity for all will rise.

SHRI RAM JETHMALANI (Bombay, North West): Sir, I wish I could, in all conscience, share the shower of praise which has been let loose by some of the distinguished speakers from the Treasury benches, so far as India's foreign policy is concerned.

It is a matter of some regret—and this is a failing not only of this Government, but perhaps of all Governments—that critics of the foreign policy of a Government are victims and objects of gross calumny and misrepresentation. Even taking the full risk of that tendency, I must seriously protest that there is another side of the coin which is being totally lost sight of. Whereas most of the distinguished speakers from the Treasury benches think that our conduct of foreign policy is impeccable, that the image of the country is to-day brighter than it ever was, and that the personal image of the Prime Minister abroad leaves nothing to be desired, I want to tell them that their self-assessment will approximate to reality if they listen in a spirit of humility to criticism of some aspects of their government's foreign policy.

I have just been handed over an article published on the 10th November 1981 by a journalist who is known to be very favourably inclined to the ruling party and the Government, a person who is so favourably inclined that I often have serious differences with him, and yet he had to write an article under the heading "India's lousy image abroad"; and what he has said I wish to adopt as my own submission on this House; and I hope the Minister-in-charge of our foreign affairs and ultimately the Prime Minister will pay some heed. He says in the article:

"Ironically, India's own image is lousy in sharp contrast. Respect and admiration of yesteryears for

India as the land of Gandhi and Nehru and its great non-violent revolution has worn thin. India is no longer viewed as a great champion of liberty and freedom. It is to-day seen as a country which has compromised its basic values and, to quote some Commonwealth commentators, come heavily under "Soviet influence." Worse, in ASEAN countries, India is now viewed not only as a Soviet ally, but even as "a Soviet stooge."

In line with this, I have three charges to make—I call them charges because I think it is a very apt word. (Interruptions). I hope my friends will appreciate the silence and the respect with which we have heard their speeches. I hope there shall be . . .

SHRI EDUARDO FALEIRO: Mr. Inderjit has complimented the Prime Minister.

SHRI RAM JETHMALANI: Mr. Faleiro, I will deal with everything in my own way—leave aside Mr. Inderjit.

SHRI EDUARDO FALEIRO: You are quoting some portions. You should quote in full.

SHRI RAM JETHMALANI: I don't want to quote everything. I want to quote about India's lousy image.

My first charge against the Government is that its conduct of foreign policy has denuded our foreign policy of its entire moral content—that old Gandhian and that early Nehru flavour is gone; and to-day, our foreign policy has come to be one of sordid opportunism in international affairs.

My second charge is that we have gravely compromised our national self-respect. My third charge is that we have gravely impaired our national security. We have jeopardized it. We proceed upon an assumption which has no foundation in international law, international history and even in current affairs, namely that there are permanent friends or permanent enemies. The friends of today

might, according to their changed national interests, become the enemies of tomorrow and I regret to say that we have put all our defence eggs in the Soviet basket and we have thereby made ourselves complete, permanent dependents of the Soviet Union.

I shall illustrate these three charges by reference to some of the important topics of foreign policy. I shall first deal with our relations with Pakistan, a neighbour of tremendous importance. Our Foreign Minister, when he went to Pakistan, in a rare flash of perception of Pakistan's unfortunate predicament and the dawning of a sense of fairness, made a Statement on the soil of Pakistan that Pakistan has a right to arm itself. Sir, even we may agree that a sovereign country has the right to arm itself. We may agree that the Foreign Minister was saying something which was only international law, when he talked of the right of a sovereign Pakistan to arm itself. But we believe that the right of Pakistan is not relevant; what is relevant is the wisdom of the Pakistani action. While, we are strong critics of the wisdom of Pakistani action in arming itself and while we are equally strong critics of the wisdom of the United States in arming Pakistan, we must not shut our eyes to the fact that we have created this situation, this situation has been directly created by our unwillingness to face the truth, by our unwillingness to speak the truth, in accordance with international law and morality and it is our unwillingness to speak inconvenient things to our so-called friends.

The defence of Pakistan by the United States against Soviet expansion, and possible Soviet interference and aggression is legitimate. We must recognise that fact and then couple it with a word of advice to Pakistan, and to the United States is particular, that the United States must take the lessons of previous history. The lessons of previous history are that arms supplied to Pakistan have on the contrary strengthened the undemocratic regimes of that country against their

own people and they have undoubtedly created a provocation to stir up controversies, conflicts, confrontation and even war with its neighbours; and yet, this objection ill comes from us today because we have displayed a conspicuous degree of moral cowardice when it was our duty to speak the truth.

War is a serious thing, the ends of the war depending on the outcome or the result, which might bring benefits to one country or another. But war is not just the outcome of it. War means thousands of—millions of—soldiers destroyed, war means thousands of widows, war means thousands of orphans, war means millions of people and more than anything else it means still greater number of—millions of—people maimed and disabled for life. War is a criminal sport, and I say that those who lose the opportunity, whenever an opportunity presents itself, of creating peace or consolidating it and avoiding war are equally indulging in a criminal international sport.

And it is in this view that our attitude to the No-War Pact offer which has been made by Pakistan must be viewed. I am not one of those people who think that a Pact is an ultimate guarantee of peace. Hitler had a large number of Pacts, he threw all of them to the winds and went to war. But, Sir, a Pact, and a No-War Pact, is bound to have one result that is that no longer can Pakistan in any international forum, justify its act of war by reference to the existence of any disputes, past, pending, impending or future. At least hereafter Pakistan will not be able to go to any international forum and say, that "We have now gone to war, our soldiers have marched into Kashmir our soldiers have marched into Kutch, or our soldiers are now attacking India because the fate of millions of our countrymen in Kashmir is today in dispute and at least that argument will go. If this Government had any wisdom, if this Government knew how to put Pakistan on the mat, the

[Shri Ram Jethmalani]

only thing we ought to have said to Pakistan is, "Please make it clear that hereafter on no account you will proceed to war on the Kashmir issue. We might talk over the Kashmir issue in our drawing rooms, over dinner or even in our conferences whenever our Ministers meet, but never, never again shall this be a pretext for any armed conflict between the two countries." What applies to the Kashmir problem should have applied to all problems, past, present and future. This might have perhaps put the President and the Government of Pakistan in some kind of embarrassing situation and they might have had second thoughts about their no war pact. But I think this offer ought to be examined with great care and attention. To throw it away out of hand, as has been done, to throw it away by quibbling over words, is something we must stop. We must use the opportunity to sterilise that old festering sore of Kashmir. Political wisdom and wise conduct of foreign policy requires that we must tell Pakistan, "We will accept it; no problem any longer be talked about as a justification for any armed conflict."

In this respect, all our criticism is levelled against the United States. Why is it that when we come face to face with our Arab friends, our usually resonant voice dwindles into a low whisper and in fact, ceases to be a voice? Why have we not condemned Saudi Arabia, which has pledged its material resources to the building up of Pakistan's nuclear might? Why these double standards, which make good the charge that our foreign policy is denuded of moral content. We have one law for the friend, another law for the neutral and a third law for our enemies. This is exactly what is meant by saying that the Gandhian flavour is gone and some kind of gross, sordid opportunism has taken its place.

Afghanistan is another issue. In a sense, it is not a recent issue. It is an issue which is at least two years old now. There are my learned friends

who justify our policy on Afghanistan. But let me remind this august House that at the Regional Commonwealth Meet in Delhi in September, the voice of the Commonwealth, the voice of the conscience of the Commonwealth, the voice of the enlightened conscience of the world, was not uttered by our Prime Minister. But it was uttered by the Prime Minister of a small tiny little kingdom, the population of which is perhaps less than that of the city of Delhi—the honourable, distinguished Prime Minister of Singapore, Mr. Lee Kuan Yew. In his speech, he mounted a very serious attack upon the two countries—Soviet Union and Vietnam—both of whom are guilty of having over-run their neighbouring countries and having occupied them. More than anything else, be denounced—he did not say it by words; political diplomacy requires that when you want to say the most unpleasant things, you still utter words of praise—he uttered words of praise for our Prime Minister, but in the next breath, he proceeded to denounce attempts at imparting legitimacy to the Soviet action. Ultimately, when the communique came to be produced, the communique was a refutation of our thesis. It was a denunciation of the moral content of our policy, because even the Prime Minister, after the conference, was constrained to say at a press conference that all were agreed that the Soviet Union should withdraw from Afghanistan—a thing which Mrs. Gandhi had refused to say in these forthright terms. She was ultimately compelled to say under the influence and the compelling influence of much smaller countries than ours, because they at least spoke the truth. When I referred to the distinguished Prime Minister of Singapore, my learned friends began to laugh. But he is one Prime Minister who, when his own Minister had only accepted a free passage from a business man, allowed him to be prosecuted and the court sentenced him to seven years rigorous imprisonment. Internal morality inside the country ultimately reflects itself in the conduct of foreign relations abroad. So,

let us not laugh at the Prime Ministers of smaller countries.

After this communique of the Commonwealth Conference came as a resounding slap in our face, the Prime Minister was asked: what did she intend to do? She said: Of course, we all agree that the Soviet Union should withdraw. Even the Soviet Union has agreed that it should withdraw, but it wants to withdraw on its own conditions. One of the conditions being that it should be requested by the Government which it has installed, to withdraw from Afghanistan, a condition which is permanently incapable of fulfilment. And, therefore, Mrs. Gandhi wants us to believe now that we should persuade the Government of Afghanistan to tell the Russian to go. I want to enquire from the Foreign Minister: what is our diplomacy doing? What action have you taken secretly or otherwise, to create conditions in which the Soviet Union shall withdraw? What are those actions? How are you going to implement those decisions and actions? When is the Soviet Union going to withdraw?

I have not heard one word of condemnation of our friend, the Soviet Union. I wish to make it clear that even I am one of those who believe that the friendship with the Soviet Union is a corner stone of our policy and it ought to continue to be our corner stone. But where I disagree is that this friendship can be at the cost of friendship with others. And certainly, this friendship cannot be either sustained or fostered at the cost of the ever abiding principles of public morality and conduct and certainly not at the cost of selling our soul in the international market. We have not been able to say one word of sympathy for those poor workers of Poland, who, today, are trapped in the ice of Soviet tyranny which the detente and the Helsinki accord have done nothing whatsoever to thaw. And the people talk about the image of our Prime Minister. The

image of our Prime Minister will rise and shine only if you speak the truth. If you speak the truth, you will reflect the conscience of an enlightened mankind.

In West Asia, I have a serious grievance to make. When one of the greatest men of history died—I am talking of President Sadat; I regard him as one of the greatest men of our times, a man who fought the time, the circumstance, the surroundings and who stood forthrightly against all odds—our reaction to that death was half-hearted. Even the statement which we issued on that occasion showed how niggardly we were in our compliments. Egypt is the largest Arab country. It is a country culturally superior to all other Arab countries. It is the centre of Islamic learning. And it is the centre of Islamic thought. It is that one country which, against all odds, is trying to foster world peace. And yet that is the country today which we treat with an amount of coolness, with an amount of indifference, which is not worthy of this great country and which certainly is not worthy of a country which had a Gandhi and a Nehru in it.

It is high time that in West Asia we adopt a more even-handed policy. It is true that we must do something to bring about respect, not merely respect for but an actual realisation of the rights of Palestinians. But the right of Palestinians can be furthered by us only if we take two steps. The first step is that we must define these rights. We must make it clear that the rights of the Palestinians do not include the right to destroy the existing State of Israel, that our policy in West Asia will mean a recognition of the right of all States to survive in that region and that it shall be in accord and in strict conformity with Resolution No. 242 of the Security Council of the United Nations. We must welcome the initiative, which was taken by the Saudi Arabian Gov-

[Shri Ram Jethmalani]

ernment, recently. We have not heard one word about it.

THE MINISTER OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS (SHRI P. V. NARASIMHA RAO): We have. You have not heard it.

SHRI RAM JETHMALANI: I have not heard it, because you have done it in a feeble voice.

SHRI P. V. NARASIMHA RAO: Something wrong with your hearing!

SHRI RAM JETHMALANI: Not even worst enemies have accused me of that.

Now a word about the Conference in Mexico, where we went. Why did not Mrs. Gandhi, or our representatives who accompanied her, raise their voice against the tyranny of OPEC? We had one proposal to make, that you must create a World Bank Energy Affiliate, largely financed by OPEC. That proposal has met no success, and this shows the futility of the friendship with the Arab countries, the OPEC countries. Because we have never told the truth, we have been taken for granted. We do not extract from them the slightest *quid pro quo*. I hope the Foreign Minister will not deny that if today India is in a state of moral and financial bankruptcy and we have to go to IMF for huge loans it is because our OPEC friends have destroyed our economy.

These countries have investible surpluses and they have energy resources, which they can harness for the use of the Third World, including India. But, because we are so much attached to them that we have never told them the truth, they do not care for us; because they know "these poodles of the Government of India will follow us". That is exactly why I say that our foreign policy is a total failure.

There is, however, one point on which I wish to compliment the Government, and that is for their initiative for establishing peace with China. But while talking peace with China, I hope the Foreign Minister does not succumb to the pressure or influence of a mini-Foreign Minister, whom we have on this side of the House, who wants us to barter away our interests for the lake regions to the Chinese. I hope care will be taken and our Foreign Minister is going to forthrightly say that that is not the kind of settlement we have in mind, when we talk of peace with China.

The last thing which I have to say is about Sri Lanka where the Tamilian minority has a legitimate grievance against the Government. The conduct of the Sri Lanka Government leave much to be desired in this respect. If our Prime Minister had acquired that kind of statute that is being advertised in this House, a mere wink of the eye from her would have brought relief to the Tamilian minority in Sri Lanka. It only shows that we are not seriously regarded in the comity of nations, our reputation is at a low ebb today, it is at a low water mark. That is why even tiny Sri Lanka can raise its finger at us and tyrannise some of the minorities, whose interests are dear to us.

It is in these circumstances today that we must build up our friendship and ties of love and affection with our neighbours, because that alone is the manner in which you can make your voice felt. Let us revert back to Gandhi, let us revert back to the Nehru of 1950, not the Nehru he became later under an influence which it is not difficult to point at, and that alone is the way to re-furnish India's image, not this kind of sychophancy, not this kind of one-sidedness, not this kind of refusal to see the truth, not this kind of slurring over the manifest deficiencies of your foreign policy.

SHRI A. LEELALOHITHADASAN NADAR (Trivandrum): Sir, Shri

Mani Ram Bagri, an hon. Member of this House, has been arrested just now...

(Interruptions)

SHRI HARIKESH BAHADUR (Gorakhpur): Rule 229 says:

"When a member is arrested..... the committing judge, magistrate or executive authority, as the case may be, shall immediately intimate such fact to the Speaker, indicating the reasons for the arrest, detention or conviction, as the case may be, as also the place of detention or imprisonment of the member...."

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: It will come in due course. It is a fact that it will come in due course.

(Interruptions)

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: That is all right.

SHRI HARIKESH BAHADUR: The Member is not being allowed to function. He wanted to come to Parliament along with some people from Garhwal.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: When a Member is arrested, the intimation will come in due course.

SHRI HARIKESH BAHADUR: The Member has been arrested and no intimation has been given to the House. The intimation should have been given immediately.

AN HON. MEMBER: You are already intimating the House.

SHRI HARIKESH BAHADUR: I am nobody to intimate the House. But, Sir, you are the person who has to inform the House.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Now, Mr. Zainul Basher may speak.

SHRI ZAINUL BASHER (Ghazi-pur): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, I was carefully listening to the speech of my colleague, hon. Mr. Jethmalani, and I was thinking that the Janata

Party Government was following very faithfully the policy expounded by him, but the result was obvious. When our Government took over, there were some promises made in our Election Manifesto. Though we are struggling hard to fulfil all those promises so far as our home front is concerned, yet the success which our Government has achieved in the field of foreign affairs is significant. We can easily think of the days when we took over from the Janata and Lok Dal Government when we found that our prestige in the sphere of foreign affairs was at the lowest ebb. At that time the prestige of our leaders, the Prime Ministers, the Foreign Ministers and other representatives of our Government who were going abroad, was very low, and in certain countries, especially the Arab countries about which Mr. Jethmalani spoke so much, they had stopped believing us. The result was that the flow of oil from those countries was almost stopped and at that time our country faced a serious oil crisis. I hope you remember the days in 1980 when we entered this august House, when the farmers were suffering, industry was suffering, transporters were suffering because oil was not available in those days, thanks to the policy of the Janata and the Lok Dal Government in those days. But when Mrs. Gandhi came to power, our Arab friends automatically without any effort on our part started sending oil to this country simply because they always had faith in our Government, in Mrs. Gandhi as she has always championed the Arab cause and she will continue to do so in the future also. The faith which was eroded during the Janata and Lok Dal Government's regime was restored so far as Arab countries are concerned. And, Sir, after Mrs. Gandhi came to power our prestige in the international field began to increase day by day. It is evident that for the last two years we have been having foreign guests regularly from the developed countries, from the developing countries,

[Shri Zaimul Basher]

from Asian countries, from African countries, from European countries—from all parts of the world. Hardly two or three days elapse, another foreign dignitary comes to this country. It shows that they have immense faith in Shrimati Gandhi. They come to discuss with her, to take her counsel on important issues, on important world problems. Within these two years our Prime Minister has received invitations from different countries. This year she has visited a large number of countries. I think this is a record—the way she was received in every country, the way she was received in every conference, whether it is Commonwealth Conference or Summit, wherever she went, she gained prestige. She was received and welcomed very well. This clearly shows the affection with which our country, our Prime Minister, and our Foreign Minister are treated these days. Is it not a successful story of the conduct of policy? Of course, it is. For this I must congratulate our hon. Prime Minister, our hon. Foreign Minister and those foreign missions who are conducting our foreign policy all the world over.

SHRI HARIKESH BAHADUR: Is it a good foreign policy that the Prime Minister is pursuing?

SHRI ZAINUL BASHER: She is pursuing a very good foreign policy. Our friend has talked about the moral values. I think morality has always been the corner stone of our policy—whether it is domestic policy or it is foreign policy.

Much is said and much has been said about Afghanistan. Our Government has clearly said and it has not hesitated in making the position clear. Shri Jethmalani is so much busy with his cases in Supreme Court and High Court that he hardly gets time to read newspapers and the statements of our Prime Minister and Foreign Minister. I think he is coming from

the Bombay High Court. I know he is coming from the airport to this House. I think it is his 'majburi'. He cannot find time to read the newspaper. Government has always declared that it is the Government's policy that any army from any country should vacate foreign soil. Government has never welcomed the Soviet Troops in Afghanistan. We have always been saying that the Soviet Government should withdraw its troops from Afghanistan soil. We should be realistic enough to admit that Soviet troops have come to Afghanistan. If we say that they should be withdrawn—are they going to withdraw the troops? It is not a realistic attitude that we only say something without considering the consequences of it. We are saying that a situation should be created by which the Soviets can be persuaded to withdraw their troops. Unless and until a negotiated settlement is found the Soviet troops cannot be withdrawn from Afghanistan. I am one of those who strongly believe that the Soviet Union had done a wrong thing when it entered into Afghanistan and sent its troops to Afghanistan. But only by saying "Withdraw your troops" it will not withdraw. Only if there is a war which they are able to win against the Soviet Union, the Soviet troops will be withdrawn. Are they prepared to go to war against the Soviet Union and win the war? But in a peaceful way, the Soviet troops can only be withdrawn when a negotiated settlement is found. I hope that our Government, particularly our External Affairs Minister is busy in finding some solutions to the problem. It will be a pride for our country, for the Prime Minister and the Foreign Minister, if we are able to find some solution for the settlement of the Afghan issue, in which a situation is created for the withdrawal of the Soviet troops.

Now, I am coming to Pakistan. These days the No-war Pact Offer

from Pakistan is the talk of the day. We are regularly reading in the newspapers about the No-war Pact Offer from Pakistan. Previously, it was said that the No-war Pact Offer had not been formally received by the Government of India, and Pakistan was insisting that it was sent to the Government of India. The Prime Minister has also recently said that this No-war Pact Offer will get due consideration. Whatsoever the fact may be, I must say that this No-war Pact Offer should not be considered forthwith. When I say this, I am not representing the Government and this is only my view. We should not be foolish enough even to consider this No-war Pact Offer. This No-war Pact Offer has come from whom? It has come from a Military dictator of Pakistan. It has come from the illegitimate Government of Pakistan. We have our experience that whenever the military dictators in Pakistan were in trouble, they started trouble against India. They started war against India. In 1965, a war was started when the military dictatorship was with Mr. Ayub Khan. During 1971, a war was started by Yahya Khan. We had very good relations, though they might be troublesome, whenever the elected Government was existing in Pakistan. We had a good and peaceful relation, during the time of Mohamed Ali or Zulfakar Ali Bhutto, who was the Prime Minister of Pakistan.

14.59 hrs.

[SHRI HARINATHA MISRA in the Chair]

I am rather surprised to hear about the No-war Pact Offer from a person like Shri Jethmalani. His Government was in power when Mr. Z. A. Bhutto was hanged. Not only Mr. Bhutto was hanged but democracy in Pakistan was hanged. Why could not his Government, the Janata Government or the then

Prime Minister raise their voice against it?

Democracy was murdered in daylight in our neighbouring country which has a historical tie with our country. When public opinion in this country from Kashmir to Kanya Kumari about Bhutto's murder had been raised; why were you silent?

15 hrs.

How can we believe Pakistan? There is a military dictatorship in Pakistan for whom even the Constitution of that country has no sanctity. What sanctity will a no-war pact have? They will not treat it more than a piece of paper. This is a diplomatic skill. On the one hand, they are taking sophisticated arms from America and, on the other hand, they are talking of a no-war pact. They know it fully that these arms are going to be used against the Soviet Union. Pakistan has no strength to fight against the Soviet Union and the Soviet Union has no ambition to fight a war against Pakistan. Where military dictatorship exists, the change of Government is very easy. It will not be surprising that on one fine morning we read in the newspapers that one pro-Moscow General has taken over Islamabad and, next day, the Russian army is marching in the streets of Karachi, Lahore and Islamabad. That will be easy enough to happen in a country where uncertainties are there, where the policies are decided on the whim of a military general.

Pakistan is not going to use the sophisticated arms which it is receiving from America against the Soviet Union. These arms are to be used against the people of Pakistan themselves and, afterwards, against India. When the military dictator will feel troubled, when he will feel that the ground is slipping under his feet, he will start tension on the borders of India and Pakistan and will start military conflict against this country

[Shri Zainul Basher]

only to keep himself in power. Pakistan's intention should not be taken seriously, unless and until a democratically-elected Government is there in Pakistan.

There are people in that country who are fighting for the establishment of democratic traditions in that country. It is my personal opinion and I also urge upon the Government to see that the democratic movement in Pakistan is strengthened. The people of India should give their moral support to any democratic movement that is taking place in Pakistan so that Pakistanis can have their own democratically-elected Government. If any offer comes from that Government, we should consider it seriously because the people of India and the people of Pakistan do not want a war. They want to live in peace. They want to live as brothers and they want to live in a traditional way, as they were living from time immemorial.

