

श्री सैयद शहाबुद्दीन (बिहार) : मैं भी इसका समर्थन करता हूँ । मैंने इस सिलसिले में इस हाउस में एक सवाल भी उठाया था ।

श्री शान्ति त्यागी (उत्तर प्रदेश) : मेरा स्पेशल मेशन भी इस विषय में है जिस पर हमारे माननीय मलिक साहब ने बोला है । यह बात सही है कि सारे वकील आज सारे उत्तर प्रदेश से यहां आये हैं और वहां की सारी अदालतों का काम काज बंद पड़ा है । वहां क्लायेंट्स का नुकसान ही रहा है । यह स्थिति वहां पैदा हो रही है । जब यह वकील इस बात को कहते हैं कि अगर हमारी यह मांग स्वीकार नहीं की गयी तो हम मुकम्मिल स्ट्राइक अदालतों में रखेंगे तो इसके पेश्तर भी उत्तर प्रदेश की अदालतों में महीनों तक काम काज इस बात के लिए ही ठप रहा है और बार एसोशियेशन्स ने भी इस बात के लिए प्रेस किया है और प्रस्ताव पास किये हैं और इस हाउस में भी इस विषय पर चर्चा हो चुकी है और और मैं समझता हूँ कि सभी दलों के नेताओं ने उत्तर प्रदेश में हाई कोर्ट की बेंच की स्थापना के लिए अपनी आवाज उठायी है और माननीय उपसभापति जी अभी लंच के वक्त जब उन लोगों का डेपुटेशन आप से मिलेगा तो लोक भावना का आदर करते हुए उन की बात को मानना चाहिए और यह पढ़े लिखे लोग हैं । उन को कोई बहका कर नहीं लाया है । उन के पीछे जनमत है । इस लिए मैं चाहता हूँ कि आप सरकार से कहें कि उस रिपोर्ट को वह मान कर उत्तर प्रदेश के वकीलों की और वहां की जनता की इस मांग को वह माने । आप पश्चिमी उत्तर प्रदेश में कहीं भी रामपुर में, बरेली में, मेरठ में कहीं भी उच्च न्यायालय

की खंड पीठ स्थापित करें, लेकिन वह होनी चाहिए ।

श्री शिव चन्द्र झा : श्रीमन्, मेरा एक प्वाइंट आफ आर्डर है ।

श्री उपसभापति : कहिये ।

श्री शिव चन्द्र झा : डा० राजेन्द्र प्रसाद यूनिवर्सिटी दिल्ली में स्थापित हो इस के लिए मैंने एक स्पेशल मेशन दिया था । उसको क्यों नहीं मंजूर किया गया यह मैं जानना चाहता हूँ ।

श्री उपसभापति: रोज रोज आप का स्पेशल मेशन नहीं लिया जा सकता आप बैठिये ।
We will now take up international situation.

MOTION Re. PRESENT INTERNATIONAL SITUATION AND POLICY OF GOVERNMENT OF INDIA IN RELATION THERETO

THE MINISTER OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS (SHRI P. V. NARASIMHA RAO): Sir, I beg to move:

“That the present international situation and the policy of the Government of India in relation thereto be taken into consideration.”

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Will you not make a speech?

SHRI P. V. NARASIMHA RAO: I will just move the Motion at this stage. That is the practice we have been following.

श्री शिव चन्द्र झा (बिहार) : मैं अपना संशोधन पेश करता हूँ । जो माननीय विदेश मंत्री जी के प्रस्ताव का अंतिम वाक्य है उस के आखिर में यह शब्द जोड़ दिये जायें :

“in the context of the principles highlighted and pursued during the

freedom movement of the country."

श्री उपसभापति : यह जो आप का संशोधन है यह प्रस्ताव से मेल नहीं खाता
Therefore I rule it out.

श्री शिव चन्द्र झा : मेरा प्वाइंट आफ आर्डर है। रूल 231 के स्कोप में यह है। उस को आप देखिये।

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: If it is according to the Rule I will admit it. This is not in order and therefore I cannot admit it.

SHRI SHIVA CHANDRA JHA: Rule 231 says: Scope of amendment:—

(1) An amendment shall be relevant to, and within the scope of, the motion to which it is proposed.

(2) An amendment shall not be moved which has merely the effect of a negative vote.

मैं इन के प्रस्ताव को निगेटिव नहीं कर रहा हूँ। उस के बाद है। उस को देखिये।

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: It is not in order. Therefore, I reject it.

SHRI SHIVA CHANDRA JHA: (3) An amendment on a question shall not be in consistent with a previous decision on the same question.

मैं आप को रूल बता रहा हूँ। आप उस को देखिये।

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I have the right to reject it. It is not in order.

SHRI SHIVA CHANDRA JHA: How it is not in order? मैं आपके इस रूलिंग के विरोध में वाक आऊँ करता हूँ।

[At this stage the hon. Member left the Chamber].

SHRI SYED SHAHABUDDIN (Bihar): Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, we are meeting here today to discuss the international situation and we are meeting under the shadow of the

multi-crore extravaganza under the title of NAM followed by the Rs. 44 crore week-end in the name of CHOGM.

Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir while I admire the Prime Minister for her stamina—she has been sealing many a summit—I appreciate her zeal for mountaineering and her dedication to summiting. But I really wonder if she intends to climb any more summits and I also wonder whether there are any more summits left. Yes, Mr. Deputy Chairman I recall one, a smaller peak: the South-Asian summit has been left by the wayside unsealed.

Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, when we look at the international situation all of us note with pessimism a certain regressive trend. *Detente* has given place to renewed hostility the hope of liberalisation in the world economic environment has given place to pressures of exclusivism; confrontation is coming up in place of co-operation; globalism is giving place to regionalism; SALT is being replaced by confrontation of missiles across the international frontiers; and the Geneva talks which were going on are now deadlocked.

And, Sir, in this atmosphere of gloom, we have to look around to see if there are any trends and I would like to place before the House the fact that the problem of the mini-States and micro-States is now coming to the fore. I think that such small States are easy to subvert and they are almost considered like fair prize by the international hawks. They are prone to foreign intervention and to gun-boat diplomacy and a new form of colonialism seems to be establishing itself before our very eyes. This introduces a new element of instability in the international order and the time has come now when the founding-fathers of the United Nations including our country should look into this problem.

Sir, on the question of war and peace, I find that the line of separa-

[Shri Syed Shahabuddin]

tion has now been blurred so much that it has almost vanished. We are in a constant state of crisis. Bush fires are burning everywhere; guns are firing; shells are falling; and bombs are dropping every minute, every second, in some part of the globe, though we may not have formal declarations of war. I do not have to name all specific situations. But we are all conscious of the situation, for example, in Lebanon, because it has hit the headlines just now. Whether there is a cease-fire or whether there is a war, one does not know. But the people are being killed. Generally, I find that the rule of law in the international arena is getting eroded. Falklands, Grenada, Afghanistan, Kampuchea, Nicaragua, El Salvador, Namibia, Angola—they all tell the same story that those who have sworn fidelity to the law do not abide by the law. The law of the jungle, the law of "Might is right", is now taking over, and the new gendarmes of the international order, the policemen of the world, are now positioning themselves here and there. Now, I cannot blame any particular nation. Different nations assume this role in different parts of the world.

I also see, Sir, a sign of compartmentalisation in world economy. The bifurcation or trifurcation of world economy that has been the major development since the Second World War seems to have become a permanent feature of the world economy. It has crystallised itself into permanence; and the hope of an integrated world economy, the hope that the world resources shall be inherited and shall be exploited to the common benefit of all mankind is now becoming a remote possibility. In place of that, we have now a new wave of protectionism, and we realise that the terms of trade, of development assistance, of access to technology or of access to markets for manufactured goods are all hardening and shrinking. UNCTAD-VI failed. Kennedy Round did not deliver any goods. And it seems to me now that the new international economic order, is almost be-

coming a forgotten word in international lexicon. We are faced now with the empty shelves of the IDA. It is not just an expression of financial crisis for some nations. It is an expression or reflection of the moral bankruptcy of the entire international order. It is also an expression of conceptual bankruptcy of the rich and the affluent countries—their shortsightedness. We are talking of a new Brettonwoods. Will it take place in our lifetime? I doubt it shall be studied, studied and studied into blissful forgetfulness.

Sir, I find, on the question of economics, that the North-South Dialogue has become virtually a dialogue of the deaf, and no one seems to take it seriously. And as far as the South-South cooperation is concerned, it does not seem to take off. The reason is that the economics of the third world countries are so enmeshed, so deeply enmeshed, with the economics of the developed countries that they do not have much room for manoeuvre. They do not have much resources, very little to spare for each other. The detentes collapse has given place to a new arms race, a new spurt in arms race. The military expenditure, which was estimated by the Brandt Commission to have attained the figure of \$800 billions by the developed countries alone, must have now reached or crossed the 1000 billion dollars mark. Instead of talking across the table, the manufacturer of nuclear arms posing nuclear threat to the whole mankind, are busy producing new generations of weapons. They are also inducing others to take part in them and involving them in the arms trade, which is on the rise.

Everybody speaks of parity. Parity in what? Parity in the capacity for Mutually Assure Destruction? MAD It is indeed mad. And they also want superiority as if a nuclear holocaust takes place and one side wins the survivor shall have something to inherit, beside a searched plannet.

Now, in this grim picture, in this very dark atmosphere, I look round

and ask what has our country done? During the last four years, I am sorry to say, Mr. Deputy Chairman, to me it is a sorry tale of missed opportunities. Let us take our own sub-continent first. The goodwill in relations that has been accumulated during the very brief period of the Janata Party Government has by now been completely frittered away. Yes, there was the Delhi Declaration, to which the Foreign Minister was a

party. Now, It has been over-1 P.M. taken by a new arms race in the sub-continent. We find

the signs of tension and instability. We have neither the goodwill nor we seem to be able to influence the course of events. In our own part of the world, Pakistan and Bangladesh in our own neighbourhood are today rocked by democratic movements. We have sympathy with them and yet ill-advised and ill-timed comments, in my opinion, have not served the purpose of democracy in our neighbourhood. Nepal goes on shouting for a zone of peace which either we do not understand or we do not wish to understand. What Sri Lanka has done in recent times, I do not have to explain or describe. The genocide was of a dimension that is unheard of in recent times. We intervened in the situation. We did attain in a measure a capacity to influence the course of events. Now, it seems that the initiative has been lost. We do not know how we could exert influence, if the next round of talks that has been brought about fails. Our relations with our immediate neighbour China have been more or less stagnant. No doubt, there have been talks. But the country has yet to know whether the two sides have even achieved a commonness of approach before they tackle with the details, come to grip with the nuts and bolts, of the situation. In Afghanistan, we have accepted, acquiesced in the Russian occupation of that country in the permanent enslavement of the Afghan people. The Iran-Iraq war in an area which is of strategic

importance to us, goes on and we seem to be a helpless spectator. They may go on fighting till the doomsday. One does not know. In the Indian Ocean we are menaced by the escalation of the super-power military presence. The International Conference that we have talked about now for more than a decade has again been put off by a resolution which we had no strength to reverse and no strength to control. In South-East Asia, we had a legitimate role in 1975 to act as an honest broker, as a good intermediary, in order to bring about reconciliation between the two warring groups of the States in Indo-China and ASEAN and that role seems to have slipped out of our hands. Vietnam sits merrily in Kampuchea. The ASEAN and Indo-China are at loggerheads and Zone of Peace, Friendship and Neutrality in South-East Asia remains a distant dream and our own contribution, our dialogue with the ASEAN, has been filed away.

Sir, in West Asia, the area which is no less important to us from a strategic angle, may I say, that the sister seems to have failed the brother or at least not to have come to aid of the brother in his moment of distress. I do not know whether it is casual or whether it is deliberate. Recently in the United Nations, I think, the Prime Minister herself talked about the withdrawal of all armed forces from Lebanon. No clarification was provided. No reservation was made that we mean Syria. We mean France and the U.S.A. Certainly, we mean Israel. But it was not clarified, do we also mean the P.L.O.? I wish the hon. Minister will clarify that today. I also notice that in total violation of our practice so far, we admitted the representative of the Government of Israel to a Conference held here in Delhi, the Conference of World Tourism Organisation which is not a non-governmental organisation. It is an inter-governmental organisation. I also find that the Israeli Consulate in Bombay seems to have widened the orbit of its activity and seems to

[Shri Syed Shahabuddin]
indulge in all sorts of activities which, I would call as extra-consular and the Government of India does not lift a finger. Do all these together mean something? I question myself. And do not wish to give a definite answer. But I would like the hon. Minister to clarify this point.

Sir, in west Asia, my feeling is that everybody has combined, everybody is united on one thing. That is to destroy the resistance of the Palestinian people, to destroy its spearhead the PLO. It is this that we must be conscious of. It is the PLO, the Palestinian resistance that we must try to defend and protect. And I would hope that the hon. Minister in his peace keeping role or in his peace making role on behalf of the Non-aligned Group shall keep that objective in view. There are said to be peace keeping forces in that region. I do not know whether the US force in that region forms part of the peace-keeping force. Or, in what context are the French forces there? And how can this escalation of military confrontation between Syria and USA justified?

Sir, in Africa, the battle for human dignity, the battle for freedom which started a few decades ago still goes on. We have certainly extended our support. We go on doing it year to year, shouting slogans like mantra. But what have we done in concrete terms to give aid and assistance to those who are struggling for their birth right of freedom and dignity? What have we done for the people of Namibia? What have we done for the people inside South Africa who are struggling? Did we come to the rescue of Mozambique when it was attacked by South Africa recently? Imperialism is flexing its muscles in other parts of the world as well. It is doing so now more and more in Central and South America. We had El Salvador, we had Falklands, we had Nicaragua. We have now Grenada added to the list what have we done? With new generation of arms, now a new arms race

goes on in Europe against the wishes of the people. But, I suppose, there we can hardly influence the course of events.

Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, we are today the leader of the Non-aligned Group. Fate has placed us in that historical responsibility. Non-alignment is the hope of mankind. And yet Non-alignment seems to be moving in directions that make it almost ineffective. There are people who have declared their commitment to the principles of Non-alignment, but who are unable to follow the principles of Non-alignment in their international relations. And the Bloc itself, the Group itself has expanded so much and so rapidly that perhaps soon a time will come when only two States shall remain outside and all others shall be paying tributes to the principles of Non-alignment. Sir, the net effect is that with the presence of Trojan horses inside the Non-aligned Movement, placed there by both the Super Powers, the Movement is being slowly reduced in the eyes of the world to nothing more than pious postures in public. Now, we have a responsibility. The Prime Minister said that we want to bring the Movement back on the rails. I wish she would do so at this critical juncture. But shall we not begin by setting an example ourselves? The Movement is weak because we are not prepared to set an example. We are not prepared to call a spade a spade. We are not prepared to name the aggressor in Grenada. We are not setting our own example, we are not prepared to make a sacrifice in the interest of South-South co-operation. We are not prepared to give a new direction to our trade and economic relations. And we are not prepared to stop and contain the arms race in our own part of the world, the sub-continent of India. We are not anxious to hide the tilt towards one Super Power from the public gaze. We seem to reveal in it.

And about the biggest issue of our times, the restructuring of the world economy, the Prime Minister went

to the United Nations as the leader of the Non-aligned Group to make a new call to humanity, to take the message of the Non-aligned Group to the international community. And it was to be a grand show. All heads of State of non-aligned countries and heads of Governments were invited to be present on the occasion to extend moral support. But, what did the non-aligned group prove? Did it prove its solidarity when only 13 or 14 odd nations out of more than 100 were present on this occasion? It was neither a tribute to Madam Gandhi's leadership nor a tribute to the solidarity of the movement. And, that is the trend that we must take note of.

Sir, when I survey the bilateral scene, I find an even more distressing picture. The people of Indian origin in many parts of the world continue to be treated with ill will; their dignity being attacked or every turn, whether it is Burma or Sri Lanka or even the United Kingdom, which is proud of its civilisation. Our trade gap seems to show no signs of narrowing down. But for our oil men we would have been in a real jam and there is no breakthrough in the field of exports. *(Time bell rings)*. Sir, I will need minutes more.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Please complete in three, four minutes.

SHRI SYED SHAHABUDDIN: Sir, the development assistance that we need, and I have put myself on record in this House as not being ideologically against development assistance, seems to be drying up and we shall soon reach a point where the annual borrowing shall not be adequate even to pay the principal and the interest on the debts we have accumulated. Our bilateral relations with our neighbours are at a low ebb, as I pointed out just now. My question is, why is it so?

Sir, the foreign policy of any country is basically the projection of its own internal policy. Here, inside the country we are obsessed with

prestige, with glory. So we are in the arena of international affairs as well. The sycophants and the drum-beaters of the regime say that Mrs. Gandhi has reached India's international prestige to unprecedented heights...

AN HON. MEMBER: Zenith.

SHRI SYED SHAHABUDDIN: At the same time, she herself never forgets to mention our insecurity. Our insecurity appears to have reached unprecedented, unfathomed depths. I do not see how the rise in prestige goes with the loss of sense of security.

Now, my point, Mr. Deputy Chairman, is that the Prime Minister uses this 'security' as an input for internal political purposes. She creates a scare, a panic, almost a mass hysteria, a fear psychosis, in the minds of our people, who had under the leadership of Mahatma Gandhi learnt one thing that is, to shed their fear. She sees foreign hand and, her Government sees foreign hand behind each and every problem of our own making and we are after glory, wasting time on totally unnecessary trivialities, ignoring vital issues, vital regions having far-reaching repercussions, casting our eyes far and wide and looking for invitations, for headlines in the foreign press. Indira Gandhi is hungry for recognition not just as *Rashtra-mata*, but as *Jagat-mata*. This is not the heritage of Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru. But, perhaps, the lady wants to prove that she must go down in history as a contemporary figure greater than Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru.

Internally, Sir, you know that all wisdom, all intelligence, all insight is to be found only in one person. In foreign affairs also it is to be found in the same person. So, the reason why we are not effective in foreign affairs is that the institutional system has totally broken down in the Foreign Office. It has collapsed as an instrument of assessment, evaluation, analysis, providing options to the Government, taking part in de-

[Shri Syed Shahabuddin]
cision making. It all is revealed from the top. It comes down. The Foreign Minister articulates it extremely well. I wonder how much part he takes in formulating it. Sir, today what we need is a change of emphasis, a change of priority, a change of style. Let there be a less personalised diplomacy and more institutionalised foreign relations. Let there be less quest of glory and prestige, less flowers and champagne, less of cocktail parties, and less of merry-go-round, less of the musical chair of visits and conferences. What we need is, facing the sordid realities of contemporary international life, the prevalence of hunger, malnutrition, disease, deformity, illiteracy all over the world, of which we have the largest share in the entire world. What we need today is plain talk, facing hard realities and hard bargaining. But what do we find? What we achieved under the Non-aligned Declaration, we gave away under the CHOGM Declaration. Under the name of consensus, we have diluted many an important concept particularly in the economic sphere to a point where we have come to nothing.

Therefore, I would request that Government should recall that diplomacy is not a style, it is not protocol, it is not exchange of niceties, it is not social calls it is the application of intelligence to the relations among the nations in pursuit of certain interests.

Our diplomacy, as I said, is well-articulated; but over a period of time, even the Foreign Minister cannot induce or inject great originality into it. It begins to sound like a gramophone record stuck in its groove, and our entire speeches become long sermons which have long since lost their capacity to inspire anyone or to influence the power that be as we go on repeating them over and over again. Once we were the ideologue of the whole developing world; we provided the energy for the emergence of the third world;

we provided ideas and the ideas flowed like sparks from the constant fall of hammer on the anvil, illuminating the dark pathways of the coldwar era. Today, we lack imagination and we fear initiative.

Therefore, Mr. Deputy Chairman, I appeal to the Foreign Minister. Let us promote causes, not persons, and let us once-again swear fidelity to the principles of non-alignment to the principles of our dynamic equilibrium between the super powers. Let us call a spade a spade; let us not act out of fear; let us not speak out of hysteria; let us not fall under blackmail and let us recapture the elan of Nehru era.

श्री उपसभापति : सदन की कार्यवाही सवा दो बजे तक के लिए स्थगित की जाती है।

The House then adjourned for lunch at nineteen minutes past one of the clock.

The House reassembled after lunch at eighteen minutes past two of the clock, Mr. Deputy Chairman in the chair.

श्री बुद्ध प्रिय मौर्य (आन्ध्र प्रदेश) :
आदरणीय उपसभापति जी, मैं आपका हृदय से आभारी हूँ कि आपने मुझे इतने महत्वपूर्ण प्रस्ताव पर बोलने का शुभ अवसर दिया है।

आज से करीब पांच हजार वर्ष पूर्व भारत माता के सपूत महान मानव बुद्ध ने अहिंसा और शांति का, भारत की पवित्र भूमि से मानव समाज को संदेश दिया था। आज दुनिया के सामने एक ही प्रश्न है, बुद्ध या युद्ध। बुद्ध से विकास और कल्याण जुड़ा हुआ है। युद्ध से प्रलय और विनाश जुड़ा हुआ है।

श्रीमन, बुद्ध ने अपनी वाणी में पंचशौल देते समय सबसे पहली शील में कहा था—

पाणतियाता वरमणी

सिक्खा पदम समाधि यामि ।

उन्होंने कहा था कि मैं हिंसा से विरत रहने की शिक्षा ग्रहण करता हूँ। यह इस पवित्र भूमि का सीमाग्य रहा कि इस भावना को ज्यों का त्यों राष्ट्रपिता महात्मा गांधी ने स्वीकारा और उनके उत्तराधिकारी जवाहरलाल नेहरू ने इस पर चलने की प्रतिज्ञा की। आज भी भारत सरकार महान प्रधान मंत्री श्रीमती इंदिरा गांधी के सफल नेतृत्व में गुटनिरपेक्षता में अटूट विश्वास रखते हुये विश्व में शांति रहे इसको लक्ष्य बनाकर देश और दुनिया को सन्देश दे रही है। लेकिन श्रीमन, उसके विपरीत दुर्भाग्य से महान शक्तियाँ अहिंसा से हटकर हिंसा की ओर, विश्व शांति से हटकर युद्ध की ओर, विकास से हटकर विनाश की ओर बढ़ती चली जा रही हैं। रक्षा की आड़ में भयंकर रूप से युद्ध की तैयारियाँ की जा रही हैं। आज न्यूक्लियर आर्मामेंट्स ने पृथ्वी के सीने को भर डाला है। एटम बम, हाइड्रोजन बम, एन बम मिसाइल्स, गाइडेड मिसाइल्स, सर्व गेसेज, पोइजनस गेसेज, कैमिकल वारफेयर—ऐसा लगता है कि दुनिया को एक तरह से ज्वालामुखी पर्वत पर टिका दिया गया है। जरा सी गलती से भी पूरे संसार का सम्पूर्ण विनाश हो सकता है। एक तरफ तो, श्रीमन, यह वातावरण दूसरी तरफ आर्थिक क्षेत्र में विकसित देश, अगुआ राष्ट्र पिछड़े राष्ट्रों का निरन्तर शोषण करते जा रहे हैं। आज जब इस पृथ्वी का मानव क्षितिज का सीना चीरता हुआ चांद और तारों में बसने की बात कर रहा है, दुर्भाग्य से वही पर इस

पृथ्वी पर 72 करोड़ इन्सान गरीबी की रेखा के नीचे अन्धकार में अपनी अन्तिम साँसें ले रहे हैं और ये इन्सान ज्यादातर पिछड़े राष्ट्रों में हैं। ये राष्ट्र पिछड़े क्यों हो गये हैं? जन्म से कोई न अगुआ होता है न पिछड़ा। कुछ होशियार, चतुर लोग अपनी शक्ति के बल पर, अपने दिमाग के बल पर, अपनी वाजुओं के बल पर ऐसी व्यवस्था बना लेते हैं कि आगे चले जाते हैं, कुछ पीछे रह जाते हैं। श्रीमन, मैं जब बहुत छोटी उम्र का था “42 में और बहुत से नारे लगे थे, सन 46 में मैं बी० एस० सी० का विद्यार्थी था और बहुत से नारे लगे थे। लेकिन एक नारा आज इस सम्मानित सदन के द्वारा पूरे संसार को मुझे देना है—‘जब तक भूखा इन्सान रहेगा, पृथ्वी पर तूफान रहेगा।’ विज्ञान के विकास ने दुनिया को बहुत छोटा बना दिया है। जो फँसले या सफर कल तक असम्भव थे आज वह सुगम हो गये हैं। जो फँसले या सफर वर्षों या महीनों में संभव थे आज केवल घंटों या मिनटों में तय किये जा सकते हैं। यह भी विज्ञान के विकास की देन है कि उस ने दुनिया को विनाश के कगार पर ला कर खड़ा कर दिया है। कुछ ही क्षणों में पूरे संसार का नाश हो सकता है। ऐसी परिस्थिति में किसी भी राष्ट्र का कोई भी कदम जो युद्ध के वातावरण को पैदा करे अत्यंत ही निन्दनीय है। आज विश्व में कलह का वातावरण सीमाओं को लाघते हुए नजर आ रहा है, विश्व पर युद्ध के बादल मंडरा रहे हैं, घृणा, भय और संदेह ने सोचने की शक्ति को कुटित कर दिया है। वास्तविकता को देखने की दृष्टि धूधली होती चली जा रही है।

अभी कुछ ही दिन पहले नई दिल्ली में राष्ट्रमंडल की बैठक हुई। उस पर बहुत सी टीकाएँ हुई। इस सदन में भी अभी माननीय सदस्य शहाबुद्दीन ने भी टीका की थी। मैं शहाबुद्दीन जी के बारे में बोलते

श्री बृद्ध प्रिय मोयं

हुए जहाँ कहीं भी आवश्यक समझूँगा कहूँगा लेकिन अपनी बात कहने से पहले यह कहना चाहूँगा कि शहाबुद्दीन जी इस एक ऐसे विद्वान हैं जो विद्वता से कोसों परे हैं। वे विद्वान होते हुए भी विद्वता से अनभिज्ञ हैं। राष्ट्र मंडल में संयुक्त राष्ट्र संघ के लगभग एक तिहाई सदस्य हैं। वह एक उत्तर-दक्षिण मंच है जिस में विकासशील देशों को प्रतिनिधित्व प्राप्त है और इस के साथ कुछ विकसित देश भी इस में शामिल हैं।

यह एक ऐसा मंच भी है जहाँ गुट निरपेक्ष देश उन देशों से मिलते हैं। जो सैनिक संधि के सदस्य हैं। जाहिर है कि इस तरह के सम्मेलन में सभी मामलों पर सहमति नहीं हो सकती थी। आज शक्तिशाली राष्ट्र शांति के मग से लगा तार हटते चले जा रहे हैं। आज विश्व युद्ध का गहराता संकट पहले की अपेक्षा अधिक गंभीर हो गया है। विश्व शांति पूर्णरूप से खतरे में पड़ गई है। शस्त्रों का टेढ़ाकाबू से करीब करीब बाहर होती चली जा रही है। यही कारण है कि आधुनिक शस्त्र जुटाने में अंधाधुनद खर्च किया जा रहा है। निर्धन देशों की विकास की गति करीब करीब रुक गई है या थम गई है। अमीर उत्तर और गरीब दक्षिण के बीच की खाई चौड़ी होती जा रही है। मानव समाज का दुर्भाग्य यह है कि इस खाई को और चौड़ा न होने देने तथा इस खाई को पाटने की कोई कोशिश नहीं की जा रही है। भारत यदि इस शुभकार्य में योगदान देने आये आता है तो उस की टांग पकड़ कर पीछे खींचने की कोशिश की जाती है। भारत का दुर्भाग्य है कि भारत की चेतन की प्रगालों से नाजाइज फायदा उठा कर कुछ प्रति-क्रियावादी विरोधी दल भी बाहर की ऐसी ताकतों से जुड़ जाते हैं, जो भारत की बहुत कमजोर देखना चाहती हैं या भारत को फिर से तोड़ कर परतंत्र बनाने

