

[Shri Indrajit Gupta]

years to protect the interests of the jute growers and therefore, the acreage under jute cultivation also, instead of increasing, is going down because the minimum prices, economic prices, which the farmer should get have never been given to him except in one or two years when it was not due to government's fixation of any price, but due to certain speculative factors in the market which led to higher prices being available in the market out of all proportion to the so-called minimum support price, but generally over the years one will find that this so-called minimum support price fixed by the Agricultural Prices Commission has not ratio or relation whatsoever to the actual increased cost of production of the farmer himself. This is done only to keep the prices low and in order to benefit the jute mill owners and every time the jute crop is ready, it is the jute mill owners who hold off from the market and create an impression that they are not interested in buying so that the prices tumble further down and since there is no way of holding on to the jute — our farmers are small people, they are not big farmers with big holdings and all that, with big resources, they are never able to hold on to their raw jute stocks — they have to sell them immediately. Otherwise they have nothing to eat the next day. This is their condition. Some of them have even entered into private contracts with the middlemen before the crop is ripened, in advance, that they will sell at such and such prices as soon as the jute is ready. The cooperative movement in the eastern part of the country is hopelessly weak, I am sorry to say it, but it is a fact. There is no cooperative society to protect the interests of the jute farmers. In such a condition this minimum support price has been of no help whatsoever to the farmers and the JCI has been asked to buy, to step into the market and buy only if the market price goes below the minimum support price. As the minimum support price is hopelessly inadequate, the JCI, I am afraid, which was supposed to act as a decisive factor in maintaining the prices of raw jute and protecting the farmers from

being fleeced by the middlemen, by the agents of the mill owners and all that, has totally failed in its job. Shall I continue tomorrow? I will take two or three minutes more. I can finish now also.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The choice is yours.

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA: If you want me to continue tomorrow, I do not mind.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Now, this discussion will be continued tomorrow. You can continue tomorrow.

---

16.00 hrs.

DISCUSSION RE: INDO-U.S. RELATIONS

[English]

MR. CHAIRMAN: Next item is, Discussion under Rule 193. Shri Saifuddin Chowdhary.

SHRI SAIFUDDIN CHOWDHARY (Katwa): Sir, what immediately prompted me to raise this discussion on Indo-US relations is the U.S. Government decision to supply AWACS planes to Pakistan against the security interests of our country and of the region.

Now, Sir, I have a book with me entitled, "National Security and Strategy of the United States". It was prepared at the end of 1986 by the White House. It says that for the first time, the United States has established substantially improved relations with both India and Pakistan. Now, this picture given by their own Government document is quite contradictory to what is the situation prevailing today. I do not know how they made this evaluation, whether it was on the basis of evaluation of a particular person or of the whole country's population, its feelings. The Government has to clarify on that.

16.01 hrs.

[SHRI SOMNATH RATH *in the chair*]

You all know that over the years, U.S. has been pouring sophisticated arms like F-16, Harpoon Missiles, tanks etc. to Pakistan and we have expressed our concern about this time and again. But this decision to supply AWACS to Pakistan surpasses all the combined effects of the weapons that they have supplied to Pakistan so far. The AWACS introduces a dangerous new element in this situation. Coupled with this, we have the report of Pakistan's capability of producing an atom bomb or they have got an atom bomb. That has been stated by the President of Pakistan, Zia-ul-Haq and also the nuclear scientist, Mr. Abdul Qadir Khan. Now, they are doing this with the active indulgence by U.S.A. Recently we have heard the U.S.A. have waived Symington Amendment to enable Pakistan to get supply from U.S.A. military aid or otherwise and their acquiring atom bomb would not stand in the way of getting that aid.

Now, these two developments have the most dangerous potential of hotting up the cold war that is already existing in the region. We all know it and we have expressed over and over again that supply of AWACS is pointedly aimed at India. Any plea that it is to be directed against Afghanistan is untenable. Given the operational character of the plane, it is not at all suitable for use over the rugged mountainous terrain in Pakistan-Afghan border. But it has the unique ability to monitor and direct air power against India without its being vulnerable to opposite attack. This is precisely for this reason, as a part of its policy of global domination, that AWACS is brought and not any defensive purpose, as suggested by Pakistan that it fears attack from Afghanistan. This has been refuted by the President of Pakistan, Mr. Zia-ul-Haq himself and by the American leaders also. We also know that there is the Soviet withdrawal of its troops from Afghanistan which is in force. And it is for all this

that Mr. Robert H. Pelletrean, U.S. Junior Assistant Deputy Secretary of Defence for Near and South Asian Affairs said while giving testimony to the Congress Committee: that US sees no threat from Soviet Union to Pakistan. This is very important and striking.

As I have mentioned it has been pointedly directed against India and again it has regional dimension and global dimension. We know Saudi Arabia is also having AWACS and some Gulf countries are also trying to get AWACS and if we take the formation of CENTCOM Basing Pakistan in 1983 and the placement of 3 lakh of army for this purpose, which is really directed to achieve the domination of Asia, and it is only in that process, the US policy is to subvert the policies of our country, that is, the policy of peace and non-alignment. They never minced words to tell it several times. We have the reference of the history of US arms supply to Pakistan and its subsequent fall out. Selig S Harrison (Senior Associate, Caruegic Endowment of International Peace) while giving testimony to a sub-committee of US House's Foreign Affairs Committee said:

"The ill-advised programme of American military aid to Pakistan from 1954 to 1965 produced disastrous results. It was American military hardware that emboldened Pakistan to initiate tragic chain of events resulting in the Indo-pak conflict of 1965."

This policy to pressurise India, USA took up very seriously when in the Asian Relations Conference at Delhi on March 23 to April 2, 1947 with some countries of Indian Ocean region, Shri Jawaharlal Nehru said:

"For too long have we of Asia been petitioners in Western Courts and Chancelleries. That story must now belong to the past. We propose to stand on our legs and cooperate with all others

[Shri Saifuddin Chowdhary]

who are prepared to cooperate with us. We do not intend to be plaything of others."

It is this new awakening not only in India but all over Asia that really alarmed USA and they understood that their policy of domination is going to be opposed by India and those countries who are trying to stand on their feet and conspiring against this particular policy.

Every one know when on October 22, 1947, Pakistan invaded India they had the tacit support of not only Britain but there was US involvement also. One of the Commanders of invading army was Russel K. Haight of the OSS, the fore-runner of CIA. Since then Kashmir has remained a favourite issue with USA to disturb India. What all USA proposed about Kashmir?

- (a) establishment of international Administration in Kashmir;
- (b) a plebiscite under supervision of a UN Administrator.
- (c) setting up of independent Kashmir with US Guarantee.

Anyway, in this background, when Mr. Jawaharlal Nehru visited USA in October, 1949 to seek US investment in India, what the US leaders told him, what they wanted from India and that is precisely clear. They wanted that Kashmir be given to them for the purpose of establishing military base there and then only they will think of giving us aid and speaking at Columbia University in the presence of Eisenhower, who was President of the University at that time, Mr. Nehru said:

"The very process of marshalling the world into two hostile camps precipitates the conflict it is sought to avoid."

If we try to have a cursory look of the history, we see, during the Korean War,

initial doubts when India took a firm position against US Bombing of Korea and demanded peaceful settlement US Senate Foreign Affairs Committee, postponed discussion of Aid to India. They postponed discussion of Aid to India. There are several instances and I believe some reference to that will be helpful to refresh our memory. During 1953, Pakistan's going to get U.S. Military Aid came in the Agenda. In December 9, 1953, Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru wrote a letter to the Pakistani Prime Minister saying: "it will thwart negotiations on Kashmir". Later, in Parliament, he said: "when military aid comes in, the whole country becomes a military base". He said, referring to India; "if India takes U.S. military aid, then it will have to merge with the American Bloc". Now, what is happening with Pakistan is precisely this; what Nehru forecast before.

