

**DISCUSSION ON THE WORKING OF
THE MINISTRY OF EXTERNAL
AFFAIRS Contd.**

SHRI NARASINGHA PRASAD NANDA (Orissa): Mr. Deputy Chairman. Sir, Shri P. V. Narasimha Rao, I must admit, has acquired the requisite sophistication to lead the South Block. Sir, foreign affairs has to be judged always in the global context and more importantly with a deep sense of history and a correct perspective and a vision for the future. If Jawaharlal Nehru succeeded in formulating a bold, dynamic, worthwhile and constructive foreign policy for this country, it was because he had that deep sense of history and he was a visionary of extra-ordinary order. That is why, the formulations which he had, became a very effective instrument in our international relations. I am glad that this Government is trying to pursue the policies laid down by that great visionary. Whatever deviations and distortions appeared like an aberration for a short while are being sought to be brought in their proper perspective. The recognition of Kampuchea, according of diplomatic status to the PLO and our sense of sharing with the people of Zimbabwe in the attainment of independence not merely by participation but in a deeper sense, are some of the achievements of this Ministry. This is one Department of the Government of India with which I agree in a large measure. But the point is: Are these actions of the Government of India sporadic and casual or are they based on long-term policy planning perception? There can be absolutely no doubt that the perceptions of different countries differ. We cannot expect China to have the same perception of the world events as we have here nor can we expect Thailand or the ASEAN countries to have the same perception of the world events as we have. There are bound to be differences of opinion. The effort has to be made to keep peace in the world and to march towards progress and to see common points of agreement. We have to find common points

of agreement with different countries as best as we can.

Sir, since I have very little time at my disposal, I am not developing the point but you will kindly see that the American policy for some time was to build bases and maintain supremacy through armed power. It had so many military pacts and I am not going into the details. Those military pacts became completely ineffective. The events of these years have completely established that the American policy of arm build-up through military agreements and military pacts has proved totally futile. That is why, Sir, even in a country like Iran, they could not succeed. The Shah of Iran was considered to be its fortress, who they thought, would prove to be a bulwark against Communism. The Shah had to leave his country, and he died rootless in another country. After a total failure in this line of strategy, America adopted a completely different strategy. That strategy is proving more dangerous to us now. And what is that strategy? They have thought that they can build up the religious countries around the socialist bloc of countries as a bulwark against Communism. Now, Sir, you must view the happenings in Afghanistan, the happenings elsewhere in this context. Many friends are suggesting here that we must keep equi-distance between the socialist countries and the Americans and that that, is the true meaning of Non-5 P.M. alignment. I honestly differ from that. I believe, Sir, that the real danger is now even at our doors. In today's *Patriot* you must have noticed that a youth branch of the Jamaat-e-Islami has come forward and it says that they will stage a revolution like that of Iran in this country. So, America does not merely destabilise Iran and other countries in the Middle East; it is also trying to destabilise the position in our own country through various methods and means and the main thrust of the American policy now is not on the arms build up, not on military pacts, which have proved a total

[Shri Narasingha Prasad Nanda]

failure during the last so many years, but their main object now is to build religious States, as many as possible, around the socialist states, as a bulwark against Communism. I will only request the hon. External Affairs Minister to take note of these developments. This is at the base of the entire American policy. That is why you find now concentration in the Diego Garcia; you find concentration in the Indian Ocean and you find concentration in the Persian Gulf, in the Arabian Sea and they are coming closer. That is the gravest danger. Do you expect similar danger from the socialist bloc? Do you expect similar danger from the U.S.S.R.? To say so and to put them on the same scale, would be absolutely wrong.

Sir, one more thing that I would like to say in this context is that people say everything must be done in the national interest. Nevertheless, our national interest is so closely connected with the international situation, that if there is an international development today and the second cold war is becoming so intense now that it will seriously affect all the nations, including us, you cannot merely think in terms of the national interest, isolate yourself from the rest of the world, live in an ivory tower, imagine that you have an independent policy, apart from what is happening around you all the world over. How can you do that? Therefore, Sir, I believe, that while we will pursue this policy laid down by the great visionary with the same devotion and understanding of history, with the same perceptions, we will at the same time, try immediately for one thing. All kinds of things are going on with China. China always tries to ride over the Government of India and talk to some individuals. Here there is some monthly journal. Its editor goes and meets the Chinese leaders and the Chinese leaders blurt out something to him, the press, and

he comes forward with a statement. They do not directly make any proposal to the Government of India. I mean, that shows how serious the Chinese Government is, not the people, to normalise relations with us.

Now, Sir, I have got information that the Chinese Government is now having their army concentration around the Karakoram road. God knows for what. But I have got information that they are now having concentration on the Karakoram road and probably they think that they may also take advantage of the situation that is now developing in Kashmir. The stand taken by Sheikh Sahib the posture of the Jamaat-e-Islami and its youth wing and the conference that they are likely to hold on the 27th, possibly all this may help them. I would only suggest that in the first instance, the territory of the highway, which belongs to us, on which land they have built this road, we should create the necessary atmosphere of goodwill and this whole region should be demilitarised. The first effort should be to demilitarise this zone.

Now I will put a few questions and then conclude. I do not want to take much of your time. Unfortunately, on such an important and vital issue also we have to limit ourselves; but we have to do it.

I would request the hon. Minister of External Affairs to look to the conditions of Indians who are working abroad. Large number of Indians are working abroad and very frequently we discuss on the floor of Parliament about their conditions, their difficulties, their wages and all kinds of things. But I am not developing that point; I am leaving it for him and he should kindly look into the working conditions and try to safeguard their interest.