में लगी हुई हैं। उसी तरह का कुछ दुर्गन्ध हमारे माननीय सदस्य के भाषण से आ रहा था। कुछ दुर्गन्ध हमारे माननीय सदस्य के भाषण से आ रहा था। He has tried to reconcile the irreconcilable pleased to state:

मैं उस पर अंत में प्राडंगा। राष्ट्र अभी स्वतंत्रता से वंचित है। नास्त्रिजिया और कुछ स्वतंत्र राष्ट्रों को खतरा है। स्वतंत्र राष्ट्रों के अंदरूनी मामलों में मुनासिब तरीके से हस्तक्षेप किया जा रहा है। ग्रेनाडा इस साजिश का शिकार हो चुका है। हमारे मित्र ने ग्रेनाडा का (कंपैरिजन) मुकाबला अफगानिस्तान से किया है। मुझे अफसोस भी है और ताज्जुब भी है कि ग्रेनाडा में रोगन साहब ने जो तर्क लिया है उस पर बाद में आऊंगा। इसका दूसरा अंग है जहाँ अफगानिस्तान का सावल है। अफगानिस्तान की कानूनी सरकार ने अपने को खतरे में देखते हुए जो लगाता हमला हो रहा था, कानून के आधार पर बनी थी उस के सदस्यों को इज्जा थी, उन्होंने दावत दी रूसी फौजों को कि वहाँ रूसी फौजें आयें और उनके देश को रक्षा करें।

हम किसी देश में विदेशी फौजों के रहने के पक्ष में नहीं हैं। हमेशा भारत वर्ष का यह कहना रहा है, चाहे किसी राष्ट्र की फौजे हों, दूसरे किसी राष्ट्र में नहीं रहनी चाहिए। हम विश्वास करते हैं कि अफगानिस्तान में जब वे कारण जिन कारणों को वजह से अफगानिस्तान की सरकार को बाहर से मदद मंगानी पड़े, जिस समय वे कारण समाप्त हो जायें तो हम आशा करते हैं कि रूस की फौजें उस देश से वापस चली जायेंगी। पश्चिम एशिया में निरंतर हस्तक्षेप किया जा रहा है। युद्ध से अभी भी किसी भी समस्या का हल नहीं हो सकता। दूसरे विश्व युद्ध की पीड़ा से आधी पृथ्वी कराह रही है।

परमाणु युद्ध से सारी दुनियां का विनाश हो सकता है। विनाश के ऐसे शस्त्रों का प्रयोग कभी नहीं होना चाहिए। इसलिये भारत हमेशा इस का विचार कर रहा है कि परमाणु शस्त्रों का पूर्ण रूप से निर्माण समाप्त होना चाहिए। ऐसी स्थिति में पूर्ण रूप से परमाणु शस्त्रों के निर्माण पर रोक लगानी चाहिए। ऐसी स्थिति में यह भी आवश्यक हो जाता है कि वर्तमान शस्त्रागारों को नष्ट कर देना चाहिए। आज से लगभग 20 वर्ष पूर्व विश्व के अंतराष्ट्रीय समुदाय ने एक दशक के अंदर पूर्ण निरस्त्रीकरण का लक्ष्य प्राप्त करने के लिये हथियारों पर रोक लगाना शुरू किया। आज उस संबंध में लक्ष्य को अव्यवहारिक मानकर अनदेखा कर दिया गया है। कल हम परेशान थे। आज हम से कहा जा रहा है कि जब हथियार हैं तो हमें इन हथियारों के साथ ही रह कर रहना सोचना चाहिए, जीवन बिताना चाहिए। क्या हा गया है हमारी मंथनशक्ति को। क्या हो गया है मानवीय मूल्यों के लिये हमारी चिन्ता को, किस तरह के रास्ते पर हम चल पड़े हैं। विनाश, जिनेवा तथा अन्य स्थानों पर अमरौका तथा सोवियत रूस के बीच कई वर्ष से चल रही बातों में गतिरोध आ गया है। आज समय को मांग है कि वे उस गतिरोध को दूर करें और बातों फिर से आरम्भ करें। शांति के इस व्यापक हित में आवश्यक है कि सभी देश चातुर्य रहें तथा वे राष्ट्र जो दूसरे राष्ट्रों में हस्तक्षेप करते हैं वे भी इस कितार से बाज आएं।

श्रीमन्, शांति के इस व्यापक हित में यह आवश्यक है कि सभी देश शांतिपूर्ण सहप्रस्तित्व तथा अन्य राष्ट्रों के मामलों में हस्तक्षेप न करने के सिद्धांतों का पालन करें। एक राष्ट्र जब दूसरे राष्ट्र के विरुद्ध शक्ति का प्रयोग करके किसी खास ढंग की सरकार वहां

कायम करके प्रयत्न असुविधाजनक सरकारों को गिराकर जो भी तक प्रस्तुत करता है, हम उन्हें न्यायसंगत नहीं मान सकते। हाल ही में ग्रेनेडा में हुई दुर्भाग्यपूर्ण घटनाओं से हमें गहरी चिन्ता हुई है। संयुक्त राष्ट्र संघ के तत्वावधान में तत्काल उचित कार्यवाही होनी चाहिए, जिससे अंतर्राष्ट्रीय हस्तक्षेप समाप्त किया जा सके।

गुटनिरपेक्ष देशों के नई दिल्ली सम्मेलन ने सफलतापूर्वक विश्व की सभी समस्याओं पर विचार विमर्श करके एक सही दिशा दी है। मिडिल ईस्ट की समस्याओं पर सफलतापूर्वक प्रकाश डाला है। विश्व शांति के आंदोलन को सहायता मिलेगी अगर गुटनिरपेक्ष देशों के विदेश मंत्रियों को बैठक बुलाकर सेंट्रल अमरौका के हालात पर विचार हो और विशेष रूप से निकारागुआ के ऊपर बढ़ते हुए संकट को दूर करने को पूरा तूरो कोशिश हो। मुझे भय है कि ज्यों निकारागुआ भी ग्रेनेडा की भांति अमरौका के आक्रमण का शिकार हो जाए।

श्रीमन्, अमरौका के नागरिकों ने भी स्वयं ग्रेनेडा पर जो कुछ हुआ उसका विरोध किया। ग्रेनेडा को निर्गुट सम्मेलन का सदस्य बनना शायद अमरौका को पसन्द नहीं आया। ग्रेनेडा पर अमरौका की जो हथकड़ी मध्य अमरौका में साम्राज्यवादी अमरौका को उस योजना का एक विशेष प्रंग है उसके अंतर्गत निकारागुआ पर आगे चलकर हमला करना, सन्नाडोर के मुक्ति संघर्ष को कुचल डालना तथा क्यूबा से पुठेड को नीति प्रदाना शामिल है। ग्रेनेडा पर अमरौका ने हमला ऐसे समय किया है जब वह लेबनान में अपनी सैनिक कार्यवाही तेज कर रहा है। दूसरे भारत के पड़ोस में अस्थिरता पैदा करने की कोशिश कर रहा है : गुटनिरपेक्ष ब्यूरो की बैठक तुरन्त बुलाई जानी चाहिए।

[श्री बुद्धप्रिय मोर्य]

श्रीमन्, हमारे मित्र जो अब नहीं हैं सदन में, उन्होंने कहा कि क्या यह सही नहीं है कि हमारे पड़ोस में पाकिस्तान को, हथियार इस इरादे से नहीं दिये जा रहे हैं, जिन हथियारों में एफ—16 और दूसरे हथियार तथा गाइडेड मिसाइल हैं, जिन हथियारों को वजह से इस क्षेत्र में फौजों संतुलन बिगड़ता है? मैं हिन्दुस्तान के डिफेंस मिनिस्टर से सहमत नहीं हूँ कि वह खुशफहमी में रहें, लेकिन मैं यह महसूस करता हूँ कि इस तरह के हथियार पाकिस्तान को इस इरादे के साथ दिये गये हैं कि जिससे टिल्ट उनके फेवर में चला गया है और कभी भी जो भारतवर्ष की आर्थिक व्यवस्था को, जो यहां के बुद्धजीवियों ने, भ्रमजीवियों ने बड़ा मेहनत करके सही दिशा पर डाला है, उसको नष्ट करने में समर्थ है, ऐसा मैं मानता हूँ। इसलिए मैं चाहता हूँ कि गुट निरपेक्ष व्यूरो को बैठक तुरन्त बुलाई जानी चाहिए। ताकि इन बातों पर फिर से मजबूती के साथ विचार विमर्श हो सके। मैं बताना चाहता हूँ कि फ्रांसीसी प्रतिनिधित्वक डोला बारे ने हमले की निन्दा करते हुए कहा कि ग्रेनाडा में आंतरिक स्थिति को बिगाड़ने के इस प्रयास का किसी भी तरह से औचित्य सिद्ध नहीं किया जा सकता तथा फ्रांस, अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय कानून और संयुक्त राष्ट्र घोषणापत्र का घोर उल्लंघन करने वाली इस सशस्त्र आक्रमण को धटना को कड़ी निन्दा करता है। उन्होंने सुरक्षा परिषद् से उचित कार्रवाही की मांग की है।

श्रीमन्, रीगन की इस दलील में कोई सार नहीं है कि अन्य कैरिवियन द्वीपों की सहायता की गुहार पर अमरीकी

फौजें वहां भेजी गई है। यह दलील अत्यन्त खतरनाक भी है क्योंकि इस दलील से किसी भी महाशक्ति को पड़ोसी देश या देशों की गुहार पर किसी भी अनचाहे देश के आंतरिक मामलों में हस्तक्षेप का बहाना मिल सकता है। श्रीमन्, मैं केवल एक ही उदाहरण देना चाहता हूँ। अगर इस दलील को हमने स्वीकार कर लिया, स्वप्न में भी, तब फिर इसी दिल्ली में पाकिस्तान या अन्य पड़ोसी देशों के सहारे रीगन की फौजें हिन्दुस्तान में आने की हिम्मत कर सकता है हालांकि वह दिन आयेगा कभी नहीं। जिस दिन इस तरह की हिम्मत रीगन ने की, उसी दिन वाशिंगटन भी विध्वंस कर दिया जाएगा, इस तरह की परिस्थिति भी बनती जा रही है : लेकिन इससे हमें आंख नहीं मूंद लेनी है और यह देखना है कि इस तरह की दलीलों आज की परिस्थिति में क्यों दी जा रही हैं?

श्रीमन्, आजकल मिसाइल के ऊपर बहुत बड़ी चर्चा चल रही है।

अमरीकी दिसम्बर के अन्त तक पश्चिमी जर्मनी, इटली, ब्रिटेन तथा अन्य पश्चिमी यूरोपीय देशों में पश्चिम, एवं क्रूज मिसाइलों की तैनाती की योजना बना रहा है। ऐसा न करके जेनेवा वार्ता को जारी रखना चाहिए। अभी ब्रिटेन के पास 64 मध्यम दूरों की मिसाइलें तथा फ्रांस के पास 98 मिसाइलें हैं। पर नाटो इस बात पर जोर देता है कि इन मिसाइलों की गिनती न की जाये। और यूरोपीय क्षेत्र में सोवियत संघ की जितनी मिसाइलें हैं उतनी ही नई अमरीकी

मिसाइलें पश्चिमी यूरोप में जोड़ दी जाए। मैं इस विवाद में नहीं जाना चाहता। मैं केवल यह जरूर कहना चाहता हूँ कि आज वक्त आ गया है कि इन आधुनिक मिसाइलों को यूरोप के अंदर भेजा न जाए चाहे अमेरिका की मिसाइल हो, चाहे रूस की मिसाइल हों। उस वार्ता को फिर से शुरू किया जाए।

स्वतंत्र नीतियां अपनाने वाले छोटे देशों पर अनेक तरह के दबाव डाले जाते हैं। "साइप्रस" की हाल की चिन्ता जनक घटना इस का एक उदाहरण है। तथाकथित टर्किश सिप्रियट एसेम्बली ने साइप्रस के अधिकृत भाग में एकतरफा स्वतंत्रता की घोषणा की, जो स्पष्ट रूप में अवैध है। साइप्रस की एकता कायम रहनी चाहिये। राष्ट्र मंडल, गुटनिरपेक्ष आन्दोलन और संयुक्त राष्ट्रसंघ को देखना है कि यह बहादुर और पीड़ित राष्ट्र अखंड रहे, अदृश्य रहे।

मध्य अमेरिका में बड़े परिवर्तन हो रहे हैं। उन्हें वास्तविक रूप में देखना चाहिये। वहाँ पुराने तथा दमनकारी शासन के विरुद्ध जनता का आक्रोश है। जब भी शांति पूर्ण परिवर्तन में होने में दबाव डाला जाता है तो हिंसा भड़क उठती है। बाहरी मदद तथा हस्तक्षेप से इस परिवर्तन को रोका नहीं जा सकता। राजनीतिक तरीके से बातचीत करके तथा आपसी समझौते द्वारा ही सभी सम्बन्धित राष्ट्रों के हितों की रक्षा की जा सकती है। मध्य अमेरिका में बातचीत करने का प्रस्ताव उसी क्षेत्र के कुछ राष्ट्रों द्वारा किया गया है। जिसमें कोलम्बिया, मैक्सिको, पैनमा तथा बेलिज्वेला सदस्य हैं। उन का प्रस्ताव संबंधित देशों द्वारा माना जाना चाहिये। रंग भेद की नीति के कारण दक्षिण अफ्रीका के अधिकांश लोग मूल अधिकारों से वंचित हैं।

आज हम, उपनिवेशवाद के अन्तिम मुख्य गढ़ नामिबिया में यातनायें सह रहे तथा स्वाधीनता के लिये लड़ रहे बीर तथा बीरांगनाओं की उपेक्षा नहीं कर सकते।

अंगोला एक स्वतंत्र तथा प्रभुसत्ता सम्पन्न देश है, जिस पर दक्षिण अफ्रीका द्वारा आक्रमण का सदैव भय बना रहता है।

जहाँ कहीं भी अन्याय किया जायेगा अथवा जहाँ कहीं भी किसी राष्ट्र की स्वतंत्रता खतरे में पड़ेगी, भारत ने हमेशा अपनी आवाज अन्याय के खिलाफ उठाई है और हमेशा भविष्य में भी उठाता रहेगा। फिलिस्तीनियों की स्वतंत्रता "पश्चिम एशिया संकट" का मूल अंश है। जब तक इन पीड़ित लोगों पर हो रहे अन्याय को समाप्त नहीं किया जाता, अथवा जब तक यह लोग अपनी जन्म भूमि में सम्मान और स्वतंत्रता से नहीं रहते तब तक इस क्षेत्र में शांति कैसे आ सकती है।

शक्तिशाली देशों द्वारा विश्व में अपना प्रभाव फैलाने के उद्देश्य से हिन्द महासागर का संन्यीकरण निरंतर बढ़ता जा रहा है। सन 1971 में "संयुक्त राष्ट्र संघ" ने, हिन्द महासागर को शान्ति क्षेत्र घोषित किया था। इसके बावजूद हिन्द महासागर में "डीगो-गार्सिया" फौजी अड्डे का निर्माण किया गया। किसी और की सुरक्षा के नाम पर इस फौजी अड्डे को आधुनिक परमाणु शस्त्रों से भरा जा रहा है। इस से भारत तथा इस क्षेत्र के अन्य राष्ट्रों की स्वतंत्रता को खतरा पैदा हो गया है। कई तटवर्ती तथा भीतरी देश फौजी अड्डों के इस जाल में फँस गये हैं। हम आशा करते हैं कि हिन्द महासागर को "शांति क्षेत्र" घोषित करने के बारे में "संयुक्त राष्ट्र संघ" का प्रस्ताव लागू होगा। और शीघ्र ही प्रस्तावित सम्मेलन बुलाया जायेगा।

[श्री बुद्ध प्रिय मोर्य]

विकास का शान्ति से सीधा संबंध है। विकास से शान्ति को बल मिलता है। और विकास स्वयं शान्ति पर निर्भर है। विकास की प्रक्रिया भी हमारे समय के तनाव, संघर्ष और अशान्ति से प्रभावित रही है। आज विश्व आर्थिक संकट इतना सर्वव्यापी हो गया है कि कोई भी एक देश अथवा राष्ट्र समुदाय इस का पूरा तथा स्थायी उत्तर नहीं खोज पाया। मुद्रास्फीति को रोकने के लिये, औद्योगिक देशों की नीतियों के कारण उनकी स्वयं की आर्थिक गति-विधियों में तेजी से गिरावट आई है। और विकासशील देशों, जिन्हें गिरती हुई अथवा नकारात्मक उत्पादन दरों, बढ़ते हुए भुगतान शेषों, घाटे और बढ़ते हुए ऋण भारों का सामना करना पड़ता है, पर अभाव का भारी बोझ डालने के अतिरिक्त, बेरोजगारी भी बढ़ गई है। उनको निर्यात से कम आय हो रही है और उन के आयात पर ज्यादा लागत आ रही है। बाहरी देशों से सहायता कम होती जा रही है।

इस वर्ष कई अवसरों पर, भारत की नेता तथा प्रधान मंत्री श्रीमती इन्दिरा गांधी ने, जो आज एन ए एम की चेयरपरसन भी हैं—गुटनिरपेक्ष देशों के सम्मेलन में, “अन्कटाड” में, संयुक्त राष्ट्र संघ में, राष्ट्र मंडल सम्मेलन में—उत्तर की आर्थिक स्थिति में निरन्तर सुधार और दक्षिण के तीव्र आर्थिक विकास के बीच निरुद्ध सम्पर्क की ओर ध्यान दिलाया है। उदाहरण के रूप में संयुक्त राज्य अमेरिका के निर्यात का 40 प्रतिशत तथा सारे ओ. ई. सी. डी. देशों का 29 प्रतिशत भाग विकासशील देशों को जाता है। क्या औद्योगिक देशों को इस सच्चाई का पता नहीं है ? उनके संरक्षणवाद से

विकसित और विकासशील देशों के बीच और अन्तर बढ़ रहा है। विश्व बैंक द्वारा निश्चित स्तर तक अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय विकास संस्था (आई. डी. ए.-7) की सावती आपूर्ति के संबंध में किसी समझौते तक पहुंचना संभव नहीं हुआ है। अन्तरिम समिति की पिछली बैठक में वास्तव में आई. एम. एफ. फण्डस तक पहुंच को कम करने का निश्चय किया गया है।

आज समय का तकाजा है कि व्यापक अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय सहयोग पर आधारित विकास के लिए मुद्रा व वित्त पर एक अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय सम्मेलन हो और गुटनिरपेक्ष सम्मेलन की सिफारिशों पर गम्भीरता से विचार-विमर्श किया जाय और उनको स्वीकार करके इस पृथ्वी को स्वर्ण बनाने के कार्य की शुरुआत की जाए।

श्रीमन, मुझे तब अफसोस हुआ जब माननीय श्री शहाबुद्दीन ने कहा कि आज पी. एल. ओ. के नाम पर भारत चुप हो गया है। उन्होंने इन्दिरा जी तक पर हमला किया। जहाँ तक भारत सरकार और भारत सरकार के प्रधान मंत्री श्रीमती इन्दिरा गांधी का प्रश्न है, जहाँ तक पी. एल. ओ. का प्रश्न है, जितनी मजबूती से भारत पी. एल. ओ. के लिए लड़ा है बहुत से मुस्लिम राष्ट्र भी इतनी मजबूती से नहीं लड़े हैं। स्वयं उनकी पार्टी में इस पर विवाद रहा है, स्वयं उनको पार्टी में इसके लिए दो तरीके रहे हैं। उन्होंने कहा कि ‘नाम’ ने जो कुछ प्राप्त किया उस पर कामनवेल्थ के बादल छा गये। पहले उन्होंने कहा कि कामनवेल्थ कांफ्रेंस और ‘ना’ कांफ्रेंस पर करोड़ों-अरबों रुपया समाप्त कर दिया गया। उसके कोई मायने नहीं थे, वह सब बेकार था। जब सब बेकार था तो ‘नाम’ की प्राप्ति कहाँ थी और अगर ‘नाम’ की प्राप्ति थी तो उस पर

काले बादल कहां से छा गये ? ये तमाम चीजें हैं जो दलील के तौर पर दिये गये हैं, दलील के कारण दिये गये हैं। मैं यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि जहां तक "नाम" का प्रश्न है, यह सही दिशा में है। इस सही दिशा को आज से नहीं भारत बहुत लम्बे अरसे से अपना रहा है। मेरा विश्वास है कि आज नहीं तो कल, कल नहीं तो परसों, हम विश्व में शांति स्थापित करने में अवश्य सफल होंगे। मैं दावे के साथ कह सकता हूँ, कम से कम मैं व्यक्ति विशेष की प्रशंसा में विश्वास नहीं करता हूँ, सत्तारूढ़ दल के लोग यह बात जानते हैं कि विश्व शांति के लिए आज इन्दिरा गांधी जी जितनी शक्ति से जुटी हुई हैं अगर उतनी ही शक्ति से विदेशों के कुछ नेता उनके साथ जुट जायें तो अवश्य पृथ्वी पर शांति स्थापित हो जाये। धन्यवाद।

SHRI SUKOMAL SEN (West Bengal): Sir, we have entered into a discussion today on a very serious issue, the international situation, and we are discussing this issue in this House when actually the sky is overcast with the danger of a thermo-nuclear war. In fact, the whole world, the entire humanity has been brought on the brink of war. Nobody knows what will happen tomorrow or the day after tomorrow. We find that in various parts of the world, aggression is being committed, the independence of nations is being snatched away, people are being killed by bomb-throwing, by shelling, and stockpiling of nuclear armaments is taking place when more than half of the world is going hungry. In this situation, India, as a very big nation, has a role to play. And today we will have to discuss dispassionately actually what role we are playing and, if we continue this policy, what role we will be playing in the near future. We have just concluded the CHOGM. The CHOGM is only a part of the international situation. I will come to it later on. But we find that just recent-

ly a very tiny country, Grenada, was invaded and occupied, and its independence snatched away. We find that Lebanon is being bombed; it is not only being bombed, but attempts are being made to dismember the country. What will happen to Lebanon? Nobody knows. We find that the duly elected Government of Nicaragua is being attempted to be overthrown. Forces are being encouraged, being equipped and being unleashed, to overthrow the legally established Government of Nicaragua. We find that when Geneva talks on the limitation of intermediate nuclear missiles were going on, at that time, installation of nuclear missiles was taking place in Great Britain and West Germany and other NATO countries. Now we will have to distinguish the enemy and the friend. We have such a situation when tight-rope walking or blurring the truth or evading the truth is no solution. We have done enough of it. Now it is high time that we abandon that policy and call a spade a spade. Who invaded Grenada? It is the US imperialism which brazen-facedly invaded Grenada and subverted its independence.

[The Vice-Chairman (Shri Syed Rahmat Ali) in the Chair]

Who bombed Syrian position and Lebanon? Who were the forces who were working for the dismemberment of that country? Who are the forces who are trying to destabilise the entire West Asia? It is the US and her accomplices like Israel and other forces. Who took the decision of installation of missiles in Great Britain and West Germany and other NATO countries, particularly at a time when talks were going on between Soviet Russia and US on the question of limitation of intermediate nuclear armaments? Who? It is the US. It is the US and her accomplices and shameless cohorts Great Britain, its Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher, West Germany Chancellor, the heads of NATO countries. They, along with US, they decided on that when the talks were going on, they would torpedo the talks. So you have to dis-

[Shri Sukomal Sen]

tinguish between the friend and the foe. Mr. Minister, when CHOGM was inaugurated in the city of Delhi, where had you been? You had rushed to West Asia. What for? Because, the entire West Asia was under fire. And who was responsible for the conflagration of the entire West Asia? Who was responsible for destabilisation of that part of the world? Did you find the hand of the Soviet Government there? Or you did find the US as the most shameless aggressor there? You found that it was the US who was committing the aggression there. It is the US, in conjunction with its accomplices like Israel and other countries, who were trying to smash the resistance of the Palestinian people and thwarting the attempts of solving the Palestinian issue. They are trying to annihilate the entire population of that part of the world. So, this is the situation. Where is therefore the scope for tight-rope walking? I would say it is not tight-rope walking, rather it is an attempt to shield the crimes of the criminals. I would like to say that our Government has unfortunately failed to pursue a clear-cut policy to tell the world. 'Look, here is the enemy, here is the foe, and here is the friend.' You were propounding the theory of two super powers. What is the meaning of this theory? It means Soviet Russia as well as US are equally responsible for the danger towards which the world is heading. Mr. Minister, do the facts prove that both the USA and the Soviet Russia are equally responsible for pushing the world towards a thermo-nuclear war? The facts prove otherwise. The Soviet Russia time and again came out with proposal after proposal for limitation of nuclear armaments. The Soviet Russia made proposals for reduction of SS-20 missiles. The Soviet Russia even was prepared to do it unilaterally in the Eastern Europe and the European part of Russia. The Soviet Russia came out with proposal after proposal upto the extent of declaring that Soviet won't be the first to use nuclear bombs so that the world can

live in peace, so that the danger of a thermo-nuclear war is warded off. Who sabotaged these efforts of Soviet Russia? These efforts were sabotaged by the USA. But the Government of India has never been able to condemn USA in a forthright manner. USA is the most aggressive imperialism in the world which wants to dominate the world. And for the purposes of domination, they want to annihilate the people and snatch away the independence of nations. Their aim is to involve the world in a thermo-nuclear war, no matter whether the mankind survives or not.

I found that even when the Geneva talks were going on, Margaret Thatcher, with a marginal majority in the Parliament and despite passionate protests by millions of people not only on Great Britain, but throughout the West Europe, against installation of missiles in Great Britain, West Germany and other NATO countries, got them installed. With the deployment of these missiles the Soviet Russia withdrew from the Geneva talks because then the talks became meaningless. But did you condemn USA in a forthright manner that they committed a great crime against humanity by installing these missiles in West Germany and Great Britain, particularly at a time when the talks were going on between the Soviet Russia and the USA? You did not condemn the United States of America. On the other hand you propounded the theory of equation of two super-powers. This was when even the national press which is not pro-Russia or pro-Communist such as the 'Hindu', the 'Hindustan Times' and 'Amrit Bazar Patrika' came out with forthright condemnation of the US action in conjunction with their accomplices in Great Britain, West Germany and other parts of the world. They sabotaged the talks. They torpedoed the talks that were going on. They did not want the talks to succeed. They were afraid that if the talks succeeded their plan to arm Europe with missiles would not succeed. What happened to Grenada and Nicaragua?

You did not condemn the USA when Grenada was invaded by them on a dangerous pretext. In the CHOGM also you did not condemn by naming USA for that. In your declaration you only deplored the loss of lives in Grenada, but not the loss of independence of Grenada. What is the meaning of this tight-rope walking or the theory of equation of two super-powers? A small country was invaded by a big imperialist power and the small country lost its independence. It became helpless. Still you did not name the aggressor. You failed to do it. You failed to say that the U.S. imperialism is committing aggression in Central America and Nicaragua. Nicaragua's independence has been threatened by the U.S. and the U.S. inspired small countries like Honduras. You could not name them. You could not name the USA. It is the US imperialism which has created danger in the Indian Ocean, in Diego Garcia. You talk of super powers. But has Soviet Russia come to the Indian Ocean region for establishing bases? Who has established bases in the Indian Ocean, in Diego Garcia? It is the USA and not Soviet Russia. Who is supplying lethal weapons to Pakistan which is endangering the security of India? It is not the Soviet Union, but it is the USA. In Sri Lanka also, Sir...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI SYED RAHMAT ALI): Your time is over now.

SHRI SUKOMAL SEN: I will finish in five minutes.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI SYED RAHMAT ALI): No. You have to finish in two minutes.

SHRI SUKOMAL SEN: Yes, I will try to finish in two minutes.