In this respect, through you, Sir, I would like to draw the kind attention of the Minister of External Affairs to one thing. He knows it; he has even told me during the Question Hour and also through our correspondence. The Government of Pakistan, the Pakistan Embassy, is not allowing Indians to visit Pakistan even on emergency visas. There are a large number of persons in India whose mothers, brothers and relations are in Pakistan. Whenever they are on sick beds whenever there is a marriage in the family or whenever there is any death in the family, even then they are not being allowed and, if the husband is allowed, the wife is not allowed and, if the wife is allowed, the husband is not allowed. Our Government is taking a reasonable attitude towards Pakistan. Our Embassy is allowing everybody who wants to come from Pakistan to India on humanitarian grounds. But the Pakistanis are not allowing our citizens to visit Pakistan even on

humanitarian ground and I would like to draw the attention of the External Affairs Minister to the humiliation which our Indian citizens face at the doors of the Pakistan embassy. They are being abused. They are sometimes being beaten at the doors of the Pakistani embassy. Their staff is misbehaving with Indian. Please find out some solution to the problem. Our Indian citizens are not misbehaving. But this country is being misbehaved by the petty Pakistani officials who do not know even what is culture. They do not know how to treat foreign nationals. Please take some action on this issue. I have been urging from the last two years in this regard kindly to see that Indian citizens are not at least humiliated by the Pakistani officers and staff at the doors of the Pakistani embassy.

Coming to China, our Government has started negotiation with the Government of China. This is a very welcome move on the part of our Government. I am happy that this time the Government, under the leadership of our Prime Minister and the External Affairs Minister, has not been caught napping.

Mr. Vajpayee went to China without any preparation. He was so overwhelmed after receiving an invitation from the Government of China that, without considering any consequences of it, he went to China, with the result that not only Mr. Vajpayee was humiliated but, our entire nation, entire country, was humiliated in China.

We should at least know the moves of the Chinese. We should know and study their intentions, whether the Chinese attitude towards India has undergone a significant change or not. We should assess it.

An official-level team has gone to Peking to study the situation and if any significant change takes place in Chinese attitude, I think that these great powers of Asia should start

negotiations. I urge upon the External Affairs Minister that during these negotiations our national interest should always be kept in mind.

China has snatched the territory of ours. This august House passed a resolution to take back that territory which is under illegal occupation of China. That territory should be taken back. Without taking back the entire territory, no useful purpose would be served, so far as Indo-China relations are concerned.

As regards Sri Lanka, we all know and I agree with Shri Jethmalani on this score that our Indian Tamilians are being harassed in Sri Lanka. They are not being treated very well. Our Government should take a very bold stand on this issue. It will not do that we lodge our protest to Sri Lanka. But through diplomatic channels or through persuasion or through any other means, our Government should see that India's Tamilians settled in Sri Lanka do not suffer.

With these words, I congratulate the Prime Minister and the External Affairs Minister on the conduct of their foreign policy which has enhanced the country's prestige.

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA (Basirhat): Sir, for many years now there has been a general consensus in this country—except for a misguided fringe, I should say—, there has been a broad consensus in support of the foreign policy that the Government of India has been pursuing, and I do not wish to spend time praising the positive aspects of that policy which are quite well known and which, I think, are certainly in the interest of this country and which, we have never hesitated in supporting. But, I think, today the global situation which includes the situation in our neighbourhood is far too serious, far too threatening, to permit of any vacillations and ambivalences on the part of our Government. About the extent of the threat

and the danger of a nuclear outbreak, enough has been said here by many other Members on both sides of the House, and I do not wish to take up time on that. It is not something which is just confined to words; it is something which has really become now a grim reality which, as the Prime Minister has rightly pointed out, has brought millions of people in almost all the countries of Western Europe on to the streets in unprecedented demonstrations, that is, the people of those countries who have been through the horrors of World War II and who know what it means to have their towns and homes devastated. And one of those countries, though not belonging to Western Europe—but it is well to remember—is the Soviet Union which lost 20 million people in the course of World War II. There is no other country which can show such a tremendous extent of destruction and damage as the Soviet Union had to suffer from 1941 to 1944. Fortunately—I say 'fortunately' because not even their worst enemies would wish them such a thing—the people of the United States of America have not had occasion to taste firsthand the horrors of that kind of warfare directly on their own heads and on their homes. So, when we speak about some forces working for peace and some forces which are more interested in developing a war-like atmosphere, preparing for war, we should bear these things in mind. The common man of Western Europe at least, irrespective of politics, irrespective of parties or religious denominations—is now demonstrating in every capital of Western Europe because those people know what it means. According to Mr. Reagan, if they get their first nuclear strike, the Soviet Union can be vanquished. I do not know what comfort these words are bringing to the people of Western Europe because they know that, in the event of an outbreak of a nuclear war, whatever may happen to the Soviet Union or whatever may happen to many cities in the

Soviet Union, the fate that will overcome the capital cities of Western Europe is something which naturally those people would not like to contemplate. It is a horrible atmosphere, a horrible situation, which has developed. My criticism of our Government is that, sometimes, they speak as though they are delinking this whole global crisis which has developed and the global strategies which are being pursued from what has happened in our own immediate security environment—as though it is something which has nothing to do with that. I do not think that is a very proper way and a very comprehensive way of looking at these problems.

PROF. N. G. RANGA (Guntur). We have not forgotten the other side.

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA: Our policy should be declared to-day in very unambiguous and categorical terms on these issues.

Before I pass on to one or two of them, there is just one event of recent occurrence. That is the only reason though it may not be a very global factor, but it is a very important thing for us in India, a matter of recent occurrence which I wanted to refer to show how this ambivalence, hesitation and vacillation affects the stand of our Government. An Air India Plane was hijacked from Seychelles and back to Seychelles. It was then later on discovered that armed mercenaries who had come from South Africa and who had been recruited in South Africa were attempting to bring about a coup against the government of Seychelles. That coup, of course, failed, it was aborted. The plane was flown to South Africa, to Durban and later on that plane was released and the crew and passengers were able to return safe to our country. If you see the reaction in a substantial part of our media, not only the unofficial media because I suppose the Minister has no control over that, but even the

official media, not a single word has been said in condemnation of this attempt by a group of mercenaries to overthrow the Government of Seychelles which is a small, tiny, little country situated in the Indian Ocean and I believe, with which we have got very good and friendly relations. Not a word is said about that. All that the media was full, the radio was full of, the TV was full of was a big, magnanimous and generous gesture the South African Government has shown by releasing the plane and the crew and the passengers so soon—as though we are under some kind of a debt of gratitude to them. Naturally they could not do anything else because it was their own mercenaries, mercenaries recruited in their own country and who had been sent in order to carry out that armed coup. Nothing is said about that.

I will remind the hon. Minister just for his reference, that on the 8th of January, 1982 the South African National Congress which has an office here also situated in Delhi, is going to celebrate its 70th anniversary of its founding. People not only of South Africa but of all other African countries who have always looked upto India for support and leadership, many of them, will be wondering and I am told that many African diplomats in Delhi have wondered why the media has carried only such a positive response towards what the South African government has done by releasing our plane. The Chairman of Air India, Mr. Raghu Rai has said in a press statement that he is so much overwhelmed by the fact that these mercenaries who took alcoholic drinks out of the store in the plane and helped themselves, have actually paid for the drinks. He has issued a statement—a good old British pucca sahib tradition, but not a word is said about the whole operation which was going to be carried out in the Indian Ocean. I am giving this

as an example. As you see we have got some kind of long, traditional and historical ties with the whole movement in South Africa. We must not forget that at times.

I am not clear yet and I do not know what the other members think of it, but what was the consideration which ultimately led our government to clear those British cricketers who have come here but who have been blacklisted for having played in South Africa? Of course, this is a controversial question and people say that these things should not be allowed to interfere with sports. But the point is that these are very sensitive issues for the Africans and the matter was being considered for several days here—whether clearance should be given or not to these cricketers, M/s. Boycott and Cook to accompany that team and come here.

Then, it was cleared—I do not know how it was cleared—it is not at least clear to me. There was some vague thing, that somebody had issued a statement, some players issued some statement later on, saying that they hate apartheid, this and that. I do not know whether it will prevent them in future from also going to South Africa and earning money by playing cricket. But, that is a different matter. I am not bothered about it. But my point is that in our own interest, our image in the eyes of the South African people and the other people of Africa should not be suspect in any way. This whole incident of Seychelles, the attempted coup and the way we got into raptures over the fact, of the South African Government's release of our plane, in a very gentlemanly way, as also our passengers and our crew and their mercenaries having actually paid for the drinks to them on board—is this the kind of reaction that they expect from us? I do not know it.

I would request the Minister to look into these things and be a little vigilant in future about the ambiva-
2860 LS—21.

lance. Many months ago, we were debating the Anti-Apartheid Bill in this House and I was the first who raised the question. The cricket team was to come. Please think about it from now as to what you are going to do. Anyway, we have our own way of functioning. So, what has happened has happened.

Now, Sir, about this question which has been dealt with here in great details by the hon. Members, namely, about the operation of arming Pakistan and the building up of the arms strength of Pakistan, I have not really got much to add because almost everybody here except Mr. Jethmalani seems to be of the view that these arms, these sophisticated weapons, the aggressive weapons and all that cannot, logically, be used against anybody except India. Of course, in that connection, he spoke about the so-called offer of no-war pact. I am fully in agreement with the Government. it is a play. There is no doubt about it. You cannot go on building up enormous military potential and, at the same time, talk about the no-war pact. I do feel that the public opinion in this country has not been sufficiently educated and made conscious about our stand regarding this because, on the face of it, many people say what is wrong with this if they are offering a no-war pact. Why should our Government dismiss it out of hand? What is the harm if we really can enter a no-war pact? Everybody is not so sagacious or wise as our Prime Minister or Shri Narasimha Rao. Among the ordinary people in this country, there is a big Muslim population and I can tell you that among many Muslims, this propaganda is going on that here is Zia-ul-Haq's offer of a no-war pact while this Government, the Indra Gandhi Government, is trying to create a situation of hostility between the two countries. All sorts of things are being said by the people. I think the Government should, by and large, more often do some explaining in the matter, explaining to the public, the

[Shri Indrajit Gupta]

real facts behind this which influence them. Recently, I am glad that the Government has said that they stand by their original offer which was made long ago and that they stand by that. But, on the basis of the bilateral settlement of disputes, at the time of the Simla Agreement, this was what had been discussed. The whole question of Kashmir need not be brought up again and again in the international forums. The matter could be settled perhaps. But, as far as the building up of their armed forces, I am glad that some other Members also have noticed that General Haq himself is on record as saying that the Soviet Government had assured him that it had no intentions against Pakistan whatsoever. Gen. Zia-ul-Haq had said that he had no possible reason for disbelieving them. Then, what are these arms for? I just want to briefly make a reference because it is always better to go to the horse's mouths and get things directly from there. I am just giving two or three quotations which are on record. These are the official documents circulated by the American Embassy, the Communication Agency; they are very efficient in this matter. I must say that I am very thankful to them that they supply us with all these in details. But, I shall be very brief. On the 31st of July, the U.S. Secretary of State, Alexander Haig giving testimony before the Senate Arms Services Committee had said the following in one part of his testimony. I am quoting:

"We are attempting to convince our friends in South-West Asia that we are a reliable and capable security partner, serious about defending our vital interests in their region in partnership with them.

U.S. Naval presence in the Indian Ocean, our efforts to improve security relations with Pakistan, and the generally expanded security assistance budget requests for South-West Asia are examples of this."

So, the way that the Americans are looking at it is very important. And here again. I find, on the 25th of August, the text of the United States' Ambassador Jeane J. Kirkpatrick's address at the India International Centre, New Delhi, when she came here. It is very important to quote what she said. I quote:

"We believe indeed we know now that India's own military strength has increased very dramatically in the period since the last Indo Pakistan war, so that India is today one of the world's major military powers. I think it is estimated that India is the fourth largest military establishments in the world. It is our estimate that any arms sales that we provide to Pakistan do not threaten the security of India and that is why we undertake that policy. We think, in fact, that we introduce an element of stability rather than of instability. That is our perception of our policy."

So, this is the logical reason why they are arming Pakistan. because, they think that there is an imbalance. Obviously what they are trying to say is that there is military imbalance. In West Europe they talk about imbalance; they say Soviet is Superior, and therefore they must build this up. Here the suggestion is that India is much too superior over Pakistan. Therefore, the imbalance should be restored by arming Pakistan.

MR. CHAIRMAN: General Zia also says the same thing.

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA: Naturally. It is helping him, it is suiting him to get so many things which he would not have otherwise got.

Mrs. Kirkpatrick in the same Press Conference has said this. I think somebody made a reference to this here. Now, after so long, we have concluded this 5,000 crore loan agreement with IMF. But there is one thing according to Mrs. Kirkpatrick which India should learn from certain 'dramatic success stories' of whom? Singapore, Taiwan, South

Korea. Hong Kong. We should learn from them! And what are we to learn? I quote:

"These countries have experienced the most dramatic growth and have achieved self-sustaining growth, cooperated with the industrialised West and sought a partnership based on close cooperation and mutual advantage. Rather than imposing command economies, on captive peoples, they have emphasized market forces, free trade, and individual initiative. Where others have sought to make the State."

—that is to say, like our public sector—

"...the motor of economic development, they encouraged the private sector through tax concessions to both corporations and individuals."

So, this philosophy, which is the philosophy of the IMF, also is something, which we have now swallowed. hook, line and sinker, in order to get Rs. 5,000 crores as loan.

Then, finally, I just want to mention one more quotation. And this is from James L Buckley, Under Secretary of State for Security Assistance. He was speaking on the 16th September at another Committee of the U. S. Congress. And he says this. He was referring to some commentators who have expressed fears that their proposed sales to Pakistan will spark an arms race on the sub-continent. He goes on to say:

"Those fears simply do not stand up under analysis. India possesses a very large, well-equipped, well-trained military establishment that provides it with a decisive superiority over Pakistan in the air as well as on the ground. Given the large number of advanced aircraft which the Indians already have or will receive from the Soviets and Great Britain, they will emerge six years from now with an even greater

edge over the Pakistanis notwithstanding the addition of 40 F-16s to the latter's inventory. In fact, they should then have an advantage over Pakistan, in terms of modern fighter aircraft, of about six to one.

These hard fact should dispel any notion that the equipment we would provide Pakistan would upset the balance of power on the sub-continent."

Lastly here again, now our friend Mr. Alexander Haig who is due to visit Delhi in another 4 or 5 days' time, has said in his testimony on US Foreign Policy Goals:

"Security assistance to Pakistan, which lies between the Soviets and the Gulf, is also crucial. The invasion of Afghanistan places Pakistan in the front line of defence against Soviet aggression. These pressures have not deterred Pakistan from courageously leading the condemnation of the invasion by the U.N., the non-aligned movement and the Islamic conference. Nor have they stopped Pakistan from agreeing to a new relationship with U. S. Indeed. President Zia has personally conducted a vigorous public campaign for renewed U.S. ties throughout his country. We must show that this confidence is not misplaced."

I think these quotations are enough. I could have given many more to show that the concern which everybody feels in this country is not based just on some kind of vague misplaced fears. Whatever the regime in Pakistan may choose to do, one cannot say anything because it is a military regime, but it is quite obvious what the Americans want there and they have made a theory that India is vastly superior to Pakistan already in military matters and therefore the balance should be corrected and restored by them. So, there is no question of fighting here against the Soviets or trying to defend Afghanistan. Afghanistan does

[Shri Indrajit Gupta]

not want to be defended by Pakistan. I can assure you on that. I was there recently last month for a few days and I had occasion to speak to many Afghan leaders and also of the Government and I asked them "do you not think that your own armed forces, the Afghan armed forces now with the armed militia they have got armed militia in the factories, villages and all that—deal with these intruders from across the border? And they told me, even Mr. Karmal with whom I had a few minutes' conversation, told me "Yes, we are capable of dealing with them." Then I said "in that case why are you troubling your Soviet friends? You could ask them to leave." And he said, "Yes, we could ask them to leave" and he said 'personally if you ask, I think they would be very glad to leave because their being here is not helping them. It is helping Mr. Zia-ul-Haq, it is helping the Americans and other people who have got good propaganda advantage". And because of this propaganda advantage they don't want them to leave, they would like them to stay: so that they can carry on this international propaganda. But he said: "Suppose we request them and they go, who will guarantee to us that after that, our country will not be bombarded and will not be attacked. There are 80 training camps across the border." We were shown from the top of the hill near Jalalabad—you can see the camps on the other side of the river.

And gentlemen like Gulbuddin, people who have fled away from Afghanistan long ago, who are now living in Peshawar, visiting nightclubs and riding in American limousines, well flushed with money, who are supposed to be the leaders of the so called insurgents—he said—if that attack comes that will happen? If we are bombarded, what will happen? We will have to call back the Soviets again; if they have to come back again after having been withdrawn

then there will be war on our soil. This is something that we have to think twenty times about. So, what is being said is quite correct. There must be a settlement. Certainly these troops should be withdrawn; they will have to be withdrawn and they must be withdrawn, just as our troops had to be withdrawn from Bangladesh. We went there with all good intentions but you know what the reception of the people was there later on. We went there at the request of a Government, a Government which at that time was not based on Bangladesh soil at all, it was based somewhere outside. Bangladesh, but we went there because it was a good cause, but we had to withdraw and we withdrew. So, this will have to be withdrawn also, there is no doubt about it. But the conditions must be created for that and I think our Government and the Prime Minister had taken a reasonable stand on this because when the proposals were brought to Delhi by the Afghan Foreign Minister Dost Muhammed, not so long ago, in which he said "we are ready to sit down and talk any time with anybody, with Iran, Pakistan, in the presence of the United Nations representatives. But let us sit round the table and decide, and see how the conditions can be created so that the Soviet forces can be withdrawn. Nobody wants them to remain there. We do not want that; you do not want that. Afghanistan is friendly to us; the country and the Government is friendly to us; it is not a hostile Afghanistan; not another base like Pakistan directed against India. We do not want that such a country should be left at the mercy of attacks from outside. It is necessary to take a balanced view of this. Why should the Government go on vacillating on other questions which are much clearer? They would go on talking about super-power rivalry. May I know who has sabotaged the move which was going on to make The Indian Ocean—zone of peace? Who sabotaged the conference which

was to be held earlier in Sri Lanka this year? Was it the Soviet Union? In today's newspaper I read that Mr. Rao has yesterday assured the visiting Foreign Minister of Egypt that India stands squarely for the Arab cause and that there can be never a lasting peace in this area, until the rights of the Palestinian people are ensured. That is very good. But does America stand for that, or has the Soviet Union supported consistently the cause of the PLO? Who stands for them?

Now-a-days, a new theory has been propagated from our foreign office and that is that the world is no longer uni-polar; it has become multi-polar, and, therefore, India must strike a golden mean of the Third World. Some people have interpreted it to mean that we should be neutral in all these issues, neutral between the forces working for peace and the forces working for war, and go on tarring them with the same brush and say that both are responsible for all these crisis.

The Supreme Soviet of USSR, that is, their Parliament, had addressed an appeal to all the Parliaments of the world, including our Parliament. I do not know if there has been any response, whether we feel like making any response. Now a delegation of the Soviet Parliament is in Delhi and is shortly to meet our Members of Parliament. They have issued an appeal to the whole world, Parliaments of all the world on the basis of certain concrete proposals. These proposals have been made time and again by President Brezhnev also. It is not necessary that we must necessarily accept everything they say. But is it not a peace initiative? Has not Mrs. Gandhi yesterday, when receiving Mr. Kuznetsov, said to him, as reported in today's newspapers, that she values very highly the peace initiatives taken by Mr. Brezhnev, and that they are completely in line with the thinking of the Indian Government? She says this to Mr. Kuz-

netsov. This is very good. But our Foreign Affairs Ministry and all its official documents and statements will go on talking about the two super powers together creating a situation which is very threatening. What is the use of this tight-rope walking? It is not going to help. You are afraid that if you say something, you will be accused by Mr. Ram Jethmalani and his friends of having become a Soviet stooge. In any case, even if you do not do this tight-rope walking, you will be accused of this. He and his friends will accuse you of that, but you should not be worried of that. You should only be worried about what is good in the interest of our country, in the interest of our security, in the interest of our friendship with those countries which have stood by us and helped us always; you should not be afraid to recognise those people who are doing things which are not in the interest of our country.

Therefore, I conclude by saying that we, generally speaking, support the foreign policy of the Government, but every now and then there are these ambivalences and shifts. When Mrs. Gandhi went to Paris and met Mr. Mitterand, suddenly she developed this theory of golden mean, of being neutral between different camps. Nobody wants you to be a camp follower of anybody. We have first and foremost to decide on the basis of our own national interest. And from that viewpoint we should not hesitate to say whose actions are helping us and whose actions are harming us. This is necessary. Without doing that, we will not be able to really recover our prestige that we enjoyed, I think, much more some years ago. And I would end by appealing to him again that nearer home much smaller people than the Soviet Union or the United States of America are looking to us, particularly, the coloured people of the African continent. Don't keep forgetting them every now and then like this by this careless kind

[Shri Indrajit Gupta]

of lackadaisical little action here and there. They are very sensitive people about these matters. Let them at least feel on the 70th anniversary of the South African National Congress on the 8th of January the warm glow of the support and solidarity of India behind their struggle. That is what I would like to say. I hope they will be more consistent in future in implementing their policy which generally is all right and which I do support.