One more point I will say and that is that there has been a recent feature

that remittances from abroad have sharply fallen. Why is it happening? I feel possibly that the interest that is being paid for these remittances by Indians from abroad is less. Therefore, would it be possible for the Minister to give them sufficient incentives so that these remittances would increase?

One more question is about the refugees from Bangladesh. In the context of Assam agitation, in the context of the identification of foreign nationals issue, the question of refugees also gained some importance and that has also to be borne in mind, as to how to deal with the refugees who came here and who were with us, in the context of the agitation taking place in the north-eastern region.

Another point is about the claim with regard to the two islands. I want to know whether the Government has already got a favourable answer from the Bangladesh Government. They are also claiming these two islands as their own. These two islands in the Bay of Bengal belong to us and we have said it that they do belong to us. I want to know whether Bangladesh Government are agreeing to the fact that these two islands do really belong to us.

One more point. Sir, recently, I had an occasion to go to Ramesh-waram and there the fishermen met me and spoke to me about their difficulties in Katcha Tivu. Formerly, Katcha Tivu was part of our country; it is only 12 miles..

AN HON. MEMBER- it is part of India.

SHRI NARASINGHA PRASAD NANDA: No, they have said it in the agreement. It is at a greater distance from Ceylon. Now there is some agreement between the Ceylonese Government and our Government on this point. Sir, our fishermen are always facing difficulties because they had been fishing since generations and they have now been facing difficulties when-

ever they go to Katcha Tivu. I want to know whether anything can be done to protect the interests of our fishermen who go from this coast to fish in the Katcha Tivu area.

Finally, Sir, after all, success of external policy depends entirely on the internal strength. A weak nation cannot play an effective role in world affairs. Therefore, Sir, while we are on the right track in regard to external affairs, in the internal field, I honestly feel that there are many things, there are many policies, which had been laid down by Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, which are being reversed by the present Government. For instance, the Industrial Policy Resolution of 1950. It has been completely reversed by the present Government. There should be some serious thinking about it. Similarly, Sir, efforts are being made to put the clock back in the matter of restoring health to the economy, industry, and so on and so forth. I am not developing that point. The point is, the External Affairs Minister, certainly, cannot function in the air. He must derive strength from the soil. He must derive strength from the country. If we are strong, this Ministry can function more effectively. Hence, while we judge the External Affairs Ministry, these issues have to be considered. The stronger we become internally, the more self-reliant we become, the more will we be heard in the comity of nations.

श्री जे० के० जैन (मध्य प्रदेश) :

उपसभापति महोदय, विदेश मंत्रालय के काम-काज के बारे में कई माननीय सदस्यों ने अपने विचार व्यक्त किए और आपने मुझे इस डिबेट में भाग लेने का मौका दिया, इसके लिए मैं आपका आभार मानता हूँ। विदेश मंत्रालय...

श्री शिव चन्द्र झा (बिहार) : मेरा

प्वाइंट ऑफ आर्डर है। मैं इतना ही जानना चाहता हूँ कि इसमें मेरा भी नाम है ?

श्री उपसभापति : आठका टाइम है बोज ना।

Your party has got five minutes. I will give you time. Congress (I) has more time. We have to adjust. I will give you time.

श्री जे० के० जन : विदेश मंत्रालय की अपनी एक खास जिम्मेदारी होती है और वह जिम्मेदारी है विदेशों में देश की प्रतिष्ठा बढ़े, मैत्री के संबंध कायम हों, सहयोग का वातावरण बने। देश के आजाद होने के बाद हमारे महान नेता स्वर्गीय पंडित जवाहरलाल नेहरू ने भारत की जो विदेश नीति बनाई श्री उपका यही आधार था और भारत की प्रतिष्ठा विदेशों में बढ़ी थी। गुटों...

श्री उपसभापति : मिस्टर जन, आप एक मिनट जरा बैठ जाइये।

THE LEADER OF THE HOUSE (SHRI PRANAB MUKHERJEE): Sir, I would like to make one submission to the House. As we have decided the External Affairs Minister will reply to the debate tomorrow, and today we will have discussion on the working of the External Affairs Ministry. In the Business Advisory Committee, we decided that tomorrow, we will have to return the Finance Bill. Tomorrow is Thursday and this is the only official day left with us. Hence, it would be my request to the hon. Members, through you, Sir, that as there is no Calling Attention tomorrow, after the short notice question, the Minister will reply to the debate and after that, the remaining speakers on the Finance Bill can speak so that the Finance Minister can reply to the Finance Bill at the end of the day. Tomorrow, we will complete the consideration of the Finance Bill.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The House has agreed to this.