Sir, when the ethnic riots took place in Sri Lanka, we found that Sri Lanka appealed to Great Britain for help. So, this is the difference, this is the distinction, between the USA and Soviet Russia. But you still go

on harping on the theory of two super powers. So, Sir, I would say that you should come out with a clear-cut policy and you should call a spade a spade. You should identify the enemy and you should tell the whole world that the security of the entire world, that the security of humanity, is being endangered by the US imperialism. Not only that. Soviet Russia took counter measures when the Geneva talks were going on. The Soviet Union walked out of the talks and the USSR unilaterally abrogated the unilaterally declared moratorium on the installation of nuclear missiles in Eastern Europe and other parts of Soviet Russia and it is because of the counter measures taken by the Soviet Union that the peace-loving people of the world are feeling secure. And, Sir, it is because of these counter measures that the USA was checkmated from earning superiority in nuclear armaments and prevented from unilaterally starting and plunging the entire world into a thermo-nuclear war. But now they have started feeling as to what will happen to their people, what will happen to that land, of the USA if the war is really triggered off. This time they are not going to remain unhurt and this time they are not going to be spared. Now they and their allies will feel what will happen to them. So, Sir, it is because of the counter measures that the peace-loving people of the world are feeling safe and secure. So, you will have to come out with these facts distinctly and tell the people all about them.

Sir, I feel that this theory of two super powers is a scandalous and shameful theory and sooner the Government comes out of this theory the better it will be for all of us. I would therefore, request the honourable External Affairs Minister to throw away this deceptive and bogus theory and to pursue a correct policy.

Sir, I am just concluding. In NAM, we made some advance. Though we had some reservations even on the declaration of NAM, still we could say that we made some progress. We

[Shri Sukomal Sen]

can say that to a certain extent we identified the enemy and we also found the enemy. We named the USA as the aggressor, as having committed aggression in different parts of the world. But that position of NAM which we achieved, you have watered down in CHOGM. You have totally retreated. Now, you talk of a 'genuine' dialogue between the USA and the Soviet Union. When the USA is sabotaging all talks and when all the attempts of Soviet Russia are being torpedoed by the USA, you say that there should be 'genuine' talks and there should be a 'genuine' dialogue between these two super powers, that is, the USA and the USSR. When the USA is going on with the deployment of the Pershing and Cruise missiles in Western Europe, how can you say that there should be a 'genuine' dialogue? Does US imperialism believe in a genuine dialogue? What happened in Geneva? Was there any genuine dialogue? Yet you are harping on these words like 'genuine dialogue' and I believe that this harping on such words like 'genuine dialogue', etc. would lead us nowhere except practising in self-deception.

Then, Sir, you talk about North-South dialogue. I would like to know from the honourable Minister who stands in the way of a fruitful North-South dialogue? The British Prime Minister, Mrs. Margaret Thatcher, was here. What was her opinion? Can you spell it out? Who is actually standing in the way of a genuine North-South dialogue? Who are the people who are thwarting the process of a North-South dialogue? Is it not the USA? Is it not the Great Britain? So, we see that when they are thwarting all attempts at a fruitful North-South dialogue, you go on repeating the slogans like genuine dialogue, North South dialogue and you are not even identifying the forces

3 P.M.

which are thwarting these attempts. So, Sir, I feel that this sort, this type, of foreign policy

that you are pursuing, or this attitude of the Govt. towards the international situation, is not helpful for the survival of the humanity, particularly at a time when humanity is being threatened with a thermo-nuclear war, with total annihilation, and it is the demand of the people of the country, the demand of the entire peace-loving people of the world, that the Government of India should come out with a distinct position, branding the USA as the aggressor, which has committed aggression in every part of the world, branding the USA as the worst and most pirate imperialist force which is trying to hold the entire humanity to ransom which is trying to plunge the entire world in a thermo-nuclear war, which is trying to subvert the independence of the countries one by one. (Time bell rings.) It is destabilising West Asia. It is arming Pakistan, helping Ceylon and Bangladesh, endangering the security of India. We should come out with this declaration.

Lastly, I would ask what is the meaning of staying in the Commonwealth which has become a motley crowd? The British Prime Minister is there. Small, tiny States are there. The aggressor and the aggressed are in the same club. When the aggressor is there, can the aggressed be also there. You have said somewhere that this club has now assumed huge proportions and its membership has increased. What is the meaning of this increase in membership? Can the aggressor and the aggressed, the tiger and the victim, remain in one (Time bell rings.) So it is high time that we refrain from indulging in the luxury of holding CHOGM, remaining in the Commonwealth and holding such big conferences, spending crores of rupees of this poor country. Better we quit this Commonwealth, taking a distinct stand against imperialism. Then only can we fulfil the aspirations of the people. Then only can we do our duty of saving the world from a nuclear holocaust.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI SYED RAHMAT ALI): Mr. Shyam Sunder Mohapatra.

SHRI SHYAM SUNDER MOHA-PATRA (Orissa): Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, I am grateful for the time given to me. I urge upon you to give me a little more time, because this is the only subject on which I speak in the Rajya Sabha.

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY (Tamil Nadu): Actually, we want to hear you.

SHRI SHYAM SUNDER MOHA-PATRA: Sir, for the first 18 years after independence we thought it was the Nehru era. For the last one decade it is the Indira Gandhi era. Mr. Shahabuddin was saying that after the CHOGM Conference Mrs. Gandhi wanted to go down in history as greater than Jawaharlal Nehru. Sir, no mistake; like father, like daughter.

Sir, the history of India's foreign policy is the foreign policy which was laid down during the long history of the Indian National Congress. Sir our support to the Chinese people during the Manchurian crisis, when Japan invaded Manchuria, our support to the Abyssinian people when Mussolini invaded Abyssinia, Pt. Nehru's article in the Manchester Guardian when the Nazis raided Czechoslovakia on the ground that there were five million Sudeten Germans in Czechoslovakia, our support to the Africans, our support to the Asians, our cause with the Afro-Asian solidarity is the basis of India's foreign policy today. Sir, the question is the international situation and India's foreign policy. Sir, I must say that the international situation which was between 1949 and 1962, the Indo-China War, was the same what fronted with the Korean crisis. Gen. Mc Arthur wanted to invade the whole Korea and unite it under the umbrella of imperialism. Nehru supported the cause of North Korea through Sir Benegal Narsingh Rao in the United Nations and but for Jawaharlal Nehru today the Koreans would have been in the hands of the Americans. At this hour, on this day, about 50,000 American soldiers are

on 38th Parallel under the flag of the United Nations.

Sir, the first decade after Independence was a period of crisis for the people who were fighting against the onslaught of imperialism. Sir, it was the Indo-China War, it was African. When Jomo Kenyatta was chained and dragged on the street Pt. Jawaharlal Nehru sent Dewan Chaman Lal to fight the case. All the African. When Jomo Kenyatta was Jawaharlal Nehru for inspiration, for guidance, for courage, for conviction and for tenacity and today, all the non-aligned countries, the down-trodden, the have-nots, the people who are struggling against imperialism, against Apartheid, against racialism and against colonialism look to India's leadership in the world. Mr. Shahabuddin has said that CHOGM was an extravaganza. Does he understand the meaning of war and how much devastation and crisis a war can create? I was in Japan last year in the peace march in Hiroshima and Nagasaki when a million people paraded in the streets for the cause of peace. I saw with my own eyes the children maimed and deformed faces of people, thousands of them, lakhs of them crying for peace and urging for peace. That was the situation when the war ended. Today, the Inter-Continental Ballistic Missiles, the Atom Bomb, the Hydrogen Bomb, the Neutron Bomb, the Chemical Bomb, all these have terrorised the whole universe and the body politic of this whole world. Now that the United States has sent missiles to be posted in different parts of Europe and Mr. Andropov has given a statement that Russia has also the matching capacity, the whole world is under the shadow of a crisis, a crisis unforeseen, a crisis unprecedented. I must admire the courage of Mrs. Gandhi and the Foreign Minister, whom I call the Castlereagh of the Government of Great Britain. When there was the Italian war of unification, Castlereagh was one Foreign Minister being under the umbrella of British imperialism, who supported

[Shri Shyam Sunder Mohapatra]

the Italian war of independence, supported all liberal movements in the world and went down in history as the British Foreign Secretary who was for the cause of peace. Mr Narasimha Rao is not a globe-trotter. He has lack legs. He goes from country to country. When CHOGM was here, he was for the cause of Palestine. The cause of Palestine is as sacred to us as to the whole Muslim world and the Arab world. We have been supporting the case of Palestine since the day of Mahatma Gandhi and Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru. Much before the Arabs were awakened to the cause of Palestine, the Indian National Congress, in different resolutions, supported the cause of Palestine. Mr. Narasimha Rao, with all courage, with all tenacity, taking his colleagues, went to Kuwait, went to Syria to discuss the Palestinian question with the Arab leaders. That is the irony of history that today the whole Arab world is divided. Today, Yasser Arafat is facing his political doom. Today, Syria and Libya are on one side and President Saddam Husain is on the other side. Lebanon is on a different side and the King of Jordan has taken a different posture. All of them are Arabs. They want one Arab culture, one Arab world, one Arab community and yet they are so much divided. And how difficult is it for the Indian Foreign Minister to build a bridge among all different sectors? How to build the bridge and bring a solution to the problems? How to bring about a compromise? It is no wonder that he has put his whole mind and soul to arrive at a very positive solution of the Palestinian questions.

India's non-alignment policy is not neutral. Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru told this Parliament long back:

"As I have said repeatedly I do not like the word neutral as being applied to India's foreign policy. It is not even a positive neutrality. But the important fact is that we are committed to various policies, various urges, various objectives and various principles."

Very much so. It was what Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru said. Mrs. Gandhi's policy is neither right, nor left. When she was asked by the journalists in Washington last time when she visited America—"Madam, are you left to the centre or are you right to the centre or are you left or are you right?"—she said: "I am erect, India is erect, neither left nor right." That is the policy of the Government of India today.

We are with Russia for a different cause. The cause is that Russia is one socialist country in the world which stands by the people, people fighting against imperialism, fighting against colonialism, fighting against *Apartheid* in South Africa, people supporting the cause of Mozambique, Botswana. These are the people who are fighting.

The people of Grenada have been crushed today and President Reagan is no less than Margaret Thatcher. Argentina's sovereignty over Falkland has been accepted by the non-aligned nations and our Foreign Minister said in the Consultative Committee that India accepts the sovereignty of Argentina over Falkland, a tiny dot in the map of the world, completely invaded, pulled down, crushed to the ground and demolished by Margaret Thatcher because she wanted to win elections. I was in England when Mrs. Margaret Thatcher visited Falklands. And every day in the media, in the TV, in the BBC, with all manipulation and mobilisation, Mrs. Margaret Thatcher was projected as a saviour of Great Britain. And that is what President Reagan has done in Grenada because it is the election year and President Reagan wanted to show his bravado to the world that President Reagan stands as the leader of a very, very strong power. So, these super powers, whether it is America or it is Russia, whether it is Great Britain or France or the Federal Republic of Germany, they are the birds of the same feather.

Sir, as far as NAM is concerned, if you see the Delhi Declaration, how

much toil Government of India did, how many sleepless nights our Foreign Minister had to spend to bring all the NAM people together. Sir, it is not an easy task to bring all the divergent opinions together. Does not consider for a moment that the NAM is a united house. Neither the CHOGM is a united house, nor the United Nations is a united house. And never the League of Nations was a united house. Mr. Tetelescu, who was twice the President of the League of Nations was in tears when he could not do anything for the Czechoslovakian people when entirely the League of Nations failed, before the invasion of Japan on Manchuria, and when Czechoslovakia was raided. And Mr. Tetelescu had to leave his chair in frustration. Today, the United Nations is a divided house. I would not say as Lenin has said that the League of Nations was a gang of robbers, I do not say that. But the United Nations is a process. We have to be in the process. The process is to get the people together.

Sir, imperialism is the last stage of capitalism. It is not possible to bring reason to Mrs. Margaret Thatcher or to President Reagan. It is possible to bring reason to Mr. Mitterand of France who is a socialist. Sir, Democrats are Democrats, Republicans are Republicans. But the Labour Party and the Conservative Party, as far as foreign policy is concerned, they are one. They are not different. You may say that the Democrats are good or the Labour Party is good. But as far as their colonies are concerned, as far as the multi-nationals are concerned, as far as their economic supremacy over the small people is concerned, they are one. How difficult it was to bring a solution as far as Grenada politics is concerned? Sir, if I could quote Mrs. Indira Gandhi, the Prime Minister reportedly expressed that 'the consensus reached by a Community with widely different perception was important by itself; everything could not be achieved in one go. It is a step forward. Sir, it is a step forward. Sir, let us understand. The CHOGM was not an ex-

travaganza. It was to unite the minds, it was to bring different people together, divergent views together. And that is the reason why we praise CHOGM as a step forward. Sir, Mrs. Indira Gandhi, said, and I quote:

"India has not compromised on the principles...there must be measures to make the international financial institutions more receptive for the needs of the poor nations."

Sir, today the whole world is divided into two power blocs. We have to go with one bloc or we have to go with another bloc. And India has taken the position that we do not go with any bloc. Let us not forget that when the Russian soldiers entered Hungary, India protested. But, today, as far as Afghanistan is concerned, India has taken a posture that all the foreign troops should withdraw from Afghanistan. But if the Russians withdraw from Afghanistan, the Americans and the British must also assure that there will be no sabotage from their side. Today, in the international politics, sabotage is a part of diplomacy. Whether it is CIA or it is KGB or it is British 35 Apparatus, all the means to subvert the independence of a country if they want to have the supremacy over them, whether political or philosophical or otherwise. And judging from that point of view, India's stand is very much correct. India's policy has been very correct. Sir, India's role, as far as the border States is concerned, is a very important thing and it has been very constructive. And it has taken a long time to evolve a policy towards the border States. Sir, it is true that Zia-ul-Haq came to the Non-aligned Conference as the leader of Pakistan, and it was a sight to see Zia-ul-Haq speaking for the Non-alignment. And when he came to India, he came with two flags—the flag of the Government of Pakistan and the flag of Government of India. It was a show of friendship. But when there was revolution in Sind, the spokesman of the Government of India sympathised with the people's

[Shri Shyam Sunder Mohapatra]

revolt against autocracy, people's revolt against oppression, people's revolt against fascism and militarism and there lies the strength of India's foreign policy.

Sir, India's policy towards China has really passed through many phases. Sir, the first phase was India's support to the Communist movement there when the Communists got freedom in 1949. And then it was a period of *bhai-bhai* when Chou En-lai the Prime Minister and Nehru the Prime Minister wanted to bring the two people together. India and China constitute one-third of world population. Thirtyfive per cent of world population live in India and China. It is prudent, it is wise and it is imperative that these two countries remain in peace. I must thank Mrs. Gandhi that after a long spell she brought the two countries to an Ambassadorial status and last year when Mr. Chu Tu N visited India as the head of a large delegation, Mrs. Gandhi told him that friendship is like a house, you have to build the house brick by brick, and today the fourth official level talks have just concluded in India, and this is a step forward. Sir, it is not possible to bring the two countries together as far as outstanding problems are concerned. Ten thousand square miles of India are still lying in the area of China. It is not possible to solve the boundary question so easily. But there is nothing wrong to make a stride in the right direction. There is nothing wrong to have a round table conference to have, at least, a discussion on culture, education, industry and commercial collaboration. All these would be steps in the right direction. Mrs. Gandhi has taken good courage and our Foreign Minister has accorded perception to reality and they are trying to bring these two countries together.

Sir, the issue of Tamils in Sri Lanka has caused great stress and strain on all of us. Sir, the Tamilians are as good Tamilians in Ceylon as Tamilians in Tamil Nadu. Their cause is our cause. If there is oppression on any Tamilian in Ceylon, the Tamils in India feel it is oppression on them. It is the sagacity of Mrs. Gandhi, the prudent attitude she

took, the great strides she made by sending Mr. Parthasarthy there, the initiative our Foreign Minister took in Colombo, which have completely demonstrated India's strength in peace and solidarity and India's friendship which Mrs. Gandhi wants to demonstrate for the border countries (*Time bell rings.*) Today Mr. Jayewardene has admitted that there will be no stateless persons and he wants to give citizenship to Ceylonese Tamils. If this utterance has come from Mr. Jayewardene it goes to the leadership of Mrs. Gandhi and the strength she has demonstrated before the Ceylonese people. Ceylon is no match to India. Tamil Nadu police is good enough to over-run Ceylon. But India believes in non-violence and peace, which has been our creed from the days of Indian National Congress till today.

Sir, today India's role in Latin America has been of great appreciation. Sir, the Argentinians, the Venezuelian people, the people of Mexico, they all appreciate India's foreign policy. The Central America has become a revaging ground for the American imperialism, whether it is Honduras, of El Salvador, Nicaragua or Cuba, these countries are in constant fear of American imperialism and the people of El Salvador, Nicaragua, Guatemala, Honduras are up in arms against the imperialist block. Here comes the leadership of the NAM. It is to the credit of the Indian people that Mrs. Gandhi is the Chairperson of hundred odd non-aligned nations. Non-aligned world is a process. Non-aligned world, according to Jawaharlal Nehru, is a platform. It is a platform to gather so many people so that it will constitute a strength against super powers like America and Russia. NAM, the third world, has become a super power with its strength. In this background I say that in the present-day world situation, in the context of global politics, India's foreign policy has been by far the best. There could not be anything more to achieve than what we have achieved in the CHOGM conference, in the last NAM conference and during the marathon tour of Mrs. Gandhi to East Europe... her tour to America, her tour to Australia, the conference of North and South—these are the achievements during the last 3

years when Mrs. Gandhi and Congress Party were returned to power in 1980. During the last 3 years at least, as far as international relation is concerned, we have had these achievements, and these will go down in history as spectacle of India's foreign policy since independence, Thank you.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH (Rajasthan): Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, the motion, the debate or the discussion is on a treasury motion on the current international situation and the Government of India's policy in respect thereof. It would have been—it is my submission—more befitting if the hon. Minister had initiated the discussion by elucidating what the current international situation is and where does the Government of India stand. It is a frequently heard truism that in international affairs, quite often, nations are recognised as standing where they sit. I am certainly at a loss to understand, and am in sympathy with my former colleague who wandered into history and into Gautam Buddha and Diwan Chaman Lal etc., because the parameters of this afternoon discussions were not defined by the Minister. The Minister has a very easy task now after we have all finished, to get up and say that what my colleague, Syed Shaha-buddin said is not so, or what Mr. Sukomal Sen said is not so and what I may say, is also not so. We do not know where the Government stands. So far we do not know what the parameters of today's discussions are. I would like to mention here that we face—I personally face—a major difficulty which is that I am unable to identify the central strategic thought which threads India's policy perceptions with its policy conduct. I am unable to identify devolving from that central strategic thought what are the tactical considerations which guide and govern Indian foreign policy, which are the contingency plans which have enabled the Government of India to cope with situations, the international situations, as they have arisen in the last one year, or since we last had this debate. A related question is about the uncertainties of domestic politics; and here I would like to illustrate because it is again a frequently heard truism that after all, foreign policy

flows out of domestic policy, and certainly I think the attendance in the House best exemplifies the moribund state of our foreign policy, because if domestic attendance of the House is in any fashion a reflection of the activism on foreign policy, surely then it is an accurate reflection. The fundamental question is that gives the uncertainties of domestic politics, international change, economic pressure and technological developments what is the most feasible strategy for India to adopt in order to safeguard its internal sovereignty and to secure its external interest. The issue is so overriding and so complex that we have never argued it in any forum to its logical conclusions. Frequently, we are handed out statements which emanate from the Government and because the statements are emanating from a situation as it exists and because there is such a chronic paucity of sustained strategic thoughts that it is precisely because of this paucity that on the Government statements, the Government or the South Block on themselves so touchy about discussing that which they themselves have not discussed. Now, there is another failing which I would try and not fall into. There has been a frequent mention of the person of the Prime Minister. I do think, we are discussing the current international situation and not the personality of the Prime Minister though I would like, in an aside, to add that each time the Prime Minister returns from a foreign tour, quite where the Congress Party gets the idea that she has emerged and is already the most accomplished international statesman in the world is left to anybody's guess. That the Congress Party should do this for their own benefit, and for their own survival is understandable. But how significant is this factor in the discussion on international affairs is certainly not understandable.

In this context, and in the absence of the Minister having identified what are the points in the current international situation which we are discussing, I would submit what I think are matters of concern. I feel, without attempting to cover the entire spectrum. East, west and disarmament is one. These are not necessarily

[Shri Jaswant Singh]

in the order of importance because to have an order of importance in this kind of situation is an exercise in futility. I think, the turmoil in West Asia, in which I include the Gulf, is a matter of very considerable concern internationally. I feel, the unresolved issue of the North-South dialogue and the mounting LDC debt are major issues of international concern. Then, the situation in Central America and in the Caribbean are also of major concern. So also Africa, and nearer home, because the Prime Minister has been so emphatic about it. I do think, our relationship with our neighbouring countries and the consideration of India's security environment are of significance and importance to us in today's, in this afternoon's discussion.

To attempt to explain the nexus between our concept and our conduct of policy, I would like to now illustrate what has been India's response to these situations internationally. We have, in the recent past, had two summits, the non-aligned summit and the recent meeting of the Commonwealth heads of Governments. India had the gratuitous honour of having the Chairmanship of the non-aligned movement. There have been certain non-aligned initiatives taken by India as the Chairman in the last one year or so. And it is for the House to determine as to how successful these initiatives have been, or not been. There is the continuing Iran-Iraq war. It is also illustrative of the turmoil in the Gulf. Sir, I beg your consideration. I am appreciative of the political compulsions of the Minister of State for Parliamentary Affairs. If he would like to have his conference outside, it will enable me to proceed. I do appreciate his compulsions. But I think, he ought to be appreciative of mine.

In the non-aligned initiative, Iran-Iraq was was one. It is not judgement of any individuality or any personality. It is an assessment of our policy. The non-aligned international, attempts at a non-aligned intervention, have resulted in nothing, as far as the continuing war between Iran and Iraq is concerned. France, with the kind of flippant attitude it has to the ques-

tion of arms supply is now moving towards supplying more arms to Iraq, which may well result in damage to Kharag island, which may well result in the closure of the Strait of Hormuz. And if anything happens to the Kharag island and if the Straits of Hormuz are closed, then, I think, it will be a matter of very deep concern internationally and certainly, India is not going to be left unaffected by it. In this context, what has been the Indian initiative in the past one year? What has been the non-aligned initiative? Initiatives may have been there in the manner of going there but what results did we achieve? I am afraid, I have to point out that the war continues as it has done and the danger to the country and internationally remains as it did. On Indian Ocean a number of other colleagues have spoken. I shall not elaborate the point. It is again illustrated by the disparity that has appeared in the pronouncements of the Non-aligned Conference and the pronouncements at the Commonwealth Heads of Government Conference. I do not think it is necessary for the Prime Minister to be so combatively defensive about India having retained her position. These are international conferences. We are adult enough to understand that in these international conferences it is not the national view point which is put across, there is a process of consensus-making and it would be more befitting for the Prime Minister to come forward and say that this is an international conference, it is not a conference where India's viewpoint is asserted and we have had to find a consensus. After all, to me personally, the Commonwealth is afflicted with the same kind of ethic which is presently available only in some of the more indigent London clubs. I cannot really see anything purposive, deliberate or directional about it.

Sir, the sad story of the PLO—I am appreciative of the physical efforts that the hon. Minister of External Affairs has made, I am appreciative also of the last minute Non-aligned initiative in the form of despatching a cosmetic group of Foreign Ministers to go and make an effort at the last minute to save Yasser

Arafat. PLO is in a turmoil. The effect of this cosmetic effort was best demonstrated one day after they returned when the Saudi peace proposal was put across and assumed to be accepted. Despite this because of Syria's intransigence Yasser Arafat continues to be a prisoner in Tripoli, unable to leave. I am afraid, I cannot cite our intervention have either as a country or as the head of the Non-aligned, as an example of success.

Lebanon; Lebanon's is a very sad story. It is reflective of the tragedy that is affecting the whole of the Arab world. Because of the PLO's travails and because of difficulties in Lebanon, the larger question, the larger continuing question of the Arab-Israel situation, the Arab-Israel conflicts has been pushed into the background. The United States of America has emerged on the scene as a protagonist. The Soviet Union has emerged on the scene sitting in the background, waiting for one of the super power protagonist, which is the United States, to make a mistake and benefit out of it. Because of the continuing travails of the PLO and the Lebanon, the question of Israel has been put in the background. In this context, what has been India's initiative, what has been the Non-aligned initiative? I am afraid, I cannot cite either as an example of our success.

Sir, now to what I would like to call the Grenada-Afghanistan syndrome. It is not just a simplistic question of whether the aggressor nation has been named or not named, in which document it has been named or in which document the name has been omitted. Somebody asked me a question the other day, what are your views on Grenada? Quite seriously the question was asked and I was able to point out that if the Grenada philosophy had to be accepted, then given the uncertain situation in Punjab, I have serious reservations in my mind if tomorrow marines are not to come and land in Christian Medical College at Ludhiana. This is unbelievable, absolutely incomprehensible. There is a group of nations in the Carribean, independent and sovereign, of whose association the abbreviation to

be unscrambled you have to refer to a dictionary. On the basis of the support sought by that group... *(Time bell rings)*... Sir, I will try to finish very quickly... Grenada is invaded. Whether the compulsions are domestic politics or whether the reasons are the absolute mindlessness of Reagan policy, the fact still remains that Grenada and Afghanistan represent the same syndrome; they represent a kind of anomy which has come to afflict the world. If the world is not the preserve of the Super Powers, it would have been our expectation that India as the Chairman of the Non Aligned Group would have provided the necessary leadership in this context.

Sir, I have to now necessarily rush. On the question of LDC debt, the North-South dialogue, I hope that the hon. Minister of External Affairs would not treat my remark flippantly when I say that the initiative was taken with great fanfare because of what my friend and colleague, Mr. Shahabuddin, said, Prime Minister's penchant for summitry, and great announcements were made on the occasion of the UN General Assembly meet that because of the initiative by the Non Aligned, we are going to collect the whole of the Non Aligned world there, that it will be all the Third World and that we will demonstrate to the first and the second worlds that we, the Non Aligned, are now standing up asking for a meaningful North-South dialogue. It is a reflection of the failure of our diplomacy that special emissaries had to be sent to President Mitterand and Prime Minister Trudeau to attend the meet. There was hardly any attendance from any Asian countries. Those, which my friends and colleagues would like to cite as friends of India—the Soviet Union and the Eastern bloc—refused to attend. *(Interruption)* These are not judgements of individuals which one is making; these are judgements of the direction of our policy. I do submit that this is not by any standards an example of a success story. *(Time bell rings)* Sir, you have rung the bell twice. I am aware of that.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI SYED RAHMAT ALI): Because your time is over, Mr. Jaswant Singh. I am very sorry

[Shri Syed Rehmat Ali]

14 minutes were allowed. It is already 17 minutes.

श्री लाडली मोहन निगम (मध्य प्रदेश) : बोलने दोजिये ।

श्री जगदीश प्रसाद माथुर (उत्तर प्रदेश) : तीन चार बार घंटी...

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री सैयद रहमत अली) :
माफ कीजिये अगर इस घंटी को इज्जत नहीं फरमायेंगे तो मुनासिब नहीं है ।

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: I understand it. I will be very brief. I will attempt to speed up. On the question of the recently concluded Commonwealth Conference, I had really looked forward to the Minister's statement. I must submit that I was not disappointed by the statement made by the Minister. I knew that the statement was not going to say anything that we did not already know and the Minister has succeeded eminently in that endeavour. The statement on the Commonwealth Conference is an essay on Commonwealth. It really says very little that was not already known. I would specifically ask for the Minister's indulgence to answer one or two questions in the context of the Commonwealth Conference. Is it correct that during the Conference, some African and Caribbean countries took objection to India's membership of the Antarctica Treaty on the ground that because of our having recently joined it, we have consented thereby to sit around the same table as South Africa and thus, by implication have compromised our virginal purity on *apartheid*?

