

DEMANDS FOR GRANTS
(GENERAL) 1992-93 -CONTED

by what time this discussion will end tomorrow

Ministry of External Affairs -
CONTED

[English]

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Now, the time remaining at our disposal is two hours fifty five minutes and we have consumed three hours and five minutes. There is also sufficiently a big list of speakers. Those Members who get the chance to speak may kindly strict to the timings.

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS (SHRI EDUARDO FALEIRO): Sir, the Prime Minister will intervene and he will reply to the questions which are raised yesterday and today in the House. But, more likely tomorrow. It does not look like today.

SHRI E. AHAMED (Manjeri): Sir, there was an assurance by the Minister of Parliamentary Affairs that he will make a statement on extradition of Mr. Anderson of Union Carbide of Bhopal (*Interruptions*);

SHRI JASWANT SINGH (Chittorgarh)

Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, with your permission, I would like to ask one or two clarifications. The first is this decision about taking up Nagaland discussion today. It was the decision of the Business Advisory Committee of which I too am a Member. In consequence the casualty is the Ministry of External Affairs and the Demands for Grants of the Ministry of External Affairs. At 3.00 P.M. This Statutory Resolution has to be taken up. We have barely consumed about half the time allotted for discussion on the of External Affairs. There are two pending issues which relate to the Ministry of External Affairs. Firstly, this assurance given by the government that they will come forward with a statement on the question of ISRO. If the House could be informed whether that statement is coming up today or it is expected tomorrow, it will facilitate the matters because the discussion on Nagaland is likely to take place till 8.00 P.M. The second point really is the intervention by the Prime Minister because it will facilitate matters and it will enable parties to organise their membership and presence of membership better. It would be better if we could be informed as to whether the Prime Minister is intervening in this discussion and when he is intervening. It is to be tomorrow naturally. We should know

MR. SPEAKER: Let us go to the subject.

(*Interruptions*)

SHRIBASU DEB ACHARIA (Bankura): There was an assurance by the Minister of Parliamentary Affairs that Government will make a statements on extradition of Mr. Anderson. We would like to know what initiative the Government has taken on that. Secondly, when voting on Nagaland will take place - whether it is today or tomorrow.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Let us see. We have got some time before us. Now, I call Sudhir Sawant.

SHRISUDHIR SAWANT (Rajapur) Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, I rise to support the Demand for Grant of the Ministry of External Affairs.

Yesterday during the discussion, Shri Indrajit Gupta said the ship of foreign policy has lost mooring. Other hon. Members commented like Shri Jaswant Singh, that the report of External Affairs is outdated. It is taken out of the dustbin. Now, I disagree with Shri Indrajit Gupta about the ship without mooring. But I may tend to agree that the report may be outdated. But what is the

reason why it is outdated, that you must see. What is the background in which this report has been framed? That is what we have to see.

We have been witness to momentous changes in the last three years in the international affairs and during this period who was at the helm of affairs? That is of essence. The situation that prevailed in June 1991 is of essence. In June, 1991, the situation was like this. The prestige of India in the international arena was at its lowest in the history of independent India.. (*Interruptions*). The credibility of this country was totally destroyed because of the mismanagement in all spheres of polity by the Government that ruled for one and a half year. And after that, much of water has flown below the Yamuna bridge. What was the consequence in June, 1991? It was consolidation. Consolidation in every sphere of State activity was widened because without consolidation we cannot forge ahead, without consolidation, we cannot take any step forward. After all, what is international prestige and international relations? They do not change overnight. It takes time. Nobody wields a magic wand which can change the situation or which can show results within a short time. In the last eleven months, the agenda before the Government was consolidation, and this period is too little to show any results in foreign policy. (*Interruptions*).

SHRI LOKANATH CHOUDHURY: (Jagalsinghpur) What is the direction of your party?

SHRI SUDHIR SAWANT: This is what I am coming to .Let me speak. After all, power forms the basic ingredient of international standing. It is only power that evokes a response to your views because anybody is going to listen to you if you have power. That is why today we have to rise from ashes. We have to go back to the

period of Jawaharlalji, of Indiraji, of Rajivji when the world listened to with rapt attention when India spoke.

Foreign Policy, after all, is the instrument of furthering your national interests or national aims. What is the national aim? The national aim is given in clear-cut terms in the Preamble of the Constitution. (*Interruptions*) After all, it is the aim that matters. And what is the aim? We have resolved solemnly to constitute India into a sovereign, Democratic, socialist, Secular Republic. We have resolved to make India when India, in the 21st century, will be second to none in the world. This is our aim. That is why we must gear up all our resources to achieve this end, we must frame our policy accordingly. Our programmes must tailor to achieve this aim. In today's circumstances, it calls for a large degree of integration. Fortunately, today we have captain of the ship who can give the required direction and take us to the destination or aim of the 21st century. Is there any other better captain here? I do not see. Indrajit is not here. I would assure him that the ship of our foreign policy is not without its moorings. It has clear-cut direction because in international affairs we have to concentrate on macro issues, not micro issues. What is Tin Bigha jamin? It is a micro issue. What about our relationship with Pakistan or Afghanistan or the recognition of Israel? these are all micro issues. We have to concentrate on the macro issue the factors of which will chart out the agenda in international relation in the coming years when we are proceeding towards the twenty-first century. It may, sometimes, be visible that we have taken retrograde steps. It is possible. But once we have set an aim, once we have chartered a policy or a programme, then sometimes, as in war, we have to lose a battle to win the war. That is precisely the essence of foreign policy. What are these factors which I consider as macro issues? The first among them is the economic factor and the second is the fundamentalism which

[Sh. Sudhir Sawant]

will dictate the behavior pattern of nations tomorrow. The behaviour pattern will depend on the primacy of one factor over the other. that is why we cannot take a sacrosanct or a rigid view in the foreign policy. Our foreign policy will essentially have to have a flexible approach because in future the behaviour pattern of the international community is going to be dictated by naked pragmatism and stark opportunism and hence we have to be flexible in our approach.

What has happened on the economic factor? In developed nations the domestic compulsions are going to dictate the foreign policy in the future. It has always done. The economy has always mattered in the matter of foreign policy. But today it is more relevant the reason being the rapid advancement in technology. More and more working hands are falling vacant in the developed countries. For this, there is a compulsion on these countries to increase production. If production has to be increased, there has to be a demand and there has to be a market. Their domestic markets are already saturated and hence they have to search for markets elsewhere. What better market is there in the world than Indian and China which constitute a major portion of the humanity? Hence the foreign policy of the developed nations will essentially be directed towards economic domination of India. We should have no doubt. I will ask the people as to why it is referred when we talk of India and U.S. as two greatest democracies in the world? But why has the U.S. consistently been at loggerheads with India? Why has it consistently supported Pakistan? I will ask the something about Pakistan. Logically Pakistan has no option but to cooperate and to compromise with India. But still it has been forced to take an anti-India stand. It has launched an anti-India rhetoric. It had supported anti-Indian people in Kashmir and Punjab. Why is it doing so? Pakistan is,

after all, a tool of U.S.A. It has always been used as a tool to destabilise this country because of the macro factor that is the economic factor, the compulsion to dominate this market. this is the reason of essence.

Some hon. Member said that we must improve our relations with Pakistan. It is a good idea. But who is going to allow you to improve your relations with Pakistan? Pakistan is governed by a Troika. The military has always dominated Pakistan. Military, by nature, is hawkish. It thrives on conflict and it thrives on confrontation. Hence the confrontationist attitude towards India.

The other part is the Zia policy. By whom Zia had always been promoted? It was by U.S. U.S. had promoted Zia. By what? Zia consciously promoted drug trade. He evolved the policy wherein the bureaucracy and the politicians and the military advocated a different cause. They had strong links with the international drug cartels. This is fact and all the military is in the pay roll of the U.S., that is what we read in the Pentagon papers and hence the confrontation. though we will have genuine desire to improve our relations with Pakistan, it is not allowed to happen because of those factors which I enumerated. The compulsions of Pakistan are forcing India into the other camp. India has no choice today when it comes to U.S. India will have to take a bold stand against the developed nations because we are in the other camp. India must consolidate the developing nations and that is the primary dictates on us today.

The second factor is of fundamentalism. Fundamentalism of any form, whether Hindu or Muslim or Christian, is an antithesis to progress and has to be combated with all our effort, but there are rulers, there are political groupings, who will essentially take religion as a crutch to further their interests, we cannot do without it and therefore, in future fundamentalism is likely to play a

major role and hence today these are the factors, one is economic and the other is fundamentalism which will decide the agenda for the future. What is India today? Where is India to go? First, India must consolidate her position in South Asia; India must consolidate the developing nations, the developing nations must unite and India must provide the leadership. The developed nations have no alternative except to go to the developing countries and dominate the developing countries. There I come again to the purchase of artillery guns from U.S. I congratulate the Government for not going through the deal of purchase of artillery guns because Defense is a factor which can bring about domination because if the developed nations have to dominate, there are two issues on which they can dominate. One is economic and the second is Defense. We must realise that we never had joint exercise with any of the Super Powers in the history of independent India. Why? Because in Defence psychological factors play a major role. If we have to expose our sailors, if we have to expose our junior officers to the alien domination, there is likelihood of having a psychological effect on them. After all, our Navy is a 'brown water' Navy, it is not a 'blue water' navy. The Navy is entrusted with the role of guarding our exclusive economic zone, not for defense of other countries and hence there is no commonality with the U.S. navy. Why for then these joint exercises?

In the field of Defence we may cooperate as far as technology is concerned. I am not talking about that, but we cannot allow ourselves to be dependent on any other power because India has got the wherewithal. India is not Iraq, India has got human resources to defend herself, to combat any power in the world and that is why we must not subjugate ourselves, we must not allow ourselves to be dominated in the field of Defence and economy, we must always have our independent approach.

The NAM is still very relevant, but the term 'non-aligned' may not be relevant today because of the collapse of the Big Powers, because of the end of the cold war, but the objectives of NAM are still relevant. Indiraji in her Summit speech had clearly stated that economic development is the primary objective before the NAM and that is why we must consolidate the developing nations and we must face the developed nations we just have had the world Conference on Environment, we must not give in, we must take complete requirement of the Third World, we must project the leadership of the Third World. When speaking about SAARC, it is natural that the small countries around us are likely to be apprehensive about India, because of the big status, because of the sheer size of this country and that is why the responsibility is on us to assure them and to impose confidence in them that India does not intend to play the role of a big brother and that is why this 'Tin Bigha' land. These are the methods with which we can impose confidence in our neighbourhood.

Sir, when it comes to Pakistan, as I have already brought out, Pakistan has its own compulsions because till true democracy takes root in Pakistan, we cannot hope for improvement of relationship. It is a stooge of US in clear terms. But, we cannot keep quiet to the sensitivities of the people of Sind, we cannot keep quiet to the sensitivities of the people of Sind, we cannot keep quiet to the sensitivity of the people of Tarn Taran, south Punjab or Baluchistan. Pakistan must be clearly warned that if they continue to interfere in the internal affairs of this country, India will be forced to look into their affairs, India will be forced to promote democratic forces in Pakistan. This is the clear-cut message that must go to Pakistan.

Sir, coming to China after all if we have to combat such forces in the future, then we

[Sh. Sudhir Sawant]

must men our fences with China. In 1947, China and India were *Hindi-Chini bhai*bhai. But what happened in 1962? Why were we forced in war? it is because of the rhetoric in this House. What was the question of essence at that time. china came and built a road linking Sinking with Tibet. They were ready for diusccssions and we were ready for discussions. But this House had indulged in rhetoric and the Members who were sitting on the other side or their parties stated that till the last drop of every Indian blood, we will not give an inch of our territory to China. This is what forced the hands of Nehruji into going for a war with China, because we demanded that discussions should start after *status quo ante*, that is, when China withdraws, But, China was demanding that dissuasions should start as it is on ground and that is why we had to sacrifice thousands of soldiers on the borders of this nation. This is a reality which the Tenth Lok Sabha must realise and we must avoid rhetoric, as far as foreign policy is concerned. The boundary issue is not a major issue which cannot be resolved. After all who drew the Mc Mohan line? After all, how the borders came to us? It is a matter of deep study. A committee can be appointed of all the parties of this House to give a proposal as far as the methodologoes of resolving the boundary issue are concerned and once the boundary issue is resolved, India and China can confidently, together, mutually work towards development, because we have the human resources and we have the natural resources to cater to the needs of the people and that is essentially the call of the day.

In conclusion, I would just say that we have come to a time of reckoning, we have come to a tryst with destiny again wherein the Members of he Tenth Lok Sabha will have to answer posterity. The posterity will ask us as to what steps we have taken to

resolve the problems, as to what steps we have take to further our foreign policy, our porogrammes while going towards the 21st Century. Fortunately, we have a very able captain of the ship in the form of Narasimha Raoji who will take us to our destination and all of us must resolve ourselves to evolve a national consensus again on foreign policy and guide this ship with a direction in which it should go to its destination.

SHRI P.G. NARAYANAN (Gobichattipalayam): Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, at the very outset, I would like to mention that we are discussing about External Affairs and particularly about our foreign policy which has been formally described as a non-alignment policy.

Though we differ very bitterly on our domestic policies, on matters of foeign affairs, there has been consensus and wide support. Our foeign pilicy has won acclamation from all over the world and this has helped us to enhance the prstige of India.

On behalf of All India Anna DMK Party, I would like to say a few words on the Demands foir Grants relating to the Ministry of External Affairs. Wehn we attained independence, the world ws divided into two blocs sharply. It is in that background, Jawaharlal Nehru formulated non-Aligned policy between 1947 and 1960 during which period, more than 70 countries has attained freedom. There were many colonies. In all the independence struggles, India helped those countries morally and politically. India's neutrality was postive neutrality, that is, supporting the right and opposing the wrong. It has withstood the test of time and earned the name for India. In this process, India became a close friend of the Soviet Union

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: You can continue tomorrow Shri Eduardo Faleiro.