श्री पी. नामग्याल (लद्दाख) : सभापति जी, अब से पहले बहुत सारे मोन्ट्रिज ज मेम्बरों ने इन्टरनेशनल सिचुएशन पर अपने स्थानों पर जाहिर किए। आज दुनिया कुछ ऐसे दौर से गुजर रही है कि लगता है कि जल्दी ही कुछ होने वाला है। एटम बम और हाइड्रोजन बम को पोंछे छोड़ कर आज न्यूट्रान बम की बात चल रही है। इसी का नतीजा है, मैं समझता हूँ कि आज यूरोप के बहुत सारे बड़े बड़े शहरों में जो कि नाटो के एलाइज हैं, लोग खुद-ब-खुद अपने घरों से बाहर आकर, उन को बुलाने वाला कोई नहीं है, उन को मड़काने वाला कोई नहीं है, इस सब के बगर, आने वाले खतरा के खिलाफ मुजाहिदा करा रहे हैं।

ऐसा क्यों हो रहा है? लोगों को महसूस हो रहा है कि अब भी नहीं कोई जंग छिड़ेगी तो गारंटी अब से पहले उबाही जो होगी वह योरोप में होगी, उस के बाद फिर दूसरे सेंट्रॉट में वह फलेगी। इसी तरह से दूसरे बारात इंडियन ओशन में बढ़ रहे हैं और दूसरे सुपर पावर और उनके एलाइड द्वारा यह कोशिश की जा रही है कि कहीं न कहीं इंडियन ओशन में उन्हें कोई बेस (base) मिल जाए, कोई अड्डा बनाने का बस मिल जाए। उसी के साथ-साथ वैस्ट एशिया भी जुड़ा हुआ है।

आज जो कुछ हो रहा है वह सब आपके सामने है। इसी कंटेस्ट में हमारे सारे कंटीनेंट्स में जंग का खतरा बढ़ रहा है। इसी कंटेस्ट में, जैसा कि दूसरे मोन्ट्रिज ज मेम्बरों ने भी कहा कि पाकिस्तान आज हर तरह के खतरनाक हथियार हासिल करने की कोशिश कर रहा है। एफ-16 का आप ने बहुत कुछ सुना। इस के अलावा और बहुत सारे खतरनाक हथियार वह हासिल कर चुका है। कहा जाता है कि वह जल्दी ही एटम बम भी एक्स्प्लोड करने वाला है। यों ही जब एफ-16 हवाई जहाज उनके हाथ मुआमे से वे कंवीन्स हो गए तब जनरल जिया साहब ने नो-वार (No war) पंक्ट का भी ओफर कर दिया।

लगता यू है कि हाथ में तलवार लेकर कहता है कि हमारी यह ओफर है। वह कन्विस हैं, एफ-16 भी आ रहे हैं, एटम बम भी जल्द बनाने वाले हैं और हथियार भी बनाने वाले हैं। वह समझते हैं कि भारत को किसी भी वक्त अपने वाद में करने या इन्हे नीचा दिखाने के काबिल वह हो गये हैं।

इस तरह बहाना तो यह किया जा रहा है कि उन्हें अफगानिस्तान से खतरा है, जहाँ तक अफगानिस्तान का संबंध है, बहुत सारे मोन्ट्रिज ज साधियों ने कहा है कि अफगानिस्तान के खिलाफ लड़ाई करने का मतलब यही है कि वह सोवियत एशिया के खिलाफ लड़ाई होगी। इस का मतलब कोई भी यह नहीं समझेंगे कि पाकिस्तान इस काबिल हो गये होंगे कि एशिया के खिलाफ एक दिन की भी लड़ाई वह लड़ पायेंगे। इसलिये जो भी हथियार, वह जिस इंग से हाजिल कर रहा है, वह साफ अया है कि वह भारत के खिलाफ हासिल कर रहा है। इस से पहले की तवारीख हमारे सामने शाहित है कि 6 बार पाकिस्तान ने हमारे मुल्क पर हमला किया और हर दफा इस के बावजूद भी कि अमेरिकन हथियार जो उन्होंने हासिल किये, उन के साथ कुछ स्टिग और एग्जीमेंट थे कि वह भारत के

खिलाफ इस्तेमाल नहीं किये जायेंगे, उसके बावजूद भी उन्होंने इस्तेमाल किये ।

अब जो एफ-16 और दूसरे हथियार हासिल किये जा रहे हैं, उसके साथ कोई स्ट्रिंग या एग्जिमेंट अटैच नहीं, लिहाजा जब भी उनकी मर्जी आये, वह हमारे खिलाफ इस्तेमाल करेंगे ।

इस कांटेक्सट में, मैं समझता हूं कि उनका 'नो-वार पैक्ट' No war Pact का जो आफर है, जब वह कंवैन्स हो गये कि हम इस काबिल हैं कि भारत के साथ लड़ सकेंगे, तो यह नो-वार पैक्ट आफर हो रहा है । वह महज दुनिया को धोका देने के लिए है ।

मैं जनाब फारेन मिनिस्टर साहब को मुबारकबाद पेश करता हूं कि उन्होंने टाइम एंड अगेन, यह साफ कर दिया कि जो कुछ भी पाकिस्तान के साथ बातचीत होगी, वह शिमला एग्जिमेंट के जो उसूल है, उस के मुताबिक होगी । मुझे ऐसा लगता है, जैसे ट्रैस रिपोर्ट भी हैं कि पाकिस्तान में जो अफगान रिफ्यूजीज हैं, पता नहीं कितने लाख हैं, उनके और लोकल बलूच कबायली के दरम्यान शांति काफी अनबन हो गई है क्योंकि जो रिफ्यूजीज वहां पर आ गये हैं तो लोकल लोगों की जो पैसिलिटीज हैं, वही लोग खारहे हैं बाजार में चीजें महंगी हो गई हैं, खाने पीने का सामान नहीं मिल रहा है तो उन के दरम्यान जो अनबन हो गई है । कहा जाता है कि कई बार क्लैश भी हो गये हैं तो अब हालात ऐसे हो गये हैं, सिचुएशन ऐसी भी क्रिएट हो गई है कि वहां के लोकल रिजेंटमेंट और लोकल लोगों की बेचैनी से तबज्जुह हटाने के लिये पाकिस्तान कभी भी हमारे खिलाफ कोई एक्शन कर सकता है । ऐसी सूरत में मैं जम्मू-कश्मीर का बाशिन्दा होने के नाते, मुझे यह ख़दशात लग रहे हैं,

कि जब भी वह लड़ाई करेंगे, कश्मीर से शुरू करेंगे, जैसे कि अब तक 3 बार पहले कर चुके हैं ।

इस सूरत में कश्मीर स्टेट में हालात का नामस होना बहुत जरूरी है । आज उस स्टेट के अंदरूनी हालात कुछ अच्छे नहीं हैं । वहां पर जितनी भी कम्यूनल फोसिज हैं, वे एक हो गई हैं । अंग्रेजी में एक कहावत है कि बि एनिमी आफ बि एनिमी बिकम्ज ए फ्रेंड "The enemy of the enemy becomes a friends" वहां पर जितने भी फिर्कानेस्त लोग हैं, जो कभी एक दूसरे के खून के प्यासे थे, आज वे एक हो कर वहां के डेमोक्रेटिक, सोशलिस्ट और सैकुलर पैटर्न को डिस्टर्ब कर रहे हैं, और वहां के माहौल को खराब करने की कोशिश कर रहे हैं, और हुकमरान जमात इस में बराबर के शरीक है । पाकिस्तान तो हमेशा ताक में बैठा हुआ है । वह हमारी तरह एक पार्लियामेंटरी डेमोक्रेटिक मुल्क तो है नहीं । वहां एक व्यक्ति की या शक्ती हुकमत है । जब भी चाहे, वह कुछ भी कर सकता है । इस लिए सेंट्रल गवर्नमेंट का जम्मू कश्मीर स्टेट के हालात को सुधारने की तरफ तबज्जुह देने की जरूरत है । अगर हम ऐसे अन्दरूनी अनासिर का वहां पर नहीं दबाएंगे जो दबे लपटों में मलहदगी की बातें फैला रहे हैं, तो वहां की हालात कभी खराब भी हो सकती है ।

चीन के साथ जो बातचीत चल रही है, उस को हम बलकम करते हैं । मैं समझता हूं कि प्राइम मिनिस्टर श्रीमती इन्दिरा गांधी जी और हमारे फारेन मिनिस्टर साहब की बयादत में हमारी फारेन पालिसी बहुत काम-याब ढंग से चल रही है । उस के लिए मैं उन को मुबारकबाद पेश करता हूं, इस उम्मीद पर कि चाइना के साथ बातचीत में, जो आज शुरू हो चुकी होगी, एक रीयलेस्टिक

[श्री पी० नामग्याल]

एपरोच अख्तियार की जाएगी। जो हमारे इलाकों का सवाल है, मैं समझता हूँ कि इस मौजूअ पर कुछ कहना ठीक नहीं होगा। जब एक अच्छे माहौल में यह बातचीत चल रही है, तो हमें उम्मीद है कि एक्जटर्नल एफेयर्स मिनिस्टर साहब जल्द ही हमें इस बारे में आगाह करेंगे।

चाइना के साथ ट्रेड रिलेशंस और कल्चरल एक्चेंज के पारे में भी बातचीत चल रही है। संचरीज से लद्दाख का तिब्बत और चाइना के साथ बार्डर ट्रेड और वार्टर सिस्टम पर होंता रहा है। उनके बंद होने से उनके भी नुकसान हुआ है और हमें भी नुकसान हुआ है। अगर एक अच्छा माहौल पैदा हो जाये, तो कल्चरल एक्चेंज के साथ साथ लद्दाख से ले कर सिक्किम और अरुणाचल प्रदेश तक के सारे पार्डर पर ट्रेड का सिलसिला शुरू किया जाना चाहिए। पिछले कई महोनों में हमारे दो तीन ग्रुप कैलाश यात्रा कर के वहाँ से होकर आए हैं। वहमें उम्मीद है कि यह आइन्दा के लिए भी चालू रहेगा। एक सुझाव मेरा यह भी है कि जे. लद्दाख बार्डर है वहाँ से भी ऐसे यात्री जे. लद्दाख के रहने वाले हैं कैलाश और मानसरोवर की यात्रा के लिये छोड़ना चाहिये। बंदिस्त लोग भी कैलाश और मानसरोवर को मानते हैं, उन के लिए वहाँ से बार्डर खोल दिया जाये या यह भी हो सकता है कि बहुत से हमारे भारत के यात्री लद्दाख के रास्ते भी वहाँ भेजे जा सकते हैं। उस में एक फायदा यह होगा कि वहाँ से वेहिकुलर रेंड मौजूद है। यहाँ से बार्डर तक हमारी और उस तरह से उन को सड़क राइट अप टु कैलाश और मानसरोवर तक है जिस पर उन की गाड़ियां चलती हैं। इस तरह से दस

पन्द्रह दिन की जे. स्ट्रेनुअस जर्नी है उस को अबायड किया जा सकता है।

इन चन्द शब्दों के साथ जे. फारेन पालिसी हमारी प्राइम मिनिस्टर की लीडरशिप में और हमारे एक्जटर्नल एफेयर्स मिनिस्टर की लीडरशिप में अपनायी गई है उस का मैं समर्थन करता हूँ, वह बहुत कामयाब रही है और हमें ऐसी उम्मीद है कि आइन्दा भी जे. बातचीत चल रही है और मौजूदा बातचीत जो खूबसी तौर पर चीन के साथ चल रही है वह कामयाबी के साथ कान्क्लूड होगी। इन शब्दों के साथ मैं आप का शुक्रिया अदा करतेहुए अपनी तकरीय खरम करता हूँ।

[شادی پو - نام نھال (لداخ) :

سبھا پتی جی : اب سے پہلے بہت سارے معزز مسہروں نے انٹرنیٹل سٹیویشن پر اپنے خیالات ظاہر کئے آج دنیا کچھ ایسے دور سے گزر رہی ہے کہ لگتا ہے کہ جلدی ہی کچھ ہونے والا ہے - ایٹم بم اور ہائڈروجن بم کو پھینک دے اور آج نیوٹران بم کی بات چل رہی ہے اسی کا نتیجہ ہے - میں سمجھتا ہوں کہ آج یورپ کے بہت سارے بڑے بڑے شہروں میں جو کہ ناٹو کے allies ہیں لوگ خود بخود اپنے گھروں سے باہر آکر ان کو بلانے والا کوئی نہیں ہے - ان کو بھڑکانے والا کوئی نہیں ہے - ان سب کے ہتھیار آنے والے خطرات کے خلاف مظاہرہ کر رہے ہیں -

ایسا کیوں ہو رہا ہے - لوگوں کو محسوس ہو رہا ہے کہ جب بھی کہیں کوئی جنگ چھڑے گی تو شاید

سب سے پہلے تباہی جو ہوگی وہ
یورپ میں ہوگی۔ اس کے بعد پھر
دوسرے کانتی نینٹس میں وہ پہلے گی۔
اسی طرح سے دوسرے خطرات انڈین
اوشن میں بڑھ رہے ہیں اور ہر
ایک سپر پاور اور ان کے الائنڈ دوارا
یہ کوشش کی جا رہی ہے کہ کہیں
نہ کہیں انڈین اوشن میں انہیں
کوئی بیس (base) مل جائے۔ کوئی
اڈہ بنانے کا بیس مل جائے۔ اسی کے
ساتھ ساتھ ویسٹ ایشیا بھی جو
ہوا ہے۔

آج جو کچھ ہو رہا ہے وہ سب
آپ کے سامنے ہے۔ اسی کونٹیکسٹ
میں ہمارے سارے کانتی نینٹس میں
جنگ کا خطرہ بڑھ رہا ہے۔ اسی
کونٹیکسٹ میں جوہا کہ دوسرے
معزز ممبروں نے بھی کہا کہ پاکستان
آج ہر طرح کے خطرناک ہتھیار حاصل
کرنے کی کوشش کر رہا ہے۔ ایف ۱۶
کا آپ نے بہت کچھ سنا اس کے
غلط اور بہت سارے خطرناک ہتھیار
وہ حاصل کر چکا ہے۔ کہا جاتا ہے
کہ وہ جلد ہی ایٹم بم بھی ایکسپلورٹ
کرنے والا ہے۔ یوں ہی جب ایف ۱۶
ہوائی جہاز ان کے ہاتھ میں آئے سے
وہ کلوینس ہو گئے تب جنرل ضیا
صاحب نے نو وار (No war) پوزیشن
کا بھی افر کر دیا۔ لیکن یوں ہے کہ
ہاتھ میں ناوار لے کر کہتا ہے کہ
ہماری یہ افر ہے۔ وہ کلوینس ہے

ایف ۱۶ بھی آ رہے ہیں ایٹم بم
بھی جلد بنانے والے ہیں۔ اور ہتھیار
بھی بنانے والے ہیں۔ وہ سمجھتے
ہیں کہ بھارت کو کسی بھی وقت
اپنے قابو میں کرنے یا ہمیں نہچھا
دیکھانے کے قابل وہ ہو گئے ہیں۔

اس طرح بھانہ تو یہ کیا
جا رہا ہے کہ انہیں افغانستان
سے خطرہ ہے۔ جہاں تک افغانستان
کا سوال ہے، بہت سارے معزز
ساتھوں نے کہا ہے کہ افغانستان
کے خلاف لڑائی کرنے کا مطلب
یہی ہے کہ وہ سویت رشیا (Russia)
کے خلاف لڑائی ہوگی۔ اس کا مطلب
کوئی بھی یہ نہیں سمجھیں گے
کہ پاکستان اس قابل ہو گئے
کہ رشیا کے خلاف ایک
دن کی بھی لڑائی وہ لڑ پائیں گے۔
اس لئے جو بھی ہتھیار وہ جس
تھلک سے حاصل کر رہا ہے وہ
صاف عیاں ہے کہ وہ بھارت کے
خلاف حاصل کر رہا ہے۔ اس سے
پہلے کہ تواریخ ہمارے سامنے شاہد
ہے۔ کہ توہی بار پاکستان نے
ہمارے ملک پر حملہ کیا۔ اور
ہر دفعہ اس کے باوجود بھی کہ
امریکن ہتھیار جو انہوں نے حاصل
کئے ان کے ساتھ کچھ اسٹرنگ
اور ایکریٹس تھے کہ وہ بھارت
کے خلاف استعمال نہیں کئے

[شادی ہی - نام گھال]

جائیں گے - اس کے باوجود یہی
انہوں نے استعمال کئے -

اب جو ایف ۱۶ اور دوسرے
ہتھیار حاصل کئے جا رہے ہیں
اس کے ساتھ کوئی اسٹورنگ یا
ایگریمنٹ ایچ نہیں - لہذا
جب بھی ان کی مرضی آئے - وہ
ہمارے خلاف استعمال کریں گے -

اس کنٹریکٹ میں میں
سمجھتا ہوں کہ ان کا نو وار (No war)
پیکٹ کا جو آفر ہے جب وہ
کڑویلس ہو گئے کہ ہم اس قابل
ہیں کہ بھارت کے ساتھ آسکتے گے -
تو یہ نو وار پیکٹ آفر ہو رہا ہے -
وہ محض دنیا کو دھوکا دینے کے
لئے ہے -

میں جناب فارن منسٹر صاحب
کو مبارکباد پیش کرتا ہوں کہ انہوں
نے قائم ایلف اگین یہ صاف کر دیا
ہے - جو کچھ بھی پاکستان کے ساتھ
بات چیت ہوگی وہ شملہ ایگریمنٹ
کے جو اصول ہیں - اس کے مطابق
ہوگی صحیح ایسا لگتا ہے - جسے
پریس رپورٹ میں بھی ہیں کہ
پاکستان میں جو افغان ریفوجز ہیں
یہ نہیں کٹے لائے ہیں ان کے اور
لوکل بلوچ قبائلی کے درمیان شاید
کافی ان بن ہو گئی ہے کیونکہ جو
ریفوجز وہاں پر آ گئے ہیں تو لوکل

لوگوں کی جو فیسٹلنگز ہیں وہ یہ
لوگ کہا رہے ہیں - بازار میں چھڑیں
مہنگی ہو گئی ہیں - کھانے پینے کا
سامان نہیں مل رہا ہے - تو ان کے
درمیان جو ان بن ہو گئی ہے کہا
جاتا ہے کہ کئی بار کلہاں بھی ہو
گئے ہیں تو اب حالات ایسے ہو گئے
ہیں - سچویشن ایسے بھی کریٹ
ہو گئی ہے - کہ وہاں کے لوکل
رجیمینٹ اور لوکل لوگوں کی
پے چھلی سے توجہ ہٹانے کے لئے
پاکستان کو بھی بھی ہمارے خلاف
کوئی ایڈوکیٹ کر سکتا ہے ایسی
صورت میں میں جموں کشمیر کا
باشددہ ہونے کے ناطے مجھے یہ خدشات
لگ رہے ہیں کہ جب بھی وہ لڑائی
کریں گے کشمیر سے شروع کریں گے -
جیسے کہ اب تک تین بار پہلے کر
چکے ہیں -

اس صورت میں کشمیر اسٹیٹ
میں حالات کا نارمل ہونا بہت
ضروری ہے آج اس اسٹیٹ میں
اندرونی حالات کچھ اچھے نہیں ہیں -
وہاں پر جتنی بھی کمیونل فورسز
ہیں وہ ایک ہو گئی ہیں انگریزی
میں ایک کھاوت ہے دی ایلمی آف
دی ایلمی ہکنز اے فرینڈ - "The
enemy of the enemy becomes a
friend" وہاں پر جتنے بھی فرقہ پرست
لوگ ہیں جو کبھی ایک دوسرے کے
خون کے پیاسے تھے آج وہ ایک ہو کر

وہاں کے قیمو کو ریٹنگ سوشلسٹ اور
سیکولر پیپٹرن کو ڈسٹرب کر رہے
ہوں اور وہاں کے محول کو خراب
کرنے کی کوشش کر رہے ہوں -
اور حکمران جماعت اس میں براہ
کا شریک ہے - پاکستان تو ہمیشہ
تاک میں بٹھتا ہوا ہے وہ ہماری
طرح ایک پارلیامینٹری قیمو کو ریٹنگ
ملک تو ہے نہیں - وہاں ایک
ویکٹری کی یا شخصی حکومت
ہے جب بھی جو چاہے وہ کچھ
بھی کر سکتا ہے اس لئے سہولتوں
گورنمنٹ کو جموں کشمیر اسٹیٹ
کے حالات کو سدھارنے کی طرف
توجہ دینے کی ضرورت ہے اگر ہم
ایسے اندرونی عناصر کو وقت پر
نہیں دہانوں گے جو دپے لفظوں میں
ملحدت کی باتیں پھیل رہے ہیں
تو وہاں کی حالت کبھی خراب
بھی ہو سکتی ہے -

چین کے ساتھ جو بات چیت
چل رہی ہے اس کو ہم ویل کم
کرتے ہیں میں سمجھتا ہوں کہ
پرائم منسٹر شریمنٹی اندرا گاندھی
جی اور ہمارے فارن منسٹر صاحب
کی قہادت میں ہماری فارن پالیسی
بہت کامیاب تھلگ سے چل رہی
ہے اس کے لئے میں ان کو
سہارکھاد پھس کرتا ہوں - اس
امید پر کہ چائیلڈا کے ساتھ بات
چیت میں جو آج شروع ہو

چکی ہوگی ایک ریڈیوسٹک ایڈروچ
اختیار کی جائے گی - جو ہمارے علاقوں
کا سوال ہے میں سمجھتا ہوں کہ
اس موضوع پر کچھ کہنا تھلک نہیں
ہو گا - جب ایک اچھے ماحول میں
یہ بات چیت چل رہی ہے تو ہمیں
امید ہے کہ ایسٹرنل انٹیکرس منسٹر
صاحب جلد ہی ہمیں اس بارے
میں آگاہ کریں گے -

چائیلڈا کے ساتھ ٹریڈ ریڈیوسٹک
اور کلچرل ایکسچینج کے بارے میں
بھی بات چیت چل رہی ہے -
سہلچروڑ سے لداخ کا تھلک اور چائیلڈا
کے ساتھ بارٹر ٹریڈ اور ہارٹر
(barter) سسٹم پر ہوتا رہا ہے -
اس کے باد ہونے سے ان کو بھی
نقصان ہوا ہے - اور ہمیں بھی
نقصان ہوا ہے - اگر ایک اچھا
ماحول پیدا ہو جائے تو کلچرل
ایکسچینج کے ساتھ ساتھ لداخ سے
لھکر سکم اور اروناچل پردیش تک
کے سارے بارٹر پر ٹریڈ کا سلسلہ
شروع کیا جانا چاہئے -

پچھلے کئی مہینوں میں ہمارے
دو تین گروپ کھلاش پاترا کرکے
وہاں سے ہوکر آئے ہیں - ہمیں
امید ہے کہ یہ آئندہ کے لئے بھی
چالو رہے گا - ایک سچھاو میرا یہ
ہی ہے - کہ جو لداخ بارٹر ہے وہاں
سے بھی ایسے پاتری جو لداخ کے رہنے
والے ہیں کھلاش تارر مانسروور کی

[شری ہی - نام گھال]

بیاترا کے لئے چھوڑنا چاہئے - بدھشت
لوگ وہ بھی کیلاش اور مانسروور
کو مانگتے ہیں - ان کے لئے وہاں
سے باقر کھول دیا جائے - یہاں
بھی ہو سکتا ہے کہ بہت سے ہمارے
بھارت کے بیاتری لداخ کے راستے بھی
وہاں بھیجے جا سکتے ہیں - اس
میں ایک فائدہ یہ ہوگا کہ
وہاں سے وہیں روک موجود ہیں -
یہاں سے باقر تک ہماری اور اس
طرح سے ان کی سرک رائٹ اپ تو
کیلاش اور مانسروور تک ہے جس
پر ان کی گاڑیاں چلتی ہیں - اس
طرح سے دس پندرہ دن کی جو
اسٹریٹیجی چرنی ہے اس کو ایوان
کیا جا سکتا ہے -

ان شہدوں کے ساتھ جو فارن
پالیسی ہمارے پرائم منسٹر کی
لیڈر شپ میں اور ہمارے ایکسٹرنل
ایفئیرس منسٹر کی لیڈر شپ
میں ایڈالی گئی ہے اس کا میں
سمجھتا ہوں کہ وہ بہت کامیاب
رہی ہے اور میں اسی امید ہے
کہ آئندہ بھی جو بات چیت چل
رہی ہے اور موجودہ بات چیت جو
خصوصی طور پر چین کے ساتھ
چل رہی ہے وہ کامیابی کے ساتھ
کنکلیوٹ ہوگی - ان شہدوں کے ساتھ
میں آپ کا شکریہ ادا کرتے ہوئے
اپنی تقریر ختم کرنا ہوں -

بھو جیپال سنگھ کश्यप (آंबला):