About the U.S. Base in Pakistan, that is now a known knowledge to everybody. When the decision to give them AWACS came, the Opposition Leaders in Pakistan said - about AWACS with U.S. Army—men U.S. Personnel who will operate it—"the whole country is going to be a base of USA and in a very big way, they are going to be. They also said AWACS with the U.S. personnel that they are going to get as lease, is in actual meaning Pakistan's sky to U.S.A. That is what they felt and they said. In 1954, when U.S. decided to give military aid to Pakistan, Mr. Eisenhower wrote a letter to Jawaharlal Nehru saying: "If India wants U.S. military aid, then we are ready to give it". They are ready to give us and consider sympathetically. Now, we can see their designs. They wanted to have their business going by using one against the other. That is what they tried to do. Now it is good for us that we had got that kind of statesman in the helm of affairs, Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru who rejected it and in Parliament he indignantly said and referred to the Assistant Secretary of State Mr. Robertson who said: "U.S. must dominate Asia for indefinite period". Condemning this, Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru demanded the removal of U.S. personnel from the U.N. Forces in Kashmir.

Non-reminiscent of today's Congress (I), the then Congress, after its Session in Kalyani, West Bengal, issued a circular to all PCCs, suggesting to organise mass meetings and it said like: "The United States has offered military aid to Pakistan despite protests raised by India and other countries. Practically, the cold-war has come to our doors". When cold-war was being converted to hot water, to what it was called "at our doors", what the CWC Resolution of 18 April 1987. has said? Why has it not mentioned the name of the U.S.A.? Do you require to go to West Bengal to get an idea about it? I have no objection. You can very well go. But then one thing I would like to mention is that they are the enemies—I mean the Government of USA and not the people. There are many good people there. There is no doubt about it. We must try to cultivate them. But then, what is the reason for the failure in mentioning them? Are they not identifiable? You have to tell that fact precisely to us.

Here, mention should be made of our efforts to settle that Indo-China question, at that time, Before the Geneva Conference was convened in July, 1954 in Colombo five countries—India, Ceylon, Burma, Indonesia and Thailand—met and urged ceasefire, China's recognition, and the French withdrawal. The U.S. did not like it. When this message went to the participants of the Geneva Conference, they were influenced by U.S. But then, what happened? Then, what Eisenhower had been doing? When the Geneva Agreement was being signed, all that he did was what he proposed the collective security in South East Asia and invited all the participating countries in the Colombo Conference to come to an alliance like the military pact and again it as Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru and then the Government of India that rejected it. Some countries, including Pakistan, Philippines and Thailand joined to form the SEATO. What was the reaction of U.S.A. of our refusal to participate in that, to become a part of that alliance? The International Bank of Reconstruction and Development stopped helping India carry-

ing out our steel projects. At that time we know what Mr. Dulles said; he said:

"Non-alignment is immoral and short-sighted." We cannot forget that. This military alliance named SEATO discussed Kashmir between 6th and 8th March in Karachi. Then we can also refer to what happened, what role the USA took when we had a crisis or where evaluation of one's friendship could be done. During the Goa liberations, they opposed us in the UNO and they wanted us to take back our army. Every time we are seeing that their real motive is to get India toe their line. There is no genuine friendship at all; nothing.

During the unfortunate conflict with China, The United States tried to exploit the situation. For the first time, military supply to India began, but again they did not come with any genuine intention. We were fighting a communist country. The USA should have been very happy because their aim is to contain communism. But again they did not come with anything that was without any strings. They tried to exploit that situation to expand their influence in this country. How their perception differed from ours, we all know. They put their main personnel to monitor what aid they gave us. And how much of it was effective and all that, I do not know; whether it was a real military aid, I do not know. But they tried to use our air-fields. Some kind of an air umbrella they umbrella they wanted to put up. Then some kind of information manipulation they wanted to do by setting up a VOA Centre in Calcutta. All that, we know.

After the Indo-Pakistan war in 1965, the United States supposedly stopped supply of arms to both. But here again we see their double standards. They allowed Iran to supply straight fighters, sabers, to Pakistan. Later on, they themselves resumed supply to Pakistan.

We all know, and we cannot forget, what they did in 1971 during Bangladesh liberation. They sent their Seventh Fleet. Who

[Shri Saifuddin Chowdhary]

then came to stand by our side? The Soviet Union, we all know. I do not have to advocate for them. That is our time-tested relationship.

Then we all know the situation in Punjab and the U.S. role in it, how they are encouraging the terrorists, how they are giving them shelter in their country. We all know about the Hardgriev's Report and all that on the assassination of Shrimati Indira Gandhi.

We know how in Sri Lanka they have entered, how Mossad, the Israeli intelligence, is operating there, and how they are responsible to keep alive the ethnic conflict there, how they are thwarting all efforts to bring about a settlement there. We all know this.

Also in our own country, about certain things like Brahmaputra Project, I am not going to refer now. But the question comes of the Indian Ocean, the Diego Garcia question. In the Indian Ocean which is very much related to our security concern, what has been the role of the USA? We know how they have created their base in Diego Garcia and what are the feelings of the littoral States. What are we trying to do there? In this context, I can quote Capt. Alfred Mahan, the U.S. naval thinker: he said about the Indian Ocean:

"Whoever controls the Indian Ocean dominates Asia. The Ocean is the key to the seven Seas. In the Twenty-first Century, the destiny of the world will be decided on its waters."

Now, it seems that that is coming true. Who is responsible for that? Whether the destiny of the world will be decided or not, I do not know, but the destiny of the USA will be decided, it seems to me. This portion, 6,500 kms long and 6,000 kms broad, around which one-third of the humanity lives— we are trying to have it as a Zone of Peace. The UNO acted in that regard. In

1971 they proposed certain things. Later they set up a Commission; they proposed an International Conference.

But it is not being held due to US aid. Colombo was decided as the Venue, but they are also backing out. I do not have to say, I believe Mr. Natwar Singh will say in the House. Even before UNO took this kind of stand, I believe in 1964 USSR proposed that Indian Ocean should be made a 'De-nuclearised Zone'. Then we have to tell the total picture to our people. I am not an advocate of anybody, But the point is we are advocates of our own country. And what is the interest of our country we have to keep it in mind. Now, what we should do? Much we understand, much can be said on what we have to do. Minimum we can do is to take a firm stand not that all time diplomatic and fluid. Take a firm stand. Now we have sought their aid. I do not know, Sir. 50 million dollars to 35 million dollars, that is, they have cut as punishment measure. You tell them (*Interruptions*) We told them we don't require your aid. What is that? As a punishment action they have said. Mr. Natwar Singh you sit here. Don't go to New York. You call their Ambassador here. (*Interruptions*) Anywhere you can go from here except to New York, to Washington. Why do you go there, I do not know? Can't you call them to your office? (*Interruptions*). You went there to buy hard time to India, it seems to me.

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS (SHRI K. NATWAR SINGH): Bush and Weinberger were here.

SHRI SAIFUDDIN CHOWDHARY: That is another danger.

Now you must know that Brazil refused to take US aid when it was given with some condition. We should go to them not at any humiliating condition, with begging bowl, "give aid, aid." AIDS are coming in our country. (*Interruptions*)

I said about the Congress Party.

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA: Don't think about other AIDS.

SHRI SAIFUDDIN CHOWDHARY: I have a new meaning of AIDS for the Congress (I). 'Acute Intelligence Deficiency Syndrome of the Congress Party. Now again, you went there. Mr. Tiwari is about to go there. What for is he going? To crack his head on the stones of the White House. What for he is going, we do not know. And now you have announced this just the other day. Michael Armacos—I believe you have a copy of his speech—he said that no country has a right to veto the US policy regarding Pakistan. What for we are going?

Then about super computers. Well, you want XMP-24, I believe. Are they going to give you? For how long super computers are going and superb things are happening in this country. Will they give us? You are going to purchase it or not. If they say we don't give, you say 'thanks'. If they say give you, you say 'thanks'. What is this lobbying and bargaining, I do not know? It is very humiliating for the people of this country.

Now the penchant of modernisation and 21st century and all that science and technology has influenced our minds, I believe. This is good. We should be self-reliant on that. But, do you know what their leading thinkers have said. How do they view supply of science and technology to the other countries. They view it as instrument of their foreign policy. Again, it is not without any strings. Your Resolution has said about destabilisation. I do not know whether Government have come out with anything concrete. What you have said is about destabilisation. Well, who is doing it? Who is behind that? You have not said but I have said it before. Now, you invited Weinberger and took him to certain projects of our defence to Bangalore. And where is the report?