श्री जे० के० जन : उपसभापति महोदय, गुटों के झगड़े से दूर रह कर अपने अपनी इमेज बनाई। दोस्ती और गुट-निरासे की नीति बनाई। हमारी नीति की न किसी पार्षदों तरफ सराहना हुई बल्कि इससे हमें अपने देश के विकास में काफी मदद मिली। लेकिन दुर्भाग्य की बात यह है कि पिछले तीन साल देश के शासन की बागडोर ऐसे निकम्मे हाथों में रही कि हमारे आगे बढ़ने का मार्ग भिलखिला चौपट हो कर रह गया। जनता पार्टी के शासकों ने देश को पीछे आने की मानो साजिश कर डाली थी विदेशों में हमारी जो कुछ इमेज बनी थी वह बरबाद हो गई। हमारी अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय प्रतिष्ठा का जो इन तीन सालों में नुकसान हुआ उससे भला कौन बाकिफ नहीं है। जनता पार्टी की सरकार में विदेश मंत्री श्री घटना विहारी बाजपेयी जो का तो कहता ही का था। भाषद विदेश मंत्री बने थे मन्त्रालय उन्होंने विदेशों में अपने चांस मंत्री समझ लिया था। विदेश यात्राओं पर खूब धन मुदामा करने में लायक 15 दिन भी स्टेशन में रहता उन्हें गवार नहीं था। इसलिए उन्हें कुछ लोग विदेश विहारी बाजपेयी कहते थे, कुछ लोग उन्हें श्रीम विहारी बाजपेयी कहते थे और कुछ लोग उन्हें आकाश विहारी बाजपेयी कहते थे। परन्तु जब वे शाकाण के गिरे दो ठोसे गिरे कि वे तो चकनाचूर हुए हों, उनकी पार्टी भी चकनाचूर हो गई। लेकिन दुःख इस बात का है कि उन्होंने देश का देशकीमती समय बरबाद किया और देश के करोड़ों रुपयों को उन्होंने दोनों हाथों से लुटा दिया। साथ ही अन्य देशों के साथ संबंध में सुधार होने के बजाय बिगाड़ हुआ। इसकी जिम्मेदारी से क्या जनता पार्टी के तत्कालीन शासक अपने को बचा सकते हैं? इतिहास उनको कभी

माफ़ नहीं करेगा । मैं इतिहास के एक मुनहरे पृष्ठ को यहां दोहरा रहा हूँ । बंगलादेश में जिस समय नरसंहार हो रहा था तो भारत वर्ष ने ही उस समय आवाज दी और वह आवाज भारतवर्ष की इस महान् नेता श्रीमती इंदिरा गांधी की आवाज थी । ये वही इंदिरा गांधी हैं जिन्होंने विदेशों में जा जाकर यह कहा था कि ऐ जगतंत्र में विश्वास रखने वालों, देखो ईस्ट पाकिस्तान में क्या हो रहा है, अमेरिका जाकर भी इसी महान् नेता ने कहा था कि अपने को बड़ी भारी जम्हूरियत कहते हो, बंगलादेश में जो नरसंहार हो रहा है उसके बारे में कुछ बोलो, राष्ट्रपति निक्सन ईस्ट पाकिस्तान, बंगलादेश में क्या हो रहा था इस बारे में कुछ न बोले और अमेरिका का क्या रुख रहा यह सभी को मालूम है । हमारे देश की इस महान् नेता ने डंके की चोट पर बंगलादेश का साथ दिया । अब उपसभापति महोदय, दुर्भाग्य था इस देश का जिसको ढाई वर्ष तक मोरारजी देसाई एवं अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी जैसे विदेश मंत्री के हाथों में जाना पड़ा । अगर ये कुछ करना ही चाहते थे तो डंके की चोट पर करते । करते कैसे, चोरी के काम डंके की चोट पर नहीं हुआ करते हैं । इजरायल के मोशे दायान से चोरी-चोरी जो हाथ मिलाया उसको डंके की चोट पर कैसे कर सकते थे । इनके साथ मोशे दायान की क्या बातचीत हुई ? उपसभापति महोदय, मैं आपके माध्यम से विदेश मंत्रालय को यह निवेदन करूंगा कि वह इस चीज की जांच कराये और उस जांच करने के बाद उस रिपोर्ट को पेश करे देशवासियों के सामने कि अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी और मोरारजी भाई ने मोशे दायान के साथ क्या गुप्त सौदा किया था, क्या गुप्त बातें की थीं और उनको क्या कुछ भारत की चीजों को सौगात के रूप में जाते वक्त समर्पित

किया था । उपसभापति महोदय, इस मोशे दायान की गुप्त यात्रा से हमारे मित्र अरब देशों के दिल पर क्या बीती, यह सभी को मालूम है । अगर इसकी जांच होगी और उसकी रिपोर्ट प्रकाशित की जायगी तो मुझे विश्वास है कि हमारे अरब भाइयों के ऊपर जरूर इसका अच्छा असर पड़ेगा और हमारे संबंध उनके साथ और मजबूत हो सकेंगे ।

उपसभापति महोदय, गत छः महीनों से जब से हमारे देश की बागडोर श्रीमती इंदिरा गांधी ने संभाली है और श्री पी० वी० नरसिंह राव जी ने विदेश मंत्रालय का कार्य संभाला है, तब से देश की प्रतिष्ठा दिनो दिन बढ़ी है । माननीय सदस्यों को याद होगा कि इंदिरा जी के प्रधान मंत्री बनते ही विश्व के समस्त राष्ट्रों ने और नेताओं ने जिस विश्वास के साथ और तेजी के साथ भारत आना प्रारम्भ किया । यही नहीं विश्व के बहुत प्रमुख राष्ट्रों ने विश्वास के साथ अफगानिस्तान के मामले में अपना यह दखलदारी दिया कि अफगानिस्तान के मामले में यदि कोई सुलह करवा सकता है, यदि सुधार कर सकता है तो वह भारत वर्ष के द्वारा हो सकता है और प्रधान मंत्री श्रीमती इंदिरा गांधी के द्वारा हो सकता है । उपसभापति महोदय, विश्व के इन राष्ट्रों के नेता बुद्धिमान हैं, जिन्होंने इंदिरा गांधी के नेतृत्व का लोहा माना है । चोरों की तरह, छल-कपटियों की तरह, जनता पार्टी के काम करने वाले तथाकथित नेताओं का विदेशों में लोहा क्या मानते । विश्व सम्मेलनों में जो भारत की नाक कटवाते फिरे ।

