

1	2	3	4	5	6
93.	Chandigarh	18,48,00,000	6,21,00,000	92,39,00,000	31,05,00,000
94.	Daman and Diu	2,07,00,000	1,93,00,000	10,36,00,000	9,67,00,000

[English]

it to the notice of the officer at the Table without delay.

### Ministry of External Affairs

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: The House will now take up discussion and voting on Demand No. 23 relating to the Ministry of External Affairs for which 6 hours have been allotted.

Hon. Members present in the House whose cut motions to the Demands for Grants have been circulated may, if they desire to move their cut motions, send slips to the Table within 15 minutes indicating the serial numbers of the cut motions they would like to move. Those cut motions only will be treated as moved.

A list showing the serial numbers of cut motions moved will be put on the notice board immediately. In case any Member finds any discrepancy in the list he may bring

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Motion moved:

"That the respective sums not exceeding the amounts on Revenue Account and Capital Account shown in the fourth column of the Order Paper be granted to the President, out of the Consolidated Fund of India to complete the sums necessary to defray the charges that will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1989, in respect of the head of Demand entered in the second column there of against Demand No. 23 relating to the Ministry of External Affairs."

### Demand for Grant, 1988-89 in Respect of the Ministry of External Affairs Submitted to the Vote of the Lok Sabha

No. of Demand	Name of Demand	Amount of Demand for grant on account voted by House on 18 March, 1988		Amount of Demand for grant submitted to the vote of the House	
		Revenue Rs.	Capital Rs.	Revenue Rs.	Capital Rs.
1	2	3	4	5	6
23.	Ministry of External Affairs	69,26,00,000	15,50,00,000	334,72,00,000	77,50,00,000

**SHRI N. VENKATA RATNAM:** Sir, the basic parameters of India's foreign policy were laid down 4 decades ago and they remained unaltered till now. The main architect of our foreign policy is our beloved leader, Jawaharlal Nehru who said this. I am quoting from the book "Foreign Policy of India", published by the Lok Sabha Secretariat in 1987:

"The architect of India's post independence Foreign Policy was its first Prime Minister, Shri Jawaharlal Nehru. In his very first policy statement on the threshold of independence, Nehru had declared:

"The world, in spite of its rivalries and hatreds and inner conflicts, moves inevitably towards closer cooperation and the building of a World Commonwealth. It is for this one World that free India will work, a world in which there is free cooperation of free peoples, and no class or group exploits another".

Nehru's vision of India's role in the world was drawn from Gandhiji's ideals of truth and non-violence."

So, this Gandhi has not discovered that. I don't think the Government of India has done anything in this direction. What it did in this direction is mentioned in the annual report placed by the Minister. The question whether it is correct, sufficient, to what utility, is to be taken into consideration. I have no objection to give credit, if any, to the Government. I have no hesitation to discredit the Government for the defects that have come into the policy.

I would like to submit here what Mr.

Ashok Mitra has put it. "1987 was the *demarch* year in the History of Republic." And the modern history of our republic is nothing but the history of one Party and one family except one or two brief interludes. So, that party and that family must take either credit or discredit of this policy. It is an undisputed fact. I would like to submit what is the progress or retardation that is made in this unaltered 40 years of our republic history. I am very sorry to put my own view point. The progress we achieved is rather very very minimal and the retardation is very very marked. I would like to say in this august House that it is the lesson of history, it is the current policy which we should study as to where we went wrong. It is for us to know where we went wrong and then correct ourselves. That is the way to progress. But insisting on the same thing whether it is right or wrong about a policy is not a correct approach.

I would like to submit that our movement is not forward but our movement is terribly backward. Now our movement is from respectability to disrespect for these 40 years and from honesty to utter corruption and from open society to a very secretive society. This is a retardation of this republic history as far as foreign policy is concerned. Again, I have no objection to give credit to Mr. Jawaharlal Nehru, the visionary, who by his correct foreign policy put our nation at the highest pedestal of the world and we were given respect by the entire polity of nations. But what is our position now? Our position has reduced itself not only to disrespect but to a position of non-entity. We are not cared by anybody. We are not respected by anybody.

**PROF. K.K. TEWARY (Buxar):** What is he speaking on?

**SHRI N. VENKATA RATNAM:** External Affairs.

'SHRI H.A. DORA: I am very sorry he is not talking about Mr. K.K. Tewary.

SHRI V. SOBHANADREESWARA RAO (Vijaywada): He is not able to understand.

SHRI H.A. DORA: He is not speaking about Mr. K.K. Tewary.

SHRI N. VENKATA RATNAM: Looking to our approach to foreign policy, rather I would like to hang my head in shame for certain things that have been done in the international politics and our honesty has drifted into utter corruption. (*Interruptions*). I do not want to be disturbed by unholy atmosphere. Once corruption was internal. I am very sorry to say that in this age, it has gone out of India and now corruption is even in international politics. That is what I am trying to drive at. Mr. So and So may not be very touchy about that. I again quote Mr. Ashok Mitra:—

"Corruption has now become institutionalised."

DR. G.S. RAJHANS: Is it External Affairs?

SHRI V. SOBHANADREESWARA RAO: That is what he is trying to explain. Have patience. (*Interruptions*)

SHRI N. VENKATA RATNAM: I would like to repeat to the hon. Prime Minister who is personally present here at least to tell his Members let them be patient to hear others which virtually is not done.

THE PRIME MINISTER (SHRI RAJIV GANDHI): I do not hesitate. The hon. Member, I am sure, is well aware of corruption, and he knows very much about Andhra and so he is talking in a very loud voice, I am sure. I would request his to give us some positive suggestions on foreign policy if he

has some alternative views.

SHRI RANA VIR SINGH (Kesarganj): How can he have any, when he has Mr. Ashok Mitra in his mind? How can you expect any suggestions from him?

SHRI N. VENKATA RATNAM: To give disrespect to anybody is not the policy either of our State or Party. I would submit that, as the hon. Prime Minister says, corruption is there. Everybody knows it. (*Interruptions*)

SHRI RAJIV GANDHI: What I said was that the hon. Member must know about corruption in Andhra very well. That is why, he is talking so loudly.

SHRI M. RAGHUMA REDDY: Why Andhra? It is everywhere.

SHRI N. VENKATA RATNAM: This debate is confined to only one State; unfortunately. (*Interruptions*)

I was submitting that corruption has gone from internal to external. We have got standing examples of corruption externally. Bofors corruption case is there and the latest thing that has come up is the bribe that has been paid to the LTTE. That is also there. That is an admitted fact. Lakhs of rupees are being paid every month. A sum of Rs. 100 crores is promised to the LTTE. Don't you call this corruption and bribe? On the other hand, the Government is trying to defend itself by saying that it is there in the Accord itself. In the Accord, what is stated is to give some assistance to the Sri Lankan Government. We have no objection in giving some assistance to the Sri Lankan Government. But giving assistance to the LTTE is not there in the Accord. Then, what should we call it? If you do not want to call it corruption or anything, I have no objection because it is for you to say it.

Sir, again, the credit goes to Pandit

[Sh. N. Venkataratnam]  
 Jawaharlal Nehru who evolved an open society in the Indian democracy. Nothing was secret, as far as his regime was concerned. But what is the present position? In this regime, everything is secret. Nobody knows anything. Bofors is a secret. HDW Submarines is a secret and even Sri Lankan agreement is also a secret. Nobody knows it... (*Interruptions*) For sometime, let me not be disturbed. I would like to submit that as far as our external position is concerned — previously also I was submitting that — distance is making the difference. The longer is the distance, the nations are a bit friendly to us. But nearer our countries, they have become avowed enemies. We are surrounded by all the enemy countries. What is the fate of India? Strictly speaking, around us we can say of Pakistan and China and all other countries. We are surrounded by the enemy countries. How are you going to solve this problem? How are you going to save this country from these people? I would like to submit that our foreign policy is mostly governed by emotional decisions and not by rationale thinking or foresight which was exhibited by Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru at that time... (*Interruptions*)

Let us see now what are the differences with Pakistan. Let us come to that first. There will not be much difference between India and Pakistan. We don't find anything except the emotional issues. As far as China is concerned, we can understand, at least there is a little problem regarding the boundary issue. But what about Pakistan? We are led by emotions. We think just like that. friends have all withdrawn the criticism against these countries. You are making them wilfully and inevitably our enemies. That will not be our foreign policy. Our foreign policy must be friendly as much as possible with all the countries. We must try our best. But, we are not going in that direction. We are going in the direction of making as many enemies as possible with-

out trying to make many friends. So, I would like to submit that let our Government take positive steps to be friendly with these countries. Government may say that they have taken all steps. These are not the positive or practical steps. What I would like to submit is that let the Government think it in positive terms. The Government may say that they have sent that delegation a number of times or they have sent the Secretaries a number of times and all that. But, those are not the steps that were required. Whatever you do and whatever you may like to day, please take the Parliament into confidence. That step is not there at all.

Even in respect of Sri Lanka, the Agreement was arrived at in secrecy; nobody knew it except three or four people. Then it was brought before Parliament and the helpless Parliamentarians were made to vote for it. This is not how things should be done. I would like to suggest: let Parliament be taken into confidence, let there be consultations first.

About delegations, I would like to submit this to the Government. Let delegations go, but not delegations of only Secretaries or goodwill missions by the Prime Minister. Let Parliament be taken into consideration, let all shades of the country be taken into consideration and let delegations go to various countries; let people come in contact with the people of other countries. Let them, after their visit to those countries, finally report to Parliament. Let Parliament discuss the issues and then let us come to conclusions. Nothing of that sort happens.

A number of times delegations have gone to China. But what has happened? Did they move an inch further? So many delegations of Secretaries have gone to Pakistan. But what has been the effect? Even now, one country is an avowed enemy of the other country. This is not how things should be done.

Regarding the expenditure that is incurred, I would like to submit that we are wasting so much money on these unnecessary things, on unnecessary Conferences, unnecessary delegations, unnecessary goodwill tours. All these are unnecessary. How much are we spending in Sri Lanka? I think we are spending Rs. 10 crores each day. And for what purpose? We have sent so many people there and we are exposing them to the greatest danger in Sri Lanka. What is IPKF? The IPKF is only a killing force — Indian People Killing Force. It is not a protection force. They are not able to bring any peace or settle any issue there.

These are a few of my suggestions. Thank you.

"That the Demand under the head Ministry of External Affairs be reduced to Re. 1."

/Failure of Government of India to get round the SAARC members to its view point./ (1)

"That the Demand under the head Ministry of External Affairs be reduced to Re. 1."

/Failure to persuade the African countries to respond to our friendly attitude towards them./ (2)

"That the Demand under the head Ministry of External Affairs be reduced to Re. 1."

/Failure to make the Government of Bangladesh to maintain friendly relations with India./ (3)

"That the Demand under the head Ministry of External Affairs be reduced to Re. 1."

/Failure to impress upon the Government of Sri Lanka to stick to the Accord between the two Governments./ (4)

"That the Demand under the head Ministry of External Affairs be reduced by Rs. 100."

/Inability to persuade the Government of West Germany to disclose the illegal payments made in submarine deal./ (5)

"That the demand under the head Ministry of External Affairs be reduced by Rs. 100."

/Inability to prevent Pakistan from arming itself with nuclear weapons./ (6)

"That the demand under the head Ministry of External Affairs be reduced by Rs. 100."

/Inability to persuade USA from supplying huge armaments to Pakistan including nuclear know-how./ (7)

"That the demand under the head Ministry of External Affairs be reduced by Rs. 100."

/Unimaginative Accord with Sri Lanka to solve its ethnic problem./ (8)

"That the demand under the head Ministry of External Affairs be reduced by Rs. 100."

/Keeping about a million of our soldiers in Sri Lanka and exposing them to danger./ (9)

[Sh. N. Venkataratnam]

"That the demand under the head Ministry of External Affairs be reduced by Rs. 100.

/Inability to achieve the non-alignment objectives./ (10)

"That the demand under the head Ministry of External Affairs be reduced by Rs. 100."

/Inability to achieve SAARC objectives./ (11)

"That the demand under the head Ministry of External Affairs be reduced by Rs. 100."

/Need to prevent killing of Sri Lankan Tamilians by IPKF./ (12)

"That the demand under the head Ministry of External Affairs be reduced by Rs. 100."

/Obstructing the Sri Lankan Tamilians in solving the ethnic problem./ (13)

SHRI B.R. BHAGAT (Arrah): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, I am totally puzzled ..

PROF. K.K. TEWARY (Buxar): Flabbergasted.

SHRI B.R. BHAGAT: .. because the hon. Member who preceded me had the honour of opening this debate. Perhaps, he was not prepared; I can only say that; he may have prepared himself for the debate which ended a few minutes ago, namely, on the Home Ministry; and that was why he started on subjects which were totally unrelated to this debate. Anyway, what he could not do, it has fallen to my lot to do, and I shall try to do my best.