Here is a report in the Times of India dated October 15. The U.S. delegation

which was led today by Mr. Weinberger's deputy, the Assistant Secretary for International Security Affairs was briefed about India's security concern and its research and development plans by the Chief of the Army Staff, Gen. Sundarji and the Scientific Adviser to the Defence Minister. What was the brief you know! You want to get super computers and they are getting super knowledge from India. (Interruptions)

Then you are going to get engine for LCA and that too by destroying our own initiative for seven years and certain other sectors. This is a very sensitive area. Are we to be dependant on them for certain things very important for us? Are they reliable? I am not going to plead to you from where you should get super-computers. If you require you search all over the world and get it but there should not be any condition to sign this and sign that.

Now a word about aid. In 1983 the Cartrucci Commission said the U.S. assistance programmes made an indispensable contribution to achieving foreign policy objectives. That is also not without strings. We know what dependance on the U.S. means on any matter. We have the experience of Latin American countries and many other countries. How they ruined themselves when they depended on U.S. aid and on that food programme and other. It thwarts the independence of that particular country who takes it. They enter in the name of Economic Aid and like that. They allure the leaders. In 1977 the U.S. news and world report said that between 1961-76 CIA carried 900 major secret operations to over-throw or influence the Government. So understand whom you are dealing with. You know in our love to get technology or some aid whom we will be bringing in our country. We have to be very careful when we deal with them. They are imperialists. That particular word is there in your CWC resolution. They are not gentlemen to be dealt with on a gentleman's basis.

Now, Sir, maybe that we should not take

[Shri Saifuddin Chowdhary]

the aid. You may refuse it. That is my suggestion. But then you should not allow them to go scot free also. All their wealth is also due to the plunder they made of the third world countries and poor countries. There are certain multi-lateral agencies. You take on U.S. there on those platforms combining with other countries and extract more dollars from them through that and from there arranged aid without any condition. You should do it. There should be a fight. You know how in Latin America they are fighting the indebtedness and how they are trying to get together. They are saying your wealth is my wealth.

Now, Sir, even in these multi-lateral agencies the conditionality that is posed by the USA is not to the benefit of the developing countries at all. In March 1979 the U.S. magazine 'Time' noted that the developing countries were becoming profitable clients. For every dollar U.S. contributed to International Monetary Organisation giving aid to developing countries the latter paid two dollars in goods and services. For every dollar paid to World Bank the U.S. received 9.5 dollars in return in the form of contracts, current expenses, interest payments and all that. It is not that they are obliging anybody, by giving aid. Actually they are reaping the benefit and through this conditioned aid the independence of a particular country is being thwarted. Their policies are being subverted. So we should try for a fair relation in the international affairs. I do not know how the North-South dialogue will lead but as suggested by Mr. Bipin Pal Das the other day the South-South cooperation is very important for us. We should bring together all these poor countries.

Now, Sir, even in our papers and they have also reported that there is substantial improvement in our relationship. They are happy with what we are doing, namely, inviting multi-nationals, liberalising the import policy and so on and so forth. They are very happy. Their happiness is

expressed in many ways. They are euphoric about it. But you should not.

You should understand that one of ten of all the U.S. workers is in manufacturing industry and are involved in export trade. So exports to other countries are also a necessity for them. It is not that they are obliging anybody. So there should be respectable equal terms. It is not like a poor beggar we should feel ourselves really elated that somebody is going to give us something.

Now in this connection while I demand that the whole lot of conspiracy that is done by USA against the interests of our country needs to be exposed and we have no inhibition in telling that to our people but then the Government has to come forward clearly. The Congress Party has to come forward clearly. It is not that for a particular period for your convenience you say destabilisation. Destabilisation is for a particular policy and not for a particular person. It is a question of the people of the country. How we view the world situation that is very important.

Here I have this Mid-Day edition of May 3, 1987. There are two news items here. One is about 'Israeli connection of PM's guards. We sent some security people via Singapore to Israel to get training and in lieu of that we brought Uzi guns for prime Minister's security personnel. Whose security you are keeping, I do not know! You have seen how Mossad is doing havoc in Sri Lanka. You have to give answer to this. The second news item is about the U.S. aid to Pakistan affecting our thinking in a wrong way. Prime Minister may review stand on NPT. What is that? It means that some people in USA think that if you sign NPT then you may be given aid. Whether we are to sign it or not that is a separate matter. You can come to the Parliament and we can debate that but the point is that there should not be anything secretive. Nothing should be secretive and in no point we should be entrapped by them. It will be a sign of our weakness. NPT you like to sign we can discuss. That is another

thing. But if you think by signing it they will be less hostile to you that is wrong. We do not require a good friend like this mad Government of Reagan.

We don't like that. And there may be other different clause that you should sign mutually inspection treaty with Pakistan. That is another way of NPT. We should not fall in that trap.

Now, what I require from this Government is that they should come very harshly against this Government of USA which is acting hostile against India, which is trying to subvert our non-aligned policy, peace policy. You should also take a lead. We are going to give you all support to mobilise the mass opinion in this regard.

At the end, I appeal to the Government that we should be unanimous on this. We can adopt a resolution from this House condemning all the acts of hostility perpetuated by USA against our country. With these words, I thank you.

SHRI B.R. BHAGAT (Arrah): Mr. Chairman, Sir, I begin my remarks by paying a tribute to the Hon'ble Member who initiated the debate for setting a very wide trend on this important matter. Sir, once more the Indo-American relations have gone to pieces and once more the underlying reasons behind it are the same. The Hon'ble Member gave certain historical anecdotes. He quoted our great leader Pt. Jawaharlal Nehru on this basic question. But I would like to remind the Hon'ble House that the basic reason for the failure of the Indo-American relations is that the United States of America because of its global ambitions and certain global obsessions failed to come to terms with one of the mighty force in history, that is, Indian nationalism, Indian independence, that force of nationalism that came out. In the 50's when Pt. Jawaharlal Nehru first visited the United States of America, he gave the slogan despite different social systems, political systems in this present-day world. At that time, only America had the nuclear

capacity, they had the nuclear know-how, they had the nuclear bombs. The Soviet Union had not yet come out and it was a very dangerous situation. There are secret reports that the American militarists—the military industrial complex—rules America. I will come to that point. I want to emphasise time and time again that it is that force within the American system that had torpedoed all peaceful relations that developed in the post-war world. They had also torpedoed the blooming relationship between India and United States. They had even planned, at that time, the secret report that when they had the monopoly of nuclear bombs, as many as 20 cities in the Soviet Union were all targeted to be attacked. It was a dangerous situation at that moment.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru had seen this great historical perception. Whatever be the monopoly of power in one hand, the world cannot be ruled by domination of that brute force. He gave the slogan that whatever be the different social system, political system—he gave the slogan in America, in the United Nations—that India is free to join any military bloc, India is non-aligned and will follow a peaceful policy in the international affairs. The independent policy of the world in international relations can only be governed by peaceful coexistence. That was the slogan India gave and what was the response? He had an excellent rapport with President Eisenhower, a man of peace, a good man, a great man. But what happened? His Secretary of State said: Non-alignment is immoral. He followed a policy of brinkmanship and all that—you know, the military bloc. Again, in the United States, it is the military industrial complex that dominates.

Then, I come to a few years later during the time when the Indo-US relations flourished as beautifully as it could in the situation. That was during the liberal period of President Kennedy and when Galbrith was the Ambassador here. I will quote Galbrith, he came only a few months back and I think, Natwar Singh had a good chat with him, they are good friends. I will quote him



[Shri B.R. Bhagat]

what he said on this and why the Indo-US relations had not developed in the manner as it should have. At that time, Soviet Union was nowhere in the picture; the Indo-Soviet relationship, the economic relationship was not there. From India the request was that the Americans, the USA would build the steel plants. President Kennedy and Galbrith were favourably inclined and it was the time when India's first industrial policy was out and it was said that the steel and other basic and co-industries would be in the public sector. President Kennedy was inclined, and Galbrith was working hard so that with the Indo-USA cooperation, the steel plant is built. But Germans later on came and built the Rourkela Steel Plant, but not the Americans. This was because President Kennedy proposed and the military industrial complex, the power in the United State systems opposed and, therefore, it was vetoed by them once again.

After that it just started the beginning of the Indo-Soviet cooperation which has developed from strength to strength and flowered and today it has become one of the best model in the world how the relations between two countries, two States should be in the international arena.