सभापति महोदय, आज अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय हालात
पर अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय परिस्थितियों के सन्दर्भ
में हमारे देश की विदेश नीति जो है
उस के संबंध में चर्चा चल रही है। यह
भगवान बुद्ध का देश है जिस ने दुनिया
को अहिंसा का पैगाम दिया, महात्मा
गांधी अहिंसा के पुजारी थे। और हमें
याद आती है पंडित जवाहर लाल नेहरू
को उस नीति की कि किसी गुट के साथ
हमें नहीं रहना है, उस नीति और पिछले
दिनों के उस के इतिहास की व्याख्या
करते हुए अपनी नीति पर हमें गौर करना
है, उसे सोचना है। शांति की बात करने
वाले, अहिंसा के पुजारी आर्य गुट निरपेक्ष
नीति की बात करने वाले इस देश के,
तीन युद्ध लड़ने के लिए मजबूर होना
पड़ा और चौथे युद्ध की बात कभी कभी
जब आती है तो हमें यह नजर आता
है कि देश में हमारी जो विदेश नीति है
उस में कहीं न कहीं कोई कमी रही है।
उसे अच्छी तरह से या तो हम चला नहीं
पाये हैं या समझ नहीं पाये हैं या कोई
ऐसा वातावरण तैयार नहीं कर पाये हैं
जिस में हम सफल हो सकें। यहां पर
बैठ कर हम अपनी विदेश नीति की चर्चा
करें और उस में केवल प्रधान मंत्री और
विदेश मंत्री की तारीफ कर दें केवल इतना कर
हम वास्तविकता से मुंह नहीं मोड़ सकते।
वास्तविकता कुछ और है आज इस देश
पंडित नेहरू का देश था, जो पंडित नेहरू
की विदेश नीति थी उस में और आज
की नीति में जमीनीन आसमान का अंतर
आ गया है। हम अपने को
कहते हैं कि हम किसी गुट के साथ
नहीं हैं। लेकिन और युद्ध की बात आती
है तो हमें मजबूरन बंधना पड़ता है सोवियत
यूनिون के साथ और आर्थिक मामलों
की बात आती है तो हमें बंधना पड़ता
है अमेरिका के साथ। हम अपने को
स्वतंत्र नजर पाते। पंडित नेहरू का स्वप्न
था, महात्मा गांधी भी चाहते थे और

डाक्टर लोहिया ने भी उस की बहुत लम्बी व्याख्या की थी कि इस देश को एक ऐसी तटस्थ नीति चाहिए जिस से इस देश का भविष्य उज्ज्वल हो सके और हम दुनिया में ऊंचा से ऊंचा आदर पा सकें। लेकिन हम उस में सफल नहीं हो सके। आज की स्थिति में जो हमारी विदेश नीति होनी चाहिए थी उस में हम पूर्णतया असफल रहे हैं। हम दुनिया में सनद लेने के लिए और सर्टिफिकेट पाने के लिए घुमे दौरे करें उससे हमारी विदेश नीति की कोई सफलता की घंटी नहीं बजती, कोई ठिठोरा नहीं पिटता। हमें वास्तविक रूप से सफल नीति चाहिये। क्या हम इतने दिनों में अपने पड़ोसी देशों के साथ ऐसा मित्रता का हाथ बढ़ा सके हैं जिसे हम गौरव के साथ कह सकें कि हम अपने पड़ोसी देशों के साथ ऐसे संबंध कायम कर रहे हैं ताकि हमारी सुरक्षा को कोई आघात न लगे? जब पड़ोसियों से संबंध अच्छे होते हैं तब हमेशा ही शीतमय जीवन जीने का मौका मिलता है। हमारा पड़ोसी देश जो हमारे ही हिस्से से बना, हमारे ही भाई वहां गये और इस्लाम के नाम पर पाकिस्तान भी बना, लेकिन दुर्भाग्य से उससे दो युद्ध लड़ने पड़े और तीसरा युद्ध करने की भी बात सोचते हैं। आज सरकार को कोई हिचक नहीं होनी चाहिये इसमें अगर पाकिस्तान आज इस बात के लिए हमसे गारन्टी चाहता है और अगर दोनों देश मिल कर गारन्टी दें कि हम एक दूसरे से युद्ध नहीं करेंगे तो मैं समझता हूँ कि एशिया के देशों के लिये एक गौरव की बात ही नहीं होगी, बल्कि जो शक्तियाँ हमको आपस में लड़ाना चाहती हैं उनकी इस कुचेष्टा को असफल करने में हम बहुत हद तक काम-याब होंगे। अतः हमको इस प्रस्ताव को स्वीकार कर लेना चाहिये। केवल पाकिस्तान से ही दांस्ती का हाथ बढ़ाने की बात नहीं है, चाहे चीन, बांगलादेश,

लंका या बर्मा हों या नेपाल हों, इन सारे देशों के साथ अपनी गहरी से गहरी दांस्ती बढ़ानी चाहिये और एक दूसरे के सुख दुख में साथ देना चाहिये। अगर ऐसा नहीं कर पायेंगे तब तक हमारी विदेश नीति की सफलता नहीं होगी और हमारे ऊपर युद्ध के हालात बराबर दूसरे देशों की ओर से थोपे जायेंगे। और अंजाम वही होगा कि कभी हमें युद्ध के लिये हथियार खरीदेंगे तो कभी दूसरे देश खरीदेंगे। और इन बड़े शक्तिशाली राष्ट्रों को तो युद्ध ही चाहिये। अमरीका चाहता है कि युद्ध तो ही लेकिन उसके देश की सीमा से हजारों मील दूर हो। रूस भी यही चाहता है कि युद्ध दूसरे देश की धरती पर लड़ा जाय। दुनिया के सारे देश यह चाहते हैं कि एशिया के यह देश, जो किसी भी समय आगे बढ़ सकते हैं और दुनिया का नेतृत्व प्राप्त कर सकते हैं, इनको युद्ध की ज्वाला में झोंक दिया जाय ताकि इनका भविष्य हमेशा के लिए अंधकारमय हो जाय। एशिया युद्ध का अड़्डा न बन सके ऐसा हमें वातावरण बनाना चाहिये। यहां शांति रहे। एशिया को बड़ी बड़ी दिक्कतें सहनी पड़ी। आज अफगनिस्तान में विदेशी सेनायें हैं इस बाये में हमको दृढ़ आवाज से कहना चाहिए कि उन्हें वहां से हटना चाहिये। एशिया का हर देश स्वातंत्र्य है, उसकी प्रभुसत्ता की रक्षा करने के लिये हमें हमेशा कहना चाहिये कि किसी देश में चाहे किसी भी अन्य देश की सेनायें हों उनको तुरन्त वहां से वापस चला जाना चाहिये। ऐसी हमारी नीति दृढ़ता के साथ होनी चाहिये तभी हमारी विदेश नीति सफल हो सकती है।

16 hrs.

जब तक हमारी प्रभावशाली सक्रिय तटस्थता की विदेश नीति नहीं होगी उस समय तक इस देश को और एशिया को

[श्री जयपाल सिंहकश्यप]

युद्ध की भयंकर ज्वाला से नहीं बचा पायेंगे। मान, सम्मान की आप बड़ी तारीफ करते हैं। लेकिन आप देखें कि इंग्लैंड में हमारे नागरिकों के साथ क्या हो रहा है। जो लोग यहां से जाते हैं वीजा पासपोर्ट पर, उनको कितनी बेइज्जती उठानी पड़ती है, यहां तक कि हमारी माताओं और बहनों को अपमानित किया जाता है। तमिल मूल के लोगों कि समस्या का समाधान आज तक श्रीलंका में हम नहीं सुलझा पाये। यह हमारी नीति की असफलता का द्योतक है। हम भारतीयों को जहां बाहर भेज गये हैं उनको किसी प्रकार का संरक्षण नहीं दे पा रहे हैं। इसी तरह से अरब देशों में भारतीयों के साथ क्या व्यवहार हो रहा है? रोज ही इसबारे में अखबारों में हम पढ़ रहे हैं। हमारे विदेश मंत्री को इस पर एक पॉलियामेंटरी कमेटी बनानी चाहिये। आज हिन्दुस्तान के लोगों को भर्ती किया जाता है कि उनको वहां काम दिलाया जायगा, हमारी स्त्रियों, माताओं और बहनों को यहां से झूठे वायदे कर के ले जाते हैं उनके साथ किस तरह का सलूक होता है, किस तरह से वे अपमानित होते हैं, वहां पर वे किस तरह से रहते हैं, कैसे जिन्दगी बिताते हैं। हो सकता है कि उनको बाहर कुछ जॉब्स मिल जाते हों, लेकिन बहुत सी कम्पनीज ऐसी हैं, जो लोगों से पैसा ले कर उनको बाहर भेजने का वायदा तो करती हैं और बाहर ले जा कर छोड़ देती हैं तथा उनका पैसा हजम कर लेती हैं। हमें इस पर भी विशेष रूप से देखना चाहिए। हमारे पड़ोसी देशों की पासपोर्ट की नीतियां हैं, हमें उनको सुलभ बनाने की ओर ध्यान देना चाहिए। मैं पाकिस्तान के बारे में कह सकता हूं कि यदि एक भाई हिन्दुस्तान में है, तो दूसरा भाई पाकिस्तान में है और बेटी हिन्दुस्तान में

है तो बाप पाकिस्तान में है। दोनों के मिलन की बात जब आती है, यदि कोई शादीया विवाह होता है या कोई और उत्सव होता है, तो प्रक्रिया इतनी परेशान करने वाली है, पासपोर्ट-वीजा प्राप्त करने में काफी दिक्कत होती है जिसकी वजह से भाई से भाई का मिलन, बाप से बेटी का मिलन नहीं हो पाता है। कितनी बड़ी समस्या आकर खड़ी हो जाती है, इसलिए हम लोगों के लिए उदार नीति बनानी चाहिए।

जहां तक हमारी अर्थ-व्यवस्था के प्रभाव की बात है, विदेशों की बड़ी शक्तियों के प्रभाव की बात है, मैं कहना चाहता हूं कि हम स्वीडन की पनडुब्बियां, जो कि सबसे अच्छी पनडुब्बियां मानी जाती हैं, न खरीदकर हम जर्मन से पनडुब्बियां खरीद रहे हैं। यह हमारे राष्ट्र की नीति को दर्शाता है कि हम आजाद नहीं हैं और हम अपनी सुरक्षा के साधन भी अपनी मर्जी से नहीं खरीद सकते हैं और यहां तक भी सुनते में आया है कि जर्मन से कुछ कमीशन तय करने की बात आई थी। मैं नहीं जानता कि यह कहां तक सही है, लेकिन, ऐसी बात आई थी। इस पर भी सरकार को विशेष रूप से चर्चा करनी चाहिए।

जहां तक हमारी सुरक्षा का प्रश्न है, हम अपनी सुरक्षा के लिए इस तरह का वातावरण तैयार करें कि हम अपने पड़ोसी देशों से बिल्कुल भयमुक्त हो जायें और इसके लिए भारत को अपने तमाम पड़ोसी देशों के साथ मजबूत मधुर सम्बन्ध कायम करने चाहिए। इसके अलावा हम सम्मान की बात करते हैं। पिछले दिनों इण्डोनेशिया से जब हमारी प्रधान मंत्री गुजर रहीं थीं, तो हमारे साथ क्या सलूक हुआ, कौन सा सम्मान हम को दिया गया। अमरीका के राष्ट्रपति के साथ हमारे देश की प्रधान मंत्री जाती हैं, तो सैंसर किया

जाता है, यह परे राष्ट्र का अपमान है, परे देश का अपमान है और हम उसकी बड़े शब्दों में निन्दा भी नहीं कर सकते हैं। हमारी हिम्मत भी नहीं है। आज यू० एन० ओ० संयुक्त राष्ट्र संघ और लीग आफ नेशन्स ने सोचा था कि दुनिया की एक ऐसी पंचायत होगी, जिसमें सारे मामले आपस में तय होंगे। युद्ध की ज्वाला से हम बच सकेंगे, लेकिन यू० एन० ओ०, जिस पर हमें आशायें थी, उसका महत्व बराबर धीरे-धीरे घटता जा रहा है, प्रभाव घटता जा रहा है। जिनको हिन्द महासागर में आना है, अपने अड्डे बनाने हैं, यू० एन० ओ० कुछ नहीं कर सकता है। दूसरे देशों में युद्ध होता है, युद्ध के मोर्चे पर लोग पहुँचते हैं, लेकिन यू० एन० ओ० और सिक्योरिटी काउन्सिल कुछ नहीं कर पाता है। हम को यू० एन० ओ०, संयुक्त राष्ट्र संघ और सिक्योरिटी काउन्सिल को मजबूत बनाने के लिए, सक्रिय बनाने के लिए, एकट्ठ प्रयास करने चाहिए वरना जितना यू० एन० ओ० और सिक्योरिटी काउन्सिल कमजोर होता जाएगा, दुनिया की हालत उतनी ही बिगड़ती जाएगी और दुनिया की शान उतनी ही नष्ट होती जाएगी।

अभी आई० एम० एफ० से लोन यानी कर्ज की बात आई, तो हमें कितनी बगलें झाँकनी पड़ीं कि कहीं अमरीका अपनी वीटो पावर का इस्तेमाल न कर दे, हमें इतना बड़ा कर्जा न मिल पाए। मैं यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि या तो भारत जैसे बड़े देश को भी वीटो पावर का अधिकार मिलना चाहिए और यदि नहीं मिलता है तो हमें पहल करनी चाहिए कि सारे बड़े देशों से वीटो पावर समाप्त हो जाए। हमें यू० एन० ओ० के अन्दर अपनी भाषा हिन्दी तथा जो हमारी अन्य प्रांतीय भाषायें हैं उन के लिए माँग करनी चाहिए।

यदि इन भाषाओं के अन्दर भी यू० एन० ओ० की कार्यवाही हो सके, तो हम अपने राष्ट्र को मान-सम्मान दिलवा सकेंगे।

हमारे दूतावासों की स्थिति यह है कि या तो कहीं पर यथेष्ट कर्मचारी या आफिसर्स नहीं हैं और यदि कहीं पर हैं तो मशीनरी ऐसी है कि सब कुछ हो जाता है, लेकिन उन को पता ही नहीं लगता है। कहीं-कहीं तो इतनी कमजोरी दिखलाते हैं कि देश की नीति का सही रूप में प्रचार ही नहीं कर पाते हैं। नेपाल जैसे देश में हमारा जो दूतावास है उस के बारे में पता चला कि वहाँ पार्टी-बन्दी है। हमारे विदेश मंत्रालय को इस बात की कोशिश करनी चाहिए कि हमारे दूतावास अधिक सक्रिय हो सकें और ज्यादा से ज्यादा उपयोगी हो सकें।

सभापति महोदय, हमारी विदेश नीति तटस्थता के साथ-साथ प्रभावशाली ढंग से, सक्रिय रूप से, इस देश के मान-सम्मान की रक्षा कर सके तथा जो बड़े शक्तिशाली देश हैं हम उन के चंगुल से मुक्त हो सकें, ऐसा प्रयास करना चाहिए। हम कमजोर देशों के साथ अच्छे से अच्छे सम्बन्ध बना कर दुनिया के तमाम तटस्थ राष्ट्रों का नेतृत्व कर सकें ताकि हमारा वह प्रयास अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय स्थिति में विशेष रूप से अंकुश का काम कर सके—ऐसा प्रयास करना चाहिए। मैंने आप की विदेश नीति की असफलता का उल्लेख करने का प्रयास किया है, जिस के लिए आप दुनिया में सर्टिफिकेट पाने की कोशिश कर रहे हैं। वह सर्टिफिकेट आप को बाहर भले ही मिल जाय, लेकिन देश के हर क्षेत्र में जिस तरह से आप नाकाम-याब रहे हैं, उसी तरह से आप की विदेश नीति भी असफल रही है।

श्री राम सिंह यादव (अलवर) : मान्यवर, आज के अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय जगत में मुख्य आवश्यकता भोजन की है, मानव

[श्री राम सिंह यादव]

को भूख को शान्त करने की है, उस को न्यूट्रोन बम नहीं चाहिए, रोजगार चाहिए, स्वास्थ्य की सुविधायें चाहिए, शिक्षा चाहिए, खाने के लिए रोटी चाहिए। आप को यह जानकर आश्चर्य होगा कि सन् 1980 में वर्ल्ड बैंक की जो रिपोर्ट प्रकाशित हुई उस में कहा गया कि विकासशील देशों के करोड़ 80 करोड़ मानव आज भी विषम परिस्थितियों में से गुजर रहे हैं जहाँ एक सप्ताह के लिए पूरी तरह से खाने के लिए भी नहीं मिलता है और 60 करोड़ मानव जो विकासशील देशों में हैं वे अपढ़ हैं, प्रौढ़ हैं लेकिन अनपढ़ हैं। आज विश्व के विकसित देशों में जिन की आबादी सारे विश्व की आबादी का 15 प्रतिशत है, वे लोग आज सारे विश्व की 75 प्रतिशत सम्पदा का अकेले उपभोग कर रहे हैं। यही कारण है कि आज विश्व में आर्थिक विषमता छाई हुई है, उस के कारण ही आज विश्व के बहुत से देशों में तनाव है। उस तनाव को दूर करने का यदि कोई साधन हो सकता है तो जैसा विश्व के अर्थ-शास्त्रियों ने अब तक खोजा है— विश्व को एक सूत्र में बांधने के सिर्फ तीन आधार हैं—पहला—व्यापार, दूसरा—ऊर्जा और तीसरा पूँजी-प्रसारण (कैपिटल-इन-फ्लो)। इन तीनों मुद्दों पर यदि विश्व के देश गहराई से नहीं सार्चेंगे तो इन समस्याओं का समाधान नहीं हो सकेगा। आज विश्व के विभिन्न देशों का तीन भागों में वर्गीकरण किया गया है—विकसित देश, विकासशील देश और अर्ध-विकसित देश। इस वर्गीकरण को समाप्त करने के लिए एक नये एप्रोच की जरूरत है, एक नई-पहल की जरूरत है और वह है—इण्टर्नेशनल इकॉनॉमिक आर्डर।

मैं श्रीमती इन्दिरा गांधी जी को धन्यवाद देता हूँ—उन्होंने विश्व को सब

से पहला रुन्देश यह दिया कि आज की आर्थिक स्थिति में सब से बड़ा इन्वेस्टमेण्ट इन्वेस्टमेण्ट-ह्यूमन-बींग होना चाहिए, इन्वेस्टमेण्ट-इन-म्यूल होना चाहिए, इन्वेस्टमेण्ट-इन-आर्म्स की आवश्यकता नहीं है। आप को यह जान कर ताज्जुब होगा कि यू० एन० ओ० में कितने भी देश थे, वे सारे देश दो वर्ष तक इस आइटम को एजेण्डे पर नहीं रख सके, इस पर सहमत नहीं हो सके कि वास्तव में विकसित देश किस प्रकार से विकासशील देशों की मदद करें। वहाँ की असफलता के कारण ही, एक सब से बड़ा प्रयत्न जो नार्थ-साऊथ के डाइलॉग से जाना जाता है, केनकुन में हुआ और उस में विश्व के 22 मुल्क इस नतीजे पर आए कि हम आगे चल कर ऐसे कदम उठाएँ, जिन से विकसित देशों को इस बात के लिए मजबूर किया जाए कि वे विकासशील देशों को अधिक से अधिक मदद हर क्षेत्र में और आर्थिक क्षेत् में कैसे दें, जिस से एक आर्थिक सन्तुलन कायम हो सके। इस के लिए भारत की प्रधान मंत्री, हमारे देश की नेता और हमारी पार्टी की नेता श्रीमती इन्दिरा गांधी धन्यवाद की पात्र हैं कि जो मसला यू० एन० ओ० में हल नहीं हो सका, उस मसले पर केनकुन कांफ्रेंस में कुछ सफलता हासिल की, जिस को उन्होंने एक स्टेप फारवर्ड की संज्ञा दी और इस तरह से एक पहल की है। यह आशा की जाती है कि आने वाले यू० एन० ओ० के सेशन में एजेण्डा आइटम पर इस सम्बन्ध में कुछ हो सकेगा।

जैसा मैंने पहले कहा है कि एशिया के देशों में जो आर्थिक विषमता है, उस आर्थिक विषमता के कारण कुछ ऐसे मुल्क हैं, जो सुपर पावर्स या जो महान् शक्तियाँ हैं, उन के इर्द-गिर्द घूमते रहते हैं और उन की कृपा के लिए लालायित रहते हैं। कुछ ऐसे भी मुल्क हैं जो हमारे पड़ोस में हैं,

जहाँ पर राजनीतिक स्थिरता न होने के कारण और आम आदमियों के वोटों पर सरकार न बाने के कारण येन-केन-प्रकारेण किसी न किसी प्रकार से अपनी सत्ता का प्रदर्शन करना चाहते हैं और वे अपने देश के लोगों को यह दिखाना चाहते हैं कि हम बहुत सशक्त हैं, बहुत शक्तिशाली हैं और इस सम्बन्ध में मैं यह कहना चाहूँगा कि संयुक्त राष्ट्र अमेरिका ने जो एफ-16 पाकिस्तान को देने के लिए पहल की है और जिस के बारे में अभी यह सूचना आई है कि अगले अक्टूबर में इस तरह के उन को फाइटर मिल जाएंगे, उस से एशिया में खान तौर से और विशेष रूप से हिन्दुस्तान के आम आदमी के दिल व दिमाग में एक भय है, एक आशंका है कि जिस तरह का पिछला इतिहास रहा है, उसी तरह से इन हथियारों का, सॉफिस्टिकेटेड वेपन्स का इस्तेमाल हिन्दुस्तान के खिलाफ किया जा सकता है। यह आशंका हिन्दुस्तान के आम आदमी के दिमाग में है और यह आशंका निराधार नहीं है, निर्मूल नहीं है। इस का कुछ आधार है और इस सम्बन्ध में मैं अमेरिका के हाऊस आफ रेप्रेजेंटेटिव्स को तीन सदस्यीय समिति ने जो रिपोर्ट दी है, उस का कुछ अंश पढ़ कर सुनना चाहता हूँ। उन्होंने अपनी रिपोर्ट में भी इस बात को कहा है कि हिन्दुस्तान के लोगों के दिमाग में जो आशंका है, वह सही है और उस का उन्होंने समर्थन किया है। उन्होंने इस बात को कहा है कि हिन्दुस्तान और पाकिस्तान के बीच में आज जो स्थिति पैदा हो गई है, उस का मुख्य कारण हथियार सप्लाई करना है। उन्होंने यह कहा है :

"The threeman team which was sent by the Committee on foreign affairs of the house of representatives has in its report, expressed the view that the U.S. decision to provide military aid to Pakistan will

seriously set back the various emerging efforts at detente between India and Pakistan. As perceived by India the stunting of this limp process of normalisation is mainly caused by the F-16 component of the U.S. aid package!

According to the study mission, the resulting rupture between India and Pakistan will probably persist for several years."

हाऊस आफ रेप्रेजेंटेटिव्स के मेम्बर यह कहते हैं कि एफ-16 या सॉफिस्टिकेटेड वेपन्स देने से न केवल आज की स्थिति में बल्कि आने वाले सालों में हिन्दुस्तान और पाकिस्तान के बीच में एक दूसरे के प्रति बुरी भावना पैदा होने वाली है और हो रही है, उस आशंका को, उस भय को उन्होंने अपनी रिपोर्ट में जाहिर किया है।

खुद पाकिस्तान के यहां जो कमेटी फोर डेमोक्रेसी बनी हुई है, उस कमेटी ने भी हिन्दुस्तान के लोगों के दिमाग में जो आशंका है, और सरकार में जो आशंका है, उसका समर्थन किया है और उन्होंने भी यह कहा है कि पाकिस्तान को अमेरिका द्वारा जो आर्म्स सप्लाई किये जा रहे हैं, उन से पाकिस्तान कमजोर हो रहा है और मजबूत नहीं हो रहा है और उस के कारण हिन्दुस्तान और पाकिस्तान के सम्बन्ध मधुर नहीं रह सकेंगे। 51 पृष्ठों की जो उन की रिपोर्ट है, उस रिपोर्ट में इस बात को ब्यक्त किया गया है।

"A close military alliance with the United States will, at least, obstruct the restoration of democracy and justice in Pakistan and could even pose a danger to the very integrity of the country", says the Pakistan Committee for Democracy and Justice in a 51page report on violations of human rights

[श्री राम सिंह यादव]

allegedly perpetrated by the Pakistan's military government.