The basic parameters of India's foreign policy have been, or are, well known now all over the world because the Indian foreign policy, after the Second World War and particularly after India's independence, is the only foreign policy which is based on certain basic principles. And for that, throughout our history, after independence, we have paid the price, we have been pressurized, we have suffered, but we have stuck to those basic principles. Today when the world is changing, we see that these very basic principles are now being accepted the world over. What are those basic parameters of India's foreign policy? The first one is to preserve India's sovereign independence. The second is to maintain the freedom of judgement and action from which came out the policy of non-alignment.

15.00 hrs.

Thirdly to promote international peace and stability — basically our commitment to peace has been totally complete and uncompromising. Fourthly to contribute towards a more equitable structure of international economic order in which the development of the scores of countries who emerged free after a process of decolonisation which was set in motion as a result of Indian independent movement — India became independent after a process of decolonisation — to create a proper international economic environment so that there should be equal development in these developing countries who became free after colonial struggle. Fifthly the cooperation; it is a policy of peace and friendship with all countries on the basis of justice, equality and fairplay.

These are the basic five parameters of Indian foreign policy. To quote the architect of this policy, Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, his perception was that he said — now they are coming true; but in the 50s and 60s he was attacked from all sides; but such was his

moral conviction in the correctness of his policies that he pursued it with vigour and now the world is changing as a result of that — 'the world inspite of its rivalries and hatred and inner-conflicts (the word emerged in 50s and 60s — rivalries, hatred and inner-conflicts; it was his great faith and belief) moves inevitably towards closer cooperation and building of a world commonwealth, a world in which there is cooperation of free peoples'. This was Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru's basic belief in the foreign policy of this country.

Since independence what has happened to the thrust of Indian foreign policy? Throughout, the thrust has been towards lowering international tension and emphasizing on disarmament. Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru said in 1954 in the United Nation's General Assembly that there should be complete disarmament both of nuclear and general. Nuclear bombs have no place in the modern world and they have to be destroyed. This was his call in 1954. This was as a result of the emphasis of India's foreign policy on disarmament and strengthening of world peace and peaceful co-existence.

In a world with different social and economic system the only practical way to survive was the peaceful co-existence among various countries, irrespective of their economic and social status and building bridges of friendship and cooperation among various countries.

From this basic policy, now emerged in our foreign relationship a policy of non-alignment. Because the world at that time was divided into powerful military blocks. Therefore the only way to preserve peace, to promote a climate of cooperation, friendship, peace and stability was a policy of non-alignment with the opposing power blocks. Such a policy flows naturally from India's own independence movement. Non-violence of Mahatma Gandhi has also been truly in keeping with our national interest.

What are our national interests? There are two ways for achieving our national interests. One is the narrow self-interest of a nation which has always taken it to a chauvinistic way and has resulted in lot of strife, confrontation, hegemonism and all the evils of the international system — domination, imperialism, colonialism and today neo-colonialism and neo-imperialism. All these are results of the pursuit of narrow self-interest by certain powerful countries. India has rejected this right from the very beginning. We followed national interest, of course, but it is enlightened national interest which is distinct from the narrow national interest followed by some powerful countries resulting in catastrophe for the world.

Then the other criteria of our foreign policy apart from following enlightened national interest is safeguarding national security. It is an important element and particularly when there is attempt of confrontation and domination by the powerful countries over the others you have to pursue the foreign policy with a view to protecting your national security interest. This we did.

The third criteria is promoting the cause of international peace and cooperation. If you apply these three criteria of enlightened national interest, of pursuing our national security interest and a policy of peace, friendship and cooperation with other countries then you see our foreign policy has not only been consistent but also we have followed it with a certain amount of success. No foreign policy can be an unqualified success but I say the success that this foreign policy has achieved is a landmark in the world after the second World War. Therefore, while there is room for improvement in the actual and specific conduct of foreign policy in international relations speaking in general terms our foreign policy has largely achieved these objectives and this criteria.

Today India's standing in the interna-

[Sh. B.R. Bhagat]

tional arena continues to be high. India is respected all over. Many countries have sought our help and counsel. Even though there are conflicts and confrontation among different countries, both sides even today and earlier like Korea and Vietnam sought our help. In the international control system of Vietnam India was the Chairman. In Korea India was the Chairman. In Cyprus India was the Chairman. In 1950s and 1960s India was badly sought after for peace keeping operations. Even today in various conflicts India has played a role of conciliation and this role is still being played. This has been due lot to the charismatic and dynamic leadership provided in the conduct of our foreign policy by our three charismatic Prime Ministers — Prime Minister Nehru in the 1950s and 1960s and his daughter Prime Minister Indira Gandhi who provided the thrust of the security interest combining national security interest with the conduct of the foreign policy. During the Bangladesh crisis India was faced with the biggest challenge, the nuclear challenge, the Seventh Fleet and the signing of the Peace and Friendship Treaty with the Soviet Union at that moment, made it known to all the capitals of the world; particularly the capitals of the world who mattered, that here was the leader who understood the fundamentals of the modern international relations in which the power, the military power, the security perceptions and the objectives of Indian foreign policy are well-connected. You can see evidence of it in the writings of such persons, who were not very friendly to India — President Nixon or Henry Kissinger.

Now, it is by our present Prime Minister, Shri Rajiv Gandhi. You have seen the dynamism he has provided. Firstly, he has continued the great traditions in pursuit of the fundamental objectives of foreign policy and the new challenges that are there in the conduct of relationship or in trying to ease the basic confrontations that are raging all over. He has played a very notable part. Only

this morning, you have seen the statement on his visit to Japan. His visit has imparted a new thrust or a new impetus to the relations between India and Japan. Mr. Natwar Singh has quoted Prime Minister Takeshita saying that during his first visit in November 1985 and his second visit again today and in-between a visit while going to Vancouver, he had provided a new impetus and thrust to the relationship between India and Japan. In the coming months or in the decades, this relationship between India and Japan is going to be very important in the affairs of Asia and in the peace and stability of Asia. Also in the development of India itself, it is going to be important.

So, what has emerged today? This is the point. What is the image of India that the three Prime Ministers — Shri Jawaharlal Nehru, Shrimati Indira Gandhi and Shri Rajiv Gandhi — have projected and they are projecting today? It is that here is a country which follows its policy of certain basic principles which never compromises and here is a country which is non-pressurisable force, positive force, in the international arena today and it is always taking up any dynamics of the international affairs, positive, forward-looking on all policies. Whether it is our relations with our neighbours, whether it is relations with the big powers, whether it is big issues like South Africa, apartheid, eliminating colonialism racism from that last vestige, India — particularly Prime Minister Rajiv Gandhi — has taken a personal interest in setting up the new institutions — the Africa Fund and various other things — taking a lead in this.

The Palestinian people are fighting for the freedom of their country. They are playing the biggest price today. They are unafraid of any amount of the barbaric repression unleashed on them by Israel with mightier force. They are not yielding. They are not relenting. They are not afraid of them. While trying to solve this problem through



the forum of Non-Aligned Movement or through the United Nations systems, India has taken a lead. In any field, India has taken the lead, say, in the disarmament. You call it the most important problem that the mankind faces today, whether we go on for the accelerated arms race, nuclearisation, accelerated nuclear arms race which will ultimately result in holocaust and the complete extinction of the human race from this planet. The Delhi declaration in March 1983 by the Prime Minister, Smt. Indira Gandhi, and the whole world takes it over, and then the six-nation initiative where this matter is followed up very concretely giving a solution in order to proceed towards disarmament. There should be a comprehensive test ban agreement and there should be verification system and in all this concretisation, India is at the front. Similarly is our relations with our neighbours because the resources of all countries are not limited but our country's resources are limited. Therefore, in order to effectively pursue a foreign policy which is successful, which is more effective, we have to have an area of priorities and we have to have to follow the policies in a given frame of time on a selective basis. What are these priorities areas that we have to determine? The first priority, according to me, is the improvement of relations with our neighbours. In this way, we have seen the South Asia. This is the area in which we have a climate of cooperation and flourishing development like in SAARC where already valuable progress has been made. Areas of cooperation have been identified. Therefore, an area of collective identity, collective spirit of cooperation is developing and so far as India is concerned, it has good relations with most of the neighbours like Bangladesh, with Nepal, our relationship is growing everyday as also with Bhutan during the last two years. The only contry with Which our relationship shrinked is with Pakistan. As a result of the Accord signed in Geneva — there again it is because we have traditional relationship with Afghanistan, we have par-

ticipated in the development of Afghanistan. We have a number of on-going cooperative projects. We have very good relations and we have taken a possession of certain principles during eight or nine years of strife in Afghanistan. We have welcomed the Geneva Accord and we hope that as a result of this accord and with the withdrawal of the Soviet troops, peace will return and we are not unmindful of the negative forces. First was the symmetrical withdrawal of the troops. Najib Government is there, there help to the rebels and the Mujahideens, the US help — I consider all these as negative factors. Pakistan is trying to put its spokes in the wheels of the agreement that there should be an interim Government or pre-conditions which they have hopefully solved and the withdrawal process will start from 15th May onwards. But the point is that the attitude of Pakistan in this respect has been purely opportunistic. They have been accumulating arms and they have got enormous benefits in terms of arms and successfully year after year, they progress and they thought that they have a real threat from Afghanistan. Now, this threat disappears but still the arms supply continues. Only yesterday, the Home Minister gave a report on this that as a result of the withdrawal or normalisation, peace is returning on their borders with Afghanistan. They have started withdrawing their troops and concentrating on the India and Pakistan side. The transfer of the rangers to the regular troops is there.

Then the worst thing that could happen, and on which I am glad the Government has warned the country, is that the Pakistan once again is playing a dangerous game. It is the dangerous game that they are playing. As the Home Minister describes, they are trying their dubious ways to create the trouble in Jammu and Kashmir. Proof after proof have been given with regard to their active involvement, their upgraded involvement in the supply of sophisticated weapons in the parts of Punjab and their giving training to

[Sh. B.R. Bhagat]

them but still the Pakistan Government, the highest level, says that they have no hand in it. Their mounting of troops, their un-declared war in Punjab and all this amount to, I hope not, that they may not try to create a very serious situation. Already the Government has warned and the country is prepared for any misadventure on their behalf. It can happen. They have done in the past and they can do it now also. We cannot trust them. But all the same our policy in this regard has been very consistent because whatever Pakistan is doing, we are interested in building a durable structure of peace with Pakistan, as we are having with other neighbour countries.

Again, mainly through the initiative of the Prime Minister, through his personal and great initiative to build up or normalise relations with Pakistan, several steps were taken. The Defence Secretary, Home Secretary, the Foreign Secretary, they went there and signed a number of agreements. The Trade protocol was signed. There has been an agreement, a discussion, on Siachin. Their involvement in the terrorists activities in Punjab has also been discussed by the Home Secretary. The cultural and various other matters have been discussed. The rail link in sind area has also been agreed but Pakistan has gone back on all these. Now, they say they do not want to discuss or talk of Siachin. They do not want to discuss anything. On the top of it they say that we are not doing anything. This is the situation. That is why we feel that this is due to the fact that Pakistan is being built as a strategically in this field. Earlier Iran was there but after its collapse, Pakistan has taken its place. This is the real problem.

Again, our Prime Minister has successfully taken steps to build up or improve our relations with the United State of America. There is the commonality of the political system between our two countries. There

has been a record of relations, personal relations, between India and the United States of America. Not only there have been peaks and valleys in our relations but there have been smaller peaks and deeper valleys. Always the relations have been abrasive. There is no problem between India and the United States of America but the main problem has been that there is a basic difference in the global strategic perception of Super-power like the United States of America and the perception of the regional national interest in the region of India.

We have always been telling that we want to build durable peace. It is our basic policy. This again is recognised by many and the Americans should know it. Henry Kissinger wrote that there was a time in 1971 when India could have destroyed Pakistan if India wanted Pakistan's destruction. Kissinger wrote in his book that they were so afraid when the Pakistani army collapsed in Bangladesh and India was in a position to make a swift run upto Peshawar. Militarily, India could have done anything to Pakistan. She could have broken Pakistan into three or four. And I may tell you that this is not our opinion. This is the written rather documented opinion of Henry Kissinger, the chief person dealing with this issue at that time. But, what happened at that time? Prime Minister Indira Gandhi declared unilateral ceasefire. If she had any idea of dismembering or destroying Pakistan, we could have done it. But, she said even on the floor of this House not once but many times that a dismembered Pakistan, a weak and unstable Pakistan would not be in our interest. We wish well of the people of Pakistan, of the Government of Pakistan.