Then, later on in the 60s you have again seen the promise given by President Eisenhower. On the arms sales to Pakistan we expressed our concern as my colleague Mr Natwar Singh, the Minister of State, expressed India's concern in Washington now. We did it three decades ago. We said that Pakistan's propensity, inclination is basically anti-Indian and that the arms were going to be used against us. President Eisenhower gave a written assurance that these arms would not be used against India. Even then, the great Krishna Menon, the Defence Minister at that time said that he did not believe it. He made a statement and he said that he was yet to see a gun which was pointed only in one direction. That was his famous statement. But it is a

fact that President Eisenhower gave a written assurance that these arms would not be used against India. But these arms were used against India in the 1965 war, so much so that we produced a Patton tank that was used against us. We captured that tank and it was displayed in Delhi and the American Ambassador protested. Just imagine! But today the situation is a little worse. Our friend, Natwar Singh has drawn a blank there. He has not been given an assurance. he asked: For whom are these very sophisticated arms being given to Pakistan? These Harpoon missiles, naval boats. Are they to be used in Afghanistan? They are all naval for the navy. Where is the navy? Where is the sea in Afghanistan? Now, F-16, the latest air warning systems, AWACS, avionics and others. Where will they be used? In the mountainous regions? On the Afghanistan border or will they be covering the 300 km range of the Punjab plains, Rajasthan plains, the military formations in India?

But, this time the situation is so dangerous and grave that they have given up the pretence. Whatever may be the reason, they kept mum. So, no assurance on this. Then again the situation has arisen like this. The latest initiative from the Indian side was taken by our Prime Minister who visited the United States of America in June, 1985. His talks with President Reagan and other leaders was described by the American Press as a milestone in the relationship between India and United States and the reason being that a hopeful atmosphere was created. It was said that a considerable progress has been made in our bilateral trade, industrial collaboration, technology including high technology transfer, cultural contacts, etc. Hopefully we are entering into an era of a happy phase of Indo-American relations. But, our experience says that our relation with America has been of deep valleys of disquiet and distrust. There has been a small piece of optimism also. At the present moment the relationship, as I have said, has gone in pieces, as it was never before, because there comes the question of per-

ception, or ambition or even of obsession to contain in the beginning. Examples were given of the faulty historic perception of American power in the world today. After the Second World War, one basic obsession was that they want to contain communism. But, the fact of the matter is that, I would like to quote at this stage what Prof. Galbrith said in Jaipur while speaking on the subject a few weeks before. He said "If Indo-American relation is to be improved and is to be normalised, then the Americans must dispel the feeling of suspicion in India that U.S. masters were replacing the British masters." Actually, this is the core of the problem. It is the tragedy of history that America, which was the first nation to get out of the British colonialism in 1876, became in the post World War the pursuer of the colonialism of the worst kind. Thanks to the ideas, inspirations given by Gandhiji, who said, "When India will become free it will work for the freedom of every man in the world," thanks to Pandit Jawahar Lal Nehru who took this mission and worked for the freedom of the countries in Asia, Africa and Latin America, that struggle is still going on because India's aspiration or perception is that till the last vestige of colonialism disappear from this earth it will not rest content. It is a matter of treat pride for all of us, for every Indian that in the Harare Summit our Prime Minister, Shri Rajiv Gandhi played a determined role to strengthen the unity of the people, to create the wherewithals the material resources, the Africa Fund and to mobilise it so that the struggle against South Africa and Namibia is continued despite the fact that the Americans and others totally opposed it. Basically what they fear most, as I said, is the Indian nationalism; its freedom, independence, their struggle for decolonisation, liberation of mankind and the unfortunate tragedy of history that the Americans follow. They follow the policy of preserving not only the pre-war *status quo*, but forging new instruments of neo-colonialism, neo-imperialism and all that. It is a very wide subject.

Hon. Member, Mr. Chowdhary, has men-

tioned how in the economic field; how in the other fields, this neo-colonialism is spreading. I would not like to go into this now. But, I said, they were defeated everywhere, because they were on the wrong side of history. They have the wrong perception. It began with Korea. They wanted them to maintain the *status quo* with the Japanese colonialism, i.e. which the Japanese left there, during the occupation of Korea. That was their perception. But they met with defeat. That was the first defeat. There, India played their role. India was the only acceptable country. Such was the moral stature of India. During this conflict, it was the Indian Military mission which went there to maintain the ceasefire. They went there to prevent the ceasefire operations. Here, you can see the Indian history, their perception and all that. You can also see the American response. But they thought India, with its legacy of non-violence, pursuing a most civilised action, involving all its masses and particularly during Indian independence, never in history of mankind, so many millions of people participated for the freedom. By means of non-violence, they said, we will sacrifice everything, but we must be free. That was the message of the Indian independence and it came into conflict in the Second World War and that has resulted in the formation of most powerful, peaceful movement—peaceful independent movement,—i.e. Non-Aligned Movement, today. Over 100 countries, today, are its members. They do not have the military power. Power in the present sense means, they have a moral power. They are prepared to sacrifice everything for their independence and for a world in which they can fight neo-colonialism, imperialism, subjugation of any form—political, economic, social and even informational and cultural. Today, these powers dominate even the cultural life, i.e. the media and all these things. I need not go into all these things. The subjugation is so total today that India under the leadership of Jawaharlal Nehru and others have posed today as the biggest and powerful movement in history. That is the answer. The Americans were trying to dominate the world both

[Shri B.R. Bhagat]

militarily and industrially. That is why, I make a distinction, whenever it comes to the political masters—the President or even the Congress—they are subverted by this military-industrial group. They call the tune finally. If something happens tomorrow Natwar Singh will go out, and Shri N D. Tiwari will go and see that the thing which has happened and if they don't like it, then, they pool their strength and then everything comes down. That is the situation there, and we are not worried at all. It has been seen that there is a move to cut the aid which is coming to India. It is now coming down every year. From 50 million dollars, it has come down to 35 million dollars. Whether they do like this or not, we are not at all concerned with it. We do not even bother, whether they give it or not. So, why give them this importance, Mr Chowdhary? We ask them, if you want to give us aid, give, otherwise, don't give. India today — now thanks to the collective efforts of our people of this country—stands on its own legs. In the Seventh Plan, we have only 6 per cent marginal resources and the other 94 percent is our's. There may be greater success stories in a democratic set up in a situation like this and particularly in the parliamentary form, where we have got support of the entire House regarding the type of social and economic order that we are building, we have the consensus of the whole House in regard to this.

The real crux is that they want to pressurize us, that we give up our independent action, independent policy. They want to pressurize us. Sometimes they screw this way—through economic aid, assistance and various other things. But there is the will of the people, it is the combined will of our people; the path in foreign policy that we have taken, the path of Jawaharlal Nehru and the Indian National Congress, supported by all others—the entire Parliament and the entire spectrum of political parties. We will never give up, whatever may be the pressure.

Today, if I may say so, the pressure is the strongest. Never was such a great pressure exercised upon us, to give up our path, to compromise, to kowtow, to bend under pressure as today. We have given the answer: we will never be pressurized. We will never give up the path which we have collectively chosen for us.

The Congress Working Committee has passed a resolution, that the de-stabilisation process is on. You accept it in respect of external de-stabilisation, Mr Chowdhary; but you do not accept it in respect of the internal one. A very seasoned politician, parliamentarian and leader like Mr Indrajit Gupta also says: 'Internally, we do not accept; externally, we accept.' You are Communists. You know the basic nexus between internal and external things. Can external de-stabilization exist without internal de-stabilisation?

SHRI SAIFUDDIN CHOWDHARY: We never deny that. But don't do certain things that will encourage both—internal de-stabilisation, and the external one. We want a good Government. That is all.

SHRI B.R. BHAGAT: We are very clear in our understanding about our foreign policy and about foreign forces. Let there be a basic understanding on this. Then there will be no difficulty in following whatever instruments that we forge. My point about the internal de-stabilisation is this. There are, you know, people; there are, of course, forces which are linked with those external forces of de-stabilisation.

SHRI SAIFUDDIN CHOWDHARY: You sever relation with communalists.

SHRI B R BHAGAT: There are forces. They were there earlier; they are there now. This attempt is an off-and-on attempt.

Another point is that there is a nexus. We cannot make a distinction between...

(Interruptions)

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please; please take your seat, Mr Ram Singh Yadav. That will not go on record. No running commentary; it will not go on record.

SHRI B. R. BHAGAT: Having said that there is a nexus between the internal forces of destabilisation and the external ones, the point I make in this: As students of post-War external developments, you must have seen that the powers that are working, never cease to operate. It is off-and-on—sometimes on, and sometimes off.