उपसभापति महोदय, इसी वर्ष की बात है अप्रैल माह में श्रीमती इंदिरा गांधी के दल के साथ जिम्बाब्वे के स्वतंत्रता

[श्री जे० के० जैन]

समारोह में एक पत्रकार के रूप में मुझे भी भाग लेने जाने का अवसर प्राप्त हुआ था, अपनी आँखों से वहाँ मैंने भारत की इज्जत को देखा। इस महान नेता इंदिरा गांधी के नेतृत्व को देखकर जिम्बाब्वे की जनता भाव विभोर हो उठी। उसके पहले तंजानिया की यात्रा भी उनके साथ की वहाँ सैकड़ों व्यक्तियों से जब बातचीत की तो वहाँ के अफ्रीकी लोगों ने कहा कि जनता पार्टी ने इंदिरा गांधी के ऊपर जो जुलम और अत्याचार किये उसकी यहाँ पिछले तीन वर्षों में बराबर भर्त्सना होती रही। उपसभापति महोदय, हम हकीकत को झुठला नहीं सकते हैं, हकीकत को हमें स्वीकार करना ही होगा और अफ्रीकी और अरब जो हमारे साथी दोस्त हैं हमें इन मुल्कों के साथ दोस्ती को और गाढ़ा करना होगा। मैं अपने माननीय विदेश मंत्री जी का ध्यान एक सुझाव की ओर दिलाना चाहता हूँ। योरोप और अमरीका के देशों में हमारे बड़े-बड़े दूतावास हैं, हमारे बड़े बड़े अधिकारी या नेता इन देशों में राजदूत एवं उच्चायुक्त के पदों को संभालते हैं, लाखों-करोड़ों रुपया खर्च होता है। मैं इसका विरोध नहीं करता। राया खर्च करने की जरूरत है, जरूर किया जाय परन्तु उपसभापति महोदय, अरब एवं अफ्रीकी देशों में स्थापित दूतावासों, राजदूतों और उच्चायुक्तों के मामले में सौतेला व्यवहार न किया जाय। अरब और अफ्रीका के अन्दर डिप्टी सेक्रेटरी रैंक के अधिकारियों को दूत बना कर भेज दिया जाता है, जबकि हमको आवश्यकता है कि हम अरब और अफ्रीकी के मुल्कों के साथ अधिक मित्रता और अधिक संबंध कायम करें। उसके लिए आवश्यकता यह है कि हमारे जो बरिष्ठ अधिकारी हैं, नेता हैं, 'ए' ग्रेड के जो हमारे अधिकारी हैं, उनको वहाँ दूत बना

कर भेजा जाए और यदि खर्च में कटौती की जाय तो उन अमरीकी या यूरोप के मुल्कों में की जाए, न कि अफ्रीकी और अरब देशों के मुल्कों में की जाए क्योंकि हमको घन और अपने अच्छे अफसरों को वहीं नियुक्त करना चाहिए जहाँ से हमको अच्छे संबंधों की आशा हो और जिस देश के साथ हम लोग अधिक मिल-जुल कर काम कर सकें।

विदेश मंत्रालय के पालिसी प्लैनिंग सैल में जबरदस्त जान डालने की आवश्यकता है। डियागो गाशिया के बारे में हमारे दोनों सदनों में काफी चर्चा हो चुकी है और अभी विदेश मंत्री जी ने इसी सदन में एक प्रश्न के उत्तर में यही कहा था कि डियागो गाशिया का मामला—मुद्दई सुस्त, गवाह चुस्त वाला हो गया है। मैं मंत्री महोदय को इस बात के लिए बधाई देता हूँ कि गवाह-स्वरूप भारत इस मामले में चुस्ती बरत रहा है। यह सच है कि पहल तो मारिशस को ही करनी होगी। पर भारत इस मामले में और ज्यादा चुस्ती बरत सकता है। डियागो गाशिया के मामले में अधिक सम्मेलनों का आयोजन किया जाए। मारिशस में हमारे और अन्य देशों के प्रतिनिधिमंडल अधिक से अधिक जाएं, वहाँ के नागरिकों में और सरकार में और अधिक जागृत पैदा करें।

मुझे विश्वास है कि श्री पी० वी० नरसिंह राव जैसे बर्मंड विदेश मंत्री के रूप में डियागो गाशिया का, उस मामले का अवश्य हल निकलेगा और हिंद महासागर जो युद्ध के बने हुए वाहनों से घिरा हुआ है, वह अवश्य मुक्त होगा।

मैं एक सुझाव और देना चाहता हूँ। हो सकता है कि यह विदेश मंत्रालय से संबंधित न हो। लेकिन गृह मंत्रालय से हो। हजारों महिलाएँ भारतवर्ष में रहती हैं जो शादी-शुदा हैं, भारतीयों

के साथ जिनकी श्रादी हो रखी है । लेकिन साल में उनको एक बार पुलिस वाले, पुलिस चीकी में जाना पड़ता है और वहाँ एक, दो, तीन घंटे तक बिठा कर उनके साथ उबाव-सवाल किये जाते हैं । हर वर्ष यह परेड की जाती है और उसका नतीजा क्या निकलता है कि जब वे महिलाएं और उनके बच्चे अपने देश में जाते हैं तो वहाँ जाकर इस बात की चर्चा करते हैं, जिससे भारत की इज्जत को भारी धक्का पहुंचता है ।

श्रीमान्, कोई ऐसा कानून बनाया जाए, या कोई ऐसा तरीका बनाया जाए जिससे यह महिलाएं अपमानित होने से बच जाएं । मैं आपका धन्यवाद करता हूँ कि आपने मुझे यहाँ पर बोलने का समय दिया ।

SHRI SHIVA CHANDRA JHA: Mr. Vice-Chairman, with your permission I would like to speak in the form of a few questions. I just want to have crystal clear answers from the Minister. But I do not find the Minister here. I do not know who will reply to those questions.