"The report said that U.S. military aid had increased 'the size, power and perquisites of the armed forces' and made it the most powerful institution in the country.

"Military training by the U.S. has imparted a technocratic repressive predilection which under-rates political solution to social crises."

मैं श्रोमन्, यह अर्ज कर रहा था कि केवल हिन्दुस्तान के नागरिकों या लोगों के दिमाग में हो यह बात नहीं है, अमेरिका के लोगों की भी यही धारणा है। इस तरह से पाकिस्तान को हथियार सप्लाई करने से हिन्दुस्तान और पाकिस्तान के बीच सम्बन्ध मधुर बनने की जो संभावना थी वह संभावना अब खत्म होती जा रही है।

श्रोमन्, यह खतरा अमेरिका की नीति के कारण पैदा हो रहा है। अमेरिका जो एशिया के अन्य देशों के साथ आज पैक्ट कर रहा है, उससे भी बहुत बड़ा खतरा पैदा हो गया है। इजराइल तथा दूसरे अन्य मुल्कों के साथ उसने पैक्ट कर रखे हैं और उन्हें हथियार सप्लाई करने में एशिया में शांति को खतरा पैदा होने की स्थिति उत्पन्न हुई है।

श्रोमन् आप जानते हैं कि पंडित जवाहर लाल नेहरू ने एशिया और साकथ एशिया को वाण्डुंग कांफ्रेंस में पंचशील के सिद्धांतों का प्रतिपादन कर के सारे राष्ट्र और संसार को शांति का एक मंत्र दिया था, एक नई दिशा दी थी। यही नहीं उन्होंने मिश्र के कर्नल नासर और युगोस्लोवाकिया के प्रेजिडेंट टोटो के साथ जिस तरह से सम्बन्ध बनाये, जिस तरह की विदेश नीति का सूत्रपात किया, उससे अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय जगत को एक नई दिशा मिली।

हिन्दुस्तान हमेशा युद्ध के खिलाफ रहा है और शांति एवं अमन के पक्ष में रहा है। आज भी हिन्दुस्तान का सफल नेतृत्व श्रीमती इंदिरा गांधी कर रही हैं। उन्होंने संसार को केवल एक ही संदेश दिया है और वह संदेश यह है कि आज विश्व का मानव भूखा है, वह युद्ध नहीं चाहता है, शांति और अमन चाहता है, वह विकास तरकीब चाहता है और आगे बढ़ना चाहता है और इस सम्बन्ध में हमारे सभी प्रयत्न होने चाहिए। अभी हमारे जेठमलानी जी ने पाकिस्तान के हमारे सम्बन्धों के बारे में कहा। मैं आप से एक ही निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि ब्रिटेन के इतिहास ने हमें बताया है कि पालिसी आफ अपीजमेंट, जिसे तुष्टीकरण की नीति कहते हैं, उससे कभी भी विदेश नीति कामयाब नहीं होती है। इसलिए हिन्दुस्तान के नागरिकों, लोगों ने कभी भी इस तुष्टीकरण की नीति को पसन्द नहीं किया है। हम भ्रातृ भाव चाहते हैं, बराबर का दर्जा चाहते हैं। यह हम केवल एक देश से ही नहीं, बल्कि जितने भी हमारे पड़ोसी देश हैं सभी से चाहते हैं। सभी से दोस्ताना ताल्लुक चाहते हैं।

हमारे मौजूदा विदेश मंत्री ने इस सम्बन्ध में जो पहल की है, उनकी जो वार्ता चल रही है उसके लिए वे धन्यवाद के पात्र हैं। चीन के साथ हमारा जो व्यवहार रहा है, उसका इतिहास बताता है कि पंडित नेहरू ने चीन को, यू० एन० अ० में प्रवेश दिलाने के लिए सतत प्रयत्न किये हैं और चीन की मूवमेंट का समर्थन किया है। हमारा पिछला इतिहास इस बात का साक्षी है कि चीन के साथ हमारे सम्बन्ध मधुर हो सकेंगे। दूसरे जो और देश हैं, उनके साथ भी हम मधुर सम्बन्ध कायम करना चाहते हैं।

हम नान-एलाइमेंट को, गुटनिरपेक्षता की नीति के सहारे चलते हुए उस नीति के आधार मानते हुए हम आगे बढ़ रहे हैं। हमारी इस नीति ने यह साबित कर दिया है कि हम विदेश नीति में कितने सफल रहे हैं। यह नीति हमारे देश के लिए ही नहीं बल्कि दूसरे मुल्कों के लिए भी सफल रही है।

आज विपक्ष के कुछ लोगों ने कहा कि हम दूसरे देशों के स्टूज हैं। मैं उनको बताना चाहता हूँ कि हमने जो भी काम किया है, हमारी पार्टी, हमारी सरकार ने जो भी कार्य किये हैं, वह अपने स्वाभिमान को सामने रखते हुए किया है और कोई भी ऐसा कार्य हमने नहीं किया जिससे कि अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय जगत में हमारी प्रतिष्ठा में निरावट आयी हो। हमारी जो विदेश नीति कामयाब है उसके लिए मैं अपनी प्रधान मंत्री श्रीमती इन्दिरा गांधी और अपने विदेश मंत्री को धन्यवाद देता हूँ।

SHRI RATANSINH RAJDA (Bombay South): Mr. Chairman, Sir, Encomiums have been showered profusely by the hon. Members on this side for efficient monitoring of our foreign policy. I feel, if there is any domain where our national consensus should work and where it is working with unanimity, that national consensus is in respect of two things, that is, the defence of the country and the foreign policy of the country.

We are very much fortunate that we had a background, as during the struggle for freedom, year after year, the resolutions on foreign policy were adopted and Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, the architect of modern India guided our deliberations and he took great initiative in moulding the Indian mind with regard to the approach to our foreign relations even when we were fighting for independence. This was the foresight of Pandit Jawaharlal

Nehru that he fought for China and he raised his voice for the independence of the countries of Asia and Africa. This has helped us a lot in clearing the cobwebs of our minds. When India became independent, Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, as our Prime Minister as well as the Foreign Minister of our country, laid down certain basic norms, the policy of neutrality, our relations with two power blocs and the way in which he interpreted that earned him great praise not only in our country but all over the world.

Moreover, what was very much visible was that Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru with a vigorous thrust and intense desire for world peace took a place in the centre of the comity of nations and he propounded certain basic ideas, Panch Sheel and other tenets which were supported far and wide by Asian powers as well as other countries. With this background, we have to see whether India is having today the same initiative in its hands with regard to our foreign policy. Are we implementing completely independent foreign policy? Are we pursuing the policy of equidistance? Are we having that initiative in our hands or are we merely reacting to the forces or the events that are happening first? Here, I am talking of certain basic norms and then I will come to certain specific events.

Indian foreign policy issues have to be perceived from the standpoint of India's national interests structured around three concentric circles of environmental priorities. What are those priorities? They are: (i) internal progress, (ii) regional stability and (iii) global peace and "equitable pattern of relationship" between powerful and under-privileged States. These elements serve as the operational criteria of India's foreign policy.

Evidently, the making of Indian foreign policy is largely a function of determining how the emphasis on

[Shri Ratansinh Rajda]

These three sets of objectives should be distributed when they exert contradictory pulls over the country's foreign policy. This is a useful macro-analytical framework for studying the problems of Indian foreign policy-making in general. Equally, if not more important would be to provide the micro-analytic, that is, behavioural dimension of the Indian foreign policy-making process. How the foreign policy makers have tended to behave in the policy-making process in response to the emerging external issue areas. Though our options are limited, what has been our behaviour? whether we have been vigorous in propounding our theories in keeping the initiatives in our hands in the comity of nations or whether we are dormant and docile or whether we have merely reacted to the events that have taken place.

From the national view point and in the national interest, I would like to submit that the basic tenets will have to be the following:—

(a) Equal friendliness with two super-powers;

(b) Long run policy of self-reliance in defence and development; and

(c) Probing into the possibilities of normalising relationship with our neighbours especially countries like China and Pakistan.

Though this is not an easy process and not an easy exercise in the light of the difficulty in assessing Chinese intentions as well as in reconciling with their conflicting world view, still in the midst of these problems, we have to put in our efforts. Kampuchia and all these problems come in the way.

We must search for new relationships with some important countries.

We must build India's deterrent capability and not merely defensive capability vis-a-vis its neighbours.

These are some of the basic problems that I have raised and we should address ourselves to these problems.

While monitoring the problems relating to international relations, I would like to ask where do we stand with regard to the super powers.

Today we are being sucked by the super-power rivalry. Whether we like it or not, we are pushed into the rivalry existing between the two super-powers who are at daggers drawn.

The new approach of the American administration, after the emergence of President Reagan who is guiding the destinies of America gave rise to some problems. We shall have to think denovo. How is the American policy guided? It is known in the present terms as neo-containment policy. This 'neo-containment' is a term which is increasingly used now-a-days to describe Reagan Administration's global strategy. We shall have to understand how a particular country, especially USA, which is a democratic country, which is wedded to democratic ideals—we are also wedded to the ideals of democracy—then how is it—it is a tragedy—that there is a gulf of misunderstanding between these two democratic countries. Why? Now, at present, the mind of Reagan Administration is conditioned by the slogan of neo-containment. Now Reagan Administration's global neo-containment strategy is containment of the Soviet Union through maintenance of forces all around the Soviet bloc and it is the central thrust in their foreign and military strategies. President Reagan, during his election, campaigned on the platform for re-establishing the US military supremacy and containing Soviet power and he got elected. We shall have to keep this in mind. In his recent Chicago speech, President Reagan has

thrown a gauntlet and a challenge to the Soviet Union in arms race. He has asked them to choose between a very viable arms control agreements or an arms race with the US. On the other hand, Soviet Union has offered to discuss on nuclear weapons on both sides as part of the arms control discussions.

A French scholar, in an International Conference of the Strategic Community, pointed out that the current US policy is getting distorted by being viewed through the prism of anti-Soviet neo-containment policy. In his view, the world is bigger than the Soviet Union and if the USA is to have a viable global policy, the Reagan Administration has to re-appraise how to deal with its allies in Europe and the developing world.

They are arming Pakistan on the plea that they will not allow Soviet Union to get away with it and therefore Pakistan has to be supported. Now these are some of the things with which we are confronted. There is an enormous amount of mis-information about India prevailing in America. That is what my impression is. Two events which have come to light will throw light on this. This mis-information about India is about her policies and her relationship with the USSR. It is very much misunderstood in America and other countries. It is said that most of the people who have moved into the Administration in America now-a-days are specialists in strategic weaponry and East-West relations and have very little knowledge about the developing world. This may be one of the factors; I do not know; but there is a gulf of misunderstanding, mistrust, which has to be removed. This misconception about India was about the Indo-Soviet Arms Deal in May, 1980 because of that Arms Treaty, they thought that we were leaning very heavily towards Soviet Russia, and when they thought that we were leaning towards Soviet Russia, it created a kind of prejudice in their minds.

In fact, this prejudice is being built up right from the days of Mr. V. K. Krishna Menon who had been, day in and day out, attacking the U.S.A.—I do not know justifiably or unjustifiably because this is no occasion to say anything, but I am very clear that most of the time it was an unjustifiable attack. Right from the beginning, this kind of prejudice was being created and over the years it has been built up...

SHRI RAM SINGH YADAV: At that time the hon. Member belonged to the same party to which Mr. Krishna Menon belonged.

SHRI RATANSINH RAJDA: I had discussed it with Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru when China attacked us, I had opposed Mr. Krishna Menon before Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru. My learned friend may not know what was going on at that time, but it is a fact, and I am proud of it.

I was talking about misinformation. The misinformation is very strong, the mistrust is very strong, the prejudice is very strong in their minds that we are leaning very heavily towards one Power Bloc, namely, the Soviet Russia. I do not know, but the present Administration has not been able to appreciate or weigh it or assess it correctly. That is what I would like to submit. Of course, we have also contributed very mildly to a certain extent because we have been following our foreign policy in a very halting manner. When Soviet troops entered Afghanistan, what was our first reaction? At that time it was not that we subscribed to what the Soviet Union did, but our leaders, our Prime Minister and our Minister of Foreign Affairs, were very late to speak against it. Of course, now they must be congratulated for making our policy very clear that we do not want foreign troops of any country on any foreign soil, now that policy is very clear. Our President, in his banquet speech, told President Brezhnev that "continuous stay of foreign troops in another country was

[Shri Ratansinh Rajda]

unacceptable to India". That has been made very clear. But my charge, my complaint, is that we always react after much water has flown down the Ganges, we always rise up very late. We are docile; we do not react vigorously, immediately, on the spur of the moment. Of course, on the basis of our basic principles and norms, we must give our reactions to the ever-changing world. We are not working in the vacuum, there are many forces and counter-forces at work in the international arena. But a successful monitoring of the foreign policy demands that we have to be always on the alert and we must always react, and react according to our national interests. Our national interests as well as our basic tenets have demanded that wherever, in any part of the world, an aggression has taken place or foreign troops intervened, we have always condemned it. But here we were very mild in the beginning, the impression was created that we were shy of saying very plainly to the USSR. Such lapses always create misunderstandings. But I am glad that our President, our Prime Minister and our Foreign Minister, Mr. Narasimha Rao have all made it explicitly clear...

PROF. N. G. RANGA: Repeatedly.

SHRI RATANSINH RAJDA: Now it comes repeatedly, but, in the beginning it was not done. I asked one question...

MR. CHAIRMAN: In the beginning the situation might have been confusing.

PROF. N. G. RANGA: We were not then in power. It was somebody else.

SHRI RATANSINH RAJDA: I am talking of the lapses of this government after they came to power.

MR. CHAIRMAN: You might give your own opinion and your own solution.

SHRI RATANSINH RAJDA: That is what I am doing. Let us not confuse things more confounded.

Here, what has happened is that haltingly we are monitoring our affairs. That is my charge.

Recently, Shri Narasimha Rao in Karachi has stated very clearly that India has a vested interest in the permanency and separateness of Pakistan. As far as this aspect is concerned, I had put a supplementary question on the floor of the House when Soviet troops had intervened in Afghanistan. When they marched into Afghanistan, I put one question and I told the Government that in view of this changed context, people of Pakistan are almost pining for the friendship of our country. You are aware that I have been one of those who have been advocating very consistently the cause for the friendship with Pakistan and with all our neighbours including China. From that viewpoint, I had asked that people of Pakistan, the common man in Pakistan in the streets of Pakistan—in Rawalpindi, Islamabad and Lahore, have been asking and there was an apprehension in the minds of the masses of Pakistan—I am not talking of the ruling clique there—'whether India, our big brother, would stand by us in case we are attacked? In this context my question was: are you prepared to give a guarantee to the people of Pakistan that if Pakistan was attacked, India would stand by Pakistan? At that time no clear answer was forthcoming. Then things developed, developments took place and thereafter, I asked another question because Morarji Desai had made a statement that if Pakistan would be attacked, India would stand by Pakistan and that there was no need for Pakistan to arm itself to the teeth because that would unnecessarily affect the economy of Pakistan and create many disturbances and upset the entire scheme of things here in the sub-continent. That is what Mr. Desai said. In view of that, I again asked

our Foreign Minister. At that time he agreed with me. He told the House "for once yes" that India was prepared to assure Pakistan in that regard. Now, these things which are developing haltingly create apprehensions and they damage or cause harm. Though we work in the right direction, we do not work at the right and opportune moment, it works to our detriment. That is what I would submit.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Tell me whether our Government would be dealing with the Government of Pakistan or with the people of Pakistan over the head of the Government there?

SHRI RATANSINH RAJDA: At least you must give that much credit to me. I told that these are the prevailing sentiments among the people of Pakistan and masses of Pakistan. It was reported in the Press. I was just basing my argument on that. Even among the rulers also they had voiced at that time their apprehension about Soviet intervention. That is why they looked askance at India. This is a fact. That does not mean that about masses we should not speak. We also have been telling that because there are problems, because of poverty and internal problems Pakistani rulers wanted to divert the attention of the people and want to attack India. Now, having submitted that, I feel that there must be a vigorous thrust as far as India is concerned to cement our relationship with our neighbours.

Sir, as President Reagan has emerged on the world arena as I stated, his policy is there which is described as a neo-containment. In the same way, China is vigorously pursuing its policies all over the world. Now, China and U.S.A. have come nearer. That is one aspect of the problem. Among the Asian countries also, China is vying with India for its supremacy. We have never tried for the supremacy or anything. India has no extraterrito-

rial designs anywhere. India has this background.

MR. CHAIRMAN: How long will you take?

SHRI RATANSINH RAJDA: I would like to take at least fifteen minutes more.

MR. CHAIRMAN: You have taken twenty minutes. So, within five minutes, you finish your speech.

SHRI RATANSINH RAJDA: That would be a bit difficult. I have just started.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I won't wait for you. You kindly finish.

SHRI RATANSINH RAJDA: I shall be as brief as possible. I shall try to cover my points only. Now, Sir, as far as China is concerned, India and China have been friends with their background about the civilisation, culture etc. I had an occasion recently to go to China with a Parliamentary Delegation as its Member. From what I could find there, the people of China have a fund of goodwill for our country. The common man in China is for the friendship of this country. The present leaders in China are not those who were just committed to the old doctrines. They are not blind to the doctrinaire approach. But, to-day they have become pragmatic. The lands from the communes are released for the private ownership. So, that production increased. These are new approaches that we have seen and my impression is that the present leadership in China is prepared to normalise the relations. Our official team is already there in China. It is a very delicate problem—border problem. I would not like to say anything on that. It would augur well for the Asian countries that China and India should come together and try to strengthen the forces of world peace. I wanted to say something and discuss in detail about China but since you have said that time is very short, I would like to

[Shri Ratansinh Rajda]

ister on the stand that he took with Nepal.

cut short my speech and cover the points. Recently, as far as our neighbours are concerned, some anxiety was being created by Nepal. Nepal has started talking about making Nepal the zone of peace. What was the necessity for the External Affairs Minister to rush to Nepal? Because new developments are taking place there. We shall have to be alert. In Asian countries I would like to submit that we shall have to be always alert. Our approaches shall have to be vigorous and our drive will also have to be very vigorous. There was an old proposal of Nepal to make it a zone of peace. They are reviving it. There is some reason behind it. Why? Can we dispel the fears of Nepal or not? Are we successfully dispelling their fears or not? Some people try to create some troubles—Nepal vis-a-vis India. But, under these circumstances, looking to the cultural ties, the ties of friendship etc. there should not be and there is no problem between India and Nepal. In spite of that some misunderstanding prevails in the minds of Nepal which we shall have to dispel.

Now, having submitted this, since the time at my disposal is very short, I would like to draw the attention of our Foreign Minister to one important matter. This morning I put a supplementary regarding the working of the Iranian Embassy in New Delhi, the way in which slogans are painted on the walls, etc. There are certain norms. There are certain protocol, some behavioural pattern, according to which all the foreign embassies and foreign diplomats have to work. I pointed out the way in which the Iranian Embassy in India is working. All these create problems for us. I would now like to read from the Urdu Daily Iqbal published from Srinagar. It says:

"During the last so many months in the valley of Kashmir particularly in Srinagar, the New Delhi Iranian Embassy is increasingly involved in suspicious activities. Propaganda material prepared by the Embassy is being freely distributed on the roads of the area and its posters pasted on the wall. The material contained in these is tantamount to interference in the internal affairs of the country.

Now, they are talking of Himalayan Peace Plan. Now, Sir, we must understand the reasons behind the move to put forward the Himalayan Peace Plan? Is it the original plan put forward by the Nepalese people or authority? No, Sir. Now, we all are aware these exists a treaty of friendship between India and Nepal. They are demanding that Nepal should be considered a zone of peace.

The objectives of these activities of the Iranian Embassy is nothing but to make the Muslims of the region to accept Iranian point of view concerning Iran's war against Iraq. This point of view reflects the extremist attitude in Iran".

I am not reading the whole of it. But this is the extract from that paper, Iqbal, Urdu Daily, from Srinagar.

16.48 hrs.

[MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER in the Chair]

Sir, the External Affairs Minister has recently cautioned Nepal and has stated that please do not try to weaken India. That is a caution or a warning in the right direction. I am supporting our External Affairs Min-

I now would like to refer to India Today which has said something in its last issue. There is a good photograph of our Finance Minister, Venkataramanji on the front of the issue of India Today. In this issue a very disturbing thing has been stated. It says that some foreign embassy is indulging in some smuggling activities. If

it is a fact, that is a very disturbing type of news. Our Foreign Minister will have to take some serious note of it. It has been stated in *India Today* that some diplomats concerned with the Soviet Embassy have been indulging in this sort of things. When I read the news I was very much disturbed. Soviet Russia is our friend. I am one of those who believe in the friendship with Soviet Russia. But consciously or unconsciously if something is done it creates lot of difficulty for us. I raised the question about the Iranian Embassy this morning. If this sort of thing goes on, it only creates more difficulty for us. We shall have to curb the same. We shall have to take steps to see that such activities are curbed because they would create unnecessary tension in our friendly relations. I would like to conclude with these words that though we are proceeding in the right direction, we are lacking in our vigour, lacking in our initiative and we are merely acting to the events that are taking place one after another in other parts of the world. From henceforth if we mend our ways and we come vigorous, we take initiative that was in our hands during the days of Pandit Nehru, we shall be able to play our part more effectively in the country of nations and we shall be able to strengthen the forces of world peace.

PROF. NARAIN CHAND PARASHAR (Hamirpur): Sir, it is a very complicated international situation in which we are placed today and the exact context can be framed up by referring to the communique of the Melbourne Conference from 29th September to 7th October, 1981. I will read out one sentence from the Communique.

"Central to their concern was a charge from the detente to confrontation, mounting tension between the super-powers and the build up of nuclear arms threatening the very survival of mankind."

This is a very key portion of the statement and it shows how concerned were the leaders who joined at Melbourne. Though obviously all over Europe we are finding a peace march, in countries like West Germany, slogans like 'No more place like Hiroshima'—no Euroshima—are ringing the West European air. But behind this there is no desire to have peace. It is a strategy and diplomatic manoeuvre of super powers that are acting and inter-acting. The Soviet Russia is trying to find a Poland in West Germany. The attempt is that West Germany which is now being swayed by wave of what is called a new patriotism is coming up slowly to the realisation that an Austrian type of neutralism would be better than deep commitment to the NATO Alliance and therefore it is that it has refused to pay 3 per cent of the escalation for the NATO expenses. In this context, it is to be seen that a very interesting plan for laying a pipeline for carrying gas from Siberia to West Germany has also been entered into and agreed upon. Whereas the West German Chancellor is accusing the USA of creating unemployment in West Germany by big industries it is the Soviet Russia which is coming to the rescue of West Germany by offering employment on this side. So, the Soviet President is also there to launch a peace offensive. Another similar attempt is made by President Reagan and he, in the last week of December last had announced a 4-point plan—formerly it was SALT, now it is called START Strategic Arms Reduction Talks, etc. It is very interesting that he has offered to reduce some of the very important arms if Russia also cooperates on the other side. And to this there is a reaction in Western Europe that they do not want a zero option. This is the crux of the problem that the movement for peace is not born out of any desire for peace. The movement for detente is not borne out of any desire for avoiding confrontation. It is the paradox of the situation that confrontation is leading the vocifer-

[Prof. Narain Chand Parashar]

ous cry for peace and we have to understand it in another context.