SHRI NARAYAN CHOUBEY: (Midna Por) rose.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Please allow Mr. Bhagat to speak. You can speak later.

SHRI B. R. BHAGAT. We are a powerful country. But there are instances everywhere. You see what is happening around you. What has happened in Grenada, a small country of just 300,000 people? There, a regime changes, peacefully— not by violence. When a new regime comes, it poses— according to the President of the United States himself — a threat to American security. And here, the American marines move. Or, look at Nicaragua. India, luckily, is not a small country. India is a big country, and the people are bigger, and are prepared to make any sacrifice for their freedom, and for their freedom of action. It is Indian nationalism—any sacrifice they will make. Therefore, you cannot treat India like this. But in an incipient way, and in many other ways they operate. They operate.

Therefore, let us be clear about it: If they can, they will do it. I will give you another example. These forces of imperialism, i.e. domination by force— economic force or military force — operate all the time. Can you think of a more powerful country than Soviet Union? Don't they seek to manipulate it? What do they say?

**17.00 hrs**

They started information campaign that the Soviet Union is a military power. There

is no doubt about it. But it is not a big economic power. Therefore, the basis behind the STI programme, the Star Wars programme is that it will cost—according to their own estimate—2 trillion dollars. It is a very big burden on them. The American scientists said that if the American Government spent 2 trillion dollars, it will be a very heavy burden on the American people and that they had to give up all the good things, social security, etc. for the poor people and the common people; and they will not be able to achieve their objective. This is what the American scientists said. This was the opinion of the other people there. But the philosophy behind this is that they will force the Soviet Union to spend the same amount for military competition with the result that the Soviet Union will break, because they are not economic power. Then what will happen is that all the 27 parties, the congress, all the programme for modernisation, doubling the income by the end of the century, providing a house to every Soviet citizen, improving the quality of life of the Soviet citizens, all these things will be nullified. Then the help that they are giving for maintaining independence of the countries everywhere in the world, they will not be able to do it. Therefore, for this reason, STI is a must. Is it not a manipulation? Is it not a destabilisation of the worst kind? Therefore, when you go into the question of destabilisation, you should not look for any concrete action. India is being destabilised all the time because India has been following an independent policy and it is a thorn in their nest; it is a thorn in the next of the entire American imperialist thinking. India not only has been following an independent policy, but India has got the guts to stand up right. Mrs. Indira Gandhi said, stand up right and face any threat, even the worst kind of threat that came in the Bay of Bengal in the Seventh Nuclear Fleet. At that time, Indira Gandhi was not alone. She was Durga. The entire House was behind her. The entire country was behind her. Such was the might. They got this taste. This was the taste of the power of non-violence, power of the people that they will die, 800 million people will die. This was the mes-

[Shri B.R. Bhagat]

sage of India's independence which is reflected in our Gandhian philosophy, in our international relations at the time of Jawaharlal Nehru. We said, we will die but we will never surrender. This is the power of the Indian nationalism. But they got that taste. They had been defeated, defeated and defeated everywhere. They got the bitter taste in Vietnam. They continued the war and they were defeated and totally defeated, but they did not learn the lesson.

Now, they have come into our region. The situation is very serious. They have come now on our path. Now the emphasis is on this region; it has started with a base in Diego Garcia. Then it was upgraded; then it become a nuclear base, nuclear submarine base; and they went around for nuclear facilities. In the meanwhile, a resolution was passed by the United Nations declaring the Indian zone as a zone of peace. This was sabotaged.

Today Indian Ocean is the most militarised zone, dangerously militarised zone having all kinds of missiles, all varieties of most sophisticated weapons, all kinds of nuclear submarines and all that; then other facilities are also there. This was the movement for Pakistan, because there is no democracy. We have always loved for the people of Pakistan because they are the same so far as the basic interest of the people of Pakistan and India is concerned. But, unfortunately, in Pakistan, there is a military regime. And military regime they saw this. Then the Afghan situation and the presence of Soviet troops, the nexus developed between the U.S. and Pakistan and now if I may say so thanks to this news, they are defeated all over. Now they are concentrating in the Indian Ocean and in the Gulf with one of the American strategies, it seems to me to make Pakistan as their main ally here and then in the Middle East Israel and in the African area you have South Africa, this is the nexus and then Diego Garcia base. And you see the scenario, and all are nuclear powers. South Africa is known to possess nuclear bombs,

Israel is known to possess some. These are all stories emanating in American papers. I have no other source of information. They say, Israel may be having fifty to one hundred nuclear bombs, South Africa is having, and the Pakistan's nuclear facility is there. Not only they are having double standards, but the policy, the support they have given to them, the Americans they have failed to persuade Pakistan—that comes to this completely—they have failed to persuade Pakistan, or to prevent Pakistan from going nuclear, and develop the nuclear facility. But they say, why not you do it, come to an agreement on NPT. Then Pakistan and India both should not have any nuclear capability. All mysterious things! Slanderous! Insulting the country! Our position on NPT is known. It is not a bilateral issue between India and Pakistan. It is a moral issue. It is a basic moral question, it is discriminatory, NPT. That is why we have not accepted it, it has nothing to do with Pakistan having the bomb or not having a nuclear bomb. But the fact is that they have again given them aid. President Carter because of the fear of opposition, he stopped aid to Pakistan and then in 1982 when President Reagan came he has started. He gave his first ever waiver of Symington Amendment that any country which is preparing for nuclear capability will not be given. They got these five years. Now again, knowing all this material that is there, they have given Pakistan. They know that Pakistan is— if not the bomb— having it in the basement, or a turn or screw-driver away from the bomb, or they are just at the threshold of the bomb, the declaration of their nuclear scientist, Dr. Khan that they have a bomb made to their own journalists. All these are but even then they have waived the amendment. This is a deception that they are practising.

But our answer is that it has cast a heavy burden on us. The process as has been pointed out in the House itself, we have been seeing the increasing military links between U.S.A. and China. We have also seen reports of trilateral U.S.-China-Pakistan military cooperation and an

American Company Burman was asked to do a feasibility study of upgrading the Chinese origin F-7 aircraft with U.S. technology for Pakistan. We have this information. We have news of the sophisticated weapons and the \$4.02 billion aid which has been sanctioned now and will be operating from October this year, of which \$1.8 billion is the direct military component.

So, you can imagine the threat reception and therefore when this is the situation this is the scenario. When I started saying that the Indo-American relations have gone to pieces, it is an understatement. We are facing a great threat in our region, all due to the disquieting developments which I have enumerated. The Hon'ble Minister will give more information in his reply since he has more information at his disposal. All these series of disquieting developments in the recent past have emanated due to the faulty and wrong actions of the United States of America, which I call it their global obsessions. This has resulted in marring the progress whenever we try to improve relations with them. We must have friendly relations with every one. When we say, peaceful co-existence despite different social systems, when we work for peace and non-alignment, we have to develop co-relations with every one. The United States of America is a strong mighty power. We have trade relations with them. We have economic relations with them. They are our trading partners. It is in our interest to develop friendly relations with them. But whenever we have tried to do it, we could not succeed. For example, the initiative taken by the Prime Minister, Shri Rajiv Gandhi, in June 1985 have all gone waste because of the wrong policies and wrong perceptions in this region. The House has already been alerted by the Defence Minister and Foreign Minister. Here is another occasion. We will have to safeguard our national interest and keep the alliance of forces for peace and progress in the world because that is ultimately the bulwark with which we will finally defeat the forces of domination or imperialism or neo-colonialism,

which are still going on in this world.

SHRI B.B. RAMAIAH (Eluru): Mr. Chairman, Sir, the two speakers have covered the Indo-American relations and exhaustively explained how it is passing through different stages. I only want to add a few points. It also requires a balance of thinking. We had ups and downs with them. When we really needed food, the PL-480 had helped us and it had really given a strong support at that time. In 1962 when we had war with China, as Mr. Bhagat also mentioned, Kennedy had given an air umbrella for India, protection umbrella. The relations have changed slowly and their policies have also changed. I also agree with the previous speakers that today's position is entirely different. It all varies from people to people. We feel they are friendly with us. We feel we have very good relations with them. When it comes to the policies of the Government, there are lot of variations at different stages. During Nixon's time, things have deteriorated I should not mention whether it was a Democratic or a Republican, in whose period it has happened or how it has happened, whether it is the U.S. President's main policy or the people are connected with their supporters and advisers during that period. Again, what is happening today is entirely different. During the time of Carter, there was a light change for better in our relations with the United States at various levels. As Mr. Bhagat has mentioned, we have good relations in some of the aspects and we have had some bad experiences. They have given science and technology. They have trade relations. They have helped us in developmental aspects in particular.