But now see the situation here. Firstly, Pakistan is following the path of nuclear weapons. We have to deal with such a situation because it affects our national security. It is a threat to us. Secondly, I would like to mention about their involvement in the

undeclared war in the Punjab. We have made known all these factors to the United States of America because Pakistan is emboldened by the policy of America by the help that they are getting and by the qualified weapons that they are getting from the US. In spite of all these things, when Mr. Carlucci came here, we were happy to note that there were positive elements in our relations with the United States of America. They are our biggest trade partners. Our biggest investment is the half a million Indians living in America who make great contribution to the American economy. It is recognised even by their own President. Indians are the most beneficial minority in the United States of America. This is the statement of President Reagan. Then, we have the memorandum of understanding, signed during Prime Minister Indira Gandhi's time. It was followed by our Prime Minister's visit in 1985 and later in October 1985. As many as 5,000 items of trade are there including things like light combat aircraft and so on. These are the positive elements in our relation. But their pursuit of a policy of building up Pakistan as a strategic ally in this region is coming in the way of improving our relations further. I do not know why they pursue the policy of domination. They did the same in Iran also and during Shah's time, Iran was dominating the Persian Gulf region, with American help. Similarly, now Pakistan is being allowed to follow the old concept of dominating a region. As long as America pursues such a policy, the parameters of improving our relations with the United States of America are also limited. So, Sir, this is the prevailing situation. In this respect also, while we must be alert in protecting our national interests from any misadventure on the part of Pakistan, we do believe in following a policy of promoting relations with Pakistan. And we hope that they realise the predicament of their own position. I say this because what they are following is a destructive policy. They may cause harm to us but they will destroy themselves in the process.

Now, our other neighbour is Sri Lanka. We have involved ourselves. Our involvement in Sri Lanka by invitation was far better thing than a unilateral action. The Agreement which was signed had been welcomed by everybody, except again by Pakistan. Our Army had gone there for an agreed political process. Therefore, at this stage we cannot afford to withdraw it without serious loss of credibility, until its task has been completed in its entirety. What is the task — Disarming the LTTE which has gone back upon its words, which refused to transform itself from a military process to a democratic process despite the agreement. Disarming the LTTE is one of the aspects. It is nearly completed. The other aspect is establishment of a peaceful process. That is a Constitution Amendment which has been done. Elections to provincial councils are to take place. Unification of the Northern and Eastern provinces have to be done so that the Tamil minorities there have an identity and security in order to play their part in that country. So, this is the task which has to be completed. Whatever difficulties have arisen, I think those difficulties can be solved, only if there is, as I said, a national consciousness. So we have to develop that. We have to complete that task. But I would say, nothing should be allowed to interfere in the process of the completion of the constitutional process, the elections, unification and other things, which have been agreed to. It is not only the LTTE which is a stumbling-block but there are other extremist elements — like the JVC — which also come in the way of a peaceful settlement of the problem. We have to disarm them. We have to bring them into a political process. So here we have undertaken a task. It affects our security interests. This should be realised. It is in our security interest that Sri Lanka should emerge as a stable, and peaceful unit. For solving this problem, there should be no outside interference. This is important. This we will pursue, rather we have pursued it. So our priority area is relationship with the

[Sh. B.R. Bhagat]

Soviet Union. It is fundamental. The friendship and co-operation of the Soviet Union over the year last 35 years has been the bedrock of our foreign policy. We are happy to note that unlike any other relations, it has not got any setbacks, any time. This is very important. It has gone from strength to strength, like a mighty Ganga, which has proceeded further. It has benefited both the countries. It is not only in the mutual interest of both the countries, but the criteria of a good relationship which is of mutual interest of both the countries is based on certain principles — principles of peaceful co-existence, principles of peace and stability. This is based on certain high principles which had gone from strength to strength. It has served our national interest, particularly, at the time when we were threatened by mighty forces, the co-operation with the Soviet Union had helped us. Today it has reached out to new branches — science and technology, joint production programme, cultural exchanges and so on. You see the people to people relationship. You can see an example, in the present day world, how two countries, with different systems — political systems — combine and make up a powerful movement. It is not only for both the countries but it is in the interest of the one billion population of Soviet Union and India but it is also a recognised factor of peace and stability in this part of the world of Asia and also the world over. This is the basis of relationship, and this should be the basis of relationship.

Similarly, China is our great neighbour. We are trying again, here. Of course, the process was started by Prime Minister Indira Gandhi when she upgradated our representation by the appointment of an Ambassador. Ambassadors were appointed, but during the time of Prime Minister Rajiv Gandhi, he have it a momentum. In his very first meeting in New York with the then Prime Minister of China Zhao Ziyang, he said: 'Let us get down to work, to improve our rela-

tions.' There have been a number of boundary talks. It is true that our boundary talks with China are deadlocked for years, for lack of a clear direction, and being embittered by the experience of 1962, and having been handed down the legacy of suspicion and distrust on both the sides. But it is being realized that we have to upgrade these talks. Now they have to be upgraded to a higher level. It is not an easy subject. It will take time. It requires patience and skill to solve this question. The problem between us, viz. the boundary question, requires patience; but the most important thing is that a climate of mutual confidence has to be created. The climate is vitiated by some things happening, as it happened in the Sumdorong Chu valley last year, as also any confrontation and other things. So, I think that the first point in pursuing, improving, developing and normalizing relations with China is the agreement of the two Governments that peace and tranquility must be maintained on the border.

SHRI VIR SEN (Khurja): Even though 40,000 Kms. of our land is being occupied by them?

SHRIB.R. BHAGAT: I am not coming to that. That is a part of the final settlement.

SHRI VIR SEN: Even inspite of that, do we have to keep peace?

SHRI B.R. BHAGAT: Is it your perception that we should go to war with them?

I am saying that this is a very complex question handed down down to us. We have to have a long-term view on this. We have to show patience and skill. The highest amount of patience and skill are required. But the point is that there has to be an agreement. Peace and tranquility are to be maintained on this border, so that there can be mutual confidence, when both the sides are willing to develop relations and solve this question

peacefully. We should arrive at a negotiated settlement. That is the point I am making.

I know they are in occupation of a vast amount of our territory. But the settlement can be there only through negotiations and peaceful methods. This is also agreed. This is the national consensus here too. They have also agreed to this. Therefore, if we pursue that line, the first important thing is that peace and tranquility should be maintained. There should be a climate of confidence. Meanwhile, we should try to renew and re-vitalize mutual relations. This will help us in building a climate of mutual trust. This is being done, because the exchanges between the two countries are many now. Almost every month you have not only Government delegations, but also private delegations, trade delegations, and exchanges. We have now entered into a trade agreement involving, of course only \$ 150 million to \$ 200 million, a modest sum, seeing the economy of the two countries — of trade this year. But the scope is enormous. Similarly, there is scope for science and technology. Our delegation has gone there, and visited their computer industry. Their delegation has come, and they have visited our construction, steel and other industries.

Various things are going on to create confidence among the people. This will help in achieving world peace. There should be a firm realisation. We have made it known to the Chinese Government. I hope they will also have this belief that peaceful and cooperative relations between the two countries will be beneficial not only for the two countries but also for the whole world. They are two joint developing countries having enormous problems of their own. Therefore, it is beneficial to both the countries to have peaceful and good relations. It is also beneficial for peace and stability in Asia. If China and India promote peaceful and cooperative relations and try to solve their problems in a peaceful and negotiated way, it will completely trans-

form the relations in Asia and in the whole world.

Similarly, in this, we took the position of Afghanistan and tried to help the process of reconciliation and agreement. In Kampuchea also I think India has played a positive role in which we will ultimately see a solution of that problem, a negotiated solution of that problem. The Prime Minister had been there. He had earlier talks also. I think slowly we are moving towards a solution which will be helpful to all.

I would like to make a reference to the great role. India is playing with regard to disarmament and development. We had signed an INS treaty. A few days before, nobody believed that this treaty could have been signed, but it had been signed for the first time. It happened that the two greatest nuclear powers agreed to eliminate a part, a particular part of their nuclear arsenals — short range missiles. They have also agreed to meet again and make 50 per cent reduction in the strategic missiles. Earlier the talks were on limitation of nuclear weapons. There was a SALT I Agreement; then there was a SALT II Agreement. But this is elimination, reduction, absolute reduction of the nuclear weapons. Even though 4 to 5 per cent of the weapons are to be eliminated, I hope a climate is being created which will lead to further reduction of weapons.

India has played a role in this. I want to emphasize on this point. There was a time when these two powers were not talking at all; whether it was in Geneva or Helsinki or in Spain or Madrid or it was Star War or European security; all the talks were deadlocked; they were suspended. At that point of time, in the NAM India played a role. The Prime Minister of India, Shrimati Indira Gandhi gave a call by saying that if the manufacture of nuclear weapons continued and accelerated, then the whole mankind will be in peril. Then on 21st May, 1984, she initiated the

[Sh. B.R. Bhagat]

Six-Nation Summit and provided a concrete framework to bring confidence in the world. It helped in creating a political will throughout the world. Today the position is that as a result of this not only the agreement has been signed but it has paved a way for future bigger agreements; it has also changed the whole language. Imagine the language. President Reagan at one time took an oath and said, the Soviet system is an evil empire and has to be destroyed. That were his words. Now they are cooperating and collaborating. When Mr. Shultz went to Moscow last time, the Press men asked him whether Soviet troops will be withdrawn from Afghanistan. He said, yes, they will be withdrawn. He further said, I give you a word for them. That is, the language has changed. Even, as I said, in Nicaragua, the Congress there, we have a positive constituency in the United States — luckily it calls itself a democratic system. We have the intelligentsia, the media, a large number of people, democratically thinking people, people in the Congress, and others they think; now they said the other day after General Secretary Mr. Gorbachev went there, there was an opinion poll and it was declared that he was the most popular man in the United States of America.

Similarly, Prime Minister Rajiv Gandhi is a great personality among the people. Because they know, the democratic people think that because of the compulsions of the old thinking, the compulsions of the old logic, domination of power, especially of nuclear power, are there which control the American system of the military industrial complex. Even the President, the mighty President of the Congress, is not able to speak the language of the people. But ultimately when things happen, the thaw comes, it opens like a flood gate and I believe the flood gate is opening and in this process I must say the Prime Minister has played his role, General Secretary Gorbachev has played his role, and President Reagan has played his role.

All this goes towards that goal. Therefore, lastly, I say, that the point I would like to make is that on the whole there is a radical change in the world today and the language has changed. Once the process of disarmament takes place, we can see it. We saw it in the Delhi Declaration. The Delhi Declaration spoke of nuclear-free world and the non-violent world. The fusion of the Great October Revolution, the concept of peaceful co-existence and the Gandhian principles of independence — independent movement of non-violence — have been seen. The ideas of these two great revolutionary events in the history have been seen. But this also underlies the change that has taken place because it says that in a nuclear-free world, in a non-nuclear weapons world, the conduct of foreign relations has to be on the basis of non-violence. And you see the change, the complete change, and that is responsible. If you are able to enforce it slowly for the two big powers to cooperate and collaborate on this basis, then similarly the whole language has changed.

The second change that has taken place is in the economic field. Although the international economic environment is very hostile to developing countries like India and India has survived it, and it is another credit for India that in this deteriorating international environment we have survived. We have maintained our self-reliance, we have maintained our dignity and the progress, the industrialisation, the second industrial revolution that has been set in motion by Prime Minister, Rajiv Gandhi of this country — higher technology, higher productivity and all round swift of the process, the economic processes. They say, in the context already we were doing too much on ourselves. But today, wherever you go, you see the assistance. Although Pakistan has got 4 Billion dollars, India's assistance is being reduced to a pittance of 35 million dollars now. But we have not asked for anything. It can be reduced to zero. There was a time when this

assistance was reduced to zero. Certainly we never asked for it. We stand on our own legs.

Therefore, the situation is that the whole international situation is changing. The dominance of the United States of America in the economic world is being challenged by countries like Japan or the stiff competition from Japan and other countries in the Western Europe. Now, today what is the situation? There is a collapse of the stock market, and the dollar is declining. The deficit is astronomical. A deficit of 70 billion dollars in the United States! The opportunities for American investment are coming down because there is a stiff competition. There are others who can come in. Japan is there. Germany is there, and then there is the threat.

Now, America has become a protectionist country. America was all the time opposing our development of public sector, because we were trying to follow a selective process in our trade liberalisation. America is saying 'you are protectionist'. But, today the biggest country, which is following the protectionist policy, is the United States of America. Our Prime Minister has rightly shown a foresight in building up relations with a country of importance, Japan. We have good relations with a country of importance, Japan. We have good relations with Japan. In the next decade or so, the economic relations between India and Japan will reach a new impetus. Our Prime Minister has opened a fast channel. I think, if it goes, it will serve India's economic strength and economic self-reliance. We have relations of peace and friendship on the basis of equality and justice and fairplay. Americans have never followed this policy. Some of the Western European imperialist countries have not followed this policy. We did it with the Soviet Union, with the socialist countries, with the non-aligned countries and now with other countries in Western

Europe — Germany, Italy, France and others, and more particularly with Japan. This is a new radical change in the situation. Therefore, it calls for a new orientation and a new thinking.