Last year, an attempt was made by certain small powers to have a university for peace in the United Nations. The resolution was put forward and both Soviet Russia and the other super power—the USA—did not approve of it. It is the majority of these non-aligned countries—45 countries—that co-sponsored the resolution and that was passed with the forces of strong opinion from the delegates. So, the genuine desire for peace is missing on both the sides. And I remember the days of President Reagan's election when he used to say "Well, if you want the USA to be second to none, vote for me and if you want the USA to be second to one, or others, then vote for Mr. Carter". So the desire for military supremacy is the primary desire of President Reagan and that is the motive behind the peace plan which has been broadcast to parts of Western Europe and which has been radiated to Moscow. Moscow's attempt in trying to have as many peace rallies on the western soil is another attempt for the same thing. We must not be caught up in the situation. I am happy that the hon. Prime Minister has put her finger rightly on the pulse and described the present international situation as a very complicated one; it has slowly gone towards the confrontation and detente is no more the cry. Let us understand our own situation. The statesmen of the world have been recognising the contribution made by India towards the cause of peace. India was one of the co-sponsors of the resolution of the establishment of University for peace in Costa Rica last year, whereas the super powers were not. The other side have not cooperated fully.

17 hrs.

What is Pakistan doing? Much has been made by our friends on the other

side of its no-war pact. It has to be seen properly and what does it mean? The Pakistan offer first came on the 15th September; it was just mentioned in a very cursory manner; it was not moved through diplomatic channels as should have been done. It is only an attempt to befool the people of Pakistan. I would refer to the Presidential order of October 1979 of President Zia-ul-Haq where he had declared his commitment to have an advisory council, known as Majlis-sura, that is an advisory council of the wise. In this council, 200 talented people would be chosen and made to advise him on important international affairs so as to guide the destiny of the ship of Pakistan. But what has happened to that? On November 13, 1981 when a correspondent asked him, "Where is your Majlis-sura; what is the news?", President Zia-ul-Haq replied: "No news is good news". Obviously, he could not form that council; he could not find even 200 people out of his selected followers or intellectuals in Pakistan to advise him. Similarly, the movement for the restoration of democracy, MRD, is at the nerves of President Zia-ul-Haq. The result is that he is upset. Eight parties have joined hands for this; four parties have not joined hands and they are not in the MRD. These Parties too have refused to support him in the open. Now, the people of Pakistan are slowly coming to the conclusion that India is not a threat to Pakistan that Russia is not a threat to Pakistan; it is General's Government it is Zia-ul-Haq's Government that is the threat to the people of Pakistan. They are coming slowly to this conclusion that they have all along been confused and deceived by the military regime of President Zia-ul-Haq. He has promised to restore democracy, but nothing has been done.

We must not be a victim of the propaganda that has been launched by Pakistan. India stands firmly for non-aggression. That clause is contained in the Simla agreement. Why does Pakistan not honour that? As has

been stated, you calculate the number of people who have been granted visas by India to visit Pakistan and compare it with the number of people who have been allowed to visit India by Pakistan. and who have been refused visas to visit India by Pakistan. You will be able to decide, in your wisdom, that Pakistan has not been fair to India in this regard. They have not allowed people to go to Pakistan, Visas have been refused on flimsy grounds, because they are afraid that people who visit Pakistan would know the real situation in Pakistan.

Pakistan at present is perched on a very risky gun powder heap and it cannot move forward. On the one hand. Pakistan has been raising the Afghanistan bogey. Of course, we are not supporting the presence on Afghanistan soil of the Russian troops; we want them to withdraw. and it has been made clear. Secondly, we also want to make it clear that it is not a military solution, that will solve the problem; it is only a diplomatic and political decision that will ultimately solve the problem. Day in and day out President Zia-ul-Haq cries out that he would support the Mujahiddins and he would support the guerilla wars, but is it going to help Pakistan? Is it going to help Afghanistan? It is not going to help anybody. President Zia-ul-Haq says that Russia has eyes on the warm gulf waters and it wants to touch them. That is what he says. That is not so easy to achieve. For Pakistan also, it is a big problem. So, the only offensive should be a diplomatic offensive. a political solution, and that has to come through the non-alignment movement. The sooner Pakistan realises this, the better it is for the democracy, for safety, and stability of Pakistan and if it does not, it has no chance for any military solution. Secondly, I would refer to the neighbouring countries on the Indian sub-continent. There are seven countries. We are happy that there are now moves for rapprochement, re-

conciliation and friendship between China and India, Any friendship between these two countries will create a good climate not only for the future of Asia, but for the future of the whole world. For this reason I am happy that our official team is visiting Beijing at the moment and the leaders from their side are also taking a realistic view. From our side we will like to keep olive branch forward in the view so that they will also extend their warm friendship in case they are so inclined. Whereas we are committed to friendship with all countries of the world and that we piloted even China's case for its UN Membership, we are also determined to see that India stands on its own feet and that it does not lose even an inch and enjoys and gains self-respect. As a result of these negotiations India is not interested in the leadership of Asia or the world. China may be interested or not, I don't know. But India is interested in Sino-Indian friendship; and that should be to the advantage of the peace-loving forces and the unity of Asia, which is our cry.

We are happy that President Sanjiva Reddy has come back after paying a visit to Kathmandu. He has been given a warm reception there and the people of Nepal were looking forward to his visit.

Another development is that Bhutan has responded to our warm friendship and recently the King of Bhutan has offered to build one Centre for the Study of Mahayana Buddhism at the Nagarjuna University in Andhra Pradesh. That shows that Bhutan is culturally linked with India and our interests and the interests of Bhutan are quite mutually helpful.

Similarly with Bangladesh and other countries we would like to have friendship. Small irritants that we may find and which have been referred to by my friends on the other side in Sri Lanka etc. can always be removed.

[Prof. Narain Chand Parashar]

So, here is a move by the leader of our democracy. Mrs. Indira Gandhi and the External Affairs Minister, Shri Narasimha Rao to find a solution to the difficult problems in the world, in the international context of today through peace offensives, through friendship treaties, through breaking of hostile attitudes, through giving a call for amity and friendship and through giving a direction in the movement of friendly relations.

This is not all. Only political negotiations will not help. Therefore, economic solutions are also to be found. The world today has moved far beyond the original position of John Foster Dulas and others. I am happy to inform you that even a country like Burma has not been criticising Vietnam. Whereas we have recognised Kampuchea, Burma too, if not recognising, at least is desisting from criticising the actions or other things in Vietnam and thereby is also helpful in this respect. Therefore, Burma is also toeing this very line.

I was talking of new initiatives; and the Cancun Conference is a step in the right direction. Eleven countries first sponsored this conference. Twenty-two countries were interested in it and they joined their hands together. And our Prime Minister also was there. This is for an ushering era of understanding and inter-dependence.

Now one bloc cannot march over the head of the other bloc and the western bloc cannot ignore the Communist bloc. What we have to find is that the third world interests are protected and they have to be protected if the realities of the third world which has most of the resources of the world—both mineral and raw material, are appreciated. It is the finished goods that the two blocs supply. We understand that at the Global negotiations, to Cancun week even Soviet Russia was invited. But if we have to call a spade a spade, Soviet Russia did not join the Conference.

Of course, we value Soviet friendship very much. But the reasons for its not joining are not convincing. They advanced the reasons at the global negotiations that they are not responsible for colonial exploitation of the world. Therefore, they owe no responsibility for this. But our appeal is that in the context of today when the economic situation in the world is increasingly coming to be inter-dependent, every country of the world must pay its attention and its due share towards a new global economic order in which the poorer countries also have a chance to survive if not a chance to flourish; and it is with cooperation that each has to march forward. It is not the confrontation that moves us anywhere. If you see the present situation right from the Western countries to the Far East, we have a situation which is explosive in nature. We have a situation which is explosive in nature, and which has a potential for destruction; but through meticulous care and through wise statesmanship and a spirit of cooperation and adjustment, our Government is trying to de-fuse the situation and trying to carry the country forward and build a better image for it abroad. We are happy to note that whereas in Pakistan, people are slowly and slowly unable to find even an advisory council, here is a Parliament working, and here are the State Assemblies which carry the flag of democracy forward. Our goal is world peace, and the prosperity of the common man.

With these words, I congratulate our Prime Minister and the Foreign Minister for their efforts to further the cause of world peace, universal understanding and new international economic order.

SHRI RATANSINH RAJDA: I have just talked about "From Russia with Love" which has come in 'India Today'. At that time, our hon. Minister was not here. I would like to draw his attention to this. It is a very serious charge. Some members from the Soviet Embassy have been indulging in smuggling. You might have

read it. I do not say whether it is right to wrong. I will hand it over to you.

श्री गिरधारी लाल डोगरा (जम्मू) :
जनाबे आली, मेरा कोई लम्बी तर्क करके
का इरादा नहीं है। मैं दो तीन बातें
हाउस और फारन मिनिस्टर साहब के सामने
रखना चाहता हूँ।

पिछले दिनों मुझे स्कैंडेनेवेयन कण्ट्रीज,
लन्दन और मास्को जाने का मौका मिला।
मैं वहाँ गैर-सरकारी तौर पर गया था।
वहाँ पर मैं आम लोगों से मिला।
हमारे जो दोस्त हमारी पालिसीज की
नुक़ा-चाती और मुखालिफ़त करते रहे
हैं, अगर वे मेरे साथ होते, तो उन्हें
पता चल जाता कि दुनियाँ के आम लोग
कितनी तरक्की रखते हैं हमारे मुल्क से,
हमारी लीडर, भित्तेज इन्दिरा गांधी से
और हमारे फारेन मिनिस्टर साहब से।
वे समझते हैं कि हिन्दुस्तान ही दुनियाँ
में अमन कायम कर सकता है और
वह हमारी मदद करेगा। उनको
मालूम है कि जंग क्या बना है, जंग
कितनी ख़तरनाक है। उन्होंने दूसरी
जंग-अर्जेंट के मज़ालिम देखे हैं और
उन्हें मालूम है कि अगर फिर जंग हुई, तो
वह ज्यादा ख़तरनाक होगी, जिसमें शायद
इन्तान इस कुरा-ए-अर्जेंट से, इस ज़मीन से,
नेस्तोनाबूद हो जाये। इस लिए
वे बहुत घबराए हुए हैं और हमारे
मुल्क की तरफ़ देख रहे हैं।

मुझे नहीं मालूम कि कैसे हमारी
पालिसीज की तनकीद, नुक़ा-चाती और
मुखालिफ़त की जा सकती है। जहाँ
तक वर्ल्ड पीस का सवाल है, पीस तो
इनडिविज़बल है, वह पार्टियों में और
मुखालिफ़ मुल्कों में तरक्की नहीं हो सकती।
बार करने वाली जंगू ताकतें लड़ाई
चाहती हैं, अगर अवाम अमन चाहते

हैं। कवेलिंग कण्ट्रीज के लोग अमन चाहते
हैं, क्योंकि बगैर अमन के वे तरक्की नहीं
कर सकते। डेवेलण्ड कण्ट्रीज में कुछ
ऐसे भी हैं, जिन्होंने डेवेलिंग कण्ट्रीज
की नाकाबन्दी ही नहीं की है, बल्कि
वहाँ ऐसे अनासिर भी पैदा कर दिए हैं,
जो अमन की पालिसी की मुखालिफ़त करते
हैं।

आज दुनियाँ के अवाम यह समझते हैं कि
हमारी पालिसी ही दुस्त पालिसी है।
वे समझते हैं कि हिन्दुस्तान एक मुल्क के
तौर पर ऐसे अनासिर की सफ़ में खड़ा
है, जो अमन चाहते हैं, और वह अमन
को आवाज़ को तर्कवियत रहा है।
हमारे मुल्क, हमारे प्राइम मिनिस्टर
और हमारे फारेन मिनिस्टर की खूबी
है कि उन्होंने कभी लीडरशिप का दावा
नहीं किया है। वे सब मुल्कों को साथ
ले कर अमन की आवाज़ में जोर पैदा
करना चाहते हैं, ताकि दुनियाँ में अमन
कायम हो और सब मुल्क तरक्की करें।

आज जंग के बादल मग़ड़ा रहे हैं।
जहाँ तक अफ़ग़ानिस्तान का ताल्लुक है,
यह नुक़ा-चाती की गई है कि कभी-कभी
हम लड़ जाते हैं, कभी एक तरफ़ और
कभी दूसरी तरफ़ झुक जाते हैं। नान-
एलाइन्मेंट का मतलब यह है कि किसी
के साथ हमारी कोई गुटबन्दी नहीं है।
हम किसी की पालिसी को फालो नहीं
करेंगे और हर मतले पर हम अपना ही
फैसला करेंगे। जितने हमारे नान-
एलाण्ड देश हैं उन में आपस में किसी
मतले पर इख़लाफ़ भी हो जाय, उस
सूरत में किसी को कोई बात पसन्द
न आए, मुमकिन है कि उस की दलील
में कोई वजन हो और हमारी दलील
में भी वजन हो, दोनों की दलील एक न
हो सकती हो तो उससे यह कयास करना
कि हम कोई एक तरफ़ झुक रहे हैं या

[श्री गिरधारी लाल डंगरा]

दूसरी तरफ झुक रहे हैं या हम न्यूट्रल बन रहे हैं ऐसी बात नहीं है। यह हमारे फारेन मिनिस्टर साहब ने और हमारी प्राइम मिनिस्टर साहिबा ने आभ तौर पर बात साफ कर दी है कि नान-एलाइण्ड का मतलब न्यूट्रलिटी नहीं है। नान-एलाइण्ड का मतलब है कि सही तरीके पर हर मसले में दखल देना।

जहाँ तक अफगानिस्तान का ताल्लुक है बात उस में हुई। शुरू से बात कही गई, मौने-मौके पर बात साफ की गई। मगर एक बात हमारे दोस्त भूल जाते हैं। एक माहील जो वहाँ पैदा हुआ जिस में अफगानिस्तान को सोवियत यूनियन की फौज बुलानी पड़ी, उस की जगह आप वह माहील पैदा करने में मदद करें जिस से वह वापस जायं। यह मैं इस सिलसिले में कहना चाहता था।

वियतनाम जाने के बाद मुझे यह मालूम हुआ, जब मैं ने वह इलाका देखा और हुंडोचाइना को देखा तो मालूम हुआ कि हमारी पालिसी कम्पुचिया में, लाओस में किस बंदर दुस्त है। नार्थ वियतनाम में देखा कि कमिटेड नेशन किस तरह से खुशी के साथ तमाम दिक्कतों को बढ़ाई करता है और आगे बढ़ता है किस तरह वह अपने मुल्क के लिए कुर्बानी करता है। वह स्मिथिज जो हमारी इंडिपेंडेंस से पहले थी वह मैंने वहाँ गवर्नमेंट बन जाने के बाद भी देखीं। आज मैंने उनको वहाँ गवर्नमेंट बनाए हुए भी देखा। साउथ वियतनाम में आप जायं और वहाँ जा कर देखें तो वहाँ वह लोग जो पहले कब्जा बनाए हुए थे सारे मीन्स आफ प्रोडक्शन पर, जब वहाँ कम्प्युनिज्म आया और वहाँ पर एकता हो गई, सारा देश एक हो गया तो वह भाग रहे हैं। वह रेफ्यूजी बन कर जा रहे हैं। जो दूसरे

देशों के लोग वहाँ पर थे वे वहाँ से वापस हो गए। क्यों कि जो अपने आप को उस आइडियालाजी के साथ, देश की तरक्की के लिए जो उन का सोचने का ढंग है उस के साथ जिन की मुताबिकत नहीं आती वह वहाँ से भाग रहे हैं। मगर जहाँ तक हमारी पालिसी का ताल्लुक है, मुझे वहाँ जा कर खुशी हुई कि हमारी पालिसी सिर्फ वहाँ नहीं, वियतनाम में ही नहीं, कम्पुचिया में भी और लाओस में भी विप्लुण दुस्त है और हम उस तरफ आगे बढ़ रहे हैं।

पाकिस्तान के मुताल्लिक जो बतें कही गईं जिस ने मुझे इस पर बोलने के लिए रागिब किया उस सिलसिले में मैं यह कहूँगा, यहाँ कहा गया कि नौ वार पैकट का आफर हुआ लेकिन ये हमारे बड़े-बड़े लीडर हैं, ये भूल जाते हैं कि पहले तो प्रेस में बात कही गई जहाँ तक मुझे इल्म है और प्रेस स्टेटमेंट को फिर यहाँ कहा गया। उस वक़्त तक तो यहाँ हमारी गवर्नमेंट को कहा ही नहीं था। तो यह कौन सा तरीका है कि प्रेस स्टेटमेंट एक दे दें और वह प्रेस स्टेटमेंट भी किस लिए दिया गया— क्यों कि उन्हें जो नया आर्मानेंट और जहाज लेना था वह किस्ता शायद यूएसए की कांग्रेस में जा रहा था तो उस के लिए स्टेटमेंट दे दिया और उस को कहा नौ वार पैकट का आफर और उसी को ले कर हमारे दोस्त यहाँ यह कहते हैं मगर वह भूल गए उस बात को, हमारे फारेन मिनिस्टर साहब ने कहा कि 'डिड' नेहरू के जमाने में हम ने वह आफर किया था, उस का अभी तक जवाब नहीं आया। कई गवर्नमेंट्स बदलीं, एक मिलिट्री रिजिम, दूसरी मिलिट्री रिजिम, तीसरी मिलिट्री रिजिम आई और कूठ नहीं हुआ और वह यह भी भूल जाते हैं कि शिमला ऐग्रीमेंट क्या था? आप

उस से नयी बात क्या करना चाहते हैं ? रामजेठमलानी जी कह रहे थे कि उन को बांधना था इस बात के लिए कि काश्मीर के मसले को और बाकी हर मसले को वह सिर्फ बातचीत से ही तय करेंगे, उस में किसी किस्म की आम्ड मदाखलत नहीं करेंगे, तो उस में शिमला पैक्ट में क्या है ? भुट्टो साहब जब तक हम से लड़ते थे तो दुनिया के सब से बड़े सियासतदां माने जाते थे । सब लोग उन को उछालते थे, उन की फौज और जंगबाज ताकतें उछालती थीं लेकिन शिमला में आ कर उन को इस बात का एहसास हुआ कि हिन्दुस्तान पाकिस्तान को आपस में लड़ना नहीं चाहिए, अपने-अपनी जगह आराम से रहना चाहिए और अपने-अपने लोगों की तरक्की करना चाहिए । तो उस के बाद क्या हुआ ? उन पर कैसे चलाए गए । कैसे चला और उन को फांसी पर लटकाया गया । जुर्म क्या था ? बड़ा अफसोस है, हमने जंग देखी है, जनरल स्पैरो साहब यहां नहीं हैं, हमने 1947, 1965 और 1971 की लड़ाइयां देखी हैं । हम सरहदों पर चलते रहे । जंग जो होने वाली है वह काफी खतरनाक होगी, लेकिन जो पहले जंग हो चुकी है उससे भी लोगों की काफी तबाही हुई । और उसका असर सिर्फ जम्मू-कश्मीर में ही नहीं, पंजाब, राजस्थान और गुजरात में भी पड़ा और वहां के लोग अभी तक परेशान हैं । और फिर हम उसी ट्रैप में जाना चाहते हैं । नये सिरे से कश्मीर इणू को वह ओपिन करना चाहते हैं । यह हमारी आवाज नहीं है, किसी और की आवाज है । कौन आवाज देता है यह सब को मालूम है और सरकार को भी मालूम होगा । हमारी सरकार बड़ी खूबी के साथ उनसे बात कर रही है और इस मसले पर हमारी फोरेन पौसिसी और डिफेंस को होशियार रहना होगा और

देखना होगा वहां के ऐवान हमारे भाई हैं, हमारा ही खून है हम एक ही मुल्क के थे और उसके दो हिस्से किये गये । वह अपने घर में आबाद रहें और हम अपने यहां आबाद रहें । इस वक्त जो वहां हो रहा है वहां की सरकार ने 50 बातें वहां के लोगों को कहीं, 50 बातें दूसरों ने कहीं, और हर बात में चालाकी और चालबाजी है । इन बातों को ध्यान में रखते हुए अगर हम उनकी किसी जाल में फंस जायें तो ठीक नहीं है ।

चीन से भी हमारी बातचीत हो रही है । अच्छी बात है । बातचीत होनी चाहिये । हमारी स्टेट का एक चीयाई हिस्सा पाकिस्तान के कब्जे में है और काफी हिस्सा स्टेट का और देश का चीन के कब्जे में है । जब आप उनसे बात करेंगे तो सरहदी तनाजा की एक बड़ी बात है इकोनामी के अलावा हमारी मजहबी कुछ जियारतें हैं खासकर के बौद्ध लोग काफी तिब्बत में हैं तो इन सब मसलों को ले कर, मजबी इदारे का मसला और हमारे एक लामा लद्दाख में जो गोम्पा है उसके लामा अभी तक उन्हीं के कब्जे में हैं । पता नहीं उसकी क्या हालत है । उसको उन्होंने भेजा नहीं । कम से कम इतना तो होना चाहिये कि कम से कम एक लिमिट हो जाय और उनसे पूछा जाय कि वह आना चाहते हैं कि नहीं ? अगर आना चाहते हैं तो आ सकें । यह कुछ बातें हैं जिनकी तरफ तत्काल दिलाना चाहता हूं ।

इसी तरह लंका में देखें वहां क्या हो रहा है ? वहां हमारे लोगों के साथ ज्यादाती हो रही है । और हमारे कुछ लोग हमें मिस्त्रिप्रेजेन्ट करते हैं । वैस्ट जर्मनी में मुझे पता चला कुछ

[श्री गिरधारी लाल डोगरा]

लोग कहते हैं कि हमारे साथ ज्यादाती हो रही है। कनाडा में इंडियन हमें मिस्-रिप्रजेन्ट करते हैं इसलिये आपको वहां की सरकार को कहना चाहिये। इसी तरह आपको एम्बेसीज के मुताल्लिक शिकायतों की गयीं। सिवाय लन्दन के, बाकी सब जगह अच्छा काम है, और अन्डरस्टाफ भी है। इसी तरह से वियतनाम में आपकी एम्बेसी अन्डरस्टाफ्ड है। जो हमारे आदमी वहां काम करते हैं उनके मेडिकल ट्रैटमेंट का अच्छा इंतजाम नहीं है। अगर वे बीमार हो जायें उनको अच्छे मेडिकल फेसिलिटी उस मुल्क में नहीं मिलती, मेडिकल फेसिलिटी वहां कुछ ऐडवांस तरीके की नहीं है। रूडोमेंटरी तरीके की है, और न हमको वह सूट करता है। अगर कोई बीमार हो जायें फेमिली का तो एक आदमी तीन महाने में बैंगलाक जा सकता है। अब अगर मियां, बाबी, माता पिता बीमार हो जाय तो फैमला करना पड़ेगा कि उनमें से कौन एक आदमी इलाज के लिये जा सकता है। तो इस तरफ भी आपको सोचना चाहिये और तबज्जह देनी चाहिये।