But still they also have lot of problems with us. For example, they earlier promised nuclear fuel for our Tarapur Plant, but later on, they went back. And we really had lot of problems on that score. This sort of things are happening and we are facing various problems. As I mentioned earlier, during our war with Pakistan on the Bangladesh

[Shri B.B. Ramaiah]

issue, things had deteriorated to such a level that it became the worst part of our relations with them. In spite of that, even at that time when you look at people to people relations, they were not that bad. But I do not know why at the governmental level their policies are different. They seem to be always supporting democracies in the world. But unfortunately, their policies are not like that. Look at what happened in Iran, what happened in the case of Phillipines and of Pakistan? In case of other places their policies are totally different. Today, what is happening in Pakistan? They should have really supported the largest and biggest democracy namely, India in various fields. But unfortunately, their policies are varying from time to time and from factor to factor.

SHRI C. MADHAV REDDI (Adilabad): They have more faith in military government.

SHRI SAIFUDDIN CHOWDHARY: Military democracy!

SHRI B.B. RAMAIAH: Whatever you may call it.

We should try various options. We should see how we utilise the advantages of various developed nations, their help to us just like the fact that an atom bomb can destroy the world but also it can help people in different ways. A cobra can kill with its poison, but cobra's poison is life saving also. It depends how our policies come to play its role, how we utilise their capabilities and whether we can make use of them properly.

It is really surprising that the United States refused to allow anybody else to make trade with China, but today they have the best relations with them. And what is happening in Pakistan-China-US link, in their own relationship? What I feel is that if we are able to do something in

different ways, in international field, with big powers and through our non-aligned policy we can influence and soften these things, that will be very good for the mankind. As Mr. Bhagat has put it, today the defence expenditure in the world is exceeding thousands billion dollars and if only 10 per cent of this can be reduced and used for the help of the needy nations, there would be tremendous amount of improvement in the civilisation of the world. That would help so many people and create lot of opportunities for the rest of the developing countries. This aspect we will have to consider and see how we can use our influence, our non-aligned policy and how to soften these big powers in various fields. It is easy to get stress and strains with anybody. But if it is possible to compromise without sacrificing our self-respect, on our external relationship, we should take advantage of that. Of course, I know that our Government is trying its best in this field wherever it is possible. But in spite of that, things are happening in slightly different ways. Every one of us is really dismayed the way assistance is being given by USA to Pakistan. As Mr. Bhagat has put it, they say it is for the Afghanistan affair. Nobody else in the world can believe it because it really does not serve the purpose for which they are doing it.

In spite of our best efforts, our relations with the United States have not improved. Our Government must have put in all efforts to convince the United States that 1.7 billion dollar military aid to Pakistan should be softened or reduced to the maximum extent. But unfortunately, I do not know what exactly has happened because things seem to be not in favour of us. For example, even on super computer system that we are trying to bargain with them, when our hon. Prime Minister was there in the USA in 1985. At that time, he was almost trying to persuade them to get the super computer technology to us. It took so long. But even now, nothing seems to be on the way. We are where we were. I really do not know where exactly the prob-

lem comes, whether the terms and dictations are very heavy. Of course, we will never sacrifice the country's self-respect. If their terms and conditions are reasonable, only then can we accept them not otherwise.

As they were saying, the Airforce Warning Contract System which this U.S. wants to lease out to Pakistan is a very dangerous system. I do not know how they are able to come into this sort of attitude to Pakistan. Probably they would like to have a base in this continent. Whoever accepts it on their terms, they will try to do it. But they must also look into the neighbouring countries as to what is the amount of danger it is going to create and also the pollution that it is going to create which will cause us anything. If a country like United States, with all the knowledge and experience, is trying to go in for a system that is going to create a lot of problems in a particular continent, it is not good for them, not for anybody else. But whatever it is, we have to prepare ourselves to face the consequences. In whatever direction it will go, whoever is trying to help us, whether the help that we will get is going to be really of the same nature or of some other nature, by what methods we do it, is a part of our responsibility.

I have mentioned earlier and also our friends have said about the small problem of 50 million assistance. I do not know why they want to make a cut. Maybe they want to show that they have disrespect or they want to give a signal of their dissatisfaction, but it is a very insignificant type of thing and I know definitely that our country will never sacrifice our respect and dignity in small things like this—of course, not even in big things. Unfortunately, the stress and strain seems to be slowly increasing and not softening. But there are ways and means how we should be able to soften the whole system by the big nations, the big powers. We have developed a tremendous amount of force in the international fields and the largest number of countries are in line with us—the Non-Aligned Countries' force; and even the

Commonwealth Countries. I do not know whether this whole system can be able to use it. I do not know what is going to be and how best we can utilise it to the best interests of our country. Just as any other country will look for their own people and for their own respect, whether it would be helpful to us, in what way we can do it, whether the possibilities are there, it is up to us how our policy can be changed to benefit our country and not to create any other problems. It is up to us how best we can try to do it.

One more thing is that the United States always says that they are the largest democracy, that there are no distinctions or colour barriers. But when it comes to South Africa, they are clearly coming out with their own policies. In their own country they say there are no distinctions or colour barriers and all these things and that they want to support democracy, but in South Africa they are not able to give their support on the same terms. So many times the issue has come up in the United Nations and people have been supporting it. In view of all these things, I only request that our relations with United States or with any big nation requires a little carefulness and thought-provoking requirement to see that we maintain our dignity and, at the same time, respect our people and help our nation. By whatever method we do it, it is up to us. I thank you very much for giving me the opportunity.

SHRI G.G. SWELL (Shillong): Mr. Chairman, I thought a debate of this type should afford us an opportunity for a hard-headed appraisal of our relations with the United States of America, one of the super powers of the world whose presence around us is felt by us, and we are worried about it. This debate should afford us an opportunity for a hard-headed appraisal of our diplomacy and foreign relations as a whole. I must say that I was greatly enlightened by the speech of my colleague Shri B.R. Bhagat, one of the best speeches he has made, in which he has made a review of the gamut of relations between our country and the



[Shri G.G. Swell]

United States and has stressed the developments to where the relations are today, unhappy relations—I won't say adversarial relations. But, at the same time, I am also grateful to my friend who has spoken just now.

17.25 hrs.

[MR DEPUTY-SPEAKER *in the Chair*]

He has given us the picture of another kind of relation that we had with the United States of America, good relation which is an indication that there is hope of doing better, of having a better relation with the United States of America, but not at the cost of our good relations with our good and tried friends like the Soviet Union. But I would also say this that it is nice to hear and we totally endorse what Mr. Bhagat has said that when it comes to it, we as a nation will stand as one man, face any danger and make any sacrifice. But just moralisation and moral posturings are not going to cut very much ice. It is very much necessary for us also to adopt certain measures to do certain things, to convey to the American Government and the American people and to the world as a whole that we are serious about it.

We attach very great importance to our relations with the United States of America. The fact that we have just held there the India Festival running for a long period was an indication that we like America and the American people to understand us, to understand the history, the background, the perception of India. And I think the India Festival has served a good purpose. We have been able to reach a very large cross section of the American people including the intellectuals. I would agree with a number of things that the mover of the motion Shri Chowdhary has said about the events and developments which were unfortunate, which have created the feeling of fear, if not distrust between us and

America. But I won't subscribe to his conclusion that all that America has done in our immediate neighbourhood, especially in Pakistan, and we know what they are doing there, is pointed towards India.

America has a global perception. It has a geo-strategic perception. It has, as my friend Mr. Bhagat says, an obsession. The obsession is the fear of Communism, the fear of the Soviet Union and its occupation is to contain the Soviet Union. We have to go back a little historically. There was a time when Afghanistan, which is so much today a centre of all the trouble involving the Soviet Russia, was an out-post for the Americans. They had their electronic listening devices, they had a base there and it was from Afghanistan and Peshawar, that an American U-2 spy-planes went to the skies of the Soviet Union and was shot down. That was Afghanistan.

SHRI NARAYAN CHOUBEY: Peshawar is in Pakistan.