Although the basic principles with which our foreign policy has started in 1947 under the leadership of Jawaharlal Nehru, who is the main architect of our foreign policy, each one of them has stood the test of time, and today we are in a situation, that in the Delhi Declaration signed between our Prime Minister Shri Rajiv Gandhi and the General Secretary Mr. Gorbachev, we said that, we are for a nuclear weapon free and non-violent world; and in this, the conduct of international relations shall be governed on the basis of peaceful co-existence; shall be governed on the basis of mutual trust, equality and not on the basis of domination. The conduct of international relations in a changing world will be done on the basis of non-violence, and that is the charter of the future.

With these words, I conclude.

SHRI SURESH KURUP (Kottayam):  
Mr. Deputy-Speaker Sir, over the years, foreign policy has emerged as a policy, which represents the consensus of the people of our country with non-alignment as its basis and its basic thrust on anti-imperialist policies.

Sir, this policy represents the aspirations of the anti-imperialist forces all over the world. It is not a policy of a particular Government or a particular party. It is the policy of our country and the people. That is why, even while opposing the anti-people policies of this Government, we have always given support to the foreign policy initiatives of our Government.

Sir, this discussion takes place in the background of one important event, which took place in the international relations, that

[Sh. Suresh Kurup]  
is, signing of the INF treaty. It may be a small step, but definitely it is a significant step and all the peace loving people of the world look forward to more and more such initiatives from all the parties concerned.

15.55 hrs.

[SHRI VAKKOM PURUSHOTHAMAN *in the Chair*]

Our country has played a role with other members of the six-nations in helping the signing of this treaty. And this signing was possible only because of the vision and initiative shown by Soviet Communist Party General Secretary, Mikhail Gorbachev. I use this occasion to extend our greetings to the valuable initiative he took in this regard.

Another important event which took place and which is of significance to us, is the signing of the Geneva Agreement regarding Afghanistan. As we all know, this is important to us and it will help reduce tension in this part of the world.

Another major event relating to our neighbour was the signing of the Indo-Sri Lanka Agreement last year. I hope that this agreement will finally succeed in spite of many criticisms levelled against it. We are still optimistic about the final success of this agreement. If we go through last year's debate, each and every Member who took part in the discussion expressed serious concern about the growing imperialistic involvement — American and Pakistani involvement — into Sri Lanka and threat posed to our security. After one year, we can proudly say that to a certain extent, we have succeeded in stopping the imperialist manoeuvres in the ethnic conflict of Sri Lanka. It is my sincere hope that the LTTE militants will understand the futility of fighting the IPKF forces, who are there to help the Tamil population and who are there to successfully

implement the Accord. I hear that some kind of talks are going on between LTTE representatives and the Government of India. I would like the Minister to come forward with more information regarding that.

One of the positive aspects of this report is that it mentions about the efforts that are going on for normalisation of relations with China. Our party has consistently took the position that the relations with our country and China should be normalised, that only through negotiations and talks all the disputes regarding boundary and other things can be resolved. This report shows that some sincere and serious efforts are going on regarding that. There are also reports about our Prime Minister going to meet the Chinese leaders and the whole country is eagerly looking forward for that meeting and the successful outcome of that meeting.

16.00 hrs.

One important thing regarding our foreign policy is our relations with Pakistan and American involvement in aiding and arming Pakistan against our country. This Report mentions that Pakistan is aiding and abetting the terrorists of Punjab. But nothing is mentioned about America's involvement in aiding the forces which are trying to destabilise our country. It is a matter of concern that we are madly after the American defence system and the American weapons. A curious situation is emerging. It is an important factor in the American strategy that they are arming Pakistan like anything. Of course, after the fall of the Shah of Iran, Pakistan occupies a major position in the American tactics in this area. On the one hand they are arming Pakistan and on the other hand we are depending more and more on US sophisticated weapons and arms. Within a span of one year, it is a matter of great concern that two Defence Secretaries of America have visited our country, and Mr. Carlucci has made it absolutely clear that even after the



withdrawal of the Soviet troops from Afghanistan, they are going to aid Pakistan like before. They are going to supply them the sophisticated arms. That he has made clear on our soil. In this Report, we are soft-peddalling on all these issues. When we mention about USA, the only major difference between USA and our country, which is mentioned here, is that America is aiding the nuclear programme of Pakistan. It gives the impression that there is no other difference. This aid for the nuclear programme of Pakistan comes from their whole strategic perspectives regarding this area. They are giving sophisticated weapons to Pakistan. It is a part of that programme that they are helping them for going nuclear. Why this Report is not mentioning anything about that, I want to know. Sometimes the leaders of the ruling party will say that foreign forces are trying to destabilise our country. Yes. We also agree. But one fine morning our Prime Minister says that USA is not at all involved in any sort of destabilisation activities in our country. How did he find it out? Now more and more American ships are coming to our force with nuclear weapons and more and more agreements are being signed... (*Interruptions*)

PROF. K.K. TIWARI (Buxar): No, it is wrong. No ships with nuclear weapons have come.

SHRI SURESH KURUP: No. He evades the whole question when the question is raised. How can he say? There is no proof, no guarantee.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Kurup, come to the point.

SHRI SURESH KURUP: More and more agreements are being signed everyday. Our officers are going to United States for training... (*Interruptions*)

SHRI SYED SHAHABUDDIN: They had been going even in Nehru's time.

SHRI SURESH KURUP: The Vaccine Agreement was signed and they say they have been going right from Nehru's time. But now with the aid of Ford Foundation our officers are going there, for higher studies or for higher research or what for, I do not know... (*Interruptions*)

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Kurien, please don't disturb him. Yes, Mr. Kurup... (*Interruptions*)

SHRI SURESH KURUP: Sir, all these things have to be taken serious note of and one important thing that causes us serious concern is our increasing debt. Sir, already IMF and the World Bank are imposing conditions regarding our policies, very vital internal fiscal policies and I genuinely fear that ultimately it is going to affect our foreign policy also because both are inter-linked and according to a Seminar held in Helsinki regarding the Third World debt, they considered India as the fifth country in the order of foreign debts, other four being Brazil, Mexico, Argentina and South Korea. Sir, we all know what their economy is and their policies are. So, this is a very important matter and I think the Government will not carry forward with this policy which will ultimately lead our country to a debt trap. One of our major campaigns all these years is making the Indian Ocean as a zone of peace. I think, now we are soft peddling on this issue. Nothing has been mentioned about Diego Garcia in this whole report. Shall I understand that America has taken away all its nuclear armaments from Diego Garcia? Why has nothing been mentioned here? Why are we keeping low regarding our campaign of making the Indian Ocean as a zone of peace? What about the Conference which we wanted to convene regarding this?

Sir, I expect the hon. Minister would mention about the Iran-Iraq war and escalation of the conflict there and more and more involvement of imperialist powers there. It is

[Sh. Suresh Kurup]  
of serious concern to us.

Now, Sir, a very serious struggle by the Palestinian people are going on in the occupied areas and Zionist culprits have killed one of the brave sons of the Palestinian Liberation Movement. I use this occasion to condemn this brutal killing and extend our solidarity to the fighting people of Palestine. Sir, I am sorry to mention here that when India was playing Davis Cup in Israel, that issue came up. Our Prime Minister made it clear that we are not going to Israel for playing Davis Cup, because brutal repression is going on in occupied area. This is not our policy. All these years we consistently opposed to any relation with Israel and we never had any sort of relations with that country. Now, what the Government has made clear is that even if there was no such repression or aggression upon Palestinian people going on, we would have gone there and played the game. That is a very sorry state of affairs, I would like to say.

Sir, another point I would like to make is about Fiji. Of course, the report mentions about it and the Minister should make it clear what steps we are contemplating for the people of Indian origin whose life and property are insecure in the present political situation in Fiji. So, Sir, as I have mentioned in the beginning in regard to our overall foreign policy perspective, we have extended our support. But again I reiterate that it is a matter of great concern that we are soft peddling on the US arming of Pakistan and the US involvement in de-stabilising our country and we are depending more and more on America for sophisticated weapon and other aids. With these words, I conclude.

PROF. K.K. TEWARY (Buxar): Mr. Chairman, Sir, I take this opportunity to extend my congratulations to the Prime Minister and the Government for the pursuit of our basic objectives in the field of foreign

policy and this pursuit in recent years has borne fruits which are there for everybody to see. Whether it is our fight against the genocide and terror unleashed in South Africa or Zionist oppression in Palestine, we have been one with the struggling people there for the freedom and right for self-determination and their rightful claims to their homeland. Besides this point, under the leadership of our Prime Minister steps have been taken during the last two years on international peace, security and a new international economic order. Specially in the field of international peace, Sir, the six-nation initiative or other measures taken from different world for a have contributed largely to the building up of public opinion even in countries where nuclear weapons and arsenals have been built up over the years. There also there is a grounds well of public opinion in favour of disarmament, peace and a new environment of cooperation and peaceful co-existence. This goes to the credit of our Prime Minister who has relentlessly followed this objective and these objectives emerged from our basic perceptions in the field of international relations.

Sir, the previous speakers, specially Mr. Bhagat and my young colleague from the CPI (M) have highlighted certain points. Mr. Bhagat made a marathon speech, I have nothing more interesting to add to that. I would only say, the foreign policy, the broad parameters of India's foreign policy have emerged after a long and sustained struggle of the Indian people both during the freedom struggle and after freedom struggle, that is, after Independence, during the course of consolidation of this nation. Our policy of non-alignment, of total rejection of any pressure from any quarters or any group or any bloc and our fierce adherence to our basic right as a nation, a self-respecting independent nation, for freedom of action on any major international issue. These have been basic parameters that have been sustained and I can say that India's freedom struggle

and consolidation of Indian State as the leader of non-aligned movement have unleashed certain historical forces. India is the seat of a very ancient civilization which was unfortunately for nearly 200 years under the tutelage of British imperialism. When India started its war of Independence, then certain historical forces were released and they got recognition as basic historical forces which were to shape the future of the world in every respect, after the Second World War. It is for everybody to see how India's freedom struggle ignited the desire for freedom all over the globe and humanity in chain, enslave anywhere started aspiring, not only aspiring but struggling for freedom. It was India's struggle for freedom and relentless fight against colonialism against all the barbarities imposed on enslaved countries, colonised countries by imperialist forces that became the major dominant trend in organising international public opinion and also in organising, in forming the international relations among the nations of the world.

In this perspective, without going into history of these developments, I would like to highlight certain points which are of crucial importance to us as a nation and they are also crucial for international peace and stability. As has been mentioned earlier, INF Treaty and Geneva Agreement on Afghanistan are very welcome developments and they have definitely established that there is now a thaw in the international scenario. The tension is ebbing away, perhaps I would say. But there is definitely a thaw in the international tension. Two Super-powers have realised it, basically in their own interests first and in the interest of international community also, because international community has been asserting itself, specially the Non-Aligned countries for quite some time, that a peaceful environment is the *summum bonum* of international peace and security. But while international environment is reassuring, our immediate environment, the environment in our neighbourhood appears

to me to be rather fragile. The factors which are militating against stable environment in our neighbourhood must be identified with realism and I can add, with sharper perception of the basic historical forces at work. I am told that gullibility has been one of the dominant features of Indian character. We are taken in by glib talk and outward trappings of friendliness and promises and it is unfortunate that for centuries — we have written history of centuries — a very heavy price that this nation had to pay for this lapse which I may call simplicity, if I may use a stronger term then, gullibility". What is happening in our neighbourhood is so clear, so thundering almost in the shenanigan of Pakistan. But what is the real role of Pakistan? How has Pakistan emerged and what roles were assigned to Pakistan? Pakistan is a creation, is an artificial creation. It has been described in different terms by historians but it is a historical monstrosity and it was created to perform a certain assigned role.

Pakistan has not come out of that role or area of activity carved out for it by its mentors and by its masters. In this perspective, if you look at the problems that we are facing, we have been talking about while discussing our internal affairs, it is proved to the hilt that we need not go into laborious researches to establish that Pakistan is playing a very dangerous game. But at whose behest, whose hatchet men Pakistan is? When we were talking in this very House in relation to our neighbour, Pakistan, some people were waxing eloquence about Pakistan's problems should know that new weapon systems supplied almost free of cost as weapons are manufactured and rolled out of American industrial centres and as they are integrated into American defence system, they are equally easily transferred to Pakistan. Pakistan has been playing that role and they said this is there because of Afghanistan embrolio. Now, that chapter is fortunately coming to an end. Soviets are withdrawing from Afghanistan.