In the declaration, of which I still do not have a copy and about which I would request the Minister to do us the courtesy of providing one, there is no mention of the country that invaded Grenada. I would be happy if he would enlighten us as to the reasons for it. Is the Commonwealth likely to take any initiative—irrespective of Secretary-General's premature announcement about it—for the institution

of a Commonwealth peace-keeping force so that the Grenadians are able to determine their own political dispensation? And does the Government of India intend taking any initiative with the Government of Greece, with whom the Prime Minister recently demonstrated a very touristic affection or attachment, to ensure that following upon the unilateral declaration of independence by the Turkish-held Cyprus, the situation will not be further aggravated by Greece unilaterally declaring its claim on the Aegean? Sir, I would take a minute to talk about the security environment, because the Prime Minister for purely domestic politics has been considerably highlighting this aspect of the situation that the country faces. And, while highlighting the security environment of the country, I would very briefly take in the question of our relationship with our neighbourhood and would like in the process both to caution the Government and also put across my point of view.

There are three principles I would like to submit to the hon. Minister. First, the Government quite often says that we are bound not to have any super power intervention in our region. I would submit to the Government to consider that it is precisely because of the Government's abrasive attitude towards our neighbours and the resultant fear that is created in our neighbourhood that super powers step in. Please consider this proposition and see what a great fracture lies in your policy perceptions. Second, I would submit to the Government and to the hon. Minister of External Affairs that perpetuating hostility is equal to very poor policy. I do not want to elaborate this. We seem to be falling into the trap of perpetuating hostility with our neighbours, more particularly with Pakistan. I cannot for the life of me see sense in perpetuation of hostility. It is hardly ever a good policy. Third, take the question of non-intervention. We continuously talk of non-intervention. I would caution the Government, in the context of Sri Lanka, which is an issue very close, very dear to Indian concerns, that our involvement with Sri Lanka sentiment has gone to an extent where things have

become very difficult. Consider the contingency that no settlement takes place in Sri Lanka. What would happen? Where would they go? Consider the contingency that the rest of the Sinhalese in Sri Lanka do not also consider themselves as totally separate from the Indian psyche, Indian ethos.

The South-Asian Regional Conference was a welcome step, but things got defeated thereafter.

With Bangladesh and Nepal we are having the problem of immigration. With the recent incidents in Siliguri, for the first time, we hear about the need to control the free movement of Indians to Nepal. This is not an example of success. The Bangladesh President, President Ershad, says; Do not build a fence along the border.. This is also not an example of success. I have already spoken about unresolved issues with Pakistan. I would now again underline it. On the question of the People's Republic of China, I do submit that our talks with them have gone well beyond the question, well beyond the limit of any settlement at the level of officials. Political initiative, political courage, political statesmanship and political initiative is what is how needed to normalize our relations with the People's Republic of China.

Sir, I would omit some of the other things that wanted to cover and, in conclusion, come to just one or two submissions. I would submit for the Government's consideration, and for the hon. Minister of External Affairs' consideration, that non-alignment is not a value, non-alignment is not a goal, non-alignment is a policy instrument. It is a policy instrument. Please do not put it on a pedestal, and do not put it across to us, that the Government of India's policy is non-alignment. Non-alignment is an instrument of policy; and if you follow this thought, by following that thought, necessarily there will be a turmoil in your thinking and same results will emerge. Sir, I do submit; please move away from global aspirations to our Asian realities. This has been the biggest weakness of India's foreign policy since our Independence. Do move away from global aspirations to our Asian reality. (Time bell rings) I would

conclude. Thirdly, discard the goal of hegemony of size. You talk about India's leadership. You achieve leadership by values and by examples. And in both these, either by subscription for values or by example, I cannot say that our foreign policy, its concept or its conduct, is a success. Sir, I do submit that please resolve the confused issue of authority for foreign affairs. Who is responsible for it? If I make a plea for institutionalisation, do understand that I am not making a plea which omits the political. The political is a necessary input, but institutional are your arms and limbs. Do not break the institution. The institution is today equipped, I believe with some of the most talented professional diplomats that any country has. Do not absolutely incapacitate them by making policy formulations such a hot house, a court atmosphere kind of activity, that nobody knows where policy is being formulated and the South Block and the hon. the Minister for External Affairs merely become articulators of it.

Finally because this thought came to me which while the debate was going on, I would submit for the Government's consideration and for the hon. Minister of External Affairs that do take into account the need for tactical changes, of course within the framework of a strategic concept. Establish both the strategic concept and your tactical options, contingency plans, so that the conduct and the content of our foreign policy moves away from its unconvincing moribund and ossified imagery. The challenge of a dynamic situation is not to be found by mistaking between consensus and conformity.

Thank you.

SHRI K. C. PANT (Uttar Pradesh): Sir, my hon. friend, Shri Jaswant Singh, has just asked us not to have global aspirations. I am afraid that in today's world which is totally interdependent, India must have global aspirations, because peace is indivisible, and war in any part of the globe in this nuclear age, affects everybody. Development is indivisible, and

[Shri K. C. Pant]

it is not possible to have a sea of prosperity and islands of poverty, and we have seen today that even the developed countries cannot get out of recession, cannot speed up their process of development unless the developing countries also manage to speed up their economies, the growth of their economies. The two are inter-linked, and so, if we have the aspiration of global peace, if we have the aspiration of global development, I think that is but a recognition of the realities today. It was not so perhaps a hundred years ago. It might not have been so even 70 to 80 years ago. But after the Second World War the reality is that both peace and development are indivisible and any country which wants to promote the welfare of humanity and regards its own objectives as being a part of that wider canvas must have global aspirations.

And it is in this context that we have had two very important conferences in Delhi recently—the Non-aligned Summit and the Commonwealth Heads of Government Meeting.

Sir, I was listening very carefully to my friends, and I noticed a certain hesitation in giving the Government its due, in giving the Prime Minister her due, in the matter of the prestige that the country has gained as a result of these two conferences. Is it not a matter of pride for every Indian today that India heads the Non-aligned Movement? Is it not something to be proud of when the Prime Minister becomes the Chairperson of the Non-aligned Movement and speaks for the majority of the world's population, the majority of the world's countries and voices the aspirations and concerns of the poor of this world? Is it not a matter of pride? And in this matter can one deny her due? The Prime Minister's touch in foreign affairs, her timing, her skill, these are matters which are acknowledged all over the world. Today she is undoubtedly a leader of world stature. Can we,

should we, be churlish in acknowledging this? Should we be hesitant in acknowledging this? Shri Jaswant Singh is far too intelligent a person not to know this. So I was wondering why he was saying these things. And then he mentioned in passing that if the Prime Minister is given her due, it helps the Congress Party. And that made me think that he does not want to do it not because he does not recognise the reality, but because he thinks that it may help the Congress Party. Well, knowing him as I do, I am sure that this is just a debating point, but in reality he would be the first to accept that the country does gain from any prestige that the Prime Minister acquires in these international meets. Today we have acquired that prestige, and if the Prime Minister is acclaimed, that is something which goes to the credit of the Indian people as a whole. It is in that spirit that I would like to approach the outcome of these two highly important meetings.

Sir, there was some mention of the expenditure incurred. Now, as my friends know, in these international meetings, certain standards are always maintained anywhere in the world. And if we are to host such conferences, I am sure they would all like us to maintain that standard of hospitality and I am sure they will find shabbiness inexcusable. So necessarily some expenditure is involved, but it is expenditure in a good cause. I agree with Shri Jaswant Singh that we should look at the results. The arrangements were on all accounts excellent and one has heard so much about it from the foreign delegates also who said it not only as a matter of courtesy, but our own newspapers, who would not have spared the Government had there been lapses, have acknowledged the excellence of these arrangements. I would like to congratulate the Foreign Minister here for the excellent manner in which these conferences were conducted.

Sir, the Non-aligned Summit and the Commonwealth Meet were the

culmination and vindication of the policy followed by the Government, by successive Government, if I may say so, ever since India became free and this is a matter on which—I think few will disagree—there is a large measure of national consensus. There may be differing voices occasionally, but by and large, the people of this country have supported this broad policy. Now in the Non-aligned Summit, a series of documents came out and certain conclusions were arrived at. Then certain documents came out of the Commonwealth Heads Conference. I think there should be no confusion between the two sets of documents. They emerged from different conferences, with different delegates, with different kinds of people, and necessarily there will be differences between these two sets of documents. We must accept those differences. This is not surprising at all. But the important thing is that in their own way, they are attempts to build bridges between different nations, they are attempts to promote understanding, they are attempts to find areas of agreement. And in this, both have eminently succeeded. This has been India's approach throughout. We have always recognised that there are bound to be differences in perception. There are historical differences, differences in historical experience, differences in geography and differences which divided people all over the world. And all along we have talked of peaceful co-existence. We have accepted that people are free to live their own lives. One must find areas of agreement and one must find areas where they can work together. And this has been the basic approach since Gandhiji, since Panditji and continues today to be the approach. I think this is in consonance with India's own rich past traditions. Anti-colonialism, anti-imperialism, warning against neo-colonialism, are a part of its tradition. In this context one has to see the achievements of CHOGM. What are the achievements? One can say that on some particular issue the statement did not say this or did not

entirely reflect our views on this point. Well, the more important thing is in terms of the broad understanding, the attempt at broad understanding which I mentioned.

Let us see the timing of this particular conference. It so happens that just now, as my honourable friend, Mr. Jaswant Singh, said, the international security situation is very difficult. Tensions have increased. The talks that were going on in Geneva broke down. Tentatively they have resumed and let us hope something happens there. The threat of missiles in Europe has increased. Tensions have grown elsewhere. The nuclear threat has increased. So all round the general climate has deteriorated. And in this situation of widening chasm between the East and the West, more misunderstanding growing everyday, we find peace movements coming up in various European countries. But at the governmental level there is this growing gap. He mentioned the Iran-Iraq war. He mentioned the situation in Lebanon. These are hotbeds of tension. But the way Shri Jaswant Singh referred to the Indian policy in respect of these hotbeds of tension, I was not very clear. He seemed to give credit to the Foreign Minister for taking energetic steps to help in defusing the situation, certainly in Lebanon. He and his colleagues succeeded in bringing about a ceasefire. In the Iran-Iraq war also, they did attempt to bring about greater understanding. And he has acknowledged that. But then he said the results are not fully satisfying. Perhaps not. But then we do not control these countries. One can only make this attempt. The whole world wants to see these tensions disappear. But I don't think that anybody could expect any country today to be in a position to dictate terms to any other country. Therefore, when he says have you made an attempt, I think that is what he expected the Government to do. And in this respect I think he has been fair in that part of his statement.

Now, the CHOGM statement refers to the nuclear threat and it lends its

[Shri K. C. Pant]

support to peace and disarmament. And I think it went as far as it could considering its composition, because some of its members belong to military blocs. Then there is the basic North-South divide, the misunderstandings that have grown over the years and the real problems that have grown over the years. And these problems relate to the international economic situation. In a way both the economic situation and the question of peace and armament are inter-related. They reflect the

4 P.M.

power structure that emerged in the world after the second world war. They resist every suggestion for change, every time a country like ours ask for a change in the past power structure. One has to measure the result in terms of the success in inching forward, because there is not going to be a collapse of that resistance suddenly. One must persevere and persist because the future of all developing countries lies in changing this power structure. Then only will the developing countries be able to develop faster which they cannot under the present dispensation. This is the crux, this is the measure and this is the criterion on which we have to judge the success of these meetings.

I would say that on the economic front there has been a movement forward. It may not be all that we may desire. But there has been certain softening of a position which was more rigid earlier. Thus there is a certain movement forward and there is recognition of the compulsion of making development a real international phenomenon in an inter-dependent world. I think this is a great gain for us. These meetings, far from the impression that is sought to be created, are not formal meetings. They did not ignore the basic issues. These are the basic issues of our times, after all.

The other specific issues which are causing concern to everybody today and therefore requiring attention

were also taken up. For example, the independence of Namibia and developments in Grenada and Cyprus to which my friends have referred. I would say, in judging the exact formulations that emerged from the CHOGM we have to take into account the character of the Commonwealth. At one stage it was a White Man's Club; today the majority in the Commonwealth are non-aligned countries. Still there are many countries there which are still in military blocs; they are parts of military blocs. Therefore, they have certain limitations beyond which they will not go on certain matters. If you look at it from that point of view and that backdrop, we have had a measure of success in persuading them to take a line which is nearer to our line of thinking. And I think in this we have made some progress, though none of us is really satisfied. Still I think we have made progress.

Regarding reflection of India's views in some of the documents, if anybody says that in some respects on some points. India's views are not fully reflected in the final document, it is only natural. It is bound to be so. Suppose we go to the U.N. Do we not make compromises there? I had the honour to be in the Indian delegation to the U.N. and on so many resolutions we had to make compromises and the resolution may not reflect our feelings. But then if that Resolution is passed, do we quit the U.N.? Or do we go along with the consensus at the moment and then strive later for acceptance of our point of view? We who are democrats must see the virtue of patience in these matters and must see the virtue of persuasion. We cannot force others to accept our viewpoint. But we can persuade them to accept our point of view. They called for political dialogue in respect of nuclear arms. They called for the end of the nuclear arms race. These are sentiments which were expressed by the Prime Minister in the opening speech and these are

reflected in the final document in spite of the fact that some of the countries represented there are in military blocs. Even then they have shared these sentiments.

Then they have expressed concern about the vulnerability of small States. Certainly we feel far more strongly on this than has been expressed in the document. But when they have talked of a situation in which foreign troops are withdrawn, in which there is no foreign interference or foreign pressure, I think at least the principles on which our point of view is based have been accepted.

This is no small gain. And, then, Sir, on the question of Namibian independence, this point has been accepted; that there is no linkage between the withdrawal of the Cuban troops from Angola and Namibian independence. It is a definite move forward and I am quite sure that this will help those who are struggling for Namibian independence and this I consider as one of the major achievements of this Conference.

Then, Sir, on the question of Cyprus, the unilateral declaration of independence by Turkish Cypriots has been condemned and this has been India's point of view also. And, Sir, a Special Action Group on Cyprus has been constituted and India is represented on that. I do not want to go into details and many of my other friends have spoken on that. But I think that on the economic question, which again is the other major area, I would like to say only this that the need for a comprehensive review of the international monetary, financial and trade issues has been recognised and we regard this as a step forward is consonance with what we had said in the NAM earlier, namely, that there should be an international conference with universal representation to consider of money and finance questions and if this is regarded as a step in that direction, then India's position in NAM and India's position in CHOGM are the same except that the CHOGM is naturally more

cautious because some of those members held a totally different view earlier and today, Sir, they have been brought round to this point of view. So, there has been a movement, though not as much as we desired, from the earlier position and I would like to underline that point. Similarly, the call for prompt and substantial additional resources for the international financial institutions is there and this is a welcome and timely statement. You know that the replenishment of IDA-7 is now very much an urgent issue and it has to be done very soon. Otherwise, IDA-7 replenishment will be in danger. Therefore, this call, coming at this moment, I think, is a timely call and I hope this will help in the replenishment of the IDA-7. Here again it has not been left to a mere statement of hopes. An eight-nation Consultative Group has been formed which will pursue this matter and which will stimulate the North-South dialogue.

Sir, I would like to mention first and promote a consensus.

Sir, I just want to make two small points more and then I am done.

Sir, I would like to mention first the deterioration in the security climate around India which Mr. Jaswant Singh has mentioned. I share his concern about this matter though I do not agree with some of the statements he has made. But I would only like to say that the best guarantee of peace in our region is for India to be fully prepared for all contingencies, for India to be very vigilant, because India has a responsibility in this area and I do not think that Shri Jaswant Singh should shy away from the responsibility that our size has cast on us the responsibility that is cast on us by history, and I do not think we should shirk this responsibility, I do not think that we should shy away from this responsibility and we have to accept this responsibility and that can only be discharged if we are prepared. There cannot be a vacuum and there is never a power vacuum and we must never forget history and we must

[Shri K. C. Pant]

never allow power vacuums to be filled by others.

Then, Sir, on the question of Sri Lanka the whole country shares the concern of our friends from Tamil Nadu and the events in Sri Lanka which affect the Tamils have hurt all of us. But, Sir, Sri Lanka is a friendly country and it is our neighbour. We have been thousands of years of traditional ties with that country and, Sir, this is a moment which calls for statesmanship. While we have to see that the people of Indian origin in Sri Lanka get protection, we have also to see that this is done in a manner which does not create any suspicion or fear in the minds of the Sri Lanka people or the Sri Lanka Government and I think the Government has to be congratulated for the manner in which they have handled this delicate task. Mr. G. Parthasarathi has done a very fine job, Sir. And now Shri Jayawardene is going to convene an all party conference. Let us hope for a solution of the problem. There has been a movement forward—a definite movement forward. I am particularly glad with the Foreign Minister's announcement yesterday that Stateless people of Indian origin will get citizenship in Ceylon. This will end another long-standing problem, a problem that was creating friction between the two countries. This is a most welcome outcome of the discussions that have taken place, and I would like to congratulate the External Affairs Minister and the Prime Minister and Mr. Parthasarathy for this happy outcome. It is these moments which test countries. And I think that in this test which was posed to us by the happenings in Sri Lanka, India has emerged as a country which understands their problems in a sympathetic manner and it can take care of the legitimate interests of those of Indian origin.

Thank you very much.

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री संयद रहमत अली) :

श्री इन्द्रदीप सिंह जो, आपको पांच मिनट बोलना है

श्री इन्द्रदीप सिंह (बिहार) : श्रीमान्, पांच मिनट में कैसे काम होगा।

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री संयद रहमत अली) : मैं आपको इतिला दे रहा हूँ।

श्री इन्द्रदीप सिंह : अगर एक्सटर्नल मिनिस्टर साहब कहें तो... (व्यवधान)।

श्री पी० बी० नरसिंह राव : गगर में सागर भर दीजिये।

श्री इन्द्रदीप सिंह : गगर में सागर की बात तो मैं मानता हूँ।

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री संयद रहमत अली) : अब आप बोलिये।

SHRI INDRADEEP SINHA: Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, since my time is limited, I will limit myself to the central issue of foreign policy which faces the people and the Government of India. Now, Sir, that central issue is the rapid worsening of the security situation both on international and national planes. It is well known how the American Government with the concurrence of its NATO allies, has unilaterally broken away from the negotiations with the Soviet Union and started deployment of its medium range nuclear carrying missiles. The destructive power of these missiles can be judged from this single fact that the 620 missiles which are being sited in Europe have a destructive potential which is 174,000 times of the atom bomb that was dropped on Hiroshima during the Second World War.

Why has this happened? It is because the American Government under President Reagan has adopted a mad adventurist militarist course. Reagan has openly declared that he wants to turn back the "tides of Communism". He has openly said that he wants to settle the ideological dispute between the two social systems by recourse to war. And it is not accidental that the deployment of

American missiles in Europe has synchronised with the invasion of Grenada, with the intervention in Lebanon, with the bombing of Syrian installations and with the declaration of an independent State in North Cyprus. All these are coordinated moves on the part of US imperialism and its allies. Sir, I am reminded of the situation prevailing in 1938-39 on the eve of the Second World War. The Sudetan land of Czechoslovakia was occupied by Hitler's Nazi hords on the so called ground of "protecting" the Germans inhabiting that area. Similarly, the island of Grenada with a total population of 100,000 has been invaded, ravaged, occupied by US imperialist forces on the plea of "protecting" the lives of a few hundred American students whose lives were not at all in danger.

U. S. imperialism is not only siting these missiles in Europe, but it is planning a global confrontation with all forces standing for freedom, democracy and progress. Now, the missiles that are to be sited in Sicily will bring within their range the Middle-East and Northern Africa. More missiles are being manufactured than are to be sited in Europe. More than 620. Where will they be deployed? May be in Israel may be in Diego Garcia, may be in Japan. So, this brings our country, our sub-continent, with the range of American missiles. Already our neighbour, Pakistan, under the military dictatorship of Zia-ul-Haq, has been supplied with most sophisticated arms which are not at all necessary for the defence of Pakistan. They are offensive weapons which can be used only against India.

Sir, I beg to submit that the question of Indian security is very much linked with the question of European security, with the question of world security and with the question of preservation of world peace. In such a situation, one would expect from the Government of India to be consistent in its application of the policy of non-align-

ment. What is non-alignment? It was defined by the Non-Aligned Summit as a policy of anti-imperialism, as a policy which stands for the defence of our freedom and which stands for the freedom of other colonial and semi-colonial countries. Therefore, if the freedom of any country is threatened, it constitutes a threat to our freedom also. Moreover, our freedom is directly being threatened. In such a situation, I would request the hon. Minister for External Affairs to explain to us how it helps our struggle when you water down our known foreign policy positions for the sake of reaching a so-called 'consensus' with persons like Mrs. Margaret Thatcher and with powers like Great Britain and other imperialist members of the Commonwealth. Now, this Commonwealth is a misnomer. As the Minister for External Affairs himself pointed out in the other House, this Commonwealth is a "mini-forum" of the developed and developing countries. We should say if the imperialist and the former colonial countries".

This is an anachronism. Why should India agree to tone down or water down its known stand for the sake of unanimity or consensus in this Commonwealth? In the CHOGM communique, references are there that many States held a particular view on a particular question. In the same communique, India's position could have been stated that India holds a particular opinion. For example, it could have been stated that on the question of Grenada, India was not prepared to compromise and wanted to denounce its invasion by U.S. imperialist forces. One feels sorry when one does not find this reference in the CHOGM communique and one feels even more sorry when we find this omission, this watering down being defended by the spokesmen supporting the ruling party.

Sir, I would refer to only one more concept and that concept is the so-called concept of the "two super-powers." It has been voiced here; it is voiced in the press also, it is voiced from various

[Shri Indradeep Sinha.]

forums. Now, what is the error in this concept? The error in this type of presentation is that the socialist Soviet Union is equated with the imperialist United States of America. And by this equation, the edge of the anti-imperialist movement is blunted. The edge of world public opinion, fighting against US imperialism, and for the preservation of peace, is blunted. Now, is it or is it not a fact that the attitude of the so-called "two super powers" is radically different towards our own country? Now, one super power is arming the military dictatorship of Pakistan with the most sophisticated offensive weapons, with which to blackmail India. The other "super power" comes to the aid of India in political, economic, military and strategic spheres. How can we equate the two super powers then? One super power installs medium nuclear missiles on the continent of Europe, thousands of miles away from its own homeland in America, and the other super power takes initiative after initiative to reach an agreement on the question of these missiles, and agree even to pull down and destroy some of its own existing missiles provided the Western powers also agree to the same.

So, Sir, it is wrong to equate the two super powers. Actually, there is one super imperialist power, the United States of America, which has adopted a mad adventurist policy of war, even as Adolf Hitler did. While the objective of this super power is to what they call, "to roll back the tides of communism" the immediate targets are the newly independent countries, countries like Grenada, countries like Lebanon, countries like Syria, and I would say even a country like India. The Prime Minister herself has repeatedly complained about the pressure being brought on her to change her course of policy. Who brings this pressure? Is it the Soviet Union? Or is it the United

States of America? Evidently the pressure is brought by the Government of the United States of America and its allies on India which occupies the august position of the Chairperson of the Non-aligned movement, to change its policy. Therefore, it becomes our duty to stand firm by our policy of peace, non-alignment, and friendship with the countries of the socialist community. It is our duty to stand firm against all war-mongering manoeuvres and steps taken by US imperialism whether it is the deployment of the medium-range missiles in Europe or it is the supply of harpoon missiles to Pakistan or it is the stationing of the nuclear-powered naval forces in the Indian Ocean based on Diego Garcia. Only in this way can we strengthen the security of our own country, and we can also be in the company of all the peoples of the world fighting for defending peace.

Finally, Sir, I would conclude by voicing my conviction that even now it is not too late. Peace can even now be defended. War can even now be averted. But that would require a firm stand by countries like India—a firm stand by the Government of India, a powerful united popular movement in our country and in the world as a whole.

On the question of foreign policy, the Communist Party of India lends its broad general support to the policy of non-alignment, peace and friendship with the Soviet Union and other socialist countries and the newly liberated countries, that is being pursued by the Government of India. We are not afraid as some others are that this policy will strengthen the Congress (I) in the elections. We are not at all afraid of it. We fully support this policy. But when the Government vacillates, when the Government wobbles, when the Government tries to seek a so-called "voice of sanity" along with Margaret Thatcher, then we feel it our duty to criticise the Government and point out that this wobbling, this vacillation is

not in accordance with the policy of non-alignment.

My friend, Shri Shym Sundar Mohapatra said that Shrimati Indira Gandhi once said, we are tilting neither to the left, nor to the right, we stand erect. Standing erect means standing erect on principles. We do want the Government to stand erect on principles of non-alignment, on principles of independence, on principles of sovereignty, on principles of defending national unity and on principles of defending world peace, and if the Government does it, it will not find the Communist Party of India wanting in its support. But if the Government wobbles, if the Government vacillates, then the Communist Party of India will never hesitate to criticise the Government of India for its wobbling and vacillation.

SHRIMATI MARGARET ALVA (Karnataka): Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, after a full days debate in the other House yesterday and so many speakers before me in this House today, there is very little that is new that can be said. But I rise to speak this evening and to express my admiration and my support to the way in which the Government under the leadership of our Prime Minister has been able to project the general consensus of foreign policy as far as India is concerned. I believe, the triumph of our Prime Minister is not the triumph of an individual but the triumph of a people and the triumph of this country. And, therefore, I was rather surprised when I sat here and heard initiator of the debate Mr. Shahabuddin, a very seasoned diplomat and a very senior leader of his party, go into a personal attack on the Prime Minister and say that all that she is seeking to do is to climb summits for her personal glorification. I do not think that she needs to climb summits today for personal glorification. But to me, as a woman, when she presided over these international conferences, the confidence with which she was able to carry along the majority and work

out acceptable consensus, I think, is a triumph not only for her but not only for women but for the country as a whole. Sir, I would begin with CHOGM.

Well, we have heard various explanations, both criticisms and defence of what happened or what did not happen. Someone asked me the other day, what binds you to the Commonwealth? What is the common link? And I was very honest when I told the person, well we have, all of us in the Commonwealth except Britain, of course, a common history of colonial exploitation, common memories of the price we paid to gain freedom, a common language which they left behind, and, I would add, the game of cricket, which is keeping us occupied.

SHRI LADLI MOHAN NIGAM:

Also language.

SHRIMATI MARGARET ALVA: I spoke of the language. (*Interruptions*) Well, you can forget them, if you do not want.

Well, Mr. Vice-Chairman, I think there could not have been a more forthright exposition of India's stand on international issues than was made by the Prime Minister at the opening ceremony of CHOGM. I am sure that she realised that there would have to be an effort at consensus and that our stand could be misunderstood. But she made it very clear at the opening that India stood by her commitment to certain policies and she did not in any way mince words and I think she made a policy statement, one of the most able statements she has made on foreign policy. It is true that Mrs. Margaret Thatcher who came after that, tried very much to dilute what she had stood for... (*Interruptions*)

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI SYED RAHMAT ALI): Don't interrupt Mr. Mallick.

SHRIMATI MARGARET ALVA:

He thinks this is a cricket match with his running commentary. He can go to the Central Hall.