SHRI G.G. SWELL: Pakistan or Afghanistan, they had a strong presence even in Afghanistan. The United States and the Soviet Union were struggling for an advantageous position in Afghanistan and Afghanistan afforded a very good base for the United States to set up their electronic listening devices and to spy on the developments in the Soviet Union. Now, that Afghanistan has gone, it is Pakistan today. It is part of a geo-strategic conception of the United States of America, it is part of the Central Command of the United States of America in this part of the world in which Pakistan today is a frontline State, a most important link in the entire chain. We have to understand this. It is not necessarily that the U.S.A. has India in its mind. I am sure the U.S.A. has nothing to fear from India. But they would like India also, if they can, to fall in line and to provide another link in the chain of their Central Command but India, because of her strength, because of her people, because of her policies and everything else, would not agree to this kind of thing, would not submit to this kind of arm-twisting. That is why there is this

kind of feeling in the American Administration towards India.

It has to be reached to the American people that their conception is faulty, their conception is flawed. There was a time when Iran was the most important State for the U.S.A. in South Asia, in West Asia, during the times of the Shah when a huge amount of sophisticated weapons was supplied to the Shah and Iran was looked upon by the United States of America as the policeman for West Asia, a policeman of this part of Asia. But all those things have crumbled like a house of cards. The United States of America failed to perceive the movements of the people in Iran and Iran, which at one time was the best friend, the most trusted friend of the United States of America became its worst enemy. The same thing is happening in Pakistan today. It is very unfortunate that this has not percolated into the minds of the American Administration, I am not quite sure whether the people of America are immune to this kind of thing, they do not understand that an absolutist and authoritarian regime cannot be relied upon. The regime that goes against the aspirations of the people is the regime that can collapse any time. There was a time when the position of the Shah appeared seemingly unassailable, but it collapsed. Today the same thing is happening in Pakistan. There is a Military rule there, there is no democracy, the people of Pakistan are embittered against their own Government and everything that is being done by the Government of Pakistan is over their heads without the consent and the approval of the people of Pakistan. It is quite likely that under internal compulsions, under internal upheavals, the regime in Pakistan may be over-thrown because you cannot keep the people down by force of arm. You do not use the nuclear bomb which Pakistan today is supposed to possess against your own people. When you destroy your own country, you destroy your own people. There is something else which you cannot control. A situation like that may as well develop in Pakistan and the whole thing

may collapse once again for America. This is a point which has to be pointed out again and again to the people of America, if not to the present Administration, the Reagan Administration which is a lame-duck administration but to the people of America who will elect their American Congress, the Congressmen, the Senators of America: that this conception is faulty: you have had this experience and this can happen again. I do not know, if my friend, Mr. Natwar Singh during his visit to the United States this time had an opportunity to talk to some of the top decision-makers in America, the Vice-President, the Secretary of State, the Secretary of Defence, the Security Adviser, all the top people in the Administration—whether he had the occasion to discuss this with them in this way—that all the eggs that you are putting in the basket in Pakistan may collapse and all your eggs will break and explode in your face, the same manner in which the situation in Iran had exploded in the past. I do not know whether it has been done. If that has not been done...

SHRI BRAJAMOHAN MOHANTY (Puri): Why do you compare with Iran?

SHRI G.G. SWELL: I am giving the historical event that what has happened in Iran can also happen in Pakistan. This is what I am saying. And this is what has to be pointed out to the people of America. I am sure that if we can do this, well, there are a large number of people in America who will listen to us. It is most unfortunate that the two countries—India and America—the two democracies, the two countries in which the will of the people is sovereign, the two countries which has in-built mechanism for peaceful transition of power—which is a very rare thing in the world—the two peoples who have inherited all the legacy of Abraham Lincoln and Mahatma Gandhi, should not be able to understand each other.

I would not, therefore, join the rank of those condemning America for its own sake much agitated as I am, much as conscious as I am of the danger to our country

[Shri G.G. Swell]

today—definitely there is the greatest danger to India today from Pakistan. America no doubt today is indulging in what I would say, a blatant untruth. When the head of the nuclear installations in Pakistan himself had admitted almost in so many words that Pakistan today has the bomb, here the President of America, the Vice-President of America, the Secretary of State of America say, "No, Pakistan does not have the bomb". Do they mean to say that the world is so naive that it will buy that kind of thing—when their own top scientists who know something about nuclear technology have said again and again that Pakistan is only two screw-driver turns away from the Bomb? They might already be having the bomb. In spite of all that, if they say, they do not have the bomb and therefore, they would proceed with the waiver of the Symington Amendment in order to give Pakistan another 4.2 billion dollars, a large chunk of which will be for military aid, it is very clear that they have something else in their mind, than just any kind of feeling for Pakistan and anybody else. On top of that, now it is clear, there is a clear possibility, that Pakistan will also have the AWACS aircraft and if the reports are correct and I believe they are correct because it is more practical, they will have these AWACS aircraft, not on purchase, not on sale which, in any case will have to be paid out of the money that America would be giving to Pakistan, which is a long-drawn out process, but they will have these planes on lease which means that the AWACS planes can be in position in Pakistan within a matter of weeks or months, if necessary, which means that the Pakistani pilots are not going to operate these planes, which means that American pilots will operate these planes, that Pakistan will have on its soil all the installations, engineering installation, in order to operate these planes, which means that, for all practical purposes, Pakistan will be leasing out its skies to the United States. That is the position in which they are today. We have mentioned about this fact a number of times. I am not quite clear about

the technical capability of AWACS planes. They may not be that useful and effective over the mountainous terrain of Afghanistan. But they will be most effective and most lethal in relation to India. These are the high flying radar platforms. From there, one can see 400 KM away as the crow flies and see everything in relation to India. One can see from the Pakistani sky beyond Bombay. All our airfield would be an open book before them. All our planes would be there, would be seen clearly and the movement of our planes can be seen and can be watched and direction and command can be given to the Pakistani Airforce to take action, even before we are aware, even before we make a move or do anything. This is the position. I would like to repeat that I am not very clear about the technology of AWACS aircraft. The other day the Minister of Defence Mr. Pant has said that the AWACS are not only the surveillance aircraft but they are also a weapon system. If Mr. Natwar Singh can enlighten us about it I will be very happy. What is a weapon system? I am told that these AWACS aircraft are also equipped with devices for shooting out laser beams and these laser beams can mobilise an enemy aircraft hundreds of kilometres away. What have we, in a situation like that? What can we do? Will you just say that the people of India will stand as one man and then die. It is not going to help. This is a hard and real and cruel world in which only a language of strength speaks and, therefore, while I am happy to hear Mr. Bhagat making a review of all that is happening, I will agree with much that he said the question today is, what do we do to convey the credibility of India to the United States and to the rest of the world. This is my question.

Another dimension of AWACS is this. American servicemen will be operating in Pakistan against Afghanistan. That is the ostensible reason. In Afghanistan, you have the Soviet troops. What happens the American pilots kill Soviet soldiers Afghanistan? Would it not bring a Super Power confrontation here, right at our doorstep? That is not the position that we can accept and the world can accept. This is

what I would like to convey. We have to take a hard-headed appraisal of this situation. What do we do to stop it? One way of doing it is to talk the Americans away from that. But if they are not bent to listen to us, as it seems they are not, they have their own perception, then something-else which we can do to convey to them is that we will resort to certain action which will make the situation here serious for everybody. What is that thing that we are going to do? I do not know whether we have anything that will meet the AWACS. I cannot foresee. I do not know if even the Soviet Union has anything technologically equivalent to the AWACS that we can get from them. I do not know about it. But then, in the case of Soviet Union, they may not have AWACS but they have nuclear missiles and nuclear bombs.

Mr. Bhagat was talking about the SDI and about America spending two trillion dollars in order to put the fortresses in space to shoot down any kind of missiles that rises up from the Soviet soil. The Soviets have gone on record that they have an easy way, simple and inexpensive way of destroying these fortresses. I will not go into the technical details. Therefore, although the Soviets may not have the AWACS, they have other means to counter them. I know that the United States of America is employing the AWACS over the NATO countries and the NATO dividing line in Europe. They have AWACS in Saudi Arabia. But that does not give them an advantage. But in the case of India, we have nothing to meet that. Therefore, they are in a position to twist our arms.