[Sh. K.K. Tewary]

But what is future scenario of Afghanistan? Are we going to limit ourselves only to the time when this Afghanistan question arose and evaluate Pakistan's role and Pakistan's potential for mischief only in this immediate past or are we also going to evaluate the role of our immediate distant neighbour? The immediate distant neighbour of India is America. With American presence in the Indian Ocean, its preponderant presence with Central Command, or in Persian Gulf with the rapid deployment of forces and Pakistan's role in carrying out the behest of imperialism, these issues, Mr. Foreign Minister, have to be gone into. Pakistan has been aided and abetted by Americans. Have you forgotten the Baghdad history right from 50s? I talk of historical forces and the historical forces are still operating. Super-powers perceptions of global scene, of global situation and historical forces that India represents and, I am sure, India will continue to represent, and fortunately, as I look at the international scene, this world is not going to remain by polar. It is going to become multipolar in not too distant future. In this world India as the bulwark and the vanguard of the new historical force of freedom, non-alignment, of peace, as the historical forces opposed to hegemonism, opposed to interventionism, may play a dominant role. India has to pursue this path. Therefore, I say, let us look at this perspective, this threat posed by Pakistan, so blatant, so concrete, in Punjab. Was this threat not perceived in the three wars that Pakistan waged against us? With whose weapons this started right from the time Pakistan was created? From 1950s onwards a string of pacts were created and Pakistan was sucked into that and that situation in a different form and in a different context has been continuing - whether it is supply of weapons to Pakistan or anything. I would like to put to this House one question when I talk of Pakistan. When we talk of Pakistan, is it not a fact Mr. Foreign Minister that similar camps, camps for training terror-

ists and people who are being prepared to spread the poison in India for its eventual dismemberment, for its eventual destruction exist there? Don't you find that similar forces are active in other countries also? Don't you find that these forces have links with terrorists being trained in Pakistan? Don't you find these forces operating from the soil of a number of European countries? I will come to that a little later.

Sir, there is a link, an unmistakable link between the terrorists being trained in Pakistan and the help, guidance they get from many countries in Europe, America, Canada and a number of other sources. The threat perception of India's security has to be very clear. This threat is, perhaps, the ultimate. We cannot face a greater threat than the threat to the very survival of India. Your Ministry of External Affairs has been highlighting this and I am very happy and I congratulate you. You have been very rightly pointing out the forces which are at work. But, Mr. Foreign Minister, one discordant note, I have to add to it. As I have said already, we have to weigh the consequences, pros and cons of all our relationship. We must improve our relationship with all countries. But, we have to realise the limitations put by historical factors. Your relationship with America and your relationship with Britain have a defined area, a historically defined area. You just cannot outgrow those limitations. You have room for maneuverability but you cannot transcend because these powers and these forces are wedded and irrevocably wedded to a certain basic perceptions and that perception is: total domination and total control i.e. Globalism, policing of the world, exploiting the resources of the world for sustaining their positions. Therefore, when you are trying to liberate, counter forces, forces which are opposed and have been opposed to this approach to international problems, naturally you come face to face with these limitations. In this context, I would like to point out

the 'Americans' assertion that weapons meant for the so-called Mujahideens, the so-called liberators in Afghanistan will continue unabated. It will continue the level of sophistication and the quantity will be the same. There will be no reduction either in the level of sophistication or volume of weapons. This was stated by the Defence Secretary of America. With all politeness at my command I must say that it was an affront to India, it was an affront to the people of India when blood-bath is taking place in Punjab, Pakistan has declared an undeclared war, is indulging in an undeclared war, and with the full knowledge of the American authorities that the weapons meant for Mujahideens are being diverted to extremists in Punjab who are fighting for breaking up Indian unity. In that context, they say that weapons will continue, but not a word of condemnation, if not condemnation at least there could be a word of caution to the Pakistani authorities; this is the famous or infamous, I must say, approach of America of equating India with Pakistan. Here we are being put to this test by Pakistani connivance with the extremists. But Mr. Carlucci found India and Pakistan on the same pedestal; he advised them that they must settle this matter bilaterally. Then Mr. Bush, the Vice President and the front-running Presidential candidate of the ruling Party in America, only recently came out with a statement saying that "Pakistan is not far behind India" and he referred to the Indian implosion of a peaceful device, atomic device, which was not meant to herald manufacture of nuclear weapons in India. On all counts, through all available channels of information, everybody now knows that Pakistan is not only in possession of the knowhow of technology and the wherewithal for manufacturing atom bomb, but they have really manufactured the atom bomb and they have got atom bombs in their possession. In the background of this, the American authorities chose to waive their own laws, I am not going into details in the face of the arrest of Mr. Parvaz, that Canadian national

who was trying to purloin or steal some parts which were helpful in the manufacture of atomic weapons, in the face of all this mounting evidence of Pakistan going in for nuclearisation, Pakistan openly interfering with our internal affairs, Pakistan holding out the threat of a 'jihad' in Siachen area, Pakistan openly interfering in Kashmir. And we keep on denouncing these activities. But the real source of all this trouble - if I am forgiven, because this is my personal view which I must express on the forum of Parliament, is the machination of the forces that have been inimical to us for generations - for years they have been inimical to us. In the strategic consensus, do you know, Pakistan is now being projected not only as a South Asian power but as a West Asian power as well simultaneously? It has been assigned a role in the Persian Gulf; its role has been recognised, as the real hatchetman. Pakistan is getting all the support from America, the imperialist power. My young friend from CPM should understand this. These are dynamics of international politics, of relentless pursuit of national interest, where the dialectics of history are made subservient to national interests. When American imperialism in this region is going out of its way to help Pakistan or to control Indian Ocean or to be active in Persian Gulf, the consequences of this are much too obvious to be missed in West Asia or anywhere. At the same time it is an abiding shame - I must say and excuse me for this expression - that a country which was till the other day shouting from the house top that it is the centre of liberation and of revealed Marxist wisdom - i.e. China - China is a part of that strategic consensus where American-Pakistani consensus meets in which Chinese consensus also becomes operative.

You will have noted that while Americans are helping the Zia regime, helping the South African racist genocidal regime, they are also perhaps helping building bridges between China and Israel.

[Prof. K.K. Tewary]

The latest report is that the sophisticated laser technology has been transferred from Israel to China. All these things are happening. Therefore my submission is that we have to be absolutely clear. We must go on improving our relations. We cannot ignore the logic of super-computer presence. We just cannot. But we have to be very clear as we have been till now on this. We have relentlessly exposed the shenanigans of imperialist powers everywhere. Now it is a direct threat to our survival. Therefore, Mr. Foreign Minister, I think while formulating the policy - the historicity and historical factors which sometimes - more often than not I must say - inhibit certain types of relationship which just cannot be realised because they cannot take place; while you must improve your relations with America, please do realise the limitations.

Or do you feel that the calculated damage that is being caused to us, caused to our security environment, caused in terms of expenditure pressure on our scarce resources which we are funnelling towards our security improvement will be offset by supply of light combat aircraft technology or a certain machine called super-computer - which I am told, I am not an expert, is not all that super, its technology is dated? Well, you go ahead, acquire the technology whether it is super-computer, light combat aircraft or I am told now aircraft carrier technology also you are taking. By all means we must beef up our defence preparedness and we must take technology from whichever sources we get. But the impact, the results and the advantages that will accrue also must be weighed properly.

Will they offset American readiness and American alacrity to go all out to supply weapons and 4.2 billion dollars suspending their own laws for which they are said to be great sticklers of but when it comes to Pakistan they say that because Pakistan's pre-

paredness is in American interest? What is American interest?

MR. CHAIRMAN : Please conclude.

PROF. K.K.TEWARY: I have expounded only one point, I have other points as well.

This is to be borne in mind and we have to keep it in mind while formulating our policy.

Then, Sir, I was talking of this situation in our neighbourhood. While we talk of this on China front we must go ahead and improve our relations. We have never supported any tension in the region. Whether it is Pakistan or China we must go ahead and improve our relations. It has been highlighted how relations have improved in recent years initiative for which was taken by Madam Gandhi and considerably strengthened during the present leadership of Shri Rajiv Gandhi. We must go ahead but the same time there is great Chinese PR campaign in India. I see people going lyric when they talk of improving relations. Have good relations but let us be very realistic on this. Let the nation absorb certain things, namely, Chinese are still sitting over thousands of kilometres of our territory. Are the Chinese really responding to our sensitivities? Only recently when our Prime Minister was in Arunachal Pradesh the Chinese media particularly started a propaganda blitz in protest against Prime Minister's visit to Arunachal Pradesh. These are not signals which speak of Chinese preparedness or right response from the Chinese quarters.

Therefore, on this also I feel we must go ahead with our attempts to improve relations but it was to be realistic, something that the nation accepts and something that is in conformity with our earlier stand and in conformity with our stand as a nation, our honour, our self-respect and also it should

not deepen the national humiliation that we had to face in 1962 - an unprovoked war that was launched and thousands of kilometres of our territory was occupied and continues to be in illegal occupation.

Sir, there are some recent developments in our neighbourhood Bangladesh. It is an important area. Thousands of Chakma refugees are in Tripura. They have been sheltered by the Government. The situation there has been deteriorating and democratic forces are being suppressed by military junta and Indian threat is being held out as the cause for the upheaval in Bangladesh. A revivalist and obscurantist atmosphere is being created. Islamic republic is being declared. When such developments are taking place in our neighbourhood that definitely pinches us. One thing, Mr. Foreign Minister, on this I think you should be very clear. Our Government must be absolutely clear, viz., our relations with the neighbouring countries. Let us not forget that millions of people of Indian origin are spread in all the neighbouring countries and any upheaval taking place anywhere in our neighbourhood affects adversely the people of Indian origin. That has its social and political repercussions in India. Therefore, we have a natural concern for democratic forces to operate in the neighbourhood. We must speak out in favour of the democratic institutions, in favour of the democratic struggle and you have held several SAARC meetings. The most deafening noise that is coming out is this terrorist business. In the SAARC you had a regional agreement on anti-terrorist measures. SAARC includes Pakistan and in contravention of everything that was agreed upon Pakistan has been supplying weapons and training terrorists.

Therefore, on SAARC also, I have to add one bit, that is, we must have, as I said, cordial relations with her neighbours. But we must let this be known that India, because of its size, because of its geography, because

of its history, has certain concerns which will work for better neighbourliness, greater stability in the region.

Then, I wanted to add one word. Our relationship with Britain has a kind of historical mystique about it. We talk of our sharing of history. We talk of so many bonds of friendship. People go on taking of democratic institutions which bind us with, Britain and America and the Western people. They have nurtured democratic institutions at home. But democracy abroad has not been one of the articles of their faith.

In recent months, Britain has played a very prejudicial role in many matters. For example, the media. So much is being made out of British free media. BBC has been indulging in blatant anti-India propaganda. A person of Indian origin, a certain Salman Rushdie, an instant writer, celebrity, internationally known, (anybody who writes anything against about India becomes a celebrity) wrote a book called 'Midnight Children'. That man was sent to India. When he went back, he said in a serial: "Does India exist?", like Churchill said in an interview to Mira Ben in 1945. Well, she said under Gandhiji, Indian nation is emerging. He said, "Indian nation is a myth. It has never existed nor will it ever exist." That Churchillian sentiment is being echoed by the BBC now in 1988 in the question, in the formulation with a big note of interrogation: Does India exist?

Mr. Foreign Minister, you remember, the same BBC wanted to broadcast an interview with certain freedom fighters - I deliberately say this of IRA. I would not call them terrorists. That interview was going to the broadcast by BBC. The British Government said: Stop it. If you really show it, telecast it, we will bring a law. Whatever happens, we will bring a law in Parliament. We will see to it that such programmes are not broadcast from BBC. This much for British freedom to their press. If it goes against other countries,

[Prof. K.K. Tewary]  
it is all right. Therefore, Mr. Foreign Minister, the foreign policy objectives have been pursued with great elan and vitality under the leadership of Rajiv Gandhi and they must continue. But a certain degree of caution is required in certain areas.

In the end, I must say that there must be greater coordination between the Ministry of External Affairs and the Ministry of Defence. This is the very basic thing that we have to do in order to protect our interests in the neighbourhood and promote a peaceful and stable international order. Thank you.