I want to know from the hon. Minister whether the foreign policy that he is pursuing in the world has any principles or not, has any standard or not. I have put this question to him because I find that the Minister is pursuing a policy which is deviating from the basic policy on foreign affairs presented by Pt. Jawaharlal Nehru. He had set some standard in his days. What was that standard? Mr. Vice-Chairman, here is the presentation of standard set by Pt. Jawaharlal Nehru. In the *Indian Express*, there is an article by Mr. Kuldeep Nayar. I am reading it to you:

"India takes credit for pursuing a policy based on principles. This was the standard set by Nehru. Addressing a joint session of the

two Houses of the US Congress than 20 years ago, he said, if freedom was threatened anywhere a aggression took place, India could not and would not be neutral". This is the main foundation of India's foreign policy. Are you pursuing a foreign policy according to these principles? I want a clear answer from the Minister because I find you are deviating from the basic line. The result of that is, instead of having more friends, we have more non-friends. For instance, Nepal is not satisfied; Bhutan is also not satisfied; Bangladesh is also not satisfied even Sri Lanka is not satisfied with us. If you reply to this question that yes, you are following the principles or Pt. Jawaharlal Nehru, then my other questions are like this: There are nations in the world which are under the domination of England. You were under the domination of England. You had the right too to be free from England. Are not other nations entitled to that freedom? Are you speaking for them? I am going to quote only two instances—one of Scotland and the other of Wales. Are not the people of Scotland entitled to freedom as you were in the past? Or the people of Wales? Have you ever spoken up for their freedom? In this way, Mr. Vice-Chairman, there are many countries still under the domination of England. But I do not find the Government pursuing or speaking for their freedom. So, this is the basic deviation from the principle or the line set by that great architect of India's foreign policy, Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru.

Now, coming to the present situation, concerning Diego Garcia reference has been made here. I want to know a specific answer from the hon. Minister. How many times did you protest against the presence of "Eisenhower", the nuclear ship that has come recently into the Indian Ocean? There were two warships there before—Constellation-I and Guadalcanal. The entire zone which

[Shri Shiva Chandra Jha]

has been declared to be a zone of peace has been made a rendezvous for all these warships. Is it not a violation of the basic declaration of the UNO that that area should be a zone of peace? How many times have you protested in the United Nations? Time is limited, Sir, and so I am just putting questions only.

Then come to the Tarapur atomic plant. Is not the United States pressurising you to follow them in the supply of nuclear fuel for Tarapur? May I know the genesis of the agreement? I had seen that in the very agreement, in the beginning, it was put under Atomic Energy—"Safeguards Inspection". If that is true, then, from the beginning we have been put under the pressure of the United States. And that is a bad aspect of our foreign policy.

My third point is concerning the Commonwealth. Why are you sticking to the Commonwealth? Why are you sticking to the Commonwealth when the Citizenship Law is going to be enacted in England and Indians are going to be discriminated against there? Are not Indians going to be discriminated against? I want a clear, cut answer about the Citizenship Law that is going to be enacted there. Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, I attended the Commonwealth Parliamentary Conference and here is a witness, Mr. Bhalerao, and here is a witness, Mr. Sankar Ghose. In the Commonwealth Parliamentary Conference I raised the issue that if you do not want to get out of the Commonwealth, at least the structure of the Commonwealth can be changed. Why should the monarch of England be the Head of the Commonwealth. Why not the President of India be the Head of the Commonwealth for one year and why not the Head of the member-country be the head, by rotation? Have you ever thought in these terms? This is the way I find the Government, Mr. Vice-Chairman,

under the present leadership, not under the past leadership of the great Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, and the hon. Minister is very proud and sitting pretty over there and I find he is deviating from the basic line.

I find there is one country in the world, that is, England, which has no basic principle of foreign policy. It has got pragmatism. It is said of England that after the conclusion of any international meeting only England makes its agenda. England never makes its agenda before the meeting but only after the conclusion of the meeting, as to what issues are there. That is gross pragmatism or practicalism, as it is said. One Prime Minister of England had said that Britain has no permanent friends. But India has a different line. India's foreign policy is based on principles and never, in case, India is going to deviate from them. But my basic charge against the Government is that under the leadership of Madam Indira Gandhi, India is slowly and gradually deviating. This is the basic question. Now, concerning our neighbours my suggestion is, if you want to bring them to that line laid by the great Panditji, stick to that principle. Clarify your stand and stick to it till the last. I do not want to go into the history of how Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru even in those days when we were fighting for our freedom stuck to it. At the Rome airport an emissary of Mussolini had come to see him, but Panditji did not come out of the airport. He knew that fascism is bad. He knew what Mussolini was doing there. In the same way it happened in the Republic of Spain. These are history. After Independence, a Dutch plane was stopped for five hours because they were going to enslave Indonesia. This was done after Independence, when India was not that strong as it is today. But Panditji had the guts, he had the belief and the conviction that, no matter what happens,

India will stick to it. That plane was stopped for five hours at our instance. A Globemaster was flying out of Vietnam. It was Panditji who stopped Globemaster from flying over the Indian sky. I do not say that you do nothing. But sometimes you are deviating from it. I have given instances only which came to my mind to show to some extent how the foreign policy was adopted in the past. Now, as regards the matter concerning the liberation of Bangladesh, I do not say much. The best certificate and the highest certificate of statesmanship was given to the then Prime Minister Mrs. Indira Gandhi by no less a person than Lok-nayak Jayaprakash Narayan himself. So you have to stick to your principles.