I would like to draw your attention, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that the danger to us is not only from the Pakistan but the danger to us is also coming from the South from Sri Lanka. Sri Lanka has virtually given up India as a mediator. The statements made by the Sri Lankan Government are anti-Indian, shrill and militant. The President of Sri Lanka has gone on record to say that he would take the assistance even from a devil himself in order to destroy, to put

down the Tamil agitation, the Tamil struggle in Sri Lanka. We know that the Israeli Intelligence outfit, the MOSSAD, has been operating there for quite some time. We know that the Anti-terrorist Organisation of Britain, the Special Air Service, has been operating there. There are reports that American Advisers are giving intelligence assistance and advice to the Sri Lankan Government and the Armed Forces. Sri Lanka is a good base. Sri Lanka would be another good link in the chain of the Central Command of the United States of America. Perhaps, it will be a better base even than Pakistan. In Sri Lanka, they have the natural bay, the natural Port Trincomalee, one of the best ports in the world which the British had left behind, as a legacy, with over a hundred of huge fuel tanks. I am told that easily more than 10,000 million tonnes of fuel can be stored in Trincomalee any time. We do not know what is going to happen but we are in this situation, we are in a difficult situation, we are in a situation which we have not faced any time before. We are unable to face this situation with our present means. What do we do about it? We may say that we have the Soviets as our friends. Of course, they are our friends. Of course, they have stood by us many times. Of course, we can count on their help. Only the other day we have received a few squadrons of Mig-29, which are superior, technologically, as they said, to the F-16s. Yes, we have them. But then is it enough for us just to say that we have a friend as against them? Is it an argument to assume that America is our enemy? Or, should we talk them out of this notion? I think, we have adopted that policy. The very fact that we have held the Festival of India in America should be a clear indication to the Americans that we want to be understood and we want them to understand that we are the most reliable friend for democracy. If their obsession is against Communism, because Communism is totalitarian, if their obsession is for democracy, the best way to safeguard democracy, the American democracy, democracy in the world, is the goodwill and friendship of India. We can put to them not to do things that will make India feel

[Shri G.G. Sw

like a besieged country, and a country that is besieged will do any desperate thing. Will the American people like the 800 million people of India feel a besieged people who are prepared to die? Is this going to serve the interests of America? This is the question that we must discuss with the American people and the American Administration. I do not know whether Mr. Natwar Singh has spoken in that vein and in that language...

SHRI K. NATWAR SINGH: Yes, but gently.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: In his reply he will tell you.

SHRI G.G. SWELL: You had gone there. All right. But another thing which I do not understand is this. While we must be friendly with the Americans, we must also speak with our back straight and our chest out. Mr. Natwar Singh had just been there. I do not understand the logic of Mr. Tiwari, his senior, going there again. For what? You had been there and you have drawn a blank. Because we are in danger, everybody should go there to pay court to the Americans, to plead with them—I do not think that that is the way in which we can win anybody's respect. I am not going to say that Mr. Tiwari should not go. But I would like that this thing be thought over again, whether it is necessary for the senior Minister also to go there immediately, in the wake of, on the heels of, the visit of the Minister of State where, from all reports, he has drawn a blank. It is, therefore, necessary for us to do something more here, and I do not see what else is to be done. There is only one thing that I can say, that we must tell the world that we are serious about it, that we are not going to tolerate that situation and if it comes to that, we are prepared to fight and destroy and, if necessary, to be destroyed. There is only one thing, and that is, that we should go nuclear. There is no

other way. Why is China respected today? Why does the Soviet Union want to talk terms with China today? It is because, in a conflict, although China may not be the winner, China may be defeated in a struggle with the Soviet Union, yet, China is in a position to inflict, to do, an almost unacceptable damage to the Soviet Union. This is the language that speaks. Therefore, there is no other way at this time but for India to go nuclear, for India to have the bomb, not to use the bomb but to say that, if it comes to that, we can fight and we can also inflict damage. The Americans will understand that kind of a language. We have to do these things, Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir. This is all that I have got to submit as far as our relations with the United States are concerned.

With regard to the Soviet Union, I would say that in them we have a friend, but there is nothing like altruism, there is nothing like philanthropy, in the world. The Soviet Union, like ourselves, like the United States of America, will be compelled to act according to their own compulsions and where compulsions of their national interest come in conflict with friendship with India, of course, the compulsions of the national interests of the Soviet Union will prevail. Why is the Soviet Union today so willing to reach a rapprochement with China? It is also trying to come to an understanding even with Pakistan. And Pakistan is trying to come to an understanding with Soviet Union. It is not because Pakistan is very strong but with the help of United States of America Pakistan can do many things. There is will, there is reason.

And I am surprised the other day to read that the President of Pakistan suddenly from a meeting went over to the residence of Soviet Ambassador. I think many of you have read that newspaper report. He went to the residence of the Soviet Ambassador in Islamabad for a Confabulation. It was astonishing and an indication of a new hard word of diplomacy. We have got to take all these into account. There will be

time when Soviet Union may not be able to help us. We have to stand on our own feet and the only option is open to us now is to go nuclear and to talk in terms of peace.

SHRI SYED SHAHABUDDIN (Kishanganj): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, it is rather difficult to speak at the fag end of the day on an empty stomach.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: You have so many ideas in your mind. That is not empty.

SHRI SYED SHAHABUDDIN: I am rather intrigued, Mr. Deputy-Speaker, I read this morning this Annual Report of the Ministry of External Affairs for the year 1986-87 which was debated just about 10 days ago. And I notice the prosaic but encouraging references to Indo-US Relations, how they progressed during the last year. And the fact that we are debating again the very important facet of our foreign policy in our international relations just 10 days later speaks for itself. Obviously, something has happened, something has clicked. Now the first point I wish to make, Mr. Deputy-Speaker, is that a foreign policy in order to be effective must have continuity. I am sure Mr. Natwar Singh would accept that. And a diplomatic posture in order to be credible must have a degree of balance. It is amazing to me to find that there are these very sharp turns, very wide oscillations, very radical switches, almost a change of phase from euphoria to hysteria, discontinuity, a tremendous discontinuity. And almost a habitual blowing hot and cold from instant to instant. This is not diplomacy. This is confession of failure. This indicates confusion and immaturity on the part of those who are today handling our international relations. Did they note 10 days ago what was going to happen? Didn't have the slightest indication of what was on the horizon? Therefore, I am rather surprised by this. I think either our past perception was wrong or our present posture is ill-conceived. You have to make your choice Mr. Natwar Singh. There was a time not long ago when

getting along with United States had become synonymous with our much heralded march to the 21st century. The rocket that was going to carry us to the 21st century was going to be fuelled by American culture and American goods, if the rocket itself was not to be manufactured in United States. The Prime Minister's visit was the great event of 1985. The Festival of India was held, the Wall Street Journal at that time was singing paeans to the new hero on the horizon.

We even employed a professional public relation firm to sell India to the American people. We adopted an open door policy towards multi-nationals. We signed a memorandum of understanding—do you recall that?—on Defence procurement. You gave them a list. You signed another memorandum of understanding on high technology transfer which included this package of super computers.

Not very long ago we had an agreement on the utilisation of PL 480 funds on mutually agreed collaboration in the field of science and technology and what not. What has happened to them? I am rather surprised. Is it not a proof of inadequate management of our diplomatic relations? Are you trying to cover up your inadequacies and deficiencies of today with the idiom and phraseology of yester year invoking all that has happened from 1947 onwards?

Mr. Deputy Speaker, there is one axiom in international relations. There are no good guys and no bad guys; there are no angels and no devils; there are no permanent friends or permanent enemies. International relation is not static, it is dynamic. Our world view may be fossilised, may be static; but a man of vision like Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru in the late 50s—I remember in one of his letters to the Chief Ministers then—said that he did not accept the vision of the world of permanent polarisation between the two systems. He said, in effect the two will come closer to each other. Because, there cannot be a Communist philosophy, there cannot be a Com-

[Shri Syed Shahabuddin]

munist physics and a Capitalist chemistry. Science and technology and the new forces of modernisation will inevitably bring them together and today we see that happening before our very eyes.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: You can con-

tinue tomorrow. The House stands adjourned to reassemble at 11 a.m. tomorrow.

**18.00 hrs**

*The Lok Sabha then adjourned till Eleven of the Clock on Wednesday, May 6, 1987/Vaisakha 16, 1909 (Saka).*

---