SHRI T. BASHEER (Chirayinkil): Sir, in our approach to international issues, India's foreign policy did not emerge all of a sudden after the achievement of Independence. It has been in the making over a long period of time during the struggle for freedom. Panditji, who was the architect of our foreign policy, had a clear perception about India's place in the world. He evolved our foreign policy based on a deep understanding of Indian traditions, heritage of the national movement and on the needs and aspirations of our people after the achievement of freedom. Our foreign policy has always commanded the respect of nations and approval of the people of our country. Our former Prime Minister, Smt. Indira Gandhi and the present Prime Minister strengthened this policy and carried forward this policy. They are luminous symbols of our perception. India and our leaders had been working for a more safe and more sane world, a world with peace, a world without arms race and a world free of oppression. I am happy that when we look at the world scenario, there is a distinct improvement in the world situation. Of course, there are areas of tensions and conflicts. That is true. Despite the Iran-Iraq war, despite the fact that Africa is in turmoil, despite the Palestinian issue, there is an overall improvement in the global situation. There are positive developments. Nobody

can deny that. The cold war conditions are giving way to a situation where mutual trust among the nations is slowly developing. That change is visible even in the case of relations between the Super Powers. The signing of the treaty by US and USSR to eliminate the landbased intermediate nuclear missiles is a historic step in the direction of eliminating nuclear weapons. In spite of the fact that Mr. Reagan took a belligerent attitude in respect of nuclear arms, starwar programme, etc., he had to come around and sign a treaty with USSR. It is a milestone in the history's journey to a new world of peace. Mr. Gorbachev, who took a major initiative in this regard deserves a major part of the credit. He definitely deserves congratulations. We could be proud that India has played an important role in creating this atmosphere and arousing the world opinion on this issue. Our Prime Minister, Rajivji can take legitimate credit for this. During the last three years, he was trying for that and he was trying to rouse the world opinion to create a new atmosphere and even the last Stockholm conference is a glaring example in this regard. I am not telling that everything is all right but my point is that things are now moving in a positive direction which our national leaders have visualised, in a direction which Panditji and Indiraji have visualised and in a direction which Rajivji is trying for. That is the point I would like to make.

Now, I will come to a few points. Firstly, about Afghanistan, the most important development witnessed this year, i.e. 1988, is the Accord signed in Geneva on Afghanistan. This is an important milestone especially so far as this region is concerned, and so far as India is concerned. The most important factor is that the two super-powers, the United States of America and the Soviet Union are involved in this issue. The Agreement also indicates the new approach of super-powers and their desire for settling the regional problems by negotiations. That is, of course a welcome step.



So far as India is concerned, India is a country which is deeply affected by the situation in Afghanistan. A cold war was likely at our door-step. Now, we hope that with this Accord the dark clouds of cold war will get away from this region. India had been making all efforts, over all these years for a solution of Afghanistan problem. So, India has every right to be happy that an Accord on the Afghanistan is signed.

Many friends have said here that in the case of all accords, the implementation is an important part. In Geneva Accord also the implementation of the Accord is important. But the concern is, reports are coming, even today in the papers reports are there, that the strains are already emerging on Accord. The Signatories are expressing conflicting views on the terms of settlement. The Mujahideens, have not accepted the Accord and has said that they will continue their fight against the Kabul regime. And they are continuing their fight.

It is also reported that the arms flow to Pakistan still continues. The United States of America has not ruled out the military aid to Mujahideens and Pakistan is also silent on this point. So, I would like to know the reaction of the Indian Government on these aspects. We are all concerned about these points. The problem is that there is still uncertainty about the return of peace and tranquility to the area. This is the point which the Hon. Minister has to clarify.

Another issue, so far as India is concerned, is about the Sri Lanka. I am not going into the details of it. Sri Lanka Accord is a historical accord. It is the outcome of the statesmanship of our Prime Minister. Everybody has welcomed it. It is a very correct step. But, now, Sir, the report says, I would like to draw the attention of the Hon. Minister to this, that there is a subtle attempt on the part of certain elements in the Sri Lankan Government to sideline India. That is going on.

This is an important element which should be taken care of. Our Government should take care of it.

17.00 hrs.

There were reports that some Sri Lankan Authorities had held discussions and negotiations directly with the LTTE leaders. I do not know whether it is true. Shri Dikshit also objected to it. The Minister should clarify the position and tell us whether it is true and if so what its implications are and what we are going to do. This is all I want to say about Sri Lanka because we have discussed all the other things pertaining to Sri Lanka many times in this House.

Now I want to mention about the peculiar attitude of Pakistan towards us. The attitude of Pakistan is getting very bad. Our attempt has always been to improve relations with that country. But the fact is, that the progress achieved is not satisfactory. There had been meetings between Heads of State, there had been ministerial and official level meetings as well. Last year also, such meetings took place. In spite of all these, the situation became more aggravated and the relations became more strained. The Report of the Ministry of External Affairs also admits these facts. It is stated in the Report:

"Our sincere sentiments for good relations have not been reciprocated by

Pakistan, as is evident from a series of negative actions taken by it, which

have vitiated the atmosphere, adversely affecting our relations."

The Report narrates certain negative actions of Pakistan such as Pakistan's weapons-oriented nuclear policy, its quest for sophisticated weapons like AWACS far beyond its genuine defence requirements, its involvement with the extremist activities

[Sh. T. Basheer] directed against India, its resorting to offensive military action in the Siachen glacier area and so on. Sir, these are very serious things. No country can tolerate such action from any other country. Pakistan's capability for nuclear bomb has been discussed many times here in this House and it is beyond doubt that Pakistan can make the bomb and Pakistan is also going for that now. Everybody knows it. It is a known fact. It has been stated by our Minister for External Affairs in this Parliament and outside and by our Prime Minister in this country and outside the country as well. Even during the visit to Japan, our Prime Minister mentioned about it. Therefore, the question is what steps we are going to take. What is your idea? Everyday, we are repeating it. Do you propose to take some steps in this regard?

Sir, our real concern is that India is surrounded by nuclear weapons on all sides. You know that there are nuclear weapons in China. There are nuclear weapons in Tibet owned by China. And there are nuclear weapons of the US in Diego Garcia, in Pakistan and in Israel. We are encircled with nuclear weapons. This is the gravity and the magnitude of the problem. So I would like to know - the Minister should tell us - as to what really the Government is going to do? What is our option in this regard.

Another point connected with this is, we should see the American attitude. U.S. is arming Pakistan with all sophisticated arms, including AWACS. When USA is doing this, they are telling India lame excuses. Actually the U.S. administration is misleading us. Mr. Frank Carlucci, the U.S. Defence Secretary, in a statement from India's soil, during his recent visit clearly indicated that USA will continue its arms supply to Pakistan. He justified in that statement, the US arms supplies to Pakistan. After reading that statement I understood that he was justifying arms aid to Pakistan. So, the picture is clear.

What America needs, as Prof. Tewary put it, is a base in this sub-continent. They lost Iran. They want a strong base and they think Pakistan is a strong base. We should open our eyes to this reality. You should see its reality. We should take these aspects into consideration when we assess Indo-Pak-US relations. I would like to know the reaction of the Government in this regard?

My next point is regarding the situation in Siachen Glacier. The latest report is - yesterday we had raised this issue in this House during the Zero Hour - that Pakistan has turned down India's proposal for a meeting of Defence Secretaries for settlement of dispute of Siachen area. They have rejected it. It is also reported, a month back, that General Zia-ul-Haq has said that Pakistan will wage a *Jihad* - meaning a holy war - against our country on this issue. The latest Pakistan's position is clear. It clearly indicates that Islamabad wants to keep the Siachen dispute alive. Pakistan's interest is that tension should prevail always in India. That is what they want. So I would like to know what is the reaction of the Government in this regard? I am not going to other issues. I would also like to draw the attention of the Hon. Minister to a news item that *Abu Jihad* - the next in Command - to Yasser Arafat, the PLO Leader was brutally killed in Tunis, last Saturday by Israelies. So, we must condemn that. That Leader was fighting for a noble cause. We have condemned it. I am happy. We should express our solidarity with the cause of these fighting. Palestinian people. With these words, I support the Demands for the Ministry of External Affairs.

SHRI SYED SHAHABUDDIN (Kishanganj): Mr. Chairman, Sir: This pathetic Annual Report is an exercise in non-information. It is blase, it provides no insight, it reflects no long-term vision; it is nothing but a record of comings, goings and sittings. (*Interruptions*) I do not know what is happening to to the Foreign Office. (*Interruptions*)

Please do not waste my time. You can take a positive view when you like. I cannot express your views, and I cannot express my gratitude to the Government, if you want me to.

I do not know what has happened to this great Foreign Office that I knew. Has it been reduced to crying in the wilderness, or whistling in the dark, that it produces such an unsophisticated document? I know that the Ministry has been reduced to an arena of musical Chairs. Ministers come and go; and the Minister of State himself is perpetually on the move; and our Foreign Minister is peripatetic. If you judge by the travels, our diplomacy is a spontaneous success. But. Mr. Chairman, motion is not movement, and we have before us nothing but a record here of failures, faux pas, farces and forays. (*Interruptions*)

The Himalayan Blunder that we committed on the shores of the Indian Ocean, our adventure in Sri Lanka, the description of Pakistani bomb as an Islamic bomb which hurt the sensibilities of our Arab friends, our cooperation with Israel in the field of sports, our friend Natwar Singh's dash to Rome call on the ex-King of Afghanistan to salvage the situation, our Prime Minister's public telephonic invitation to the head of a neighbouring State to come and visit him, and our High Commissioner's statement about the payments made by us to buy peace, the facilities that we have provided to the naval ships of many a nation to the ships which are known to carry nuclear weapons—if I may name one for the information, for the enlightenment of the Minister, I shall name it; it is *French Ship Clemencau*. All these show a certain degree of deviation; all these are characterised by some sort of a kneejerk reaction, a reflex action, a superficiality and shallowness what we should have overcome in our mature years, with forty years of diplomacy behind us. There seems to be a craze for catching

headlines, and sometimes we are euphoric and claim credit when nobody else gives us credit. I remember that the famous statement about what a great role we played in bringing USA and USSR to signing an agreement on intermediate missiles.

We are faced with a very serious problem in Sri Lanka. In Persian they would say—and I would not have the time to translate it—*Na Jai Mandan, na pai raftan*. We have been caught in quagmire. We are faced with an agreement which has led us into a military situation which I can at best describe as a stalemate. It is a political stalemate, and a military stalemate.

SHRI A CHARLES (Trivandrum): Do you have any positive suggestion?

SHRI SYED SHAHABUDDIN: I shall come to it sir; please don't worry. Allow me to run the Government for a while, and I will show you what positive steps I can take. (*Interruptions*)

There is no sign of reconciliation between the Sinhalese and the Tamils. There is no peace on this battered and bruised island. Our blood is flowing, and our money is flowing like water: Rs.10 crores a day, and the ethnic disturbances and the perturbations may seen overshadow our own country, all without any purpose, to my mind without a mission.

We are firmly in the grip of the Head of a foreign state - President Jayawardane. He is free to do that he likes. We are not free to do what we like. We cannot stay a minute longer when he orders us out. We cannot leave without his permission. Our sovereignty and independence of action have been compromised in our adventure in Sri Lanka. The only way out today is to announce a schedule of withdrawal and put both the parties on notice, the Sri Lankan Government and the Tamil militants and

[Sh. Syed Shahabuddin] nudge them towards the negotiating table to work for a direct agreement between them which should be guaranteed by us. Withdraw progressively, I have said about maintain of a presence till that agreement is fully implemented.

I come to Indo-Pakistan relations where we had a number of statements here, which, of course, merely repeat the revealed wisdom. The fact is that during the last one year, the normalisation process to which we are committed is at a standstill. There is a stagnation on the cultural front, no progress on the question of transport or exchange of information; and because of the tension that is mounting, our defence expenditure is skyrocketing.

The Report says that we are engaged in a quest for better relations. I wish the Government success. We carry a historical burden. There is mutual suspicion and distrust. But one fact we must keep always before us is that the destiny of the sub-continent is indivisible. Our history teaches us that. Our area of the world has suffered due to foreign intervention time and again in our history at the behest, at the call of one power or the other on this sub-continent. We sink and swim together. Therefore, I would say, when we present a chargesheet against Pakistan, there may be a lot of truth in it, but the Government has not taken pains to inform the public opinion or taken the people into confidence. They have not issued a White Paper; they have not even told us when protests have been lodged with Pakistan and yet I would caution the government that our charge-sheet against Pakistan- and that is a failure diplomacy - does not enjoy international credibility. We charge Pakistan with encouragement to Punjab terrorists but we have no concrete evidence to place before the Bar of World public opinion. We say they are engaged in a quest of nuclear weapons capability. The world says, why not? We say,

they are acquiring sophisticated weapons. The world ask us, so are you?

PROF. P.J.KURIEN (IDUKKI): Are you believing what he says and what others say?

SHRI SYED SHAHABUDDIN: Please listen to me very carefully. (*Interruptions*) I know what I am talking. Please sit down. Don't interrupt me. (*Interruptions*) Mr. Chairman, I seek your protection. (*Interruptions*)

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, Order. Don't shout. I will try to control the House. Don't get agitated. You don't worry. (*Interruptions*)

MR. RANA VIR SINGH: You are very good. (*Interruptions*)

MR. CHAIRMAN: Please resume your seat.

(*Interruptions*)

MR. CHAIRMAN: Let him offer his opinions. The Minister is there to reply.

(*Interruptions*)

SHRI RANA VIR SINGH: You cannot allow him to speak anything he likes. (*Interruptions*)

MR. CHAIRMAN: Why are you unnecessarily making some noise? Please resume your speech.