I would say that the official Declaration did not satisfy all sections of opinion in the country but as we have seen and as we have accepted, it was a consensus statement in which we had to carry along those who did not agree with us also, to accept a formulation. But I would certainly say and I repeat what I have said before in the presence of the Foreign Minister that there is bound to be a conflict between our stand in the Non-aligned and our stand in CHOGM, and what would happen when there is a conflict. And he had made it clear that if there is a conflict between the two stands, then our stand in NAM prevails and we stand by our commitments to NAM and nothing can change our stand from there. In this connection I would like to draw the attention of the Foreign Minister to a speech I had earlier raised the question of this speech which the Commonwealth Secretary had made at the height of the Falkland crisis, when he had supported, in no uncertain terms, the British stand, which was completely contradictory to India's stand in the Non-aligned Movement—and that was circulated by the British Information Service almost as a policy statement of the British Government. And here is the speech delivered by the British Foreign and Commonwealth Secretary on November 14, 1983 circulated again by the British High Commission. And I quote: "The Commonwealth saw it as their duty in Zimbabwe to help us to discharge a British commitment. It was the same with the Falklands. Many of you will remember Mr. Ramphal's speech at the height of the Falkland conflict. Its title was: "Not Britain's cause alone", another clear example of the situation in which the Commonwealth came to the aid of Britain in dealing with what was technically a national res-

ponsibility". And he goes on to say: "I am convinced that Commonwealth support for Britain in Falkland crisis among non-aligned countries was a significant factor in deterring the Soviet Union from vetoing Security Council Resolution 502." In other words, the British are trying to say that it is the commonwealth which stands committed to Britain's policy on the international scene, and he goes further, Mr. Vice-Chairman: "Foreign policy is not, of course, susceptible to accurate cost-benefit analysis, but in terms of the Commonwealth, the visible and invisible balances of costs and advantages do appear to leave us in substantial political surplus as far as Britain is concerned. "Under these circumstances now, perhaps, as one who belongs to the post-Independence political generation, our participation and our complete involvement in the Commonwealth could remain an open question; though I do not wish to go further today and make any alternative suggestion. Sir, one cannot ignore what happened in Grenada. I heard several speakers speak about it, but this is a question which I think today concerns all countries, big and small, and the argument that was used was that because the neighbouring countries felt insecure, they invited the U.S. to come and the U.S. walked in and overthrew an established Government. My point is, as Mr. Jaswant Singh also pointed out, if this argument were to be accepted as part of international policy, our neighbours tomorrow—small and big—may claim to feel threatened for some reason or other, however well-armed they may be, that they are disturbed because of some disturbances in Assam or Punjab or may be somewhere down in the South and so invite an outsider, an outside country to come and put the internal affairs of India right so that the neighbours could feel secure in that environment. Today, in the 1980s, can anybody accept this doctrine of international affairs? This is, no doubt, an invasion. But this is worse than an invasion. It is nothing but an act of

a bully who tries to get whatever he wants by the use of force. For us to have hesitated in the CHOGM, not only for us, but for the whole group in CHOGM to have hesitated to name the aggressor, or, as some people are trying to do, to equate what has happened in Afghanistan with what has happened in Grenada is, I think, to go completely off the point. If, in Grenada, the Government had invited an outside country to come and protect it against whatever threat they had I would have understood it. Any country has the right. Angola had invited Cuban troops to come to its aid. Many countries have asked for help. I do not deny the right of a sovereign Government to ask for any kind of assistance in its own defence. But for an outside country to come and say that we will restore order inside because neighbours called us and the neighbours want help in order to restore order in a third country, is something which I believe is not acceptable. This cannot be accepted under any international norms. (*Interruption*)

As far as Lebanon is concerned, Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, I do welcome the initiative which has been taken by the non-aligned group, of which our hon. Minister was also a member. The delegation went there in order to see that the warring factions in the PLO are brought to an understanding and to a negotiated settlement among themselves. No matter what the causes of the differences are, I think, the PLO will destroy itself unless the various factions within the PLO can come to terms and find a way of fighting together for their own common cause. But I would like to say that I have my doubts about this proposal of getting Arafat and his men out of Tripoli, by a ship. One never knows what will happen. It may be claimed to be an accident or whatever else it might be. I do not trust the people in the neighbourhood to ensure Arafat's safety even when he is to go out of Tripoli under U.N. flags as it is claimed.

Sir, we see what is happening in Syria today. The so-called peace-keeping forces which have been sent there to keep peace have been the very cause of the escalation of war in the region. What we see is anything but peace-keeping.

Then, Sir, I do welcome the statement of CHOGM as far as Namibia is concerned. It is for the first time, perhaps, that they have been able to delink the presence of Cuban troops in Angola from the freedom of Namibia. The hard core people like Margaret Thatcher have been compelled to agree to the formulation which delinks the presence of Cuban troops in Angola from the freedom of Namibia. But what I would like to say is that these are the very countries which still stand committed to support and prop up the racist regime in South Africa. (*Time bell rings*) if it was not for the political, military and economic support of the so-called contact group of the west, South Africa would have collapsed long ago. In this connection, Mr. Vice-Chairman, I would like to ask the hon. Minister whether it is not a fact that we had, for the first time, admitted a delegation from South Africa to participate in the recent international tourist meet in Delhi. These are the reports. I would like him to tell us what prompted the Government to permit this to happen for the first time.

Sir, speaking about decolonisation, I would like to say once again "how can one speak about decolonisation without talking about Falklands?" CHOGM never mentioned any aspect of this. Perhaps, it was felt that this was too much of a domestic matter for Britain for anybody else to talk about it.

Now, Sir, coming to the Indian Ocean, I regret the announcement of the postponement of the international conference on making the Indian Ocean a zone of peace, the UN conference which was scheduled for next year. We see that a situation has

[Shrimati Margaret Alva]

been created in which the postponement had to be made. In the meanwhile the Indian Ocean continues to become a zone of confrontation. Diego Garcia is built up with more and more arms and we have literally floating naval commands in the Indian Ocean today, almost coming to blows with each other.

Sir, disarmament seems to have been given a go-bye for the present with the arrival of the latest cruise missiles in Western Europe and in reply, of course, everything else has followed. I do not believe that this confrontation in Europe is going, in any way, to help or serve the cause of peace. Everyone who looks at Europe today realises that it is almost a preparation for an open nuclear battle.

Well, there are many who have asked the question, is our policy really one of equidistance? If it is so, I would say, equidistant from whom? I am one of those who have always believed that our policy is not something negative, nor is it of neutrality, as somebody said earlier, it is a commitment to positive ideas and positive policies. I would say that these policies are anti-imperialist and anti-colonial. We have never had a doubt about what we stood for, with whom and against whom we stood and in that sense, we can never be equidistant from the exploiter and the exploited, from the coloniser and from those who suffer under colonial rule, from those who stand for freedom of even the smallest country and from those who do not believe in the right of those people to decide their own futures. Therefore, I would say, even when one speaks about consensus, consensus at what cost and on what policies? I would say that those who claim that we are closer to the socialist countries, there is only one answer, it is not that we are closer to anybody but it is just that on most international issues where we have taken a stand and, maybe, where the NAM has taken a stand, we happen

to be on the same side of the table as the socialist countries, because we all stand committed to common policies and principles in international affairs.

There are those who have said today that the Prime Minister, in her self-interest, is creating a sense of insecurity and fear, talking about the threat to our national sovereignty and to the danger from outside and from within. Well, I do not think there is any intention to create a sense of fear, but I think it is necessary for a country to know where the threat comes from and where the danger lies. It has become international policy today to follow a kind of policy of encirclement, of threats and pressure from outside. And if that does not work, if you are not able to change Governments, impose Governments or make Governments change their policies to suit your own international aims, then there is the consistent effort at destabilisation and dismemberment from within. I think it is never anybody's intention to create a sense of fear, but it is the duty of the Government to warn the people that not everything that happens around us or inside the country is just an accident. There is a method in the madness, there is a method in the violence, there is a method in the policies which are being pursued as far as India is concerned. Towards that there are many people around. I would speak about arming of Pakistan, the so-called desire of defending Pakistan against Russian troops in Afghanistan. Earlier these arms were supposed to be to fight communism and how many Communist countries was Pakistan able to fight? Now they are supposed to be defending themselves against Afghanistan and let me tell you, Mr. Vice-Chairman, if it is a question of confronting the Soviet troops, I would say very honestly that Pakistan is certainly incapable of doing it on its own, with whatever they are getting at the moment. We have already spoken about the nuclear capability which Pakistan is developing for itself. I am talking about the threat from the North,

which they are always claiming is at their doorsteps. And then the MRD. There are many who say that the persons who support the cause of those who are fighting for democracy (themselves the people who during the emergency went round the world, asking for support, asking for help and weeping that democracy had been buried in this country. They went to the United States, they went underground and they got help from every where). And today when there was the detention of Khan Abdul Gaffar Khan and our Prime Minister made a statement, we are told that we are interfering in the internal affairs of another country.

Sir, so far as Bangla Desh is concerned, there again the question is that refugees are coming in. You either stop them, or we tell that Government to stop it and if they cannot do it, we will try and fence the border and do whatever we can to try to prevent this from happening. They do not do it and tell us that we have no right to do it either. Now this is considered to be creating bad relations with our neighbouring countries by some people on that side.

As far as Sri Lanka is concerned, I do realise that we have gone through a very difficult time, particularly with our friends, the political parties in Tamil Nadu, clamouring for immediate action. But I think a certain amount of consensus did prevail and I welcome the progress made by Mr. Parthasarathy. His mission has proved quite successful and I have no doubt that with this announcement of citizenship rights for those Stateless of Indian origin, things will move forward and a lasting solution will be found.

Finally I would just say this. Whatever our friends might say, I believe that the effort of the Prime Minister to put the United Nations in the centre of international relations is a step which must be welcomed in a world where more and more nations have been taking to the path of set-

ting their disputes by localised conflicts, by their own so-called arrangements. She made this call that all those who believe in international peace, should make the United Nations a forum of discussion, of understanding and of settlement of international disputes. And yet they say that she tried to get international glory by going to the United Nations, she tried to project herself in the international arena, she is trying to become, as somebody said, "Jagat Mata". If you think that going to the United Nations, to an international forum, and calling for an understanding and commitment to the policies of the United Nations is seeking glory for herself, I think you have lost your very commitment and your very understanding of the working of the United Nations. I can only say that Mrs. Gandhi's call at the United Nations as a leader of the Non Aligned Movement, representing two-thirds of the membership of the United Nations, was a call to sanity in a mad world heading for death and destruction. In that sense, I welcome her initiative. Besides her call to peace, her call on various Economic issues—Sir I know you are on the verge of ringing the bell again and I do not dare take too much time—her emphasis on international economic issues, her realisation that there cannot be lasting peace unless there are just economic relations among nations, is something which cannot be ignored and Mr. Vice-Chairman, I would only say this just as a suggestion at the end that India has got to give a lead in helping the developing world, in helping the smaller countries economically, in whatever way we think we can, of sharing knowhow of sharing whatever we have with the developing world, especially the countries of Africa, Latin America and South-East Asia.

In conclusion I would say that for too long have we in India been looking to the West, and particularly to Britain, as the centre of the world. I think it is time for us to shift our gaze and to move closer to the small-

[Shrimati Margaret Alva]

ler countries, the developing countries, the weaker countries, particularly in the regions of Africa, of South America and of Latin America, because I believe these are the countries of the future, these are the countries where we do have a role to play and these are the countries which today are looking to India not only for guidance but also for support in many fields. Thank you.

श्री रामेश्वर सिंह (उत्तर प्रदेश) :

उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय,...

संसदीय कार्य विभाग में राज्य मंत्री (श्री कल्पनाथ राय) : आपका विदेश विभाग का अनुभव बहुत थोड़ा है।

श्री रामेश्वर सिंह : अभी आपके पास विदेश विभाग नहीं है। तब आप क्यों विदेश विभाग की चिन्ता कर रहे हैं।

उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं इस चर्चा को इस तरीके में ले जाना चाहता हूँ कि दुनिया की नज़रों में और दुनिया में हमारी हैसियत क्या है? हम कहां खड़े हैं यहां इस बात की चर्चा होनी चाहिये, ऐसा मैं मानता हूँ। कोई भी राष्ट्र, चाहे वह विकासशील देश हो और चाहे अविकसित देश हो, पहले इनकी हैसियत के बारे में हम को सोचना चाहिये। हमें यह देखना है कि विकासशील देश और अविकसित देश जो हैं उनमें अन्तर क्या है। मुझ को ऐसा याद आता है, मेरी समझ में है कि दुनिया की नज़रों में हमारे देश में हरिजनों की जो हालत है, गांव में बसना, चारपाई पर न बैठना, बराबरी की बात न करना, यह हैसियत भारत की है, यह दुनिया की नज़र में है। दुनिया के जो राष्ट्र हैं उसमें आप

का 117वां स्थान है, 116 वां स्थान भी नहीं है। चाहे आप आर्थिक मामलों को लें या सामाजिक मामलों को लें और चाहे पालिटिकल मामलों को लें। जिस किसी भी स्थिति पर आप देख लीजिए वहां पर आपकी स्थिति 117वां नम्बर पर है।

सबसे पहले चर्चा करना चाहता हूँ आर्थिक मामलों पर। इस मामले में हमारी हैसियत क्या है दुनिया की नज़रों में, यह आप सोचें। अमेरिका और रूस जो विकसित देश हैं इनके बारे में आप जानते हैं। 800 वर्ष तक आप गुलाम रहे और फिर 200 वर्ष तक गुलामी आपकी अंग्रेजों के हाथ में रही। आजादी मिले अभी 36 वर्ष हो गये और आपने अपनी धरती को भी गवां दिया। आप की धरती पर दूसरे लोगों ने कब्ज़ा कर लिया। यह हमारी स्थिति है इस देश में। आर्थिक मामले में जब हम चर्चा करते हैं तो चाहे अमेरिका हो, रूस हो, जर्मनी हो, जापान हो, इंकुलडिग चीन, वह चीन जो हमारे बाद आजाद हुआ, दुनिया की नज़रों में अर्थ के मामले में उसकी हैसियत क्या है और हमारी हैसियत क्या है, इसको आप देखें।

[उप सभाध्यक्ष (श्रीमती माप्रेंट आल्वा)
पीठासीन हुई]

60 करोड़, 70 करोड़ की जनता यहां पर है यह आप कहेंगे। आज दुनिया की नज़रों में 60 फीसदी जनता गरीबी की रेखा के नीचे है या 50 फीसदी जनता गरीबी की रेखा के नीचे है। इसके बाद भी दुनिया में आप बराबरी की बात सोचते हैं। उन मुल्कों में जहां पर इंसान भोजन के बगैर रहता है, वहां फल और दूध पीने को मिलता है जबकि हमारे यहां अन्न तो क्या घास भी लोगों को खाने को नहीं मिलती और हम दुनिया में बराबरी की बात कर रहे हैं

जैसा मैंने वर्णन किया कि अमेरिकी, गोरी चमड़ी की जो जनता है और काली चमड़ी की जो जनता है इसमें क्या फर्क है। गोरी चमड़ी वालों का, काली चमड़े वाले लोगों, काले इलाके के लोगों के बारे में आज भी वही दृष्टिकोण है जो आजादी के पहले था। गांधी जी को ट्रेन से उतार कर प्लेटफार्म पर डाल दिया। गुलामी के दिनों वाली आज भी आपकी हालत है, हैसियत है। आज आपकी यहां की बहनें इंग्लैंड जाती हैं, बाहर के देशों में जाती हैं तो उनकी जांच होती है। यह कौन देश कराते हैं? गोरी चमड़ी के देश कराते हैं। आप में हिम्मत नहीं है। आप हिम्मत के साथ नहीं कह सकते हैं कि हमारे देश का सम्मान करो। यह आज हमारे देश की हैसियत है... (व्यवधान)। श्री नरसिंह राव जी, आप अभी यहां पर नहीं थे। मैं जो कुछ कह रहा था वह आपको मुना देता हूँ।

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्रीमती मार्ग्रेट आल्वा) : रामेश्वर सिंह जी, रिपीट करने के लिए टाइम नहीं है।

श्री रामेश्वर सिंह : मैं रिपीट नहीं करूंगा। मैं यह कह रहा था कि दुनिया की नज़र में हम कहां हैं। आर्थिक मामले में कहां हैं, सामाजिक मामले में कहां हैं, हथियारों के मामलों में कहां हैं, शिक्षा के मामले में कहां हैं और हम किस हैसियत के हैं। ऐसी हालत में हम कैसे कह सकते हैं कि तुम हमारी बात मानो। भारत सरकार की नीतियां, जैसा मैंने पहले कहा था, ऐसी नीतियां हैं जो एक कमजोर आदमी की नीतियां होती हैं। बलशाली आदमी की नीतियां ऐसी नहीं होती हैं। अमेरिका और रूस अगर तेवर बढ़ाते हैं तो आप कुर्सी पर बैठ जाते हैं। आप चिल्लाते

रहे कि पाकिस्तान को आर्म्स मत दो और आप लाख चिल्लाते रहे कि चीन के साथ हमारे दोस्ताना ताल्लुकात खत्म हो गये हैं क्योंकि उसने हमारी धरती पर कब्जा कर रखा है, लेकिन अमेरिका और पाकिस्तान चीन के साथ दोस्ती करके हमारी सरहदों पर सड़कें बना रहे हैं, उसको आर्म्स दे रहे हैं।

उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदया, इस सरकार ने तीन काम किये जिनका जिक्र बड़े जोरों से किया गया है। आपने एक एशियाड का खेल किया। एशियाड के देशों में आपकी क्या हैसियत थी? आपके खिलाड़ियों की क्या हैसियत थी? एशियाड पर आपने दो हजार करोड़ रुपये खर्च किये, लेकिन इससे देश को क्या मिला?

श्री कल्प नाथ राय : आप यह गलत बोलते हैं।

श्री रामेश्वर सिंह : क्या इस एशियाड से हमारा देश दुनिया के देशों के मुकाबले में खड़ा हो गया? क्या हमारा देश अमेरिका के मुकाबले में खड़ा हो गया? आपने एशियाई खेल कराये। क्या इन खेलों से हमारा देश रूस के मुकाबले में खड़ा हो गया? क्या जापान के मुकाबले में खड़ा हो गया। अगर दो हजार करोड़ रुपये खर्च करके हमारा देश अमेरिका के मुकाबले में खड़ा हो जाता, ब्रिटेन के मुकाबले में खड़ा हो जाता, जापान के मुकाबले में खड़ा हो जाता, फ्रांस के मुकाबले में खड़ा हो जाता, जर्मनी के मुकाबले में खड़ा हो जाता तो बड़ी खुशी होती। यह खुशी हम को ही नहीं होती बल्कि उन देशों को भी होती जिनके मुकाबले में हम खड़े हो जाते और वे कहते कि दो हजार करोड़ रुपये खर्च करके भारत, जापान, रूस और अमेरिका के

[श्री रामेश्वर सिंह]

मुकाबले में खड़ा हो गया है। लेकिन आपकी हालत तो बद से भी बदतर होती जा रही है। अगर आप इतना पैसा आर्मों पर लगाते, फौज के ऊपर लगाते, किसी प्रान्त के विकास पर लगाते तो कम से कम उस क्षेत्र का विकास तो होता। दूसरा काम आपने निर्गुट सम्मेलन किया। निर्गुट सम्मेलन के क्या नतीजे निकले हैं? निर्गुट सम्मेलन का यही नतीजा निकला है कि आपने वहां पर विधवा विलाप तरह से विलाप किया। जैसे विधवा अपने सुख के लिये, अपने स्वार्थ के लिये और अपनी तकलीफ दूर करने के लिये बोलती है उसी तरह से आप भी विधवा विलाप करने रहे। कौन सा देश है जिसने निर्गुट सम्मेलन की बात मान ली? मैं पूछना चाहता हूं कि निर्गुट सम्मेलन ने क्या किया? वहां पर जो फैसले हुए उनका कौन देश मान रहा है।

इसके बाद कामनवैलथ सम्मेलन किया गया। कामनवैलथ सम्मेलन में श्रीमती थैचर अपनी राष्ट्रीय पोशाक पहन कर आईं। अपने आधे अंगों को खुला करके कपड़ा पहनकर आईं। आपने भी उनकी नकल की। आपने भी वही कपड़ा पहन कर अपना दुपट्टा भी छाड़ दिया, आप भी सलवार पहनकर, कुर्ता पहनकर गईं... (व्यवधान)

श्रीमती उषा मल्होत्रा (हिमाचल प्रदेश) : फारन पालीसी पर बोलना नहीं आता है और कुछ समझ कर नहीं बोल सकते हैं तो चुप करके बैठ जाइये।

श्री रामेश्वर सिंह : मैंने कल ही इस बात का जिक्र किया था कि जो रास्ता आप लागू दिखाएंगे हमारे नौजवान उसी का अनुकरण करेंगे। जो हमारा खान होगा, जो हमारा पान होगा, जो हमारा रहन होगा, जो हमारा सहन होगा उसी तरह से हमारे नौजवान भी करेंगे। अगर

आप ब्रिटेन का मुकाबला कर अगर वे नंगे हो कर निकलें तो आप भी कहें कि मैं भी नंगा हो जाऊं... (व्यवधान)। यहां पर नंगे का क्या मतलब है?

श्रीमती उषा मल्होत्रा : बिना सॉचे बोले जा रहे हैं। (Interruptions) You should speak only on the foreign policy. (Interruptions)

श्री रामेश्वर सिंह : हमारी जो बात है आप उसको रखिये। हमारा यह कहना है कि भाषा के मामले में ले लीजिये। आप ने जनता गवर्नमेंट का नाम लिया। आप जब संयुक्त राष्ट्र में बोलते हैं तो उस भाषा में बोलते हैं जो कि गुलामी की भाषा है। वह हमारे कालीदास, व्यास और तुलसी की भाषा नहीं है। वह राम और रहीम की भाषा नहीं है, बुद्ध और अशोक की भाषा नहीं है। आप उस भाषा में वहां जा कर भाषण करने हैं जिसमें आप 200 वर्षों तक गुलाम रहे थे। आजादी मिलने के बाद 32-34 वर्ष के बाद जनता गवर्नमेंट के विदेश मंत्री जब वहां पर गये तो उन्होंने हिन्दी में भाषण किया था। जनता गवर्नमेंट ने एक अन्धी परम्परा शुरू की थी। लेकिन नरसिंहराव जी वहां जा कर अंग्रेजी में भाषण करते हैं। यह आपकी विदेश नीति है समानता की और बराबरी की उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं उन लोगों में से नहीं हूं मैं इस लिये सदन में नहीं आया हूँ कि मैं किसी की भाटगिरी करूं। मैं यह पर जनता की भाटगिरी करने आया हूँ किसी व्यक्ति विशेष का श्रुत बनकर इस सदन में नहीं आया और न यह अपर्न परम्परा है। जो हमारी परम्परा है मैं उसका निर्वहण करने की कोशिश करत हूँ।

उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदया, आज दुनिया हथियारों के मामले में कहाँ है ? आप रूस और अमेरिका की तरफ जाना चाहते हैं । आप उनकी नकल करना चाहते हैं । आप रूस और अमेरिका ने जो आधुनिक हथियार बनाये हैं उन हथियारों को बनाने में अपनी ताकत लगायेंगे तो देश में समृद्धि आप ला नहीं सकते । आप उनका मुकाबला नहीं कर सकते । 400 साल से उनका यह उद्योग है, 400 सालों में उन्होंने यह टैक्नालाजी हासिल की है और विकसित की है । लेकिन आपकी परम्परा जो टैक्नालाजी है उस टैक्नालाजी को आपने छोड़ दिया है । उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदया, तो मेरा कहना है कि आप हथियार के मामले में भी दुनिया के ऊपर निर्भर होकर बैठे हो जैसे कि पाकिस्तान बैठा है, बंगलादेश बैठा है । बंगलादेश और पाकिस्तान तो छोटे देश हैं, नेपाल भी बहुत छोटा है । अभी किसी ने कहा कि हम पुलिस भेजकर सीलान पर कब्जा कर सकते हैं । जब यह मानसिकता बनो हुई है । जब आप यह सोचते हैं कि पुलिस भेजकर आप किसी देश पर कब्जा कर सकते हैं तो इसका क्या अर्थ है ? यह वह मानसिकता है कि कमजोर के ऊपर पुलिस भेज सकते हैं और ... (समय की घंटी) उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदया, मैं दो-तीन मिनट लूंगा ।

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्रीमती मार्ग्रेट आल्वा) :
आपका 6 मिनट का समय है और मैंने आपको 12 मिनट दे दिये हैं । आप खत्म कीजिए ।

श्री रामेश्वर सिंह : दो तीन मिनट का समय और दे दें, मैं अपनी बात खत्म करता हूँ । (व्यवधान)

उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदया, कल्पनाथ जी चाहते हैं कि हम ऐसी बातें न करें । माई कल्पनाथ, आप समाजवादी रहे

हैं, आप अपना आचरण न बदलें, आप जहाँ भी जायें हम चाहते हैं कि आप समाजवादी बन कर रहें । हमें बहुत खुशी है कि एक समाजवादी कम से कम वहाँ बैठा हुआ है । श्री नरसिंह राव जी के पीछे कम से कम एक समाजवादी नेता बैठा हुआ है ।

तो मैं कह रहा हूँ भाई नरसिंह राव जी से कि हथियारों के मामले में आप उनके मुकाबले की बात सोच रहे हैं । साउथ ईस्ट एशिया और अफ्रीकी देशों को देखिए । उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदया, मैं दो-तीन बात कहकर अपनी बात खत्म करूँगा । आज अफ्रीकी और एशियाई देशों में क्या हो रहा है ? हिन्द महासागर में आप अमेरिका से कह रहे हैं कि वह अपना बेड़ा मत लायें लेकिन वह आपकी छाती पर बैठता जा रहा है । और अंदर घुसता चला आया है और आप केवल यही कहते जा रहे हैं कि हमारे देश पर खतरा है । वह हमारी सरहद में घुस गया है । इससे देश को खतरा तो रहेगा ही क्योंकि आपने देश को मजबूत नहीं बनाया है और विदेशों में आपकी हालत जैसा कि मैंने कहा, जो हमारे देशों में हरिजन की हालत है, वही हालत, गरीब चमड़ी वालों के सामने आपकी है । आप भी इसी तरह माने जाते हैं क्योंकि आप विकसित देश के नहीं हैं, पिछड़ा हुआ देश है, गुलाम रहे हैं और इस कारण से आप उनके मुकाबले में नहीं बोलते हैं । कर्जा मांगने जायेंगे अमेरिका के पास, कर्जा मांगने जायेंगे जर्मनी के पास, कर्जा मांगने जायेंगे इटली के पास, कर्जा मांगने जायेंगे स्विटजरलैंड के पास और ये जो सारी बातें हैं ये बातें आपको कहाँ ले जाकर खड़ा कर देती हैं ? विदेश नीति का क्या मतलब है । विदेश नीति का मतलब है, विदेशी नीति ऐसी होनी

[श्री रामेश्वर सिंह]

चाहिए जिससे कि जो बात आप कहें उसका असर पड़े। मेरा कहना है और मैंने पोछे भी सुझाव दिया था कि भारतवर्ष एशिया में बहुत बड़ा देश है नम्बर 2 देश है, चीन के बाद उसका नम्बर है तो वह ताकतवर भी हो सकता है। अगर चीन की पापुलेशन 80 करोड़ है तो हमारी 70 करोड़ पापुलेशन है। हमारी उनकी बराबरी की लड़ाई हो सकती है। लेकिन बंगलादेश, पाकिस्तान, नेपाल, बर्मा, अफगानिस्तान के लोगों को हमें समझाना है कि हम उनके साथ हैं। आपके साथ पाकिस्तान का झगड़ा है, आपके साथ बंगलादेश का झगड़ा है यानी चारों तरफ आप झगड़ा कर के बैठे हुए हैं। अब यह झगड़ा क्या है, इसका भी मैं कारण बताऊँ। यह इसलिए कि दुनिया में अमरीका, ब्रिटेन और रूस चाहते हैं कि भारत मजबूत न हो। यह चाहते हैं कि बंगला देश को भी उभाड़ो, यह चाहते हैं कि सीलोन को भी उभाड़ो, यह चाहते हैं कि पाकिस्तान को भी उभाड़ो और नेपाल से हिन्दुस्तान को तंग कराते रहो। आप में दम हो तो ऐसी नीति बनाओ जिस नीति के द्वारा आप इन देशों को अपने साथ करें, यह देश तुम पर विश्वास करें। लेकिन आप खुद ही भिखमंगे हो, उन से भी ज्यादा भिखमंगे हो। वे सोचते हैं कि हमारी यह क्या रक्षा करेंगे। इसको अमरीका से मदद लेनी है तो हम भी लें। आज अफगानिस्तान में क्या हुआ, क्या आप कहते हैं कि वहां से रूसी फौज चली जाए, फाकलैंड से ब्रिटिश फौज चली जाए क्या आप कह सकते हैं? यह भी हमें कहना चाहिए। लेकिन जो हमारी सरहद के इलाके हैं, जिनका हमारी धरती से लगाव है, भारतीय संस्कृति से जिसका लगाव है, तक्षशिला और मोहनजोदड़ों की संस्कृति

हमारी संस्कृति है, आपके बुद्ध का जो संदेश है वह चीन और जापान में हिन्दुस्तान से भी ज्यादा है, ज्यादा माना जाता है मगर आप आपनी नीति की वजह से फेल कर बाते हैं। तो मेरा कहना है, पिछली वज्र भी मैंने नरसिंह राव जी को सुझाव दिया था, आज भी मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि जो हमारे साथ दो तीन राष्ट्र हैं इन्हें मिलाकर के जैसे, भारत, बंगलादेश इनका एक संघ बनाइये और उनको विश्वास दीजिए कि हम तुम पर हमला नहीं करेंगे ताकि उनको विश्वास हो जाए कि हिन्दुस्तान उनको लेना नहीं चाहता। वास्तविकता में हिन्दुस्तान की जनता और सरकार की नीयत नहीं है कि वह पाकिस्तान को ले मैं जानता हूँ कि हिन्दुस्तान की जनता का जो मानस है वह किसी पर आक्रमण करने वाला नहीं है लेकिन अपनी सरकार पर किसी को विश्वास नहीं हो रहा है क्योंकि आप खुद अपनी नीति नहीं चलाते हैं, खुद ही नीति से भागते चले जाते हैं।

अभी विश्व हिन्दी सम्मेलन हुआ। समें रूस के प्रतिनिधि ने बहुत लंबा-चौड़ा भाषा हिन्दी में किया, सारे वोगो ने हिन्दी में भाषण किया लेकिन हमारी प्रधानमंत्री अंग्रेजी में बोलीं। तीन दिन हिन्दी जी चिट्ठी लिखी शिक्षा विभाग को पहनलएक का स्तर गिर रहा है। किसी को चिंता नहीं हुई कि हिन्दी का स्तर गिर रहा है। इसलिए मैं कहता हूँ कि मेरा दिल जला हुआ है क्योंकि हमने ऐसी आजादी के लिए सपना नहीं देखा था? हम यह नहीं कहते थे कि जो लड़के अंग्रेजी में पास करेंगे वही बड़ी नौकरी पाएंगे। हमने आजादी की लड़ाई इसलिए नहीं लड़ी थी कि अंग्रेजी में पढ़े लिखे लोग ही आई० सी० एस० और

पी० सी० एस० अफसर बनेंगे। हम तो यह कल्पना करते हैं कि जो लड़का तेलंगु में सर्वोपरि हो वह देश का राष्ट्रपति बने, जो लड़का तमिल में ब्रिलियेंट हो वह देश का प्रधानमंत्री हो, बंगला में जो लड़का सब से ब्रिलियेंट हो ... (व्यवधान)

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY: This is not on UP Bill. This is on international situation.