आखिर में अपने तजुर्बे के आधार पर, और जो हमने देखा है, आपको मुबारकबाद देता हूं कि बहुत अच्छे तरीके से, मजबूती के साथ आप अपनी फॉरेन पालिसी चला रहे हैं। पता नहीं हमारे आपोजीशन के लोग टी.वी.० देखते हैं कि नहीं, हमारी प्रधान मंत्री की जो बाहर प्रेस कानफरेंस हुई है उसी से मालूम हो जाता है कि उनकी कितनी इम्पोर्टेंस है। लोगों की प्रेस कानफरेंस में कोई आता नहीं था। लेकिन हमारी प्रधान मंत्री को प्रेस कानफरेंस वेल अटेंडेंट रही। जो प्रेस कानफरेंस होती थी, उसमें बैठने तक को जगह नहीं मिलती थी और किस खूबो

के साथ जवाब दिए गए, यह कहने की बात नहीं है। जब इस तरह से हम अदालत के सामने नुक्ताचीनी कर रहे हैं, तो उसका क्या जवाब दिया जा सकता है।

इन शब्दों के साथ उपाध्यक्ष महोदय मैं आपको धन्यवाद देता हूं कि आपने मुझे बोलने के लिए मौका दिया।

श्री शिव कुमार सिंह ठाकुर (खंडवा):
उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, हमारे देश के विरोध में हम देखते हैं कि हमारे देश की सीमाओं पर चीन, पाकिस्तान और बंगलादेश मिल कर एक ट्रायंगल बना रहे हैं। बंगलादेश में वहां के राष्ट्रपति की हत्या के बाद जिस ढंग से वहां के स्वतंत्रता संग्राम में भाग लेने वाले व्यक्तियों की हत्याएं हो रही हैं, उस से और भी स्पष्ट हो जाता है कि भारत के खिलाफ एक गहरा षडयंत्र हमारी सीमाओं पर चल रहा है। जब से चीन और अमरीका के सैनिक संबंध सुधरे हैं, तब से अमरीका दिगोनाशिया में बैठ कर ट्रायंगल में परिपूरन करने के लिए प्रयत्नशील दिखता है। इस ढंग से जो सुगर पार्वत हैं, वे इस कोशिश में लगी हुई हैं कि आने वाला महायुद्ध एशिया की जमीन पर लड़ा जाए। यह कोशिश कर रहे हैं कि यह जो आने वाला युद्ध है, चाहे यह आणविक युद्ध हो या किसी ढंग का युद्ध हो, वह उनके देश की सीमाओं पर न लड़ा जाए, बल्कि बहुत दूर उनके देश की सीमाओं से होकर लड़ा जाए। पाकिस्तान, अमरीका और चीन—ये तीनों कोशिश कर रहे हैं कि रूस के खिलाफ तीनों मिल कर कोई कदम उठाएं, परन्तु मेरी स्वयं की यह मान्यता है कि न तो सीधे रूप से अमरीका कोई रूस के विरोध में कोई कार्यवाही कर रहा है और न रूस

यह चाहता है कि अमरीका से सीधे-सीधे कोई लड़ाई लड़ी जाए। इस प्रकार ये तीनों सुपर पावर्स यह कोशिश कर रही हैं कि ये छोटे-छोटे मध्यम आकार के जो देश हैं, वे हमारे आसपास चक्कर लगाते रहें। ये देश केवल डर दिखाकर अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय जगत में अपनी महत्ता को बनाए रखना चाहते हैं। इस प्रकार वे कोशिश कर रहे हैं कि एक ओर उनके हथियारों की बिक्री हो और दूसरी ओर उनका पैसा अडर-डवेलपड कन्ट्रीज में लगे और उनका प्रभुत्व उन पर कायम रहे। इस प्रकार की कोशिश आज हमें अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय जगत में देखने को मिल रही है।

1962 से 1975 तक हमारे देश पर युद्ध के बादल छाए रहे, तब अमरीका ने स्पष्ट रूप से हम से कहा है कि वह कभी भी हम को चीन के विरोध में किसी भी प्रकार की मदद नहीं पहुंचाएगा और इस लिए विवश होकर हमको बार-बार रूस की ओर देखना पड़ता है। मेरा ऐसा मानना है कि हमको घबराकर या हमको किसी भी प्रकार जल्दबाजी में कोई कदम उठाकर कोई ऐसी कार्यवाही नहीं करनी चाहिए जिस से कि हम किसी एक शक्ति के जाल में चले जायें और जैसा कि अभी श्री राजदा जी ने हम पर आरोप लगाया कि हमने बहुत देर कर दी अफगानिस्तान में रूसी सेनाओं का विरोध करने में। मगर बहुत से ऐसे नाजुक प्रश्न होते हैं, अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय जगत में बहुत से ऐसे नाजुक अवसर आते हैं, जिन पर तत्काल अपनी प्रतिक्रिया जाहिर करना उचित नहीं होता है। मुझे बहुत ही प्रसन्नता है—हमारी प्रधान मंत्री जी और हमारे विदेश मंत्री जी बहुत ही लायक हैं और जिस ढंग से तथा जिस समय पर जो कदम उठाना चाहिए, वे लगातार उठाते जा रहे हैं।

मैं अपने इन भावों को इस शीर में प्रकट करना चाहता हूँ—

लोग कहते हैं बदलता है जमाना अक्सर
मर्द वह हैं जो जमाने को बदल देते हैं।

जमाने को बदलने के लिए हमारे विदेश मंत्री और हमारी प्रधान मंत्री लगातार कोशिश कर रहे हैं। आज न केवल भारत, बल्कि पूरे विश्व की जो समस्या है, अडर-डवेलपड कन्ट्रीज की जो आर्थिक कठिनाइयां हैं, जो विकसित राष्ट्र अपने पसों के बल पर, अपने शस्त्रों के बल पर आज दबाने की कोशिश करते हैं—ऐसी नाजुक और विकट परिस्थितियों में किस ढंग से सामना किया जाए, इसके लिए हमारी प्रधान मंत्री और विदेश मंत्री लगातार कोशिश कर रहे हैं और हम को गर्व है कि ऐसा सुन्दर और सशक्त नेतृत्व हमारे देश को मिला है।

अभी बहुत से प्रश्न हमारी सीमाओं के सम्बन्ध में हमारे अनेक विद्वान साथियों ने उठाये हैं। मैं भी बहुत संक्षेप में यह कहना चाहूंगा कि जहां तक पाकिस्तान का प्रश्न है, वहां पर एक सैनिक-शासन शासन कर रहा है और आज जितने भी लोकतंत्र हैं या जो इस्लामिक कन्ट्रीज हैं, आप उनके पिछले इतिहास को उठा कर देखें, वहां पर अभी तक स्थायित्व कायम नहीं हो पाया है। एक सत्ता आती है, फिर एक भाई दूसरे भाई को मार कर दूसरी सत्ता स्थापित हो जाती है, जन-जीवन के लिए हमेशा संकट बना रहता है। आज विश्व के लोग भारत की डेमोक्रेसी को देख कर गर्व करते हैं, उनके मन में एक प्रकार से आश्चर्य होता है कि हिन्दुस्तान जैसे 68 करोड़ की आबादी वाले देश में किस ढंग से कितनी सफलतापूर्वक, लोकतंत्र फल-फूल

[श्री शिवकुमार सिंह उन्नाव]

रहा है। आज दुनिया के उन देशों में जहां सैनिक सत्ता शासन कर रही है वहां हमको अस्थिरता नजर आती है। अभी बहुत से साधियों ने और विशेष कर श्री जगपाल सिंह कश्यप ने कहा कि हमारे लोगों को बीजा की बहुत तकलीफ होती है। लेकिन मेरा व्यक्तिगत अनुभव यह है—बूमि मेरे अपने क्षेत्र में 40 प्रतिशत मुसलमान लोग रहते हैं—बीजा की कितनी तकलीफ पाकिस्तान एम्बेसी में हिन्दुस्तान से पाकिस्तान जानेवाले निवासियों को होती है, उतनी तकलीफ पाकिस्तान से हिन्दुस्तान आने वालों को नहीं है। बल्कि वे तो यह कहते हैं कि हम लोग सुबह एप्लोकेशन देते हैं और शाम तक बीजा मिल जाता है, लेकिन हमारे हिन्दुस्तान के लोगों को एक शंक की निगाह से देखा जाता है।

मेरे बहुत से साथी बकालत कर रहे थे कि पाकिस्तान और हिन्दुस्तान जो पहले भाई-भाई थे, अब उन को नो-वार पैक्ट को मान लेना चाहिए। उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, दो-दो अवसर हमारे राष्ट्र पर संकट के ऐसे आये जब पाकिस्तान की ओर से हम पर आक्रमण किया गया। पाकिस्तान के शासकों ने अपनी कमजोरियों को छुपाने के लिए, अपनी गलतियों को छुपाने के लिए, हमेशा ऐसे प्रयास किए हैं, युद्ध का माध्यम अपनाया है, जिस से वे शासन करते रहे। लेकिन जो नो-वार पैक्ट की बात है जिस समय शिमला समझौता किया गया, जैसा अभी डोगरा जी बतला रहे थे, भुट्टो जब-जब हमारे देश से लड़ते रहे उनकी तारीफ होती रही, लेकिन जब शिमला समझौता हुआ तो उन पर तरह-तरह के आरोप लगाये जाने लगे। उस व्यक्ति ने जब यह महसूस किया—भले ही देर आयी, वरुन्त आयी—कि भारत के साथ

ठोक ढंग से व्यवहार किया जाना चाहिए तो वहां पर जो प्रतिक्रियावादी तत्व थे, उनको यह सहन नहीं हुआ और उनको हटा दिया गया। आज अमरीका की ओर से एफ-16 हवाई जहाजों की सप्लाई की बात हो रही है—इसको लेकर कोई भी इस बात को नहीं मानेगा कि इस से पाकिस्तान का शासन मजबूत हो रहा है, लेकिन वे इस का प्रचार कर रहे हैं और दूसरी ओर हिन्दुस्तान के साथ शान्ति की बात करते हैं—यह तो वैसा ही हुआ जैसे “मुंह में राम, बगल में छुरी” की बात है। मैं नहीं मानता कि इस प्रस्ताव से हमको सहमत होना चाहिए मगर साथ ही साथ मैं यह भी निवेदन करना चाहता हूं माननीय विदेश मंत्री जी से कि हमारे देश का प्रचार और प्रसार बहुत कमजोर है। अभी भी हमारा जो बोर्डर है, उस से लगे हुए जो डिस्ट्रिक्ट्स हैं जैसे अमृतसर और दूसरे पंजाब के इलाके, वहां के लोग पाकिस्तान के टेलीविजन की बड़ी तारीफ करते हैं कि वह बहुत अच्छा कार्यक्रम देता है। एक प्रकार से हमारे देश के विरोध में पाकिस्तान रेडियो और पाकिस्तान टेलीविजन लगातार जहर उगलता रहता है परन्तु हमारे यहां का जो रेडियो या टेलीविजन है, उन से कोई ऐसी बात नहीं सुनाई देती है। यदि हमारे ऊपर विदेशियों द्वारा आरोप लगाए जाते हैं चाहे वह पाकिस्तान हो, बंगला देश हो, चीन हो, या अमरीका हो, हमारे जो प्रचार के माध्यम हैं, उन के द्वारा उस ढंग का जनमत तैयार नहीं किया जाता है। हमारे देश में भी इसी तरह का जनमत तैयार किया जाना चाहिए।

एक भाई पहले कह भी रहे थे और शायद श्री इन्द्रजीत गुप्त कह रहे थे कि हमारे यहां यह एक बड़ी कमजोरी है कि हमारे देश में जो मुसलमान रहते हैं,

उनके मन में स्वभाविक रूप से एक प्रश्न यह उठता है कि यदि पाकिस्तान की ओर से नो-बार पैकेट आता है, तो भारत क्यों नहीं उस को मान लेता पहलुतु हमको उन को यह समझाना चाहिए कि वास्तविकता क्या है और किस ढंग से यह प्रस्ताव जो आया है, उस के पीछे भावना क्या है। जब तक हम अपने जनमत को नहीं समझाएंगे, नहीं तयार करेंगे, तब तक हम विदेशों में अपना पक्ष सहो रूप में स्पष्ट रूप में नहीं रख सकेंगे और तब तक हमारी विदेश नीति कामयाब नहीं होगी।

मुझे खुशी है कि दो-तीन माह से हमारे विदेश मंत्री जी और हमारी प्रधान मंत्री जी बहुत से देशों का दौरा कर रही हैं और इसके साथ-साथ 1980 के चुनावों के बाद और विशेष कर जनता पार्टी को अप्रफन विदेश नीति के बाद जब हमारी पार्टी ने सत्ता भाली, तब से लगातार विदेश डिमनेटरोज पूरी दुनिया की हमारे यहां आ रही है और हमारे नेता दूसरे देशों में जा जा कर अपना पक्ष रख रहे हैं। इस तरह से विश्व में भारत का पक्ष और स्पष्ट होता जा रहा है, हमारी नीति और स्पष्ट होती जा रही है।

चीन के सम्बन्ध में ज्यादा नहीं कहना चाहूंगा क्योंकि गोनसाल्वेज महोदय के नेतृत्व में हमारा भारतीय प्रतिनिधि-मण्डल वहां पर चर्चा कर रहा है लेकिन मैं उस सम्बन्ध में इतना ही कहना चाहूंगा कि हम को सावधानीपूर्वक बात करनी चाहिए और हमारा जो एग्जिक्चीव चीन ने छोना हुआ है, उस के लिए पूरी कोशिश करनी चाहिए। हम चाहते हैं कि मित्रता के साथ, बजाय इसके कि हम लड़ें, दूसरे देशों के साथ अच्छे सम्बन्ध बनाएं।

इस अवसर पर फिर से अपनी ओर से हार्दिक बधाई विदेश मंत्री जी को देना चाहता हूं और प्रधान मंत्री जी को देना चाहता हूं और इतना कह कर अपनी बात समाप्त करता हूं।

SHRI AJITSINH DABHI (Kaira):
Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, the United States of America has taken a decision to give Pakistan, our neighbour. \$3,200 million military economic assistance package. Again, it is also decided by America to supply the latest and sophisticated arms including the F-16 Fighter Bombers to Pakistan. Again America has supplied Advance Warning and Control System (AWCS) planes to Saudi Arabia and it is also noteworthy that the Defence Minister of Saudi Arabia has declared that Saudi Arabia will stand by Pakistan in war or peace. Further, as we all know, China has formed an alliance with America and it has also supplied military hardware, ammunition and F-16 Fighter planes to Pakistan. Further, China has constructed Korakoram Highway linking Pakistan occupied Kashmir with Sinkiang in China. It shows that there is undeclared military alliance between Pakistan, America, Saudi Arabia and Communist China. This undeclared alliance has endangered the security of our nation.

In October last our Prime Minister went to Mexico to attend the Cancun Summit Conference. She apprised Mr. Reagan, American President, of the danger to the security of India and also to the peace in the South East Asia. She said the up-dated military aid given to Pakistan will be used against India as it had happened in the past. To this President Reagan explained by saying that America had taken this decision because America was worried about the presence of Russian troops in Afghanistan. This particular explanation of President Reagan is unswallowable. Firstly, because America also knows well from the Report of

[Shri Ajitsinh Dabhi]

the Rand Corporation that even after the presence of Russian troops in Afghanistan Pakistan considers India to be its 'enemy No. 1.' Soon after the Russian troops entered Afghanistan Pakistan had rejected the request of America to re-deploy its forces to meet communist danger from its Western border. Even to-day out of six corps of Pakistan Army only one is located near the Afghanistan border but five corps of Pakistan Army are near the Indian border. Thus practically the whole Army of Pakistan is lined up against India. It is not positioned against Afghanistan border. Therefore, the American President lives in a fool's paradise. Or shall I say in the Hollywood, where as an actor he had fought mock battles, if he thinks that with only one corps of Pakistan Army, Pakistan would be able to 'stem the tide of communism.'

Again, Americans are praising the No War Pact offer made some days back to India by Pakistan President Zia as if India wants to wage war against Pakistan. But this No War Pact offer is nothing but the result of conspiracy between America and Pakistan to find an excuse to arm Pakistan with latest and sophisticated weapons including F-16 Fighter Bombers and thus to put Pakistan ten years ahead of India so far as armaments are concerned.

After the assassination of Mr. Sadat, President of Egypt, the Prince Fohd of Saudi Arabia wants to become the leader of Arab countries. Saudi Arabia has deposited billions of petro-dollars in American Banks. Now, America wants to help Saudi Arabia in order to build up army with sophisticated electronic command system so that Saudi Arabia would be the nerve-centre of the American forces. They would stay in Saudi Arabia under the pretext of fighting for that nation. The sale of five Advanced Warning and Control Systems (AWACS) by America to Saudi Arabia

is a proof of the intention of America. Now, the intention of Saudi Arabia is also there. It is two fold. One is it wants to deal with the insurgents within its own country. Secondly, Saudi Arabia wants to cooperate with America in its arm strategy with respect to the Persian Gulf and the Indian Ocean. So far as this strategy is concerned, it has its origin in the 'rapid deployment of force' proposed to be used in the event of danger to Gulf-oil-fields. All these things are important and note-worthy because, as I said, a few days back, the Defence Minister of Saudi Arabia has declared that Saudi Arabia will remain with Pakistan in war and peace. Pakistan is, again, going to get a loan of petro dollars from Saudi Arabia.

China, our neighbouring country on the North, which had attacked us in 1962, thinks that it is the natural leaders of South East Asian countries and considers India as its rival. As a matter of fact, India never aspired nor does aspire to become the leader of the South East Asian countries. India considers all of them to be its friends. But, never the less, China has formed an alliance with America and is supporting Pakistan economically and also militarily, as I said in the beginning. Our delegation headed by the Foreign Secretary, Mr. Gonslaves has already reached Peking to make a background for negotiation to settle certain problems like border dispute between us and China, which is the foremost. So far as China's attitude is concerned, I want to quote my previous speech in the Budget Session, because we have to be very careful in dealing with China.

"China has been always adept at double dealing. It unashamedly blowshot and cold at the same time. When China is going on with a good smile negotiating with you it may be laying mines behind you so that you may perish if you are recalcitrant."

Therefore, I hope that our delegation, which is there, will be very cautious while negotiating with its counterpart in China. In blatant violation of the United Nations' resolution to make Indian Ocean a zone of peace, the United States has piled the latest and sophisticated nuclear arms in the Diego Garcia island, thus making this island a formidable military base from which India can be threatened and attacked. On 3rd March, this year, the Pentagon had openly declared that America wanted to upgrade the air base in the Diego Garcia island for the deployment of B-52 fighter bombers which are the backbone of the American arms. From this island which is indeed a formidable military base, India can be attacked at any time. Therefore, the militarisation of the Diego Garcia island is a constant threat to the sovereignty of India.

Fortunately, we have Shrimati Indira Gandhi as our Prime Minister who has the correct understanding of the international events and she has also inherent diplomatic talents in her. In fact, all these qualities have made her a world leader. Recently, she made a whirlwind tour of foreign countries and before international forums and also in her personal meetings with foreign dignitaries, she made abundantly clear India's policy vis-a-vis international situation. During her tour, she maintained India's stand for peace and for peaceful cooperation irrespective of whether a country has a particular political philosophy or Government. She also said that India believes in settling international disputes not by force but by bilateral dialogue. She also reiterated India's policy of non-alignment. She said that this policy of non-alignment is not the result of weakness or fear. She openly declared that India had been attacked five times within a span of 30 years and, therefore, this time, India does not want to be taken unawares or sleeping. The people of India are ready to meet any eventuality.

Nepal is our neighbour and our friendship with Nepal is more than thousand years old. We are also helping Nepal. But now Nepal has come forward with a proposal that Nepal should be made a zone of peace guaranteed by the two Super Powers and also by China and India. This is nothing but directly and deliberately inviting Super Powers into the relations between India and Nepal. Therefore, we should think twice or rather we should think several times before accepting this proposal of Nepal.

Our policy of non-alignment is not liked by many countries like America. In our own country, there are also some people who criticise our policy of non-alignment. But, as a matter of fact, it is because of this policy of non-alignment that India has achieved such a great international stature in the world. Some say that India is tilted towards Russia. This is not correct. During her recent tour of foreign countries, our Prime Minister has openly declared that India is neither pro-Russia nor anti-America. Again India is neither anti-Russia nor pro-America. The Prime Minister had told the foreign correspondents that she had told Russian leaders personally and openly that Soviet Russia should vacate Afghanistan. One would recall that though during the Bangladesh war in 1971, Russia had helped India, still, our Prime Minister Indira Gandhi did not accept the Asian Security concept of President Brezhnev and exchanged ambassadors with Communist China.

The policy of non-alignment that our nation is following is, therefore, correct.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: The time is over.

SHRI AJITSINH DABHI: Shri Jawaharlal Nehru said that India will follow non-alignment even if there was no country to follow it and even if it meant that we have to plough a lonely furrow.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Hon. Members the list of speakers now available before me is over. Therefore, I think the Minister can reply now.

THE MINISTER OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS (SHRI P. V. NARASIMHA RAO): Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am grateful to the 15 Hon. Members who have participated in this debate, a debate which has spanned two sessions of the House. It started in the last session and has concluded today. That shows the amount of interest and the keenness with which Hon. Members wanted this debate. I am glad we had it because the benefit is entirely mine.

It has been stated by several Members on several occasions and stated by me also that we are continuing the very wholesome tradition of a consensus in foreign affairs in this country. If there is a consensus in Parliament, it means that there is a consensus in the whole country. That is why I would not take up the time of the House by repeating what all has been said in favour of the policies of the Government. That is hardly necessary.

I would only refer to a few points raised on behalf of what Mr. Indrajit Gupta termed as the misguided fringe. I shall lightly touch upon those points because those points deserve only a light touch. Nothing beyond that.

18 hrs.

On the positive side, I entirely agree with Members who have given a vivid picture of the dangers that the world faces today, the danger of extinction and the danger of a nuclear holocaust. Therefore, the importance that they have attached to disarmament is entirely well-founded and India has always been in the forefront of the cause of disarmament.

We have not made any distinctions between one kind of a nuclear weapon and another kind of nuclear weapon. We have not tried to quibble between

these weapons nor tried to take positions which are not clearcut. We have taken a clearcut position. Whether a neutron bomb is a good thing or a bad thing, whether a neutron bomb, as compared to the other nuclear bombs, is something to be preferred as a lesser evil—we have not gone into those niceties. Right from the beginning we have said that we stand for total disarmament because we consider nuclear weapons of mass destruction as a crime against humanity and therefore, we come to the of resistable conclusion that we just cannot make any distinctions between weapon and weapon, all of them should go, lock, stock and barrel. That has been India's stand and we have never swerved from that stand.

On several occasions various countries have approached us with several different formulations. It is possible that a particular formulation may be very tempting and very attractive to us in one respect. But if you go into the depons of it, you will find that somewhere it clashes with our basic approach. We have been persistently and consistently refusing to fall for these other formulations and we have stuck to our original formulation, namely that we want the abolition of all nuclear weapons and we want total disarmament.