Another thing is that with your neighbours think of having a federation—a federation of India, Pakistan, Bhutan, Nepal, Sri Lanka and all such other countries. This idea was put forward earlier. I hope you understand what this means.

You call yourself non-aligned. That is your basic policy. Tito is no more in the world. The mantle of responsibility is on India. You have to take the initiative and lead the non-aligned countries. But you are halting and wavering in the matter of taking the initiative. That is another charge against you.

I do not want to say much about our relations with China. The relations are improving. But certainly the statement made by the Government of China representative about the McMahon Line has not even been clarified here. We had given calling attention notices and special mention notices about it, but those were rejected. I do not remember whether the Minister replied to this query of ours that the McMahon Line controversy has rather disturbed the normalisation process that had started. Anyhow, we have to speed up the normalisation process. These are the points on which I would like to have

839 RS—14.

specific clarifications from you. Mr. Minister, you have been away on some private work. You can ask the representative in your place who worked in your absence. Specific answers I want to have from you. There are many other things concerning the External Affairs Ministry. Some other time I am going to ask about them. But the basic questions I have put before you and you must be unequivocal while answering them.

Thank you very much for your patience.

SHRI NARSINGH NARAIN PAN-DEY (Uttar Pradesh): Mr. Vice-Chairman, at the outset, I must say that Dr. Bhai Mahavir has expressed some opinion about the foreign policy of his Party President Dr. Atal Bihari Vajpayee—I say him 'Doctor' because he has inherited the words "genuine non-alignment" from a newspaper which is not published in India but in America, and that is the *New York Times*, if I am correct, Mr. Atal Bihari Vajpayee's and his party's leanings were well expressed by his party and that can be known to the people of this country and the people of the world.

Sir, India's foreign policy is based on the principles of non-alignment, non-interference and peaceful coexistence. As my hon. friend, Mr. Nanda has rightly stated, this is the outcome of the visionary, the late Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, who propounded this foreign policy so that our country may have good relations with its neighbours, our country may have good relations with the comity of nations of the world and it may live in peace and co-existence.

That is why, Sir, our party manifesto had also correctly criticised the Janata Party and its Government for reversing the foreign policy of Nehru and it had reduced India to a nonentity among the "comity of nations. Also the policy of the so-called genuine non-alignment had paid not

[Shri Narsing Narain Pandey]

very good results to our country in the comity of nations. This had drawn India closer to the forces of neo-colonialism and economic imperialism while tending to alienate the sympathy and support of our friends who stood by us at the time of crisis.

With this end in view, we pledged to provide a dynamic, useful and positive role for India in the international affairs, specially in narrowing the gap between the developed and developing nations. In this context, therefore, our party has categorised certain tasks before our Government.

- (1) Strengthening India's defence capabilities;
- (2) Safeguarding the right to use nuclear technology "for peaceful and productive purposes;
- (3) Forging closer relationship among the countries of South Asia, with the states of Indo-China, South-East Asia, West Asia, Africa and Latin America;
- (4) Transforming the Indian Ocean into a zone of peace free from outside interference;
- (5) The struggle against imperialism, colonialism and racialism;
- (6) Palestinians' genuine demand for a home land; and
lastly
- (7) Making concerted effort to counter the nefarious attempts to destabilise and entire region, free from the Suez to the Far-East in a neo-imperialist global strategy and recognising the new Samrin Government of Kampuchea.

That is why, Sir, this policy, in our party manifesto, was clearly given, and our Government and our Prime Minister have therefore, after coming to power at the Centre, based its policy statement on these vital points and, thereafter, the recognition of the Samrin Government of Kampuchea,

which truly enjoys the people's confidence, is the first attempt in this direction.

Some may have delusions that Madam Prime Minister and her Government have vacillated over the Soviet troops in Afghanistan.

It is worth mentioning that even Lord Carrington, Foreign Secretary of Britain, who visited India in the first week of January, 1980, on leaving New Delhi admitted before newsmen: "Although both India and the U.K. want that Soviet troops must leave Afghanistan, they differ on the cure, and that is the crux of the matter". And our Foreign Minister has very ably and categorically stated it in many statements.

Sir, the Sino-U.S. axis in this region has far-reaching consequences, and it is also threatening the very existence of tranquillity and peace in this region. It is, therefore, out of conviction that if there is no attempt to foster insurgency in Afghanistan or to make common cause between the Muslims south of the Amu river and those north of it, there may be no cause for the Soviet Union to cross its borders as regards Afghanistan. Sir it concerns their national interest. Mr. Bhupesh Gupta has rightly said that Afghanistan asked for the Soviet troops for the liberation of their country. It may be rightly said so. But, Sir, their national interest was also in the minds of the Russian Government and the Russian people. It may be correctly analysed in this light so that we may know what is the fact behind it and why the Russian Government was forced to send troops into Afghanistan for the liberation of that country. It is also a fact which can never be denied, that Britain, China and the U. S. are trying to create a strategy of destabilisation in this region, especially in the Indian peninsula and in the Indian Ocean. Sir, these imperialist forces are bent upon creating trouble and it should be a warning to the littoral countries to the hinterland coun-