SHRI SYED SHAHABUDDIN: We are naturally concerned about military operation in Siachin, but the world did not even do about Siachin problem until a while ago. We talk about Pakistan's statements on Jammu & Kashmir States. They say this is an exercise in verbal diplomacy which means nothing. Now, what I am trying to say is this: let us produce concrete evidence in order to convince the world public opinion, in order to carry them with us. We should from the

positive side respond to Pakistan's diplomatic gesture in a meaningful way. If Pakistan is bluffing, let us call their bluff. But we cannot allow them to carry the world with them, either, on the question of the suggestions that they have made: "If you are worried about the border, why not have joint border patrolling? Why not talk of mutual arms limitation? Why not create a demilitarised zone on the border and separate the forces? Why not have mutual inspection of nuclear facilities?" We have got to convince the world about our response towards these ideas. We have got to take the initiative to revive the ground rules in order to avoid a conflict and we have to break new ground make a new beginning and create a wave which would in one sweep surmount these traditional walls of suspicion and separation.

I have always said in this House that we have a special responsibility, a historic responsibility to this sub-continent and that I must say we are not fulfilling.

On the question of Afghanistan, it is a historic accord, that we all welcome. It is a victory for the indomitable spirit of man. It is a triumph for freedom. But there is many a slip between the cup and the lip. Afghanistan has to be saved from a civil war. The Afghan people must enjoy the untrammelled right to decide their form of Government. It is their business what they want and whom they want. Mr. Natwar Singh have missed the bus. We have been here for thousands of years, the country has not yet missed the bus.

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS (SHRI K. NATWAR SINGH): You missed the bus. I did not. I am on the bus.

SHRI SYED SHAHABUDDIN: I am not talking of the internal bus, I am talking of the Afghanistan bus. We have not burnt our boats. I think with a little though we can

salvage the situation and with that we can still play a role in Afghanistan that we are seeking, by exerting our influence against continued foreign intervention, or interference, or military assistance from outside. We should on saying that the accord is not complete untill all avenues of interference and intervention are completely plugged. And we shall also try to urge or nudge the various factions in Afghanistan at least to form an interim Government which shall have the responsibility for organising the exercise of self-determination through free and fair elections if possible under NAM's supervision. I suggest that we think of these possible initiatives.

17.22 hrs.

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

On China I do not see very much in the annual report. Apparently, not much progress, not such headway has been made in resolving the border dispute. But seem to be crawling. But what is more important to me is this that during this year there have been several incursions across the line of actual control, and the consequent occupation of the territory that we were holding. Now this must be looked into. There is a report at the Prime Minister might soon visit China. He has been invited. I would suggest that until intensive negotiations have created a ground through official and ministerial level talks the Prime Minister's visit shall not produce results and it should not be indulged into merely for the sake of adding another headline.

On the question of Palestine, I think everyone in this House today feels or shares the sense of exhilaration at the uprising of the Palestinian people against the Israeli occupation. It is a revival of the Gandhian tradition on, application of the Gandhian technique. It has generated a new hope for liberation, for self-determination, for the col-

[Sh. Syed Shahabuddin]

lapse of the garrison state and for the liberation of the imprisoned people. And our hearts and minds are with the Palestinians. But on this we should do a little more than just sending a message of sorrow. We should mobilise the world public opinion on this question, exert all possible pressure so that the flame of freedom that has been lit in the occupied territories shall not be extinguished.

On the Indian Ocean, I am afraid, again this whole year has not seen any progress at all. For 15 years we have been talking about the U.N. Resolution on the declaration of the Indian Ocean as a zone of peace. I see no progress during this year, and I find, on the other hand, many a commentator have talked about escalation of foreign naval presence. Now, we are faced with direct interference by foreign powers in our regional conflicts. I do not have to tell the House about the U.S. attack yesterday on Iranian installations, and if I am not wrong - the Minister might correct me if I am wrong - that the military bases, the military presence, the stationary presence on the rim, on the littoral of the Indian Ocean, have been strengthened during the last few years. Now, this is a painful development and we must look into this. We must try to accelerate the process of creation of a zone of peace.

Sir, on the Iran-Iraq conflict, it is a painful and agonising situation for us, because we are in the neighbourhood and we are friendly to both. It is a fight among two friends of ours. It seems that they are fighting to the finish. I make a statement with a sense of responsibility - Iraq began the trouble, but Iran is responsible for prolonging it, and to my mind, one fact, which has not yet been noticed, as well as it should have been, is the use of chemical weapons in this conflict. That is a crime against humanity, that is a crime against international law.

I wish irrespective of who is involved, our country with its moral strength must stand out and condemn the use of nuclear weapons, and our efforts should be to go on chemical weapons and to urge our friends to have a ceasefire, to establish a *status quo ante* and refer the question of reparations or damages to an international tribunal, and even offer to organise an international consortium for rehabilitation of their war ravaged economies.

This bring me to NAM. I do not know what is happening to NAM after Harare summit. One does not seem to be hearing enough of it. It seems to be in a state of stagnation. Although we are not responsible and we are not its Chairman today, we are still one of its founders and one of its prominent members. I would like to know from the hon. Minister whether any significant development has taken place in implementing the decisions of the last NAM summit, and to what extent we have moved forward during this current year. I do not wish to criticise the NAM Movement, as talking shock, as some people do. I find its basic job is to create a consensus on important issues and I find this NAM movement to be in a peculiar state of stagnation, as far as our family disputes are concerned. We have hardly had any impact on the course of Iran Iraq war or on the question of foreign naval presence in the Indian Ocean or to exert any influence on the resolution of Afghanistan situation. Now, if NAM is to be effective, the non-aligned movement must be given another shot in the arm. I think, India alone can do it and India alone is capable of doing it, and you got to take this responsibility more seriously and inject a sense of purpose and a sense of direction, once again into the non-aligned movement.

I know, we have been very much involved on the question of disarmament and apartheid. I think, on that whatever was possible to be done at an international level,

has got to be done under the personal direction and personal involvement of the Minister of State, Sh. Natwar Singh. I have only one question to ask, that is very basic question. I know that will give rise to another uproar in the House. Our voice against universal and general disarmament loses its moral force when, in our own region, *willy-nilly*, we are caught into an arms race. That is a dilemma and you must find a solution.

On the question of apartheid and Africa Fund, the government of India have done very well. But, I notice one lacuna. Recently the Sharp wills six were hanged. I do not know what we could have done to save them. I thought that the uproar it should have caused in this country was conspicuous by its deafening silence. We have the people of Indian origin all around us. Some of the speakers have referred to them. I am concerned about Fiji. I have been writing to the Government about Fiji. There is a reversion to racism. There is a denial of democracy. We must make it clear to the Commonwealth that there is no question of re-admission of Fiji into the Commonwealth unless the new Constitution that they are drafting is democratic in letter and in spirit. And if it is not, then we shall initiate a move to keep them not only out of the Commonwealth but even to try to get them out of the United Nations.

In Burma nothing tangible seems to have happened even after the Prime Minister's visit. In fact, the statement that we have made - I was dealing with Burma some 10 or 15 years ago. It had almost a very familiarising; the same sort of generalised promises where we know that the people of Indian origin in Burma go through their travail.

In Bangla Desh we have Biharis. In Pakistan we have people of Indian origin who are being persecuted. We have a concern for the people of Indian origin all over the world. It is 40 years since partition. I wish

to just to remind the Government and request them to think, do these people of Indian origin also deserve some attention on our part?

On the new international economic order, we find that there has been no progress at all during 1987-88 neither in the field of trade nor in the field of developmental aid. The world economy has been re-structuring slowly but these have been noticeable shifts. Many developing nations are very close to the precipice before they fall into the debt trap. But the IME, the grand institution of international monetary management reform, has refused to introduce a global debt facility. Our negotiations in the GATT have not yielded any beneficial result from the point of view of the developing world. In fact, the developed countries have tried to exploit this forum for pushing their own services and making their own forays into the developing markets of the developing countries. On the other hand, we have not been able to persuade them to graduate down their new protectionist tendencies. On the one hand, they wish to penetrate into our markets and on the other hand, they wish to protect their own markets from our products. This is the situation that does not land itself to a sense of globalism.....

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Please wind up.

SHRISYED SHAHABUDDIN: I will take only two, three minutes.

Primarily this, to my mind, is due to our own weakness. The South-South interaction that we have been talking about all these years has not really taken shape. The share of trade with the developing countries or our economic relations with the developing countries are a very small proportion of our total picture. In technology transfer or in development assistance, we have not played any leading role. There are some

[Sh. Syed Shahabuddin]  
figures given here. We want to have a brave new world of South South cooperation on an investment of Rs.44 crores, if you leave out the assistance that we have given to our immediate neighbours.

To conclude, as a country we value our freedom and we value the freedom and dignity of others. As a country, we are a big country. It is not a sin to be big. It is not a crime to be great. We have a legitimate aspiration towards greatness but we must then curb hysteria, the seige complex, the persecution mania that seems to envelope us from time to time. Let us take the initiative to set a model settle all our outstanding bilateral disputes. At least engage in a continuous intensive process of negotiations with all our neighbours. Let us enter into a bilateral treaty of peace, friendship and cooperation with every neighbour with a view to cut down our defence expenditure which will mean a much higher rate of development for our own country and pave the way for a regional treaty of peace, freedom and cooperation which shall transform SAARC into a regional forum for development planning and economic cooperation and even an institution, if I may say so, for resolving the small family disputes that might arise. Let us set an example for the world. Nothing less than this our country deserves. If we are true to the legacy of Mahatma Gandhi, if we are true to the inheritance of Buddha, we must respond to the indivisibility of the destiny of the sub-continent. Let us learn from history and let us try to make this region safe from foreign intervention by bringing about, by establishing and creating an atmosphere of a family harmony that this area deserves. Thank you very much, Sir.

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE  
MINISTRY OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS (SHRI  
K.NATWAR SINGH): Mr. Deputy Speaker,  
Sir, this debate on the Grant for the Ministry

of External Affairs provides us with an annual occasion for stock-taking of our foreign policy and its implementation. It provides the House an occasion to throw up new ideas on important subjects relating to our relations with not only our neighbours but also with other countries of the world.

The roots of our foreign policy go back to our freedom movement. In the forty years and more that we have been a sovereign independent country, the foreign policy of this country has earned the admiration of the entire world, with one or two misguided exceptions. I will, if I may, quote from an article that the late Shrimati Indira Gandhi wrote at the time of the Twenty-Fifth anniversary of our Independence. She said:

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

These have been the fundamentals of our foreign policy to which reference has been made by Shri B.R.Bhagat and by Shri K.K.Tewary, whose intervention, if I may say so, was of a very high order - intellectual, conceptual and public-spirited. I am grateful to them that they have said that the conduct of our foreign policy has been one of élan and vitality, and that we have not been pressurised by anyone.

The conduct of foreign policy, the conduct of diplomacy, the conduct of negotiations appear easy but are very difficult and complex because relations with other countries are involved, and you do not have any control over the foreign policy or the domestic policies of other countries, just as you do



not like them to interfere with your internal affairs or with your foreign policy. So, one has to use the maximum amount of patience and tact and skill and experience and maturity and understanding and goodwill in dealing with the complications and the hazardous subtleties of dealing with foreign affairs. I want to submit to this House that for the past forty-one years, our record in the field of foreign affairs has been second to none. We do not look for certificates from other countries because we have the self-confidence to know that what we are doing is right and in our national interest.

Mr. Shahabuddin who obviously wasted his twenty years in the foreign service, said in his intervention, which I would describe as sterile, negative and unworthy of someone with his background, that nobody has said anything about our foreign policy achievements, except ourselves.

SHRI SYED SHAHABUDDIN: I did not say that.

SHRI K. NATWAR SINGH: Yes, you said it. I have taken note of it.

SHRI SYED SHAHABUDDIN: I thought that the Ministry is taking credit for that.

SHRI K. NATWAR SINGH: I am talking about this year. You read Gorbachev's 'Presthreeka'. I will send you a copy of it. You read what he said about India's foreign policy and its role in international affairs.

SHRI SYED SHAHABUDDIN: I am speaking about the specific relationship to the agreement between the super powers on the intermediary missiles. I would like to know whether Mr. Reagan and Mr. Gorbachev had credited us with any contribution to that agreement.

SHRI K. NATWAR SINGH: You said that this report is an exercise in non-informa-

tion, with negative clauses and an unsophisticated document and you said that motion is not movement. Just as your rhetoric is no substitute for policy.

SHRI HAROOBHAI MEHTA (Ahmedabad): For the information of my learned friend, I may point out that His Excellency of Soviet Ambassador of India had said that the foundation of this agreement between Reagan and Gorbachev was made in New Delhi. That is New Delhi Declaration.

SHRI K. NATWAR SINGH: I am grateful to you. It is the New Delhi Declaration. You have not read it. I would advise you to read it. It is a document which has been referred to more and more in international document the world over.