SHRI DINESH GOSWAMI (Assam): Madam Vice-Chairman, we must also get our opportunity.

श्री रामेश्वर सिंह: हमारा कहना है कि इसका इंटरनेशनल सिचुएशन से संबंध है। एक मिनट सुन लें। इससे संबंध इसलिए है कि कोई भी राष्ट्र अपनी भाषा, अपनी भूशा और अपनी संस्कृति को बचा कर के ही बनता है। अपनी भाषा, अपनी संस्कृति, अपना कल्चर, अपना भोजन यदि कोई राष्ट्र छोड़ देगा तो वह देश खड़ा हो नहीं सकता है। वही राष्ट्र खड़ा हो सकता है जो राष्ट्र इन तीनों चीजों को माने।

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY: This is nothing but Jingoism.

श्री रामेश्वर सिंह: इसलिए, सरकार की जो नीति है दोनों को बारी-बारी से खुश करने वाली नीति इसको सरकार को छोड़ना पड़ेगा नहीं तो इसका परिणाम देश को भोगना पड़ेगा। इन शब्दों के साथ मैं अपनी बात समाप्त करता हूँ।

SHRI DINESH GOSWAMI: Madam Vice-Chairman, may I have the permission of Shri Rameshwar Singh to speak in the *guami* language now?

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI-MATI MARGARET ALVA): You have my permission to do so.

SHRI DINESH GOSWAMI: Madam, Vice-Chairman, the Foreign Minister was not at all kind to me to send me any invitation to attend the CHOGM and I did not have the opportunity of listening to Margaret Thatcher. But how sweet it was to listen to Margaret Alva commenting on the statements made by Margaret Thatcher in different international meetings.

Madam, we are meeting at a very crucial time of human history. It appears that true to our tradition of philosophic indifference, we want to ignore the reality. If we look round the world, the possibility of a nuclear holocaust seems to be very much nearer than at any point of time earlier.

Many Members have referred to the situation in this sub-continent. I do not want to dwell on that. Even yesterday the Defence Minister spoke about attempts by Pakistan to acquire the nuclear technology to manufacture nuclear bombs.

The situation in Diego Garcia is causing equal anxiety.

Two non-aligned nations, Iran and Iraq, are engaged in their senseless fight.

In spite of the fact that we all stand together for the Palestinian cause and for restoration of the inalienable right of the Palestinian people to their homeland, the PLO seems to be a totally divided house today. Everyone seems to be totally helpless in bringing them together.

If we look to Europe, the employment of missiles there has led to a situation when two super-powers have come to direct confrontation with the possibility of a nuclear war.

In Latin America, Nicaragua and El Salvadore, the situation presents different, contradictory pictures with America trying to destabilise a legally constituted Government in one and indirect invasion of the other.

[Shri Dinesh Goswami]

Mention has been made about Grenada and I do not want to repeat that.

We have been in the non-alignment movement and I must say that I do not agree with Mr. Rameshwar Singh when he says that the non-alignment meet was something like the widows' lament. India is a non-alignment country and is not like a widow. In a debate on international affairs when we make reference to not only our country, but about other countries also and we must not use words which may hurt the susceptibilities of other countries. Non-alignment movement today occupies a very important place in the political development history and if we feel disappointed at all or if we feel that the possibility of the non-alignment movement taking a very decisive course is getting eroded, it is because a large number of other countries have joined the non-alignment movement without commitment to its ideology. But we want this movement to go from strength to strength.

Madam, much has been said about CHOGM. Mr. Bhagwat Jha Azad is sitting here. He was one of those persons who moved, quite a few years back, I think, a Private Members' Resolution opposing India's participation in the Commonwealth. I am sure he would not have been a Minister today...

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF FOOD AND CIVIL SUPPLIES (SHRI BHAGWAT JHA AZAD): In view of what England said about the Indo-Pakistani war, I said that England should be expelled from the Commonwealth.

SHRI DINESH GOSWAMI: I hope he will take it in the spirit in which I said it.

Looking to the developments of CHOGM I think it is time that we consider seriously the suggestion of Mrs. Margaret Alva in this House, without spelling it out.

So far as CHOGM is concerned, no doubt we know that what we achieved in NAM cannot be achieved in CHOGM. The perceptions of the countries which came to NAM were very closer than the perception of countries that came to attend CHOGM. But I think CHOGM was a place where we ought to have discussed threadbare and very seriously the danger that has been posed to the world today because of the colossal arms race. Let us look at the figures. According to a U.N. estimate of 1982, 650 billion US dollars are being spent annually on arms, 1.7 billions per day and one million per minute. After all, the NAM could only express its determination that there should be disarmament. But the contribution of the NAM will be comparatively less because those developing countries are in NAM and those countries are not really the participants in the armament race though the share of the developing countries in matters of acquisition of arms has also increased from 3.3 per cent in 1955 to 16.1 per cent in 1981. I expected that in the CHOGM, where countries who are directly responsible for acquisition of arms have come, there would be a threadbare and open discussion on this aspect and I am very unhappy that neither from the newspaper reports that we read nor from the declarations of the Commonwealth Heads of Governments it appears that any serious attempt was made to discuss this vital problem and the only paragraph that has been mentioned in the Goa Declaration was the reference to the statement made by the honourable Prime Minister. But, in the final communique, the question of arms race does not find any place.

On the question of Grenada equally, Madam, we virtually surrendered our position in the name of consensus. Not only was the US not named as aggressor on the question of Grenada, but also the declaration, the Goa Declaration and the final communique did not ask for the withdrawal of foreign troops from Grenada. Even on the question of Afgha-

nistan, if you look at page 10 of the document there was a call in the final communique for the withdrawal of foreign troops. It has been said that for consensus a compromise draft had to be arrived at. I am totally unhappy with the statement which the honourable External Affairs Minister has made in this House and also in the other House regarding the Commonwealth Meet—the statement he made the day before yesterday.

Let us look at his statement about the CHOGM. We would have understood if the honourable Minister would have said in this statement that India's position was not adequately reflected in the CHOGM because, since we were the host of the CHOGM, we could not pressurise other countries to accept our line of thinking and we had to accept some sort of a compromise. In that case, I would have understood. Now, let us look at the statement and what it says on page 2. It says:

"The Summit's attention was focussed on a few important issues: the tense world political scene and the nuclear threat, the difficult global economic situation, and the need for North-South dialogue and specific issues such as the independence of Namibia, and the developments in Grenada and Cyprus,"

Why could not he use the word "invasion" instead of 'developments' in his statement here? Is it our case that in Grenada it was only a development and not an invasion? In this statement the honourable External Affairs Minister was not making a statement on behalf of the CHOGM delegates. Here he was expressing the views of the Government.

Equally, Madam, I am very unhappy about another thing. On page 3, of the statement on CHOGM Madam, the honourable External Affairs Minister says:

"The Summit expressed itself in a forthright manner on Cyprus, Palestine, Grenada, etc., etc."

How could India take the position that the Summit expressed itself in a forthright manner on Grenada? The honourable External Affairs Minister ought to have come here and said: "No The Summit did not express itself in a forthright manner on Grenada because there were compulsions. Different countries, with different perceptions had come and we could not have a draft in our own way." In that case, Madam. I would have understood it. I am extremely unhappy over this formulation and I am equally unhappy when he says that India's views on important issues were adequately reflected in the CHOGM documents. We are not prepared to accept that India's views were adequately reflected in the CHOGM documents. If India's views had been adequately reflected and if it is view of the Government that it was proper not to mention about invasion and withdrawal of foreign troops, then I shall say that the Government have slipped far back from the NAM Declaration. If, however India's views were not adequately reflected in the CHOGM, then, in that case, the statement of the honourable External Affairs Minister is wrong. The External Affairs Minister cannot have it both ways if India's views have not been adequately reflected, then India have gone far far back from the NAM Declaration, and we have, instead of going forward, taken certain steps backward and this is a point which I hope the honourable External Affairs Minister will clarify while replying to the debate.

Coming nearer home, again on Grenada, it has been said that this is a time for reconstruction and not for recrimination. Does it mean that a country will invade and thereafter we will say, "Let us not indulge in recrimination, but let us have reconstruction." and, therefore, take it like that? I am equally worried, Madam Vice-Chairman, when it is said on the question of Grenada that the countries, the Caribbean countries, had to assist in the maintenance of law and order. The countries of the Carib-

[Shri Dinesh Goswami]

bean region did play a part in the invasion of Grenada by the US forces. There are talks also of Commonwealth peace keeping forces. Madam, I think it is important that we assert that we do not accept in the international order any peace keeping force, except the United Nations peace keeping forces. How can there be a Commonwealth peace keeping force when there will be a number of countries whose stand on Grenada is not at all happy. We have seen the performances of peace keeping forces in Lebanon, peace keeping force in the Middle East. This has been an effort to dilute the very efficacy of the United Nations. Peace keeping forces of other groups and countries should under all circumstances be prevented, and U.N. should only be entrusted with this responsibility.

Coming nearer home, it appears that, unfortunately, our relationship with our neighbours today is at a very low ebb. I am not going to make a blanket charge that the Government has been wrong in dealing with these countries. But the fact remains that today our relationship with Pakistan, our relationship with Bangladesh, our relationship with Sri Lanka, with all ASEAN countries, with Nepal even, is at a very low ebb. Pakistan today is pursuing a policy of comradeship relationship with Islamic countries, cordial relationship with China, military relationship with mutually strategic benefits with USA and a non-provocative relationship with USSR. You have yourself referred while speaking from here regarding Bangladesh. It appears that the perceptions of these countries with extra-regional powers has varied from country to country. All the neighbouring countries of the South East region have different perception regarding one power or the other, I believe that if we are really to safeguard the interests of this region as a whole it is not possible unless the countries in this region come to much better understanding. Unless we can come to a common agreement regarding the dangers posed in

this region, our deliberations in NAM was a success. The Declaration was a very good document. This Declaration appears to me something like an election manifesto of parties. The documents express very pious wishes but the declaration do the opposite the next day. I believe that the initiative must come from us, not from a position of a high pedestal—that will create a crisis of confidence—but in a spirit of equality, so that this serious situation may be done away with. *(Time bell rings)*

Madam, as you have rung the bell, I will not go further, except refer to one or two aspects which may be peripheral aspects of the debate.

One, as you have yourself referred to, is the fencing with Bangladesh, to which Bangladesh has taken objections. You know that we are interested in this. I would like to know from the hon. External Affairs what is the development in this regard. Has this item been really discussed with Bangladesh and if so, what is the real position?

The other aspect is regarding the role of the British Council of India. I think I am correct in saying that since 1972 the British Council, for tax exemption purpose because of Government's decision regarding regulation of foreign cultural organisations, are acting or functioning as a division of the British High Commission, and their staff enjoys diplomatic status. *(Time bell rings)* The British Council is adopting how a linguistic jugglery—if you look at the sign-boards of the British Council, you will find that the 'British Council' is printed in bold and the 'British High Commission' is printed in small letters. And what gives me greater worry is that it appears recently the British Council has decided to flout the norm which is expected of a Division of a diplomatic mission. For example, they showed a commercially sponsorship programme Merchant Ivory's "Heat & Dust" and also invited a folk and country music group—The YETTES

and sold tickets worth Rs. 50, Rs. 25 and Rs. 15 for the show. I think—I hope the hon. External Affairs Minister will correct me if I am wrong—that “Heat & Dust” was imported under an exemption certificate. Such commercial sponsorship is never permitted to any cultural wing of a diplomatic mission. In spite of the fact that the British Council decided to abolish themselves in 1972, and their staff is enjoying diplomatic status, if they are violating the diplomatic norms, I think it is time that the Minister for External Affairs takes some action and also enlightens the House about the position in which this Council stands.

Madam, I am thankful to you for giving me this opportunity of expressing my views on this subject.

[Mr. Deputy Chairman in the Chair]

SHRI BHUVNESH CHATURVEDI (Rajasthan): I am grateful to you for granting me this opportunity. I find that CHOGM and NAM have been discussed very often. Everybody has touched it. I would like to add that the country is proud of its achievements with the results of both these conferences. It is only a minority of confused minds in this country who are unable to appreciate the results, the deliberations the achievements and the heights to which India has gone in the eyes of the world. But I would like to submit that in the changing circumstances and in a very uncertain world, there is nothing very much we can change in our foreign policy as a nation. Our foreign policy has been evolved through our period of freedom movement. After Independence or near Independence in 1946, we hosted the Asian Conference. It means that we emphasised our role in Asia. Therefore, my submission is that we should somehow put our emphasis on our priority on joint Asian policies or our policy should be Asia-oriented. After that Asian Conference, we supported the Chinese revolution and thereafter we advocated its reco-

gnition. We were the first or near first to recognise China. Thereafter, we played an active role in the Geneva Conference which was organised on the Indo-China problem. Therefore, my submission is that our touch to our Asian problems, our touch to our Asian brothers should not be lost sight of and we must have an Asia-oriented policy.

Secondly, my submission is that the world is no more bi-polar. It is also not multi-polar. It is developing into an inter-dependent world. My submission is that we have two roles. One role is in our region and the other role is in the world affairs. What is the role in our region? Our neighbour Pakistan, our neighbour Bangladesh, or Nepal or Ceylon are there. We do appreciate their sovereignty. But we should also care about the sensitivity of these Asians because they are very touchy about their sovereignty. Therefore, we must not give any ground to offend the sensitivity of these countries. Nepal will one day realise the special relationship with India. Ceylon has appreciated our role as an adviser and they have responded very well. But at the same time, we must also understand that the balkanisation of a neighbouring country or the weakening of a neighbouring country will invite the big powers at the door of India and it is the greatest danger. We must appreciate that we should never give an alibi to the big powers to come to our doors. There cannot be any difference, there cannot be any contradiction in our role in the global phenomenon and in our role in the regional area. But, at the same time, India has a role to play in the global atmosphere. And, therefore...

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: That will do.

SHRI BHUVNESH CHATURVEDI: I would like to take only two minutes.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You cannot cover the whole world. There is no time.

SHRI BHUVNESH CHATURVEDI: My submission is that at the same time we should also prepare ourselves because the real test lies in the strength of our country, and we do not know what combination of enemies or what country we will have to face at our doors. Thank you, Sir.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Shri Madan Bhatia—please take only ten minutes.

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY: Sir, my name is also there.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I am calling you. Let some other Members also get a chance. I have not passed over. It will take only ten minutes.

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY: I do not object to that. I should also be given a chance.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I assure you that I will give you a chance. Yes, Mr. Bhatia. Please take only ten minutes.

SHRI MADAN BHATIA (Nominated): Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, some of the hon. Members on this side have accused the Government of having frittered away the goodwill of India's neighbours. But, remarkably, they have shown total unawareness of the massing of Pakistani troops on the western frontiers of India. They have maintained an enigmatic silence over the induction of massive US offensive weapons into Pakistan. I would like to ask those hon. Members: Is it not Pakistan which has dismantled brick by brick the whole structure of the Simla Agreement? Is it not Pakistan and the rulers of Pakistan who embarked upon the policy of acquiring the US sophisticated offensive weapons right in 1980 when the present Government came into power in India? The hon. Members have charged Mrs. Indira Gandhi of highlighting the deterioration in the strategic climate around India for domestic politics. I would accuse the hon. Members who have made this charge of making this charge on account of

their domestic and partisan politics. I shall accuse them of having placed the interests of their party, their partisan interests above the interests of the nation.

Sir, at the Non-aligned Conference, Mrs. Indira Gandhi declared: "The hood of the cobra is spread; the humankind is frozen in fear, hoping against hope that it will not strike." Sir, after the developments which have taken place in the world in the last few months like the deployment of nuclear missiles in Europe and the escalation of the situation in West Asia, one might say that the hood of the cobra is leaning backwards, but there are stirrings in the humankind to escape the deadly strike. So far as India's policy is concerned, the greatest contribution that India's policy has made is the contribution to these stirrings in the humankind to escape the deadly strike. Sir, what is India's foreign policy? The perceptions of the world situation, the national imperatives of India and the long centuries old traditions of peace, goodwill and brotherhood by which India has stood have gone into the making of India's foreign policy. India's foreign policy is a response to a very sinister development which has overtaken the world since 1981 when the present policy-makers assumed office in the United States. It was a new aggressive and militant spirit which came to the fore in the United States and if today we are getting bedevilled by the various dreadful developments all over the world they have to be traced to this militant aggressive spirit of the policy-makers of the United States. When they assumed office they gave expression to the dreadful concept of the inevitability of the nuclear war and after that how has India been effected? That is more important India has been drawn into the vortex of the strategic perceptions of the United States. And what has happened in Pakistan? The strategic perceptions of the United States have coincided with the military intentions of the military rulers of Pakistan.

That is the situation which India is facing. When India talks about peace, it is not solely out of altruistic motives, it is not solely an expression of India's long traditions of peace and goodwill. Unless there is peace and disarmament in the world there is no future for India, there is no security for the frontiers of India. If you wish to improve the strategic environments which are engulfing India, you have to strive for peace and security and disarmament. What is the other aspect of India's foreign policy? India is concerned like all the developing countries with her economic growth. India is facing like all the developing countries an outmoded economic order, characterised by all sorts of old economic ideas and restrictions and depression of commodity prices and crisis in the foreign exchange. So, it is because of this that India's foreign policy is characterised by three aspects, one is to ensure the security of India, the other is to secure peace and disarmament in the world, and the third is to secure a new economic order. It is these three aspects, Mr Deputy Chairman, Sir, which have characterised the declarations of the non-aligned movement. Some of the hon. Members on this side tried to castigate the CHOGM by saying that it was an extravaganza. I respectfully submit, Sir, that so far as the Commonwealth organisation is concerned, we must bear in mind the distinction between the non-aligned meet and the Commonwealth Conference, so far as the nonaligned meet is concerned, it represents the African, the Asian, the Central American, the Latin American and the Caribbean countries with the exception of Yugoslavia. But so far as the Commonwealth is concerned, it takes within its fold some of the most developed countries. So, it could not be expected that on all the issues Commonwealth will speak the same language as the non-aligned meet did. But, I must say that it goes to the credit of India and the leadership of Mrs. Gandhi and her colleagues that on some of the most vital issues Non-Aligned Movement and the Commonwealth spoke the same language.

So far as the economic order is concerned, I would respectfully submit that in regard to this positive step have been taken in the direction of the attainment of those objectives which the Non-Aligned Meet has set out before itself. That is the positive achievement and I respectfully submit, Sir, that if Mrs. Gandhi is striving for peace, is striving for disarmament, is striving for a new economic order, her strike carries within itself the strife of the Indian people, for peace, for disarmament, for security of their motherland and for a better life for themselves in the future. And through her, I respectfully submit, centuries of old India's tradition of peace, India's culture, India's concept of brotherhood and concept of humanity and peace are speaking, and for that reason, I wish good luck and God-speed to Mrs. Gandhi and her illustrious colleague, Mr. Narasimha Rao.

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY: Mr. Deputy Chairman, the world is sitting on a volcano of nuclear arms, with the constant fear and panic of its eruption and holocaust.

I was listening with rapt attention to the speeches of many hon. Members about the foreign policy of India. Pandit Nehru was the architect of our foreign policy. Wherever human rights were violated, he raised his voice and expressed his concern, and till the day he passed away, he was not for any pact with our neighbour. Sri Lanka, Sir, at this juncture, I would like to register my unhappiness and distress over the ceremonious red-carpet reception and welcome given to that third world autocrat racist Jenu Richard Jayewardene who had blood on his hands, you have received a person who had not uttered a word of regret, a syllable of sympathy for the victims of the genocide of those persons who lost their lives, lost their property. You have received a person who was the root cause for the abrogation of all the pacts which were entered into between Tamilians and Sinhalese. In

[Shri V. Gopalsamy]

1957, there was a pact between Selvanayakam and Bandaranaike. In that pact, the very same proposals, Development Council proposals, Regional Council proposals, were mooted. Rather, I can say, that was better than the present proposal, because question of land was to be decided by the Tamilians in the Regional Councils. But that pact was abrogated. Why? Mr. Jayawardene paraded the Sinhalese mob towards Candy; that was called Candy march, against the pact. So, the pact was torn into pieces. Again in 1965, when the United Front Party was in power, they had an agreement again with Selvanayakam. Again Jeyawardene was the villain of peace, again the pact was abrogated.

Sir, most of the Members who touched upon this subject lightly, for 2 or 3 minutes, presented bouquets to Mr. G. Parthasarathy. I don't throw any brickbats on him; I am not here to criticise the motive or the sincere earnest efforts of the Government. But, Sir, I would like to draw attention of this House to the other side of the picture. Mr. Jayewardene has come here to whitewash cruelties he has committed there. Sir, Mr. Jayewardene has come here to gain time... (Interruptions) Mr. Kalp Nath Rai, you would not understand our feelings; I am not speaking here for the sake of speaking. This is the only forum where we can express our views. We expected a statement, a specific statement from the hon. External Affairs Minister on the Sri Lanka issue and the talks between Mr. Parthasarathy and Jayewardene, they had here in Delhi. Therefore, I would like to express my views on this vital subject. Mr. Jayewardene wants to buy time. He wants to gain time. Do not forget this. It is my humble duty to bring to the attention of our hon. Minister for External Affairs that commandos are being given training in Israel. Commandos belonging to the Sri Lankan forces are being given training in the UK. In every place. In every flight from

Colombo to London, twenty-five seats are reserved for these Commandos, for these persons, who are taken to these places to get commando training. Sir, in Malayasia, according to my information, they are getting commando training and anti-insurgency operation training. Therefore, on the one side, they are giving commando training for their forces. Between Trincomalee and Jaffna, there is an area, Kokalanjolai, where more than two thousand fishermen belonging to the Sinhala community have been brought and they have been given arms and guns and everything. On the one side, they are preparing for another onslaught. Therefore, do not expect he will honour his words which he has given here. We know past history. Every time, he was the cause for the abrogation of every pact entered into between the Tamils and the Sinhalese,

Now, he wants to annihilate the militant youth. You can say that the TULF is represented in the talks. TULF leader, Mr. Sivasidambaram, Mr. Amrithalingam and many other MPs came here. I have great respect for them. But they have lost their credibility there. Do they have the mandate? What mandate they have got? They got the mandate on the platform of a separate Eelam. Did they go to the people? Did they go to the Tamil masses? They have not gone. They do not represent the Tamil masses. It is my duty to draw the attention of the hon. Minister to what is going on there.

Mr. Jayewardene is trying to annihilate the militant youth who are dubbed as terrorists. Can you say that there has been a single incident where they had attacked a single civilian of the Sinhala population? No. Has there been a single incident where they had attacked or raped or molested or outraged the modesty of any Sinhala woman? No. But on the other hand, every time, it is our population who have been attacked and killed. Sir, as far as this insurgency operation is concerned, in 1971,

when Shrimati Bandaranaike was in power, the Peoples Liberation Front men attacked police stations. They attacked Army officers. Police and Army officers were killed by the People's Liberation Front men and hundreds of persons were imprisoned. But when Mr. Jayewardene came to power, when he assumed power, the very same persons, who were dubbed as criminals and terrorists, were given amnesty, general amnesty. They were released, rehabilitated and the irony of it is that, one person, Rohana Wijayaveera, even contested for Presidency. General amnesty was given for these terrorists. But Tamil youths who were inside the prison, were killed, were massacred and there was slaughter. Mr. David is the President of the Gandhian society. He is the Jayaprakash Narayan of Sri Lanka. He is the person who organised the rehabilitation of the Tamils. He has given a statement, this Gandhian. He says:

"The 35 dead were heaped in front of the statue of Gautama the Buddha in the yard of the Welikade prison as Minister Atulmudali so aptly described as a 'sacrifice to appease the blood thirsty craving of the Sinhala masses'. Some who were yet alive raised their heads and called for help but were beaten down to death in the heap."

Therefore, these militant youth broke the gates of the high-security prison at Batticaloa like Bastille was opened. The prisoners came out. But till today, the Sinhala Police and the Sinhala Army is not able to apprehend even a single terrorist. Why? They have got the machinery, the Police, the Army and so on. Every house in Jaffna, every Tamil house in Trincomalee, is a shelter for these boys. Why? Why do they harbour these boys? Why do they give shelter to these boys? Of course, there are draconian provisions, as in the Prevention of Terrorism Act. If anybody is found guilty of harbouring any youth, he will be sentenced to twenty years imprisonment. Even then the

police and the army are not able to catch anybody, even after the combining operations. Why is it? The people are with the boys, the people are with the militant youths. Why were the Hindu temples attacked and demolished? This is a book in which the Subramaniam temple, the Shiva temple, the Kali temple, all the temples were attacked and demolished. Why did they attack the temples? They did so because they were the places of worship of Tamils. They attacked the Jaffna library because it contained 96000 valuable books cherished and loved by Tamils. The women were raped, pregnant women were attacked. Their abdomen were ripped open by bayonets and foeti pulled out, dashed against the ground crashed under the buckled heels of the soldiers. Sir, these scars will never get healed. That is why the boys are getting the support of the masses. So, even if there is a round table conference, if the conference is not attended by the youth there is no use. Even if they attend they won't compromise the ideals of eelam because they have vowed to dedicate their body and soul, every breath of their existence for the cause of eelam. Sir, there are three organisations. I appreciate and congratulate our External Affairs Minister who had a historic trip to resolve the difference between the PLO dissidents to help the sieged leader Arafat. Sir, here also there is a growing feeling among the youth. There are three groups. One is the Liberation Tigers of Tamil Eelam headed by Prabhakaran, the other is the Peoples Liberation Organisation of Tamil Eelam headed by Uma Makeswaran and the third is the Tamil Eelam Liberation Organisation headed by the colleagues of Kuttimani Jaggan Tangadurai. These groups are going to unite under one umbrella. They have understood the position. Now what would happen if TULF compromised the ideals for Eelam at the round table conference? They do not represent the masses. The boys, the youths are representing the masses. Therefore, I would say, after gaining time Jayawardene on the one

[Shri V. Gopalsamy.]

hand he is giving military training for the commandos for another slaughter and, on the other, he is bringing the Singhalese mob in the predominant Tamil areas. Between 60 days after the holocaust 50,000 people have been brought in Petticola and Trincomanili just to change the ratio. So, this is going on. He won't honour the agreement. Even that day when he was about to leave some pressmen asked him a question whether Mr. Parthasarathy will go there, and to that do you know what Mr. Jayewardene said? He said, what is the necessity for Mr. Parthasarathy to come over there, we will settle the matter ourselves? Just because he had come over here, he got the reception and he went away. Sir, I am afraid there is going to be another attack on Tamils, but they have nothing to lose. They have lost everything already. The wounds will never get healed. The boys, the militant youth will fight. They will either perish or die but they will not compromise. That is why every house in Jaffna is their shelter. In Tamil Nadu also that is the trend among the youth. We do not want to interfere, they say. You say we should not balkanise any country. But, Sir, this is not a secessionist movement, this is a liberation movement. What happened in Bangladesh? Why are the Palestinians fighting? They have no land of their own, still they are fighting for the cause of their motherland. Tamils have got a history of their own, of their own nation.