tries and also to the non-aligned countries. If the hinterland countries and the countries of the Indian Ocean sit together in a conference and unequivocally pass a resolution for creating world opinion for declaring the Indian Ocean a zone of peace, it will be good for the non-aligned countries also to toe the same line. So, the imperative need of the hour, therefore, is that the infusion of arms and other military wherewithal that generate an attitude hostile to coexistence, and mutual accommodation should be stopped. There should be an end to political pressures on nations, inducements or threats of covert action, to get them to back the U.S.-Sirio-Pak axis. General Zia-ul-Haq, President of Pakistan, must also stop morbid thoughts about 1971. India should make amends. Amends for what? India in 1971 occupied some territory of Pakistan and under the Simla Agreement, they have returned that territory to Pakistan. So what else does the Pakistan President, Zia-ul-Haq want? Does he think that peace and tranquility in this region could be established only by the creation of an "Islamic bomb" or by creating a situation where peace could be restored? Therefore, these are the issues which may be settled bilaterally, as was said in Simla Agreement which was the basis for improving relations between the two countries. It is no use to threaten for exploding the Islamic bomb and its preparation, to its neighbour, for showing strength.

The other aspect that the Government must take into account is to persuade friends in the developing world to refrain from exacerbating the situation, by lending even the moral support to the militarisation of the region.

India is naturally concerned to make Indian Ocean a zone of peace and thus the Prime Minister in Lusaka Non-aligned Conference even on 8th September 1970 has rightly said. I quote:

"We would like Indian ocean to be an area of peace and cooperation. Military bases of outside-powers will create tension and great power rivalry."

Among the resolutions adopted by the Heads of non-aligned States one relating to calling upon all States to consider and respect the Indian ocean as a zone of peace from which great power rivalries and competition—whether army, navy or air force—are excluded and the area should also be free from nuclear weapons.

The other leader of non-aligned conference at the third summit meeting Mrs. Bandaranaike urged that all countries bordering the Indian ocean should join us not only giving effect to the proposal, but in keeping the Indian ocean as a zone of peace free from all power rivalries. She also referred and reiterated Ceylon's stand and the Lusaka conference appeal in U.N. General Assembly on the 12th October, 1971.

In the background of these important utterances, I could vouchsafe to say that it was not liked by the Warlords of imperialism and neo-colonialism and have thus created conditions for overthrowing the political leadership from these areas by their nefarious designs and political intelligence. I warn again the people of India to beware of these machinations and nefarious designs and propaganda again for stabilisation of the political apparatus in the Indian peninsula.

As against this, the Diego Garcia base in Indian ocean which was once established for communication base is being armed by modern missiles and naval strength. The development base of the 'Cock Burn' in Australia, the British reiteration of the importance of the Simonstown Agreement and the reported preparation by China to test its intercontinental missile

[Shri Narsingh Narain Pandey]

by firing it across the Indian ocean may not be taken in isolation, but require a realistic view and appropriate steps in this direction. Therefore, a diplomatic strategy is called for to clarify the dangers posed to our neighbours and to the littoral and hinterland countries of the Indian ocean. With this end in view, Sir, I would very humbly request our Foreign Minister, who is a well-known person, and who is quite conversant with the global strategy which is being formulated by these warlords, to see that immediately this noiv-aligned conference takes place and, before that, Sir, as I have said earlier, the littoral and the hinterland countries and their governments should be consulted so that some constructive and positive approach towards the international affairs at this critical hour is formulated. Thank you, Sir.

श्री लाडलो मोहन निगम : सभाध्यक्ष जी, मैं पहले तो विदेश मंत्री जी को इस बात के लिये धन्यवाद दूँ कि उन्होंने इस सदन में पूरे दिन की बहस अपने विभाग पर चलवाई। बहुत-सी बातें जो कही गई हैं, उनको मैं दोहराना नहीं चाहता। मुझे जो सबसे ज्यादा चिन्ता है और सिद्धान्तरूप में मैं समझता हूँ कि आप भी उसको कबूल करेंगे। आज मुझ को लग रहा है कि हिन्दुस्तान की चमड़ी को ही खतरा हो गया है। चमड़ी और शरीर का जो रिश्ता है वह हिन्दुस्तान की सीमा के साथ लगी हुई किसी देश की सीमा और उस देश का भी वही रिश्ता हुआ करता है। सुबह अखबार देखते हुए जब चीन के मामले में पढ़ने को मिला तो उससे ऐसा लगा कि जैसे वे बहुत बड़े इंसान हैं और हम दो नम्बर के आदमी हैं। मैं एक बात बड़े अदब के साथ कहना चाहूँगा कि एक बार हम लोग गलती कर चुके हैं। 1956 में जो गलती तिब्बत के मामले में हम से हुई है उन गलती को मद्देनजर रखते हुए अभी भी भोका है कि हम यह गलती सुधारें और उसका एक ही इलाज है। तिब्बत को सार्वभौमिक देश मानना हमने नहीं छोड़ा है इसको कभी न