With regard to Pakistan, you made some rather astounding observations. Normally I ignore what you say because really your views are of no consequence about such weighty matters. You spoke on Pakistan, I was surprised to see that there is somebody in this House who should be pleading Pakistan's case. (*Interruptions*)

SHRI SYED SHAHABUDDIN: If it is your understanding, I take pity on you. I was saying that people ask this question and you have not been able to convey your case to the international community. That is what I have been saying. These questions are being raised to which you must answer and respond. I was not pleading Pakistan's case.

SHRI K. NATWAR SINGH: You were. You were saying Mr. Shahabuddin "Why do we not have talks on posts reductions?". This is what you said. I will give you the reason why we don't (*Interruptions*) Your education is incomplete and will remain incomplete.

SHRI SYED SHAHABUDDIN: The American Defence Secretary made a state-

[Sh. Syed Shahabuddin]  
ment to which my friend, Mr. Tiwari referred  
(*Interruptions*)

PROF. K.K.TEWARY: The American  
Defence Secretary is like you.

SHRI K.NATWAR SINGH: Mr. Shahabuddin I have known for a long time. Sir, I don't normally take him seriously and it is not necessary to do so at this time. But he spoke about matters which are important to this country and they should not be allowed to go unchallenged because they affect the defence of this country and the territorial integrity of this country and the observations that he was made with regard to Pakistan and Sri Lanka are serious. The efforts that this Government has made to improve relations with Pakistan are numerous. We have offered them a treaty of friendship and cooperation. We have asked for improved relations in trade, we have asked for easier visa regulations, we have asked for the Khokra Power railway line to be opened, we have asked for more tourists exchange of scholars, journalists, cultural troupes, books and magazines. No response and we are here told why don't you discuss troop reductions with these people, why don't you sit down and discuss with them nuclear issues as if this was a bilateral matters between these two countries and not global matters. We are told that we have not provided incontrovertible proof of Pakistan aiding and abetting the terrorists. It is an extraordinary statement to make for a Member of this House. We have provided the information. We know exactly what they are doing and where they are doing. (*Interruptions*) We have said it to Pakistan. We have said it to the friends of Pakistan and we are doing this constantly. We know the places, where these training camps, their locations, the names of people who are training them. I don't want to go into greater details but to say that we have not told them is not correct. The whole world knows about it. (*Interruptions*)

PROF. K.K.TEWARY: That will not help you. (*Interruptions*)

SHRI K.NATWAR SINGH: You see, K.K.Tewary has answered you. You are beyond redemption, so, we won't waste the time on you.

SHRI SYED SHAHABUDDIN: Suddenly I am out of pale! (*Interruptions*)

SHRI K. NATWAR SINGH: About the issue on Afghanistan, it was observed here that we had nothing to do with it, that I am supposed to have missed a particular bus. Well, I wish you had caught half the bus that I had caught. You have not caught a single bus in your life and I don't think you will, if you go on the way you have been on national and international issues.

SHRI SYED SHAHABUDDIN: Don't you worry about me. Neither you nor I matter, Mr. Natwar Singh. We are talking about the country.

SHRI K. NATWAR SINGH: Listen please, don't talk in bombastic language. I know you long enough.

SHRI SYED SHAHABUDDIN: You have been absolutely abusive today. You have no reason to talk in these personal terms.

SHRI K. NATWAR SINGH: On the contrary, I have been extremely tolerant and I am paying you a great compliment by taking notice of you for a change.

SHRI SYED SHAHABUDDIN: I am not worried about your taking notice.....

SHRI K. NATWAR SINGH: You are. (*Interruptions*)

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order Please.

SHRI K. NATWAR SINGH: Now, with regard to Afghanistan, with regard to China, Vietnam, USA, UK, France, there is the whole litany and including Fiji, which only goes to show that the Hon. Member is unfamiliar with what has been going on and if he has taken the trouble to read this Report, he would know it does not claim to be anything else but an account of the activities of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, he would have found that a great deal of activities going on in all areas at the highest level in different parts of the world and the feed back has been 'yes'. Take Afghanistan. We were asked by the Afghans, the Americans, the Soviets to take the initiative in Afghanistan, and we did. Unfortunately my meeting with King Zahir Shah was leaked somehow. I had met Prince Sihanouk two months ago, nobody knew about it. We wanted to do it quietly, I had a 90-minute talk with the King, we made our little contribution as we could, we had talks with President Najibullah; he came to Delhi, we had talks with Mr. Vakil, we have kept in touch with what is going on in Geneva, we had contacts in Kabul, we had contacts in Moscow. To say that India has not role to play in Afghanistan or we have not affected the eventual outcome is to say that he is unfamiliar with what has been going on. We are very much involved in it; there was not even a mention of Kampuchea in the statement of the Hon. Member. We have played our role in bringing the two sides together in Kampuchea. After a stalemate of nine years, no cognizance was taken of India's role at any positive aspect, whether you take the relations with our neighbour, you take disarmament, you take SAARC, look around and please, if you have an alternative framework for the foreign policy of India do suggest it to us, we will look into it very carefully. You have the opportunities to do so for many years. The foreign policy that has been laid down 41 years ago by Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru and carried on by Shrimati Indira Gandhi, Mr. Lal Bahadur Shastri and Mr. Rajiv Gandhi.....

SHRI SYED SHAHABUDDIN: Nothing wrong with the framework. What is wrong is your implementation and application. (*Interruptions*)

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA: You are also making it very personal.

SHRI K. NATWAR SINGH: We are trying to make the policies of the Government of India as clear as we can before this House, before this country, in the international fora, and if there are any fundamental objections that hon. Members may have, I do not know of any one who has spoken today—the Members who spoke have all spoken in warm terms with the implementation of India's foreign policy, with the initiative that we have taken on a number of issues which are delicate, which are sensitive, which are important. Now, a reference has been made to Sri Lanka. Here is an agreement which has been universally acclaimed only a couple of days ago in Japan by the Prime Minister of Japan, at the Commonwealth Conference in Vancouver there was unanimous approval of the agreement. Every country has said that this is the agreement which has saved the unity, territorial integrity and sovereignty of Sri Lanka. We want the ethnic strife to end as soon as possible. This agreement ensures unity of Sri Lanka, its integrity and its sovereignty. It ensures outside interference being precluded from what is has been happening there. Now I want to know, if there is a substitute policy for Sri Lanka, we would like to have a look at it. I have not heard here from any hon. Member of this House, if there is an alternative policy that should be proposed. If you do have, we will certainly like to have a look at it. If you have a policy-framework proposed for the solution of Kampuchea, please let us know. If you have a proposal to offer on the solution of Afghanistan in the post-Geneva scenario, let us have a look at it. Now, if you have any proposal concrete on the improvement of our relations and reduc-

[Sh. K. Natwar Singh]

ing of tension with Pakistan, please let us know. You asked, why is there an arms race in this region? Now the answer should be self-evident. Why it is so. It is because, Pakistan is being armed by its friends in the West and the people of India ask us, this Government what are you going to do to meet this challenge of Pakistan? If the friends of Pakistan here can persuade the Pakistan authorities to reduce their armaments, not to accept military aid from America, we will be very grateful for that assistance. We are trying for it. As Ambassador in Pakistan, I tried. The Indo-Pak Joint Commission was established when I was Ambassador there. The offer for Treaty of Friendship was made when I was Ambassador. We are willing to have good neighbourly relations with Pakistan because as was observed by Bhagatji and Tewaryji that a weak Pakistan is not in India's interest. We would like to have good neighbourly, friendly relations with Pakistan. It is in their interest and in our interest. It was in this spirit that the Prime Minister of India invited the President of Pakistan to visit India to discuss this. This was not to be a formal meeting with a formal agenda—no question of success or failure. A decision had been taken among the heads of States of Dhaka that they could ring up each other and if this would require a flyover, the Prime Minister was willing to go to Islamabad but could not a few days before the Budget. He said to President Zia, India and Pakistan should join together in finding a solution for Afghanistan. We have supported the membership of Afghanistan in SAARC. Pakistan opposed it. We are hoping that they will change their mind now, the Accord has been signed. Now Pakistan has said, "We do not recognise the Government of Najibullah", even though they have signed the agreement with them in Geneva. I know, we all know that there is a Pakistan's Charge-d'affaires in Kabul and an Afghan's charge-d'affaires in Islamabad for the last so many years. So, where does the question of recog-

nition come in? I could not understand.

What I am trying to say is, we are attempting to do our very best with all our neighbours, to have good neighbourly and friendly relations and to reduce the tension. What comes in the way of it? We have been told for a number of years, Americans assistance to Pakistan was on account of Soviet intervention in Afghanistan. Now, Mr. Gorbachev has announced that the Accord was signed, they will withdraw from the 15th of May. We have the statement of the Defence Secretary of the United States that military aid to Pakistan will continue. Now what are the people of India to make of this? For whose benefits, are these arms being given, having our past experience and knowing that they are interfering in Punjab, that there is drug trafficking and their nuclear weapons programme has been progressing at a rapid pace. So, it becomes necessary for us to take the minimum measures for our defence and safety. After the creation of Bangladesh, Pakistan defence requirement was reduced to 50%. So, logically, their army should have been reduced, airforce reduced, defence budget reduced. But the reverse has happened. The army has been doubled; the airforce has been doubled and the Defence Budget has gone up a a number of times. The Army in India has not been doubled, although her responsibility in defence has not been reduced. That is why, it is necessary to have at least the minimum safeguards against anything that might happen, by accident even, if not by intent. It is not that we are flexing our muscles. We are a peace-loving country. Our record shows this. I have first-hand information because I have dealt with this issue. With Pakistan, we want the closest friendliest relations. So, there is no earthly reason why we should not. But the response has not been what we expected it to be. This is not so only today. Panditji offered no-war pact in 1949. But as prof. Tewary said there are certain historical forces working and the compulsions of the

historical forces have taken a particular shape—and form in our neighbouring country. We have said this from the house-tops that we do not want any conflict. It is not in our interest. Similarly, with regard to our relations with China, we want to improve them. The Prime Minister when he replies to the debate tomorrow may refer to the subject. Similarly, with regard to all our neighbours. Take Fiji, for instance. It was entirely due to our efforts that Fiji was to withdraw from the Commonwealth. We have said that what we condemn in South Africa; we cannot condone in Fiji. It is as simple as that. But for the strenuous efforts made by us, the outcome of the summit might have been different than it was. We have made it quite clear that unless the political rights of all citizens of Fiji are got safeguarded as they were in 1970, any change is not going to be acceptable to us. And, therefore, we have named our man in Fiji as Ambassador and not as High Commissioner. Even there, we have encountered problems and, as I said, foreign affairs are complex and complicated. We have turned these problems into opportunities and, for this, credit goes to the people who are in charge of the conduct of India's foreign policy and for its implementation. A large number of people serving in various parts of the world work very hard, to try and see that our foreign policy is understood, appreciated, taken note of, and generally, people find it helpful. That is why, both sides in Kampuchea have said that "we would like India to be the Chairman of the International Control Commission." We did not seek to take any initiative in Afghanistan till the right time came but we kept in touch with what was happening in Afghanistan. Take any issue in the world. There are, of course,

changes, there are nuances. One has to be alive to those nuances. One has to keep one's international antenna sharp to know what is going on. As I said earlier, foreign policy appears simple. Diplomacy appears easy. Negotiations do not appear difficult from outside but, when you get into it, you are negotiating with people, the people's experience, peoples, skills, how they safeguard their national interest as they see them and it is in this exercise which is sensitive, and complicated and intricate, that our foreign policy has not been found wanting and if it had, then it will not have got the national consensus that we have had on this issue for the last 41 years and even when there was a change, in Government in 1977, the foreign policy could not be altered, for the simple reason that the framework laid down by Jawaharlal Nehru was not found wanting and it is the one major country in the world which has not found it necessary to have any U-turns in its policy. You can look at the policies of major countries. There have been tremendous changes. But India is one major country where there have been no U-turns. Our foreign policy has not been episodic. It has not been opportunistic. It has been principled and that is why, the voice of India was heard in the world and any Member of this House knows it, not today, for the last 41 years. That is why, I thought it is necessary to intervene and to thank the hon. Members who have participated in this debate, made their contribution, Bhagatji, Tewaryji, Mr. Basheer and the Hon. Member who opened the discussion and I must say I was somewhat disappointed that the star performer should have begun on the rather tentative feeble note that he began. I want even to thank Mr. Shahabuddin for intervening in the

499 D.G., 88-89

APRIL 19, 1988

*of Min. of E.A. 500*

[Sh. K. Natwar Singh]  
debate and, his intervention made this discussion more lively than it might have been otherwise.

stands adjourned to meet again at Eleven of the Clock on Wednesday, April 20, 1988.

18.00 hrs.

Thank you.

*The Lok Sabha then adjourned till Eleven of the Clock on Wednesday, April 20, 1988/Chaitra 31, 1910 (Saka).*

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: The House

---