And what about the plantation labour? Mr. Tundeman does not represent the entire plantation labour, but he is coming from a small area. There are so many other areas like Badulai, Candy, Hattan, Ratanpura and Bandaravilla. All these areas are not represented by Mr. Tundeman. I have met some of these plantation labourers who had come as refugees. They are with the boys, they are for Eelam and they are going to fight for that. This is the real position there. So they are going to have a Round

Table Conference. This is a conspiracy of the Jayewardene Government, because he has not uttered a word of regret, a syllable of sympathy for the Tamils. We should not fall in the trap of Mr. Jayewardene. This is the sentiment in Sri Lanka among the Tamil masses and I would like to request the hon. External Affairs Minister that this is the past history and the present attitude of Mr. Jayewardene and in future the boys are going to fight and I expect our Government will have its own sympathy for those boys. If the boys had been brought here, had they been consulted by this Government, then I would not have found fault with them. After getting the mandate from the Tamil masses, the TULF leaders are compromising on the basic issue. Do you think they will get support from the masses? Definitely not. So this is the picture, this is the real situation of Sri Lanka. I am thankful to you, Sir, for giving me this opportunity.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Shri G. C. Bhattacharya. Please you will have only ten minutes.

SHRI G. C. BHATTACHARYA (Uttar Pradesh): I shall not take even that much time.

I thank you very much for giving me an opportunity to participate in the debate on international situation. But I am really dismayed after listening to many of my colleagues here who have spoken on the international situation. When we are discussing international situation, we will have to first see the main danger posed to the entire human race. The main danger is the possibility of nuclear holocaust, as a result of which life on the globe will be extinguished. When the Parliament of this country debates the international situation, naturally the first and foremost duty of any civilised man today is to defend world peace and to do everything possible to prevent a nuclear holocaust. This is the basic thing. Once we agree on this, then many things which have been said can be answered. Today what has happened? After Euro-

missiles have been put by the United States of America in Europe, there has been a qualitative change in international situation in that even a nuclear war by accident cannot be checked today. You are quite aware that before that the other powers had at least 16 minutes' time at their disposal to verify whether a missile carrying nuclear warhead has been put in action by accident or really by way of a war measure. Today after the Euro-missiles have come in Western Europe, the time limit is only 7 minutes and within 7 minutes it is not possible at all to know whether the missile has been put by accident or as a measure of war. I want to know if any of my colleagues can give an answer to this. And it is not a new thing. Before this also many times it has happened that the possibility of a nuclear war by accident has been averted. Such accidents do take place because of the nature of mechanism and other things. This is known to every body.

Apart from this, after the 6 P.M. Euro-missiles have been there, is escalation now. Naturally a country which was sought to be surrounded, which was sought to be liquidated, during the Second World War will like to defend its own interests. Therefore, now there is no communication. General talk on medium range nuclear missiles is dead. No communication. This is the dangerous situation. Can you ever imagine that when the world powers are faced with this situation and there is lack of communication, this danger triggered by accident even can be averted? If this is the position, what is the duty of our country? Our foreign policy will be judged by our country doing its utmost to defend peace and also by struggling for peace and doing whatever is possible to avert this danger of nuclear holocaust. Sir, in the United Nations, in the Conference of Heads of State, CHOGM, can you say that the Government of India or Prime Minister Mrs. Gandhi has compromised on this question of war and peace? You may have a lot

of criticism. But she is the only leader who has said that peace is in peril. She is fighting against various forces. Is there any compromise either in the Conference of Head of State, CHOGM, or in the Non-Aligned Meet? You can criticise, but the criticism will not be valid unless you go to the root of the matter. Therefore, I am putting this question to my friends. On this question of war and peace there has been an uncompromising stand. You can say anything. But, if you take the declaration on war or the question of international security, can you call it a compromise? Everybody knows that Mrs. Margaret Thatcher is a member of the NATO, she is a very close ally of Mr. Reagan. But she is also a signatory to it. Do you think that it is a mean achievement? You say that it is a dilution. What I am saying is that you should have a proper perspective. Otherwise, we will be weakening ourselves; and this will not cut any ice. They say it is dilution, the Conference of Heads of State. One of my colleagues said that many people did not come. How did he expect everyone to come? They had their own interests. You do not expect everyone to come. The question is that India should have made that effort to collect them by sending a special envoy to bring them to a conference where at least two issues on the question of war and peace and on the question of international economic order were discussed. At least there was a discussion. As the Prime Minister says, we will have to bang the door again and again. After all, the imperialist countries have their own vested interests. They are not going to give things on a platter. You have to make an effort. If our country has made this effort, can you say that it is a failure? And you say that nobody came. It is seeing with a coloured vision. It is not seeing from a realistic point of view. Then, Sir,....

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Now you conclude.

SHRI G. C. BHATTACHARYA: I am concluding.

(Shri G. C. Bhattacharya)

Now, what are the flash points? After Grenada, American imperialism is now trying to intervene in Nicaragua. If this happens, what will be the situation? My friend was reading from the statement. All right, that is there. But the whole thing is whether this country has unequivocally condemned the American invasion of Grenada, or not. The Foreign Minister may say things in a different context. But the question is whether our country has taken an unequivocal stand that America is the aggressor and there has been aggression. In that case, I would like our Foreign Minister... (Time bell rings) I am finishing.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Please conclude.

SHRI G. C. BHATTACHARYA: I will finish, Sir. I would request our Foreign Minister now to raise his powerful voice against possible American intervention in Nicaragua.

Then, Sir, what is most alarming is the development in Lebanon. Sir, there is again a qualitative change for the first time. America has directly intervened by bombing the Syrian positions in Lebanon, and there is now an imminent threat of direct military attack against Syria. In this case there is bound to be a super power conflict and because of the treaty relationship as we have a relationship with the Soviet Union, Syria also has that relationship—they have to intervene. Therefore, we are near the doorstep of a nuclear holocaust. There also I would like our Foreign Minister to raise his powerful voice and to ask America to leave Lebanon.

My friend, the Foreign Minister, Mr. Rao, one year back, when I raised this question that the Americans were going in Lebanon, at that time he asked, "Where are you seeing the Americans"? Now the Americans are there, you can see. At that time, you may kindly recall, you told me like that.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Now please conclude.

SHRI G. C. BHATTACHARYA: I am making only one more point. Now it has been said that our relationship with the neighbours....

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Leave that point. It has been covered by so many speakers.

SHRI G. C. BHATTACHARYA: They have said that we had failed there. I would like to know whether our neighbours are members of strategic consensus of American imperialism. Whatever you may do, however hard you may try, how can you have a good relationship till you are not in the strategic consensus of American imperialism and so long as you oppose the American strategic consensus because all these countries are not independent? They play to the tunes of America in this sub-continent. Then, what is the use of saying this?

Last point. One of my friends has said, "Do not put non-alignment on a pedestal. It is not a value. It is a policy." Sir, I cannot understand. Non-alignment is nothing but a strategy against imperialism. It is a legacy of our freedom struggle. If that is correct, this is the value which we have inherited. Even Pt. Jawaharlal Nehru said, "Our policy is based on morality and values". Others' policies may be Hitlerian policies or machiavellian policies of convenience or contradictory or whatever policies you may say. When you say that we should never attach any value to non-alignment, then; you are only teaching Hitlerism, Nazism or Fascism in this country. You are pleading for that. You say that non-alignment should be made a policy instrument only. That is absolutely wrong.

Thank you, Sir.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Shrimati Usha Malhotra. Five minutes only, madam.

SHRIMATI USHA MALHOTRA: Mr. Deputy Chairman, I rise to support wholeheartedly the foreign policy pursued by our Government and our leader. I would like to congratulate the Government for making all the efforts to bring about world consensus in favour of world peace and global development. I would say that rich tributes have already been paid to our esteemed leader, Shrimati Indira Gandhi, as leader of non-alignment, for having brought about success and ushered in a new era where there is hope for mankind when its very survival is at stake. I would vehemently oppose the attempts made to minimise her efforts by some of my colleagues who went down to somehow attack the policy. Asiad does not come under the jurisdiction of this. And then the dresses and what not? He came down to such a low level of debate that I think he never realised what he was saying. This year has seen the non-aligned countries making a declaration, moving towards peace and collecting consensus from non-aligned countries keeping in view that there could be a hundred, or a thousand Hiroshimas any time on this earth. Just imagine what the world would be like. There would be no place to hide ourselves. And only recently we saw CHOGM being concluded with a message to the world that we can think of common things, common interests, at a common forum and work towards a common goal. Today we see the North-South divide; we see frozen postures by nuclear powers. At this juncture, when the world stands on the brink of a nuclear holocaust, a temper of tension criss-crosses the entire world. Movements like NAM and Commonwealth hold out a hope for peace and peaceful co-existence, headed by a leader acknowledged and acclaimed all the world over for her commitment to peace. Recently we have seen that these two summit have very successfully voiced the feelings of the people of different shades of opinion from all over the world. The NAM and the CHOGM addressed themselves to the task before them and

they have achieved quite a bit, to a degree which is lauded all over.

World peace and global development are two goals which are inter-twined. Only if you achieve one, you can achieve the other. World peace is a pre-requisite for the developed societies as well as the developing societies. It is not that you can divide it, or that it is only meant for one part of the world and not the other. Only if peace is there you can divert your resources towards something that can bring about a change in the quality of life of the teeming millions of this world.

Astounding amounts are being spent on armament which otherwise would have been spent on economic development. When a super-power like the USA thinks of arming Pakistan, it does not realise that it would bring about destabilisation in the region. But this is not possible. It does realise. This is some sort of a scheme which has already been worked out or a strategy that is probably directed against us. We can well understand it, and as such we cannot remain quite or close our eyes to the impending dangers that surround our borders. The NAM has stood for freedom, peace and peaceful coexistence and cooperation. Under the Chairmanship of Mrs. Gandhi, our esteemed leader—she has lent courageous and hold leadership to the two forums—I would say that we can hope that one day we can come closer to the goals that have been set forth by them. Our commitment to these two goals is there, and we pledge to stand by them and work for them.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much. अब हो गया । आप बैठिए ।

श्रीमती उषा मल्होत्रा : मैं तो कभी कभी बोलती हूँ । अभी मैंने शुरू ही किया है ।

श्री उपसभापति : ठीक है, हो गया।

You have highlighted the main points. There is no time.

SHRIMATI USHA MALHOTRA:

The political declaration adopted at the New Delhi summit emphasises in particular nuclear disarmament. It demands an immediate prohibition of the use of nuclear weapons by the nuclear States, and calls for a freeze on development, production and stockpiling of nuclear weapons and speedy finalisation of a treaty which would ban any testing of nuclear weapons anywhere.

श्री उपसभापति : अब हो गया।

आप बैठिए। Thank you, Mr. Jadhav.

श्रीमती उषा मल्होत्रा : मुझे खत्म तो करने दीजिए।

Under the stewardship of Shrimati Indira Gandhi, we can hope to see that the principles of non-alignment are spelt out clearly. India has always espoused the cause of peace and that foreign forces be withdrawn wherever they are. They have found their way in Grenada and they are in Afghanistan. Of course, the two cannot be actually compared because in Afghanistan the Government over there invited them but in Grenada things were different. You just cannot go and say, well, I am self-invited. This is what the position is over there....

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Don't go into details. There is no time for details. You have already spoken enough. You just read one sentence and finish it.

SHRIMATI USHA MALHOTRA:

There is the fear of a holocaust....

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You just read the last sentence, you read one sentence which the newspapers will carry.

SHRIMATI USHA MALHOTRA:

There is the fear of a holocaust any-

time and at this stage I would say that the countries which have collected together for collective self-reliance will also sink into insignificance if there is no peace. So, keeping in view all these probabilities of a near danger to all what we aimed at and worked for, I would say all that India, under the leadership of Shrimati Indira Gandhi has been able to achieve is commendable and has been acclaimed all the world over.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Jadhav; only five minutes, please.

SHRI VITHALRAO MADHAV-RAO JADHAV (Maharashtra): I am really glad that you have given me five minutes at least. Recently there was the CHOGM conference in New Delhi and before that there was the NAM conference and I am really glad to speak before this august House and say that Shrimati Indira Gandhi, our esteemed leader, is the only ray of hope to establish peace and co-existence in the entire world. I would like to speak about the American bombardment in Syria. There was a heavy bombardment of Syrian territory in Lebanon. This is an aggressive posture which is adopted by America. It has committed aggression on Grenada. Grenada is a very small country like a district town in India. It is like crushing a rat by dropping an atom bomb. It is a shameful act that America has done and by that they have shown their imperialist policy to the entire race and they want to spread their imperialism throughout the world and they want to destroy the mankind. Secondly, America and its NATO forces who are co-partners, want to threaten the mankind, threaten the entire world. They are going to instal missiles; they have already installed Euro-missiles in West Germany and Britain and they have set their targets elsewhere. And when the time comes these missiles and cruise missiles can be dropped on several positions of the Soviet Union. Even they can drop their missiles on several positions of India. They have

planned to bring sub-marines and missiles. It has been printed in the press that they want to create their bases in Pakistan also and from there they want to threaten India and Soviet Union and the roundabout countries. While considering all the above things Madam Gandhi is playing a very important role. When I was abroad I gathered there is a widespread feeling in the entire world—as Mahatma Gandhi showed the way—the entire world wants to live in peace and believes in peaceful co-existence. We had the gathering of non-aligned countries, of 102 nations—representing 40 per cent of the entire population of the world. More than 95 per cent of the mankind does not want war. They want to create a good life, good human beings, a scientific development for the welfare of the people. It is for the welfare of mankind and not for destruction of mankind. It was Maucalay who said about the good effects of war. But bad effects are more and because of the bad effects the entire human race can be eliminated.

Most of the points have been covered by other speakers. There is only one important thing from the national point of view. I have gone through some press reports which say that Pak. is set for a lightening strike at India. Recently there was a procession led by religious leaders in which effigies of Mrs. Gandhi were burnt. Gen. Chisti who is a retired General has said that we can create another Pakistan in India. And they want to annex Ferozepur and some other parts of Punjab. This is confirmed by the supply of offensive arms to Pakistan by the USA. Till some years back they were supplying only defensive arms. It is now crystal clear that Pakistan has no other intention other than to attack India. It has also appeared in the press that Pakistan has started diplomatic talks with Afghanistan. They do not have any intention to attack Afghanistan with these weapons. Even if they want, they do not have that might because Soviet Army is already there.

Zia-ul Haq has said that he has Persian Gulf and Arab Gulf. They are making statements to deceive people because America has got an idea to attack Iran. Then there is the super-power rivalry Pakistan with its offensive arms is threatening to attack Indian democracy. In the last two or three years in all the bordering States like Bangladesh, Srilanka, Nepal and Pakistan there are disturbances. There are also reports that there are training camps for the terrorists and through them they want to spread unrest in our democratic country. Now the time has come for the UN to defend the entire democratic world and therefore India must be developed into a strong country in the world. From that point of view I congratulate our hon. External Affairs Minister, Shri P. V. Narasimha Rao. But the credit goes to Shrimati Indira Gandhi, our esteemed leader, though some people say that all this was done by her for self-glorification. The matter of personal glorification is very less, not even one per cent. But 100 per cent of the human race will be saved by the pious deeds of Mrs. Gandhi. For this she definitely may be called Jagat Mata. My friends may say that Congress people are posing that she is Rashttra Mata and Jagat Mata. But she deserves to be called Jagat Mata and to lead the entire world towards peace and prosperity.

SHRI HAREKRUSHNA MALLICK (Orissa): The Foreign Minister should resign because the entire credit has been given to the Prime Minister and nothing to him.

SHRI GHULAM RASOOL MATTO (Jammu and Kashmir): Thank you, Mr. Deputy Chairman, for giving me some time to speak on the subject. We the people of Kashmir, although we belong to the opposition party, must say that our foreign policy by and large has stood the test of time. There is no doubt about it. Particularly our friendship with the Soviet Union has stood the test of time. We in Kashmir have been very

[Shri Ghulam Rasool Matto]

much influenced by the thoughts of Soviet Union and it was because of that that in 1947 we abolished zamindari without compensation and jagirdari and other things. Friendship with Soviet Union is very essential for India. We are also grateful to the Government of India for our policy towards Arab countries. We appreciate the policy that the Government of India is adopting towards the Arab countries. But I have a little....

SHRI HAREKRUSHNA MALLICK:
Doubt?

SHRI GHULAM RASOOL MATTO:
...word of caution about that. We have stood for the forces of peace in the Arab world and these forces, so far as the Palestinian problem is concerned, are represented by Mr. Yasser Arafat. It appears that now we are taking a lukewarm attitude towards Mr. Arafat. It is not Yasser Arafat, but I would like to call it Yasser Arafatism, and it is that which we should encourage, and till the last moment we should support this.

The second point that I would like to make—and this is a very important point—is that the Government of India has spoken something sometimes back about the happenings in the Sind province of Pakistan. I do not understand under what compulsions it was said. The compulsions may be that we stand for democracy in the world and wherever democracy is in danger, we must speak in favour of democracy and all that. But for the last five days what is happening in Pak-occupied Kashmir, in Azad Kashmir? From the 1st of December, two thousand people are marching towards Rawalpindi from Pak-occupied Kashmir. Now, in the statement made by the honourable External Affairs Minister, Sir, not a word of sympathy is there for these people. It is our own territory. We did say something about the happenings in Sind in Pakistan for which there may or may not be any justifiable approach. But, about occupied Kashmir,

which is a part of Kashmir, the honourable Minister has not said anything at all and he has not said that we have sympathy for that part of Kashmir which is legally ours, and that we are in sympathy with the aspirations of the people of that part of Kashmir for which they are struggling there. These are the two points that I wanted to make.

I have also one more point to make. Mr. Jaswant Singh said that the machinery in the External Affairs Ministry is not fully geared to reply to the points, to the propaganda, made against us. Here, Sir, I have got the magazine, "India Today" in which there is a write-up under the title "Worse Still To Come" by one Mr. Mushabid Hussain. In this article, Sir, he says:

"The Pakistan-India relations are bleak. Conceivably"—this is an important point—"New Delhi could also be confronted with diplomatic resistance from this region, from the Anti-India "Gang of Four", Pakistan, Bangladesh, Sri Lanka and Nepal. Looming large in the minds of some Pakistanis is the experience of 1971."

"Specifically, the view here is that India would like Pakistan to play a role in South Asia which is a kin to that of a glorified Bhutan, in effect, a country which has to seek an NOC, a "No Objection Certificate", from India for practically for a very foreign policy initiative."

Then again, Sir, he goes on to say:

"Mrs Gandhi needs to take a good hard look at the long-term implications of some of her actions, both from the standpoint of India's national interest, and the future of co-operation in South Asia."

And then, Sir, the last point is this:

"There is a feeling that after the assumption of the chairmanship of the NAM, India sees a larger-than-life role for her in international affairs."

"As a consequence, South Asia has been downgraded in South Block in the ranking of priorities. That is why Mrs. Gandhi has never condescended to visit any of her South Asian neighbours and why none of them has a friction-free relationship with India."

I would like to bring to the notice of the honourable Minister these things. These things are being mentioned and I would like to know what counter measures are taken by our diplomatic, crops to counter such allegations. I would like to know what is the opinion of the honourable Minister with regard to these allegations if these allegations are incorrect. Also, what is our bureaucracy doing in the diplomatic field to counter these allegations? This is all that I wanted to say. Thank you, Sir.

SHRI P. N. SUKUL (Uttar Pradesh): Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, at the very outset, I wish to congratulate our Government, our able External Affairs Minister and our most beloved Prime Minister for the success of the recent CHOGM which has concluded on an optimistic note. There is no doubt that on the international front, through our great Prime Minister, Mrs. Indira Gandhi, our country today is occupying and enjoying the most enviable Position as the leader of the third world and, Sir, in the firmament of the third world, Mrs. Indira Gandhi today is shining as the brightest star. She is the most luminous ray of hope, I think, for half the humanity inhabiting this planet. It is unfortunate that our Opposition is trying to belittle all that the Government want to achieve. Irrespective of its good character, they want to belittle things; they want to belittle the achievements of our Prime Minister. But, Sir, it cannot be denied that there are a hundred countries in the Non-alignment movement and there are 44 countries in the CHOGM. Forty-two came and out of these 42 only 10 were having somewhat different ideologies:

6 Caribbean countries and 4 developed countries. The remaining are 32 in the CHOGM and 100 in NAM, which means 132. Thus she is the most accepted leader of 132 countries of the world. That is not a little achievement. This is not a mean achievement. So I would advise my Opposition friends not to belittle the importance of Mrs. Gandhi because they are simply incapable of doing that. Sir, the greatness of Mrs. Gandhi, the success of Mrs. Gandhi, lies in managing unanimity on so many important issues in the recent CHOGM meeting. Unanimity on Grenada, unanimity on Turkish, Cypriots problems, and also in the vindication of NAM's economic stand through a Statement on economic action adopted by the CHOGM meeting. Sir, Mrs. Gandhi has meet candidly put forth our viewpoints before the different leaders of the world that assembled in CHOGM. Mrs. Gandhi called upon the Commonwealth" to reaffirm its firm will and determination to root out apartheid." She said: The Commonwealth should do "everything in its power to terminate the occupation of Namibia, which was illegal and immoral". This is what she said. She rejected outright any linkage of Namibian independence with the withdrawal of Cuban troops from Angola. And she said that Commonwealth must do something to end the pernicious policies practised by the South African racist regime.

And she also said: "India will not need concessional external aid 'after a few years', as its efforts towards self-sufficiency were bearing fruit". This reflects our national dignity and our integrity, Sir.

Sir, as regards our neighbours, Mr. Goswami was saying that all is not well with our neighbours. Maybe it is not so well with Pakistan. But I do not agree that there is anything wanting or there is anything not normal in our relationship with either Nepal or even Bangladesh or, for that matter, Burma or Ceylon. Des-

[Shri P. N. Sukul]

pite all that has happened in Ceylon, as we read in today's papers, all Stateless Indians are to be granted citizenship in Ceylon.

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY: Wait and see.

SHRI P. N. SUKUL: I read. The News, a paper published in Sri Lanka, dated 29th November. I quote from the editorial:

"Mr. G. Parathasarathy, the Indian Envoy, has plainly helped to bring about the better climate now prevailing over the Tamil problem in Sri Lanka. Mr. Parathasarathy, one of India's most distinguished and experienced public figures, is hardly the man not to know that politics is the art of the practicable. It could be, perhaps, the fact that he is an outsider, sympathetic but unbiased was able to bring home to the Tamil leadership, the wisdom of moderation."

What more proof do you want of the success of our foreign policy? This is what Sri Lanka is saying. Their papers are saying this. I think there is no doubt about the success of our policy of non-alignment, of which Pt. Jawaharlal was the architect.

I am sorry that I fail to understand the logic of my very hon. friend, Mr. Shahabuddin, who said that we should be equi-distant. I do not actually know what he means by our being equi-distant. We are equi-distant in internal matters. We are also equi-distant in political ideologies. But how can you be equi-distant with friends and enemies both? There are those who are helping us; there are those who want our help. Can we be equi-distant with them? So I think it is not fair for Mr. Shahabuddin to demand that we should be equi-distant from all. Now, an hon. Member was saying that we failed to call a tiger a tiger or to call a spade a spade. We have called, we could call and we can even today call that U.S.A. is the

aggressor. But merely by saying that U.S.A. is the aggressor, you are not going to achieve anything. You can achieve something only by bringing about that unanimity of approach amongst 42 nations on various world problems and that is where lies the success of this meeting and the success of our leadership.

I need not say anything about Mr. Rameshwar Singh who was saying that our leaders should have spoken in Hindi. Perhaps he does not know that English is the language of Commonwealth. Since you are not permitting me...

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I have permitted you enough.

SHRI P. N. SUKUL: With these words, I once again congratulate our leaders and the Government for a very fine and good policy.