Now this looks Utopian. People have told us that we have taken a stand which is not capable of realisation in the short run. We have turned round and asked them whether their formulations are really capable of realisation in the short run. Obviously they are not. So there is no point in our diluting our stand because we see that there cannot be a winnable war by nuclear weapons. We cannot see any war which can be limited to a particular area or to a particular weapon or to a 'particular' section of humanity or a country. It is just not possible. We do not subscribe to all those theories and therefore, we say that all nuclear weapons should go and total disarmament has

to take place. I am glad that this stand has been endorsed by Members once again.

This basically is the non-aligned stand. All non-aligned countries and more or less a very vast majority in the international community has agreed with this and, therefore, we are in very good company. We do not have to neutralise it, we do not have to change it and we shall continue to stick to it. Then what is more important for our purposes to-day is the linkage between disarmament and development. The stage has come when mankind will have to choose between the armaments and development. You cannot have both. You cannot have armaments to your heart's content or to the heart's content of those who want them—we do not want them anyhow. The third world does not want them anyhow. But even those who want them for any reason whatsoever, have to choose between the two. That time has come. That stage has come. We have seen that very affluent countries are now afflicted by all kinds of economic difficulties. They have inflation, they have unemployment and they are not able to balance their budgets. Once this escalation in their defence expenditure has taken place once for political reasons they have decided on this escalation consciously and deliberately in the hope that they would still be able to balance the budget, in the hope that they would have the guns and the butter both, they have perforce come to the conclusion that this is not possible—not even for them. I am not talking of the developing countries; I am talking of the developed countries themselves that they cannot have guns and butter both. Obviously, there is very little to say in regard to developing countries.

Therefore, if there is the principle of inter-dependence, which is being accepted by more and more countries to-day, how does development come? Where do the funds for development come from? Obviously, they cannot

come from anywhere because, in the affluent countries, in the developed countries, they themselves are not in a position to find funds for their own development given a particular quantum of outlay on armaments. Therefore, this money has to come obviously from that earmarked for armaments. There has to be a cut on the armaments. Only then will this money flow in the other direction. So, the choice between these two, i.e., development on the one hand and armaments and extinction on the other this is the real choice before every country to-day, before humanity to-day and that is why we were very clear in our minds when we went to Cancun when we prepared for Cancun. For the last one year this preparation had been going on. Many eye-brows went up. Many people told us that we were wasting our time and energy and that this was not going to happen. They said that it was not possible for the developed and the developing countries to come together and to come to an understanding in regard to the economic re-structuring of the world. But, we stuck to our guns and said that at some point or the other this has to take place, we just cannot go in two different and irreconcilable directions for ever. They have to meet at some point or the other. We had these preparatory meetings and, finally, we came to a framework, to a working formula, by which these 22 heads of Governments could meet—some of them developed, some of them developing, some of them, perhaps, middling—not quite developed, not quite developing either. So, all the typical kinds of levels of development will be found in these countries. They met and they accepted the principle of interdependence. This inter-dependence has brought us to a stage where a further dialogue has become possible.

Last year, when we were in the United Nations for the 11th Special Session, we found that we could not make any headway—neither on the timeframe nor on the agenda nor on

[Shri P. V. Narasimha Rao]

anything in regard to the North-South dialogue. This year, the position is not very much better, but it is a little better and, we hope, that the effect of Cancun will be felt in the further proceedings in the General Assembly or further proceedings in the other agencies of the United Nations. So, this is how, inch by inch, we are going forward to a situation where real interdependence is realised on all hands. It is very easy to accept inter-dependence in theory on paper. But, what does it mean? Inter-dependence really means, in terms of the people of a developed country, that they will have to sacrifice something in order to benefit themselves in the long run, not merely the developing countries. They are not giving any charity. But, they are benefiting themselves as much as they are benefiting the others because the interests are inter-dependent. This is the realisation that has to come not only at Government level but at the level of the people. As I once said, if there is a family in a developed country which wants the next car for itself—if it has got two cars already, it wants a third—that family has to understand that the possibility of its getting the next car will depend on the possibility of some family in some other country getting the next meal.

Inter-dependence in fact means this. It is being realised. I do not say that we are really galloping towards it. But, inch by inch, very slowly, we are going towards the full realisation of this. It will take time. But it will come, it has to come, we do not have any alternative to it.

I have already referred to the question of Peace. In this connection, I would like to say that when we take a non-aligned stand, there is bound to be some criticism,—at least from two quarters, if not more. Because, a Non-aligned stand does not fully tally with one side or the other and therefore there is bound to be some kind

of criticism—mild or strong—depending on the issue.

But today, what we have to realise is that this kind of dichotomy, this kind of total estrangement between the two sides, two blocs, cannot continue for ever, because we find, as a matter of fact, that on several points, on several issues, what happens is this: You have the non-aligned countries on the one hand, then if you take the others together you can call them by the generic name of 'non-non-aligned'. And between these two, you find agreement on many matters. How is it that some European countries today take a much closer stand to that of India or that of the non-aligned on matters like, say, Namibia, South Africa, West Asia, Middle-East, North-South, Cancun,—all these? How is it that they are much more forthcoming in their attitudes, and much more liberal, let us say, or much closer to the attitudes of the Non-aligned countries? The fact of the matter is that it is no longer possible to divide the whole world into two water-tight compartments and to see that each compartment contains its own countries so tightly that they cannot take any other view except the view of the compartment itself. The compartments are cracking. And therefore, India's effort has been, and the effort of the non-aligned world has to be, to make as many friends as possible outside the movement, because—let us face it—the future of the world not only depends upon the non-aligned but even more so on what happens outside the non-aligned movement; because, the power of destruction is not in our hands, it is in the hands of those who are outside the movement. And therefore, it would be in the interest of the world and of world peace, that the Non-aligned movement makes as many friends as possible outside the movement. This is what we have been doing. We are being benefited and also benefiting the others in this process; we have a technological base; we are having co-ope-

ration in several fields of technology with these developed countries. This is because India is in a position to absorb any sophisticated technology which any developed country will be able to give.

So, India's position has been recognised, has been acknowledged, as the country where the highest possible technology can be easily absorbed. And therefore, other countries are coming closer to us. And this again is an example of interdependence. They find that some of their industries do not pay, for various reasons, economic reasons, within those countries, while the same industries, with the same technology, can flourish in India, because, India has better conditions, more congenial conditions. It is again a question of understanding conditions in each other's country and trying to get the best out of this situation. So, we are doing this.

Coming to the Indian Ocean, we have supported the idea. We have been co-sponsors and we have been taking a consistent line right from the beginning. I have answered a number of questions in both Houses on the Indian Ocean. The only question that seems to be nagging Mr. Indrajit Gupta all the time is this rivalry.

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA: Nagging me?...

SHRI P. V. NARASIMHA RAO: Nagging you. I have heard you raise it. I do not know how many times, as many times as I have heard you speak! Sir, there is a very simple answer which I would like to give him in all sincerity. This concept of "rivalry" in fact we are not using that word at all these days—is not my interpretation; it is not my invention. I would like to read out to you the Resolution by which we all swear and that Resolution is the Resolution of 1971—Implementation of the declaration of the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace. This is the United Na-

tions Resolution. It reads as follows, *inter alia*:

"Deeply concerned at the intensification of great power military presence, conceived in the context of great power rivalry leading to an increase of tension in the area."

So, I have not created that word. It is there in the Resolution. Because of these misunderstandings which are caused we say that we do not want "presences". We are using the "plural". If that makes it better from your point of view, we will use plurals, but the idea is the same. It is not a question of equating one with the other. There is no question of equality or equating. The question is we do not want anyone. We want this area to be free of all these powers, and these presences. The Prime Minister has said that one presence attracts another. Now, who is going to decide who came first and who came last; why did the first one come and why did the second one come? This kind of scrutiny is not going to pay us any dividends. The point is pure and simple. We want this area as an area of peace, as a zone of peace and that is why since it has occurred in the Resolution—it still occurs in the original resolution—we have been using it, but it does not mean anything more than what I have explained.

We know who our friends are, we know which country has helped us, we are not really unaware of all this. But in this context, that argument does not fit in. Here is a question where you want an area to be a zone of peace; even with one presence, you cannot have a zone of peace; so we do not want either one side or the other. And it is not only two; there are 5 or 6 sides, because it is not only two countries, but 3, 4 or 5 other countries as well. They too have some kind of presence there. We want all these presences to be out of that area and that is all pure and simple, what we stand for. Therefore this question of equating need not be raised again and again when

[Shri P. V. Narasimha Rao]

we talk of the Indian Ocean. Some Members also referred to collective self-reliance. The House knows that India has played a very important role in collective self-reliance, the programmes which India has with other developing countries are more in number, depth and extent than any other country. Since, unlike many other developing countries, we are not only in a position to send raw materials—in fact we are sending less and less raw materials and more and more intermediate goods, more and more sophisticated machinery even. We are in a position to implement this principle of collective self-reliance much better. As the years go by, we will be able to stand competition even with developed countries. But here there is no question of competition, when it serves the interests of the third World; amongst ourselves, we are able to share with other developing countries the expertise we have built up, the experience we have gained. We may have faltered during the last 30 years, we may have failed in some respects but we have learnt by mistakes and other countries need not go through the process all over again. Therefore, quite a number of countries are taking advantage of this and we are happy that this is being done.

There has been a passing reference to Afghanistan. I do not want to go into all the details of what has been happening from time to time, or not happening, to be more exact. But I would like to say that immediately after I came back from Moscow last year, I made a statement to both Houses of Parliament. And some eyebrows went up, but I said, what we feel is the correct position we have to tell the House, tell the people, tell the nation. We felt that the situation in Afghanistan was developing on certain undesirable lines, the result of which we thought, would be that it would be taken as a pretext for increasing the presences of those, whose presence would not be liked,

who would not have been able to increase their presences otherwise. This is what we said in so many words and this is what has happened.

Today cynical as it may sound, you have to really search for anyone, who wants the Soviet troops out of Afghanistan. Everyone seems to be getting some advantage out of this situation. Why did it happen? Why should it have happened? Why should it have been allowed to happen? India has been taking the most sincere line that we do not want any foreign troops in Afghanistan, as we do not want foreign troops in any other country. As I said once, some people make exceptions, we do not. Our principle applied to all countries, all foreign troops, in all countries and on all soils. That was taken as a mistake, that was taken as prevarication, and that was taken as a half-hearted statement. We have faced all these things, but we have stuck to our guns, we have stuck to our principles. But, what is happening today? There is no attempt regionally to find a solution. Shri Indrajit Gupta says that we are not able to distinguish between the global aspects and the regional aspects and therefore we confuse the two. That is what I understood him to say. Yes, deliberately so, because we know that if countries like Afghanistan and Pakistan are locked in a struggle and they become part of the global phenomenon, they will never get out of it. Our entire effort during the whole of 1980 was this that we find a non-aligned formula by which a political solution is found. It is quite clear that there can be no military solution to this. I have not come across any power which was prepared to send its own troops to throw the Soviet troops out of Afghanistan. So, it is quite clear that there is no military solution; it has to be a political solution. We have been trying to find a political solution. And if you do not talk with one another, how can a political solution emerge? This is purely and simply what we have been telling both the countries both the parties, with whom we have friendly

relations. This has not happened. So much as going to the negotiating table to talk not to agree but to talk even this has not happened! How can any country afford the luxury of not talking to the other country, and still being locked in Confrontation, having millions of refugees? Is this really comprehensible? It is not. There must be something else to it than what meets the eye and it is not very difficult to guess.

This is the situation from which we wanted to extricate these countries so that a solution is found. Take Kampuchea for instance. The same thing has happened there. Finally, everybody today agrees that we should settle this problem on a regional basis without interference from outside.

How it is going to happen, no one knows. They have been trying all kinds of things, but they have not really succeeded. But ultimately even those countries of South East Asia, which do not see eye to eye with us on this issue, today agree that it has to be a solution found by the concerned countries by a process of negotiation amongst themselves without outside interference. This is what we stood for all the time. Today it is being realised that this is the only way. Whether it is going to happen tomorrow is not the question, but whenever it happens, only this has to happen, because this is the only way. Again, if it becomes a global affair, if it is going to be decided when the global East West confrontation is decided then we have had it, these countries have had it. The question is whether these countries can afford all this. Can Vietnam afford this? Can Kampuchea afford this? who is thinking of the people of Kampuchea? We are thinking only of technicalities. Many countries are wondering whether Kampuchea should be recognised or not; whether the Heng Samrin Government should be recognised or not. I have asked many

friends who have raised this question, Well, if you don't recognise, Heng Samrin, whom do you recognise? Do you recognise Pol Pot? They immediately say, "No, no, we are not for Pol Pot! Then whom are for— God, devil, who? So, the fact of the matter is that we are not taking this issue in a practical way.

Before coming to neighbours, I would like to dispose of one small matter, rather it is not small, it is a very important matter, because it is right in the middle of the Indian Ocean—about the Seychelles.

Hon. Members may remember that the day this hijacking took place, the situation in this House and the other House was something to be seen to be believed. Every member was on his feet and was asking for the latest reports in regard to the passengers, the Indian passengers on board the Air India aircraft. The whole day was spent by the Government in trying to find out the whereabouts, of the well being of those on board, finding out what actually happened. No one knew what had happened. All these stories, all these details about the coup etc. came days later. So, on that day our sole preoccupation was to see how our compatriots, who had been dumped there, could be brought back safely. We did not even know that it was to South Africa that the plane had been hijacked. For quite some time we had to go on making inquiries and when it came to light that it was South Africa, we were faced with another difficulty. We have no relations with South Africa. So we had to think of other friendly countries to help us out of the situation. I am glad they did their bit and helped us out. We are grateful to them. But our preoccupation, let me repeat, was the safe return of the aircraft, the passengers and the crew. After that we tried to find out the facts. As the facts came out, we not only have taken cognisance of the facts, but we have actually supported the version of the Seychelles' representative in

[Shri P. V. Narasimha Rao]

the United Nations General Assembly. I do not see how else we can take a stand. And while taking a stand, we have to be absolutely sure about the facts, we cannot go by newspapers, we cannot go by unconfirmed reports. I have nothing against newspapers, but the point is until we had certain confirmation from official quarters, we could not have come out officially with a stand.

I now come to our relations with the neighbours. The President has just returned from Nepal this afternoon. About a week ago I was there. I am glad to say that there are much brighter possibilities of cooperation with Nepal now than about a couple of years ago. There is a realization on both sides that these two countries are so inter-linked—their economics, their population and their cultural ties are so strong that it is not possible for them to go their own separate ways. This has been realized. These two countries are independent, sovereign countries. They have to live as neighbours—independent, sovereign neighbours with so much in common, and still independent and sovereign. (This is a relationship which is not easy to establish; and even if you establish it, it is even less easy to work it out in day-to-day life. But we will have to do it; and I am sure that after my talks with the leaders there, I am convinced that this is the approach of both the countries. I am sure this intention has been reiterated and confirmed, when the President went there. I hope to get the details from him; and I am sure that most of the questions can be solved. After all, these questions can crop up only between neighbours. They cannot come between distant countries. Whether it is the waters issue, or whatever be the other problems—we have been approaching these problems constructively; and I am glad to say that within the last one year—in 1981 particularly—there has been a lot of

progress on many of these matters, which had somehow not progressed for some years. I can only say that the realization on both sides is there, and we hope to progress even faster in the months to come.

On water resources, for instance, my talks revealed that whatever lack of progress was there, it was because of very small things which could have been sorted out by mutual discussion. But no team went from here; no team came from there. The first meeting took place in January, 1981. It cleared many things, many matters, and there was very quick progress. Now, certain matters are to be looked into. Once again a team is coming. After discussion with the officials, these things will be sorted out.

Again, on the industrial side, there are several things which could be done. There are many projects in which we are participating already. I had occasion to visit some of them; and I have found that there is full satisfaction on the other side in regard to the efficacy, in regard to the promptness and the timeliness of the work which we have undertaken there. So, it is good story. It is a good prospect that we find in Nepal.

I had been to Bhutan some months back. I find that in Bhutan, the same spirit prevails. I don't have to go into details, except to say that we have no problems with Bhutan. It is only a question of cooperation, of really intensifying cooperation and finding more and more areas of cooperation. That is being done.

With Bangladesh, you may remember that we had this small difficulty with regard to the New Moore Island. It was touch-and-go for some days. We had some anxious moments. And given the situation in that country after President Zia-ur-Rahman's assassination, anything could have happened. But I am glad to say that with goodwill on both sides and a determination not to allow the situation to

get out of hand. We have been able to defuse it, not only on the islands issue, but on the question of boundry demarcation also. Our team has gone; it has come back after making some progress. In fact, they could have made a little more progress. But they really wanted to do their home-work once again, in consultation with the Government of West Bengal. So, they have come back. There is good progress and we are hopeful that that question will be settled before long.

SHRI SATYASADHAN CHAKRABORTY (Calcutta South): Is it a fact that Bangladesh has allowed a small island near Chittagong for building an American military base? Has Government of India any information? But this news item has appeared...

SHRI P. V. NARASIMHA RAO: At the moment, I have no information. This is not bilateral. I am talking of our relations with friends, our neighbours. We are on a different subject.

Now coming, finally, to Pakistan, I made a statement in regard to the 'No War Pact'. There has been a deliberate attempt, may be out of non-seriousness, to show that we are not responding positively. This is not... (Interruptions).

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA: A deliberate attempt by whom?

AN HON. MEMBER: By Shri Vajpayee.

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA: By Shri Vajpayee, by Subramaniam Swamy or by Pakistan?

SHRI P. V. NARASIMHA RAO: It does not matter by whom. There has been an attempt. It has not succeeded. It will not succeed. This is not a simple matter. I shall place before the House two scenarios.

On the 15th September, a 'Non-Aggression Pact' is "offered" by President Zia of Pakistan. So, the whole matter starts on the 15th September, 1981. That is one scenario. What does India have to say? "Do you accept it? Don't you accept it? Do you accept with qualifications?" Immediately all the questions are

shot at us. I can understand that scenario.

Take the other scenario. A 'No War Pact' is offered by India in 1949. No one seems to talk about it for 31 years. There has been persistent refusal to accept this from the other side and suddenly something is sprung at us from the other side and again we are asked, "What have you got to say? Do you accept? Don't you accept?" Now, this is not fair. You cannot wish away all this history of 31 years. I have made a detailed statement, telling the House, who said what, when, in what context, the whole background has been given. I have not given it non-seriously lightly. I have to tell the House. I have to tell my people that this is the background against which we are having another so-called offer now and this is the position in which Government finds itself. So, I have said, very simply, the Simla Agreement has bilateralised the entire gamut of relations between India and Pakistan. They also agree, we also agree, because they said, "in the Simla spirit". Now, we had made an offer. Is it possible for us to brush that offer aside. our own offer? Would it be right if we did that, particularly when this offer has had a chequered history, the history of being refused time and again by the other side? Suddenly, if there is an offer from the other side, and we say, we accept it, without going into the details of the background, is it fair, is it right, is it in the interests of the country, is that what a responsible Government should do? Obviously not. That is why I placed the entire background before the House and how, I said, I would like to know—I did not even say, I would like to know—I said, my response will be positive on the basis that the 'offer' now made from Pakistan constitutes an acceptance of our offer which has been there for the last 31 years. Why did I say that?

PROF. N. G. RANGA: It has been repeatedly made.

SHRI P. V. NARASIMHA RAO: Why did I say that? It is not lightly that I said it. It is not just for the sake of scoring a debating point that I said it. I mean it because I made an offer 31 years ago. Objections were raised to that offer. The offer was refused on several grounds and when I say that on this basis my response is going to be positive today it impinges on the entire history of the last 31 years, it has implications and these implications have to be gone into and that is why what I have stated is exactly the correct thing to say. We have not been negative. We have not refused it. We have drawn the attention of the whole world to the fact that this has been here for the last 31 years. In one ground or the other, it has been refused. Now, what happens to those grounds? I have not asked questions. I have only said, this is the basis on which my response is going to be positive. There is nothing to be said beyond this. It is very clear. A no-war pact would therefore be: (a) in amplification of the Simla Agreement, because in the Simla Agreement, use of force or threat of use of force—these have been eschewed deliberately by both sides, by unanimity; so, a no war pact can only be an amplification of what has been said in the Simla Agreement; (b) in the bilateral framework decided upon in that agreement; and (c) as stated earlier, on the basis that Pakistan's "offer" constitutes the acceptance of India's offer of the no-war pact made in 1949.

These are the things which have been very clearly stated. So, there is no justification in charging the Government with inactivity with not having responded or having over-reacted. We have said nothing about the F-16s we have said nothing about anything. We have only said that when this offer was made, something was happening in the United States Congress. Should we not point that out? Is it such a very insignificant coincidence? It is not. Therefore, I pointed out that also without comment. So, this is our position today.

There is nothing further for us to do. We have said our piece, the exact piece. Our response, as we have promised, is going to be what we have promised it will be. That is all I would like to say.

About Sri Lanka, I have only to report that we have this problem of the remaining persons of Indian origin. I am not talking of the other side, the other Tamils of Sri Lanka who belong to Sri Lanka and are citizens there. We have nothing to say on that account. But so far as persons of Indian origin are concerned, who are stateless—today, we have to take some of them and they had to take some of them. That agreement has come to an end last month. Now we are prepared to take those who are registered with us. The question has to be resolved on that basis.

About China, we quite advisedly did not dwell on this subject *en extenso* during this debate, because our team, our delegation, is right now talking to the Chinese delegation on several issues. So, after they come back, we will be able to know how much progress has been made. It is not proper to anticipate anything one way or the other. So, I have discreetly omitted saying anything about that. I thank the hon. members also who did not really raise too many questions on that issue.

This is all I have to say. I think I have covered particularly the points raised by the "misguided fringe", in Mr. Gupta's terminology. I am grateful to the hon. members for having reiterated the consensus and having given me some valuable suggestions.

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA: Did you say, misguided fringe? Or lunatic fringe?

SHRI P. V. NARASIMHA RAO: Misguided only. Do you want to improve on it?

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Substitute motions have been moved by

Shri Ramavatar Shastri and Shri B. V. Desai. Shall I now put them together or one by one?

SHRI P. V. NARASIMHA RAO: If the House agrees, I would like to accept Shri B. V. Desai's substitute motion. It is quite positive. It says:

"This House, having considered the present international situation and the policy of the Government of India in relation thereto, wholeheartedly supports the Government of India's firm determination to pursue the policy of non-alignment in dealing with present international situation."

So, it will be very illogical to oppose it.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Now I shall put the Substitute Motion moved by Shri Ram Avtar Shastri to vote.

Substitute Motion No. 2 was put and negatived.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Now, I put the Substitute Motion moved by Shri B. V. Desai. The question is:

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

"This House, having considered the present international situa-

tion and the policy of the Government of India in relation thereto, wholeheartedly supports the Government of India's firm determination to pursue the policy of non-alignment in dealing with present international situation." (3).

The motion was adopted.

18.44 hrs.

BUSINESS ADVISORY COMMITTEE

TWENTY-THIRD REPORT

THE MINISTER OF PARLIAMEN-
TARY AFFAIRS AND WORKS AND
HOUSING (SHRI BHISHMA NARA-
IN SINGH): I beg to present the
Twenty-third Report of the Business
Advisory Committee.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: The
House stands adjourned till 11 A.M.
tomorrow.

18.45 hrs.

*The Lok Sabha then adjourned till
Eleven of the Clock on Friday, De-
cember 11, 1981/4 Agrahayana 20, 1903
(Saka).*