छोड़ें। एक बात मैं और बता देना चाहता हूँ आपके माध्यम से उन लोगों को जो लोग देश की विदेश नीति तय करते हैं। हिन्दुस्तान में ही नहीं बल्कि दुनिया में यह कायदा न कि एक तो भौगोलिक सीमा हुआ करती है और कुछ ऐतिहासिक सीमाएँ भी हुआ करती हैं। मैं चाहूँगा कि जो लोग हमारी सीमा के बारे में बात करने जायें, कहीं भी जायें, उनको अशोक और अकबर को नहीं भूलना चाहिए। उनके नामों से होटल बनाने से काम नहीं चलेगा। जो वे कहा करते थे उनका भी ध्यान रखा जाना चाहिए। हिन्दुस्तान की कहने के लिये सीमा कराकोरम, जो कि पुरानी सीमा है, जिसको मैकमहोन लाइन कहते हैं, वह रही है। लेकिन सही मायनों में हमारी भौगोलिक सीमा हिन्दुकुश रही है। इसलिये भी हम चिन्तित होते हैं जब अफगानिस्तान में कोई मामला होता है। मैं आपसे बहुत विनम्रता के साथ निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि अगर तिब्बत आजाद रहता तब तो मैकमोहन लाइन हमारे देश की सीमा हो सकती थी, सीमा रेखा बन सकती थी। क्योंकि दो बड़े राष्ट्रों के बीच, जो अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय सिद्धांत है, उसके तहत एक बफर स्टेट की शक्ल पर कोई न कोई राज्य होता है और अगर तिब्बत आजाद नहीं रहता तो फिर मैं यह बात कहना चाहूँगा कि अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय जो नियम हैं, जो सिद्धांत हैं, उसके हिसाब से हमारी सीमा बने और उसके लिये नदियाँ, पहाड़, 6 सिद्धांत, बातें हैं, भाषा भूषा, नदी उसका डलान और पहाड़—ये सब चीजें जो रखी हुई हैं, उसी के आधार पर यह सब तय करें। आप एक और बात हमेशा याद रखियेगा कि कैलाश और मानसरोवर का हिन्दुस्तान के साथ एक आध्यात्मिक रिश्ता जुड़ा हुआ है, उसको कभी न नजरअंदाज करियेगा और अगर हिन्दुस्तान की पूरी सीमा निर्धारित पुरानी है तो मैं बहुत अदब के साथ कहना चाहूँगा कि अगर तिब्बत आजाद नहीं रहा तो फिर हिन्दुस्तान की सीमा कैलाश-मानसरोवर से छूती हुई जिसको चीनी भाषा में सांगको कहते हैं और जिसको पूर्व बाहिनी ब्रह्मपुत्र बहते

है। वह हिन्दुस्तान की सीमा रेखा बने। अगर यह हमारी सीमा रेखा बनती है तो मैं आपको यह भी कह देना चाहता हूँ कि यह धरती हिन्दुस्तान की है और रही हैं। कैलाश-मानसरोवर से भी 70 मील ऊपर एक गाँव मंसर है। हमारी नालाबगी रही वहाँ से हमारे खजाने में माल-गुजारी बसूल होती थी। हमारे पास 60-61 के रिकार्ड हैं कि मंसर गाँव की मालगुजारी हिन्दुस्तान लेता था। लेकिन यह हमारी नालाबगी है कि उस मंसर गाँव को हम लोगों ने छोड़ दिया। और मैं एक बात यह भी बता दूँ कि यह सब इलाका कैसे हिन्दुस्तान का था। क्योंकि अब कभी कोई हिन्दुस्तान में से कोई जियारा के लिए या तीर्थ यात्रा के लिए वहाँ गया था तो उस वक्त उसके सम्मान में यादगार के रूप में यह सब चीज तिब्बत को दे दी थी और एक गाँव अपने लिए रख लिया था। इस वास्ते मैं कह सकता हूँ कि अगर चीन इस बात की देखभाल करना चाहता है, अपनी रेखा की नहीं मानता है तो हम यह कहेंगे कि हमारी सीमा रेखा पूर्व-बाहिनी ब्रह्मपुत्र जिसको चीनी भाषा में सांगपो कहते हैं वह होगी क्योंकि, इसको भाँति करने के लिए यह है कि इससे 70 मील ऊपर तक का इलाका हमारे राज्य में था। 1961 का रिकार्ड इसका सबूत है। अब सबाल यह है कि हर देश की सीमाएँ नित्य नहीं बिड़ती। क्योंकि आज जो हो रहा है इसके पास जितनी धरती है उसको मान कर बैठ जाओ। यह हमारी विदेश नीति का अंग नहीं हो सकता। इस वास्ते मुझ जैसे लोगों ने जैसे शुरू में कहा कि हमारी चमड़ी को खतरा हो गया है, तो मुझ को अबान खोलनी पड़ी। मुझे ऐसा लग रहा है कि लोगों के दिमाग में है कि कहीं न कहीं इस बात को तय कर लें। मैं एक बात यह कह देना चाहता हूँ कि हमें अपनी विदेश नीति को नया आयात देना पड़ेगा और नया आयात देने के संबंध में मैं इतना ही कहना चाहता हूँ कि मेरे देश की धरती के साथ जिन मुल्कों की सीमाएँ छूती हैं वे मेरे हैं और उन देशों की सीमाएँ जिन दूसरे देशों की छूती हैं वे देश मेरे मित्र हो

सकते हैं। अगर इस आधार पर हम विदेश नीति का विकास करें तो यह हो सकता है कि हिन्दुस्तान में हम कोई अच्छी नीति बना सकेंगे। इसके साथ हिन्दुस्तान की जो खोई हुई इज्जत है वह मिल सकती है। मैं एक बात यह भी कह देना चाहता हूँ यह हमारा मामला सदियों से नहीं चला आया है। कभी हमको घबराना नहीं है। आज जो हिन्दुस्तान है वह आने वाले बीस पच्चीस वर्षों के बाद वैसा हिन्दुस्तान नहीं होगा। इस वास्ते आने वाली पीढ़ी के भविष्य को गिरवी नहीं रखना चाहिए। मुझे पुरा भरोसा है कि एक न एक दिन हमारा देश भारत मजबूत हिन्दुस्तान होगा और तब मजबूत हिन्दुस्तान मजबूत चीन के साथ बैठ कर कहेगा कि हमारे बाप-दादाओं ने जो गलती की है अगर समझौता करना है तो इस आधार पर करो, तो हमारा