श्री लाडली मोहन निगम : उपसभापति महोदय : आपका बहुत बहुत शुक्रिया । मैं सिर्फ दो तीन बातें ही अर्ज करना चाहता हूँ । अच्छा होता, मैंने पहले भी विदेश मंत्री जी से कहा था । जब चोगम शुरू हो रहा था जब कभी हम ऐसे बड़े आयोजन करें उसके पहले अपने देश की क्या नीति हो सके इस पर कुछ बहस हो जाया करे तो अच्छा हो । पहले एक सिलसिला था कि हर सत्र में विदेश मंत्रालय पर विदेश नीति पर बहस होती थी पता नहीं क्यों यह छूट गई और आज मुझे ऐसा लग रहा है कि आज सारे दिन की कार्यवाही जो हुई वह कुछ ऐसी है कि दूध गिर गया और बैठ कर रो रहे हैं । असल में यह सही है । मैं इन बातों पर नहीं जाता कि इस पर क्या खर्च हुआ लेकिन मैं इस बात के लिए जरूर मुबारकबाद देना चाहता हूँ कि ये दो बड़ी व्याख्यान मालाएं इन्होंने बहुत अच्छे तरीके से आयोजित की । व्याख्यान माला में कुछ न कुछ होता है

तो करो। मैं इतना ही जानना चाहता हूँ कि क्या तीसरी दुनियाँ, गुट निरपेक्ष के नाम पर जोड़े गये किसी एक राष्ट्र में इतनी ताकत है कि किसी भी एक राष्ट्र में हुई विश्व-घटना को प्रभावित कर सके, रोक सके यह प्रश्न है। यह बात सही है कि आज आपके हाथ में कुछ नहीं है क्योंकि स्थिति हमारी निकल गई है और मेरी समझ में नहीं आता कि कोई आदमी बैठ कर अपनी पीठ खुद ठोकने लगे। मैं बहुत विनम्रता से निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि जिस रोज हिन्दुस्तान ने सलामती कौन्सिल, सुरक्षा परिषद की जब भी अध्यक्षता का चुनाव लड़ने का इरादा बनाया आज तक वह फलीभूत नहीं हो सका और वही राष्ट्र जिनके साथ आज हम बैठे हैं किसी ने हमारा समर्थन नहीं किया। यह पता लगता है। जैसे हांडी का चावल देखते हैं। हमारी हैसियत दुनिया के बाजार में क्या है? अगर यही होता कि हम किसी संगठन के अध्यक्ष बन गये, मैं तो इतना ही जानना चाहता हूँ कि यह तो दुनिया का दस्तूर है कि जो मेजमान होता है जहाँ मेहमान आते हैं वो मेजवान को तिलक करते हैं। यही "नाम" अगर दूसरे राष्ट्र, में होता तो वहाँ का अध्यक्ष होता। उसमें कोई दो राय नहीं है। इसलिये पीठ नहीं ठोकनी चाहिए। मैं आपसे दो चीजें जानना चाहता हूँ। दोनों बड़े बड़े सम्मेलन इन लोगों ने किये, विश्व बन्धुत्व की बात करते हो, दुनिया में जो असंतुलन बन गया है उसको रोकने की बात करते हो क्या किसी में ताकत हुई एक रोज भी बहस हुई हमारे इन फोरमों पर जिनके हम वाली-वमाली बनते हैं, हम एक बात भी कह सकते हैं कि दुनिया में विश्व-शान्ति तब तक नहीं हो सकती जब तक राष्ट्र संघ से वोटों का अधिधार वोट रोक का अधिकार नहीं हटता। किसी राष्ट्र में हिम्मत नहीं

हुई है कहने की। यह बात सही है। यह लोग शायद समझ नहीं रहे हैं। यारी और दोस्ती का मतलब क्या होता है? यह बात जरूर है कि दुनिया के यार हम बन गये विश्व-याराना हमने बहुत किया है लेकिन विश्व-बन्धुत्व हम नहीं कर पाये। याराना में कह रहा हूँ। यारी तो की जाती है जब चाहे जिसके साथ जिसके पहलू पर करो।

श्री विठ्ठलराव माधवराव जाधव :
याराना के बाद बन्धुत्व होता है।

श्री लाडली मोहन निगम : मैं अगर आपकी भाषा में बोलता जो आप बोले थे मैं तो मैं यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि आप कास्मोपॉलीट बने हैं यूनीवर्सलिस्ट नहीं बने। अब आप समझ गये विश्व-बन्धुत्व और विश्व-मित्रता का मतलब? मैं जो निवेदन कर रहा था वह यह है कि हम लोग ऐसी बुनियादी चीजें नहीं तोड़ पाए हैं। कभी-कभी लगता है जब इस तरह की चीजों को मैं पढ़ रहा था वर्जदार चले हैं साहुकार को रास्ता बताने। आखिर हमारी हैसियत है क्या? सवाल यह है कि जब तक हम पूरे आमूल-चूल तरीके से विश्व के तारे में अपनी दुनिया को न देखें, मोर जब तक अपने पैर नहीं देखता तब तक कुछ नहीं बनता नहीं है, हम हकीकत देखने से कतराते हैं और कमोवेश ऐसा लगता है कि इन दो बड़े सम्मेलनों के बाद हम अपने यथार्थ को अपने विगत को, अपने अतीत को भूल गये हैं। इस वास्ते मैं चाहता हूँ कि आपके माध्यम से बहुत विनम्रता से निवेदन करता हूँ कि हिन्दुस्तान की विदेश नीति का जो आधार है, जो उसकी घर नीति होती है और उसके साथ जो पड़ोसी के रिश्ते होते हैं, मैं हमेशा से कहता आ रहा हूँ कि जिस तरह से मेरी चमड़ी है, यहाँ पर मेरी सीमा है इसके साथ यह दीवारें है यह मेरी आबाद सीमा है। आपको यह

[श्री लाडली मोहन निगम]

रिश्ते तय करने होंगे कि जिन राष्ट्रों की सीमाएं हमारी धरती की सीमाओं से जुड़ती हैं उनके साथ हमारा क्या रिश्ता होगा और जिन राष्ट्रों की सीमाएं हमारी धरती से जुड़ती हैं उन राष्ट्रों का दूसरे राष्ट्रों के साथ क्या रिश्ता होगा। मेरा मतलब बिल्कुल साफ है कि जिन राष्ट्रों की सीमाएं मेरी धरती के साथ जुड़ी होंगी, मैं उनको मित्र मानूंगा, भाई मानूंगा और जिन लोगों की सीमाएं मेरे मित्र और दोस्तों के साथ जुड़ी होंगी वे मेरे दोस्त हो सकते हैं और इस आधार पर, क्योंकि मेरे पास समय नहीं है, आपसे निवेदन करना चाहता हूं कि पुनः वर्गीकरण हमको अपनी विदेश नीति का करना है और मैं इतना ही कहना चाहता हूं ... (व्यवधान)

श्री कल्पनाथ राय : मित्र और दोस्त में फर्क क्या है ... (व्यवधान)

श्री उपसभापति : वह मंत्री जी जवाब देंगे आप कहिए, उनको छोड़िए।

श्री लाडली मोहन निगम : और एक चीज को ध्यान में लाना है। यह मत भूलिए कि जो राष्ट्र यहां बैठते हैं पहले तो हथियारों से वे कहीं न कहीं बंधे रहते हैं आज धर्म और धन से जो बंधे हुए हैं, पहले दुनिया का मुस्तकबिल बंधा था हथियारों पर, किमके पास कहां है, आदमी डरकर वहां जाता था। आज हथियारों की दौड़ आदमी को ले गयी है धर्म और मजहब की पनाहों पर : धर्म के नाम पर दुनिया के मुल्क इकट्ठे होना शुरू हुए हैं। धनवान के पास आदमी भागना शुरू हो गया है, लेकिन न हमारे पास धन है, न धर्म, न हथियार हैं। इस वास्ते विदेश नीति इस दुनियादी आधार

पर सोचने की कोशिश करनी चाहिए। मैं एक चीज आखिर मैं कहकर खत्म करता हूँ। क्या ही अच्छा होता जब दुनिया में शांति की बहस कर रहे थे, मैं उस बहस की उम्मीद कर रहा था, इन दो बड़ी व्याख्यानमालाओं में किसी भी व्याख्यानमाला में नाम में या चोगम में इस बात की बहस हो गयी होती कि दुनिया के शांति के आलमबरदारों अगर शांति चाहते हो तो गुट निरपेक्ष सम्मेलन यह प्रस्ताव पास करो कि जो भी राष्ट्र हैं दुनिया के जब तक वे अपने सुरक्षा बजट में अपने देश के हथियारों के बजट पर 25 प्रतिशत की कटौती नहीं करते। तब तक उनको शांति की बात करने का हक नहीं। यह कहते और उससे दुनिया का जो पैसा और सरमाया बनता उसे अविश्व-शित देशों के विकास के नाम पर खर्च करते। मेरा कहना यह है कि मैं हथियारों पर बहस नहीं, निशस्त्रीकरण पर बहस नहीं चाहता हूं बल्कि दुनिया की गरीबी पर बहस अगर हम तीसरी दुनिया के देश बैठकर इन सम्मेलनों में करते तो शायद कुछ कारगर होता। एक ने मुझको कहा कि आपने चोगम में क्या पाया तो मैंने कहा कि चोगम हमको चुगद बनाकर चला गया और क्या कह सकता हूं। मैं बस इतनी ही बात के साथ मैं आपको धन्यवाद करता हूं।

SHRI P. V. NARASIMHA RAO:
Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, nineteen hon. Members have participated in this debate and I am grateful to them for their valuable contribution. It is always good to have a full debate on international relations because we know that during the interregnum between the last debate and now, certain changes have come about and hon. Members have their views in regard to these changes which the Government should try to know. From that point of view, I am glad to say that this debate has been instructive

and I once again thank the Members. While coming now to individual speeches, in the first instance I would like to inform some hon. Members that I would skip some snide remarks that they brought in while making otherwise good speeches, for two reasons. Number one, I cannot match that phraseology. That is my weakness. Number two, I hold them in such high esteem that I do not want to allow these remarks to affect my esteem for them in any way. These are the two very valid reasons why I would like to skip those remarks. Having done that, I find that all sections of the House have almost said the same thing about the international situation. I did not find any difference in the factual presentation of the international situation that has taken place during this debate. Therefore, I do not have to say that I agree with what all has been said on the international situation, nor is there any need for me to give my own description of the international situation. That has come on the record and that should be enough.

What I would like to concentrate on are a few points that have been raised and, more or less, whether Members liked it or not, most of them have finally zeroed in on the Commonwealth and what they consider the NAM Commonwealth slide down, from the NAM to the Commonwealth. Now, I will come to that in a moment, although even there some speeches that have been made have lightened my burden. Mr. K. C. Pant and others have explained this and even those who criticised the Government did say that these two are different forums and it would not be realistic to expect identical documents to emanate from both. One very important aspect I would like to place before the House we got the chairmanship of the Non-Aligned Movement and the opportunity to host the Commonwealth Heads of Government Meeting. Both these opportunities came not because we were running after them. If hon. Members have not become too short memo-

ried, I am sure they do remember the circumstances in which these two host-ships came to us. I will also point out that in 1980 we had hosted the Regional Heads of the Commonwealth Meeting and I might also remind the House that the decision to hold that Regional Meeting in Delhi was not taken by this Government. It was taken in Sydney in the previous Regional Meeting in 1978. So, this is how decisions are taken. In this meeting we took a decision for the venue of the next meeting. But it so happens that even in 1980 Mrs. Gandhi had to chair the Regional Meeting which she was not responsible for deciding when it was decided. So, this is a routine that has been going on. Every one knows that NAM had to be hosted by us under extraordinary circumstances. I need not go into those details. Therefore, to say that we are only trying to scale summit after summit and we are thinking of nothing else, is, to say the least, unrealistic and also far from the truth. Therefore, when a responsibility falls on the shoulders of the Government we have to discharge it. We have to discharge it to the best of our capacity, and that is where we have to zero in. Chairmanship of the NAM, our position in the Commonwealth or the opportunity to host the commonwealth Heads meeting—these came the way they came. What did we do when these opportunities came to us? This is the crucial point to consider and this point there could be differences of opinion, differences in assessment, and that is the aspect on which I would like to take the House into confidence to the best of my ability.

Sir, take the Non-aligned first, because that was the first conference we held here. Everyone knows that in this world, there are countries which belong to the North, to the South, to the East, and to the West. These classifications, these divisions were not of our making; they were not India's making. Now, what India is striving for, what all other countries also want, is that something

[Shri P. V. Narasimha Rao]

should emerge as a result of interaction between the East and the West and North and the South, all put together. What did we want in NAM? We wanted all the countries, all the heads of the countries, North, South, East and West to take advantage of their presence at the 38th session of the General Assembly and have informal discussions amongst themselves. It was not an invitation extended by Mrs. Indira Gandhi as a person; it was not an invitation extended by India as a country. It was an invitation extended on behalf of the Non-aligned Movement in pursuance of the decision of the Non-aligned Summit in March 1983, and India being the Chairperson had to extend it. It is that simple. But if you expect North, South, East and the West to come to New York and pass a unanimous resolution identical with NAM, then you don't have to have all these differences. They will all become NAM. So, such an expectation is absurd on the face of it. Some Members, it seems, think that we wanted to line up all non-aligned countries in New York. No, we did not want to line up all non-aligned countries in New York, because they were already lined up here. It was in pursuance of the unanimous decision of all the non-aligned countries that we wanted the non non-aligned countries also to come; and they did come. It is not that all of them came; but East, West, North, South, all the four corners were represented in that meeting. And what came out, howsoever small it might be, howsoever rudimentary it might be, something did come out of that, and that something is what we have to build upon. It was the first ever meeting of its kind and, therefore, we have to have a perspective in judging these things. And the perspective is that for the first time, everyone has started thinking in terms of a dialogue which will save the whole world from a catastrophe. How do you do it if you don't have East and West coming together?—Not immediately to sign an agreement that is not going to happen

today. We may have our own opinion. One may say the East is at fault; someone else may say, West is at fault. Whoever is at fault, the result is that today the world is teetering on the brink of disaster. This is the actual position that the World has to face. So, by name-calling or by labelling or by passing resolutions for or against a particular country, we are not really taking the world any nearer to peace. And peace has become the most compelling factor of international life, of human life today on this planet. And, therefore, the entire outlook has changed. We have come to that conclusion. If the situation today had not been as dangerous and as perilous as it actually is, we would have, perhaps, afforded the luxury of name-calling, of having a long debate as to who is responsible, how he is responsible or how he is not responsible, etc. For these last ten, twenty and thirty years, we have been doing enough of this name-calling. But today, there is no time, there is no opportunity. We just do not have the chance to continue that kind of thing. We have to see how to stop it. That is why, we say 'freeze now'. Why did India say 'freeze'? Why did the non-aligned movement say 'freeze'? Because only then you can see how to reduce. There, of course, all these calculations will come. In which department is one side weaker? In which department the other side is stronger? If one side is weaker in one department, is it stronger in another? All these very very sophisticated and complicated calculations which we are not even acquainted with, will come. They will come when they have to come. But first of all, they have to sit together.

Now, take the parleys in Geneva, far instance. Nobody knows what happened between them, because, it is common knowledge that the Geneva talks are confidential. Whatever has appeared in the newspapers, we do not have to make a song and dance about it because those reports may be far off the mark. Therefore, what we need

is a, renewed Geneva conference, with people again coming together and talking, because, without talking, without a dialogue, nothing will come out. Let them even start with mutual recrimination, if necessary finally they will have to come to some understanding on what needs to be done next. This is the position.

Coming to CHOGM, I have to submit just a few things, not to many. Nobody has claimed that the CHOGM has completely met the aspirations of the people. But I would like to say that India, as she is constituted, cannot but have global aspirations. But global aspirations in one, particular sense. Mr. Jaswant Singh, perhaps, wanted to advise the Government not to aspire to become something for the whole world. I have no quarrel with that. But I have aspirations for the globe. I do not have global aspirations in the sense of wanting to become something for the globe. But I have aspirations for the globe itself. And in that sense I must have global aspirations and if I do not have global aspirations, I shall be shrinking into a regional or even a local power or a local entity, which the Chairman of the non-aligned movement cannot afford to do, which an important member of the Commonwealth cannot afford to do. Therefore, what is this aspiration? What is this Chairmanship which will be there for three years? What you have done within these three years will remain for ever but the Chairmanship itself is not going to remain for ever. Therefore, there is no aspiration, there is no aspiration for India as such to become permanently something. No. Our aspiration is that within these three years of our Chairmanship, if we can make this world a little less unsafe than what it is today, this is what we would like to do. Have we done anything or have we not done anything in that respect?

Middle-East has been mentioned. We do not claim to say that we have solved the Middle-East problem.

But for one year we have seen that the labenese question has been super-imposed on the Palestinian question. The PLO is divided today. Is it not very clear that when you say that the PLO is the sole and authentic representative of the Palestinian people and the PLO is divided, then there is onthing left to work on? Who is going to be your spearhead? India is not going to be spearhead, Syria is not going to be spearhead, Saudi Arabia is not going to be spearhead of the Palestinian people. So, if the Chairman of the Non-aligned comes to the conclusion that PLO unity is the most crucial factor in the West Asia situation today and sends a mission there, how is it to be found fault with? What did we achieve? We did not achieve anything very spectacular, nor did we go there to achieve anything spectacular. It was a very specific mission, very limited mission of finding out why this disunity had come in the ranks of the PLO, and without interfering with their internal affairs try to persuade them if they can close their ranks. In that respect the assurances that we got, which were contained in the press release at the end of our visit, were quite encouraging. As far as I can see from the newspapers and from the reports emanating from there, our visit has had some effect. In fact, personally I did not want to say anything publicly, claiming any success because anything can go wrong any time. When my Ministry wanted that we should tell the press a little more, I said, no, let the world see for itself what has happened. If the ceasefire holds for three days we shall be happy, if it holds for 10 days we shall be more happy, but we do not know how much happy we are going to be, we do not know how long it is going to last. Therefore, I took a low profile on that, I did not brag, I did not claim anything, but this is what has been done. The comrades in the PLO, who were opposed to Chairman Arafat told us, number one, that they are going to

[Shri P. V. Narasimha Rao]

respect the ceasefire without any time limit. When we went to Damascus we thought we should consider ourselves very lucky if we are able to get ceasefire for one week and there we actually got an assurance that they would respect the ceasefire without any time limit; number two, whatever their differences, they are going to resolve those differences within the framework of the Palestinian institutions that they already have. If we come back with these two assurances, it is not a mean achievement, not for us, not for the four who went there but for the Non-aligned Movement because we told them in so many words that the PLO is not just for the PLO, PLO is the body dependent upon which the Non-aligned Movement has to act and if there is no PLO, there is no resolution of the Non-aligned Movement and nothing to act upon. We had long long meetings of 4½ hours, we met so many people and finally this came up. This is a small step in the right direction. Tomorrow anything can go wrong. I am not claiming anything for the future. This is what has been done and what is being done.

Take Iran and Iraq. What is expected of the Non-aligned Movement, I want to know? Is it expected of us that we bring about peace by methods which cannot be employed, just cannot be employed by anyone any third country, whether it is a movement or not a movement? What is it? We have been shuttling between the two countries, we have been talking to them, we have been trying to find formula after formula after formula. Unfortunately, these are not meeting with their approval, with approval on both sides at the same time. If one formula meets with approval on one side, it meets with disapproval on the other by the same token. This has been happening. So what do you expect India to do? Will one hon. Member enlighten me on that? I am prepared to do whatever else you want me

to do if that is feasible. Just show me, "you can do this and this is feasible" and I will do it. I want to tell you what I have done, what I have been doing, what India has been doing. So there is no use of saying that we have not been able to do something. It is not within our control. These matters are outside our control. International politics is not like taking a decision within the country. Therefore taking a decision, acting on it, trying to persuade others to fall in line—all this is a part of international diplomacy and where have we failed? If we have not done what we ought to have done at a particular point of time, then even that I am prepared to consider. We went on such and such a date. Would some Member tell me we should have gone one month earlier, two months earlier and why we should have gone two months earlier? Because we had a meeting of the eight at the official level in Delhi itself just one month earlier and they came to the conclusion after talking to PLO that there was no need for any ministerial committee even to be called here because we have to see the situation, we have to coordinate with the Arab Committee. But within three weeks, conditions became so difficult, there was a qualitative change in the situation. And Mrs. Gandhi had to call an urgent meeting. People from Cuba, from the other part of the globe, had to come within 48 hours. It was not easy for them to come, but they did come. So we have done what needed to be done at the time it needed to be done. This is what I would like to submit to the House. So if there is anything constructive which can come from any quarter, from any Member, I am prepared to take it even now.

Coming to the economic side of CHOGM, again, Sir, I have a dilemma here. I cannot say that the hon. Members have not read the documents. I cannot say that. I presume that

they have read them. I am sure they must have read them. Now I have to ask myself, if they have read them, why are their remarks such that they appear to emanate from one who has not read them? This is my dilemma. Have they read the section on the economic side of the Non-Aligned document first? Did they note that global negotiations, the North-South dialogue which was supposed to be an immediate necessity, which was resolved to be an immediate necessity by the G 77? But when it came to the Non-Aligned Summit of March, 1983, we found that if you really want to achieve something beyond passing a resolution and going home you have to go a little deeper into the matter. And that is why the Non Aligned Summit had conceived of a two-tier approach to the global negotiations for the first time. We were so nervous about it, I was so nervous about it, because if this had not been properly explained to the G 77, they would have misunderstood it. So I made the trip all the way to Argentina to explain this part of the Non Aligned document to the G 77. We were a member there also in G 77. Yet NAM and G 77 are two different forums. 90 to 95 per cent of the composition is the same. But the emphasis is different, the forum is different. Therefore, we did not have to incur the situation of having these two forums working at cross purposes. So I had to go to Argentina and to explain this. They incorporated a statement appreciating the Non Aligned resolution in their resolution and therefore the positions of the G 77 and the Non Aligned were properly and duly harmonised. Now comes CHOGM. Does any hon. Member find anything in the CHOGM document on the economic side which is counter to the Non-Aligned document. True, we did not go into all those details. The Non-Aligned document is a much bigger document in these matters. But, taking the thrust as a whole, does anyone find anything against? If it had been against the thrust of the Non-Aligned, India would certainly have recorded its re-

servation; but there is nothing like that. For the first time, in a forum where there are countries of the North and of the South—they are not like-minded, this has been brought out in the discussion very clearly—we find a developed country, namely, New Zealand, taking up the cause of the developing countries. Now, is this not, as I said, a mini North-South summit? Is it not going to be a useful input for the main North-South dialogue if and when it takes place? Have we to cavil and look down upon this thing? So these are the positive aspects of the Commonwealth. The negative aspects have been brought out, but nothing is an unmixed blessing. That is why I have said that I am not going to praise the Commonwealth to the spies. But I would like to submit to the House that what happened at the Commonwealth has not in any way compromised our position in the sense of making it inconsistent. Yes, naturally, there have been certain different formulations, but there has never been a reversal of the intent of the document or the intent subscribing to that document. Therefore, I would like to say that these are different forums, and we have to accept differences. So long as you can harmonise them, so long as one merges in the other, so long as they do not really go counter to each other, we have nothing to be sorry about.

Yes, on one question, there was a difference of opinion, and we expressed our difference very clearly, on the question of withdrawal of troops from Libanon, for instance. We have very clearly come out saying that we cannot equate the Israeli troops with others; Israeli troops are the aggressors; therefore, they have to withdraw first; others also will withdraw, but there is no question of equating one with the other. This is what India has come out very clearly with. The Prime Minister said that in the press statement; and also our spokesman said so to the press. So, wherever there was a difference, it was brought out. There is no sweeping

[Shri P. V. Narasimha Rao]
under the carpet. We just said, no, we do not agree on this, and there the matter ended. So I would like to request Members to appreciate these nuances and see how we can really build on what has been achieved. It is not an achievement of one country; it is not an achievement of one person. When Members praise Mrs. Indira Gandhi's leadership, there is no need for anyone to get sore about it. There is nothing to feel that way. She does happen to be the Prime Minister. She has led all these things; she has presided; she is taking decisions in both the forums. Therefore, her name necessarily comes in. Her name is necessarily mentioned and appreciated. Now for some senior Members to nurse a grudge on that is really not good. Let us take it as a fact of life, as a fact of contemporary life. This happens to be so.

Sir, on Sri Lanka, I am glad Mr. Gopalsamy raised the point. I expected him to raise it. In fact, I was a little surprised when I did not find him during the debate in the House. So I was looking for him all over. Sir, the point is, he is quite right that a statement needed to be made on the latest position in Sri Lanka in both the Houses. But it so happened that while I was ready to make a statement, the debate has overtaken me. I made a statement on GHOGM. I could not have made two statements on the same day. The next day the debate started in the other House, and even so I gave the gist of the latest position in the other House. (*Interruptions*) That is why, I would like to take this House into confidence and submit the latest position, Sir. (*Interruptions*)

I have already, made a statement when the Prime Minister's envoy went there on his first visit. Later on he went on his second visit. And I do not remember to have made any statement because Parliament was not in session at that time. I would like to touch upon this very briefly without going into details. It is best to avoid details at a very delicate stage such as this.

During the second visit of the special envoy the discussions were held mainly with President Jayewardene. The papers prepared during the first visit were further considered. Now I would like to add here that there was no Indian proposal as such. We did not carry any proposals. Mr. Parthasarathy did not carry any proposals. That should be very clear. I would like to state categorically that India did not take any proposals, India did not author any proposals, India has only tried to ascertain the views of both sides and conveyed them from one to the other. And in this discussion certain ideas were thrown up, certain ideas emerged, and on the basis of these ideas, proposals also were formulated. This is how it happened. So, we cannot be either criticised or given credit for any proposal. We say that proposals have to come finally through discussions between the parties concerned, the sides concerned. We are only trying to help that process. A set of proposals were formulated on the basis of the text of President Jayewardene, reflecting the Sri Lankan Government's view. These included several suggestions made in the earlier paper and also some new approaches. It should be pointed out that both the papers mentioned above were working papers for consideration by the two sides with a view to narrowing down the differences. They were discussed with the TULF. On the special envoy's return to Delhi, their response was communicated to President Jayewardene who visited Delhi to attend the CHOGM summit.

I would not go into Mr. Gopalsamy's remarks at the treatment which was given to President Jayewardene. The treatment given to him was exactly the treatment given to any Head of State, and I do not think that we could have done anything different.

The President had two meetings with the Prime Minister, at which the Tamil question was discussed. He also had talks with the special envoy. We separately had talks with the

TULF leaders. So, it was a kind of talking all round, and the occasion for the President's visit to the Commonwealth summit was utilised for this purpose, in addition to his contribution at the CHOGM. Hon. Members will have seen the statements issued by President Jayewardene and Mr. Amrithalingam consequent upon their discussions in Delhi. These statements speak for themselves. But for the benefit of the hon. Members I would just briefly summarise the present position.

Initially the Sri Lankan Government was prepared to make improvements in the District Development Council Scheme. The Tamils on their part made it clear that this would not be adequate for meeting their aspirations. As a result of the discussions that have been held, the Sri Lankan Government has now agreed that larger units may be formed. The proposals provide for establishment of Regional Councils through amalgamation of the District Councils within each province. There would be effective devolution of legislative, executive and financial powers to these Councils, including powers of taxation and responsibility for law and order. All subjects not specifically assigned to the councils would continue to be the responsibility of the President and the Parliament who would also have overall responsibility for the unity, integrity, security and economic development of the country as a whole. A Central Port Authority is proposed to be set up for administering Trincomalee port. There is going to be an all-party conference and it is expected that the TULF will be invited to participate in the conference. President Jayawardene has informed us that he intends to place these proposals before the all-party conference. So, this in short is the position.

Mr. Gopalsamy has raised several other points, about land and other things. I am sure they will come up for discussion and if these proposals are akin to the proposals already adumbrated at some point in the past,

at some time in the past, naturally all that will come back and the pros and cons of that will be discussed. I would not like to discuss it because we would not like to be a party to the discussion. We have brought them together. Let them discuss at the all-party conference. We wish them well. We hope that something acceptable to all concerned will emerge. And that is the role which we have been playing. I hope that the House will agree with me that we could not have done anything more than this as a friendly country which wants the unity of Sri Lanka to be maintained and our relations with that country to be maintained and at the same time wants the legitimate rights and aspirations of the Tamil minority there to be fully safeguarded and provided for. This is the position with regard to Sri Lanka.

One point was raised about the British Council. In one sentence I would like to say that the British Council functions as a part of the British High Commission and it, therefore, enjoys all the rights, privileges and immunities of a diplomatic mission. Mr. Dinesh Goswami brought to the notice of the House some facts in regard to how that Council is functioning, and in his view it is not functioning according to the norms of diplomatic behaviour or whatever the obligations. We will look into that. At the moment, I do not have any further information on that except to say that it is functioning as a part of the British High Commission.

Sir, I think I have covered all the points. One last word about what Mr. Jaswant Singh said in his speech. Sir, sometimes this has been my difficulty with Mr. Jaswant Singh: the conceptual and philosophical content of his speeches is not easily grasped; at least, I cannot grasp it. And in any case, he said he had written something while the debate was on. So, at least if he gives me what he has scribbled while the debate was on, I will try to decipher the meaning of it. Yes, I would certainly like to go into these things. Mr. Shahabuddin, for instance, said

[Shri P. V. Narasimha Rao]

something about mini-States and macro-States. Yes, this is a matter which is very much on everybody's mind. Today it will not be possible for all States, given their size, their position, their dependence, their background and their level of development, to be able to be independent in all respects. This is an inter-dependent world. This is well known. Therefore, in this new context, how are small States to function, to survive and to keep their independence intact? This is a matter which really needs a deep examination.

Now, coming to non-alignment as a value, as Mr. Bhattacharya or some other Member pointed out, I would like to say that this distinction between a policy and a principle, I think, has come to us from the times before independence. About non-violence there was a raging controversy, whether it is a policy or a principle. This is only a kind of point for discussion. What I would like to say is that if with any country, non-alignment is not a value, then that country cannot be really non-aligned in its dealings, in its behaviour. I would like to take non-

alignment both as a value—and as a policy postulate emanating from the value. These two cannot be divorced. The exercise itself is so complicated and difficult and the dichotomy between the value on the one hand and a policy postulate on the other, cannot be said to be valid because we are to take decisions; we are to take decisions on the basis of certain basics and those basics we cannot abandon, we cannot desert under any circumstances. And as was expected, a country like India, if she finds herself even isolated on matters of conviction,—we have done so before, we are going to do it again—we do not mind being isolated but we would not compromise on basics. This is my position. Thank you very much.

श्री उपसभापति : सदन की कार्यवाही
कल 11 बजे तक के लिए स्थगित की
जाती है ।

The House then adjourned
at twenty six minutes past
seven of the clock till eleven
of the clock on Thursday, the
8th December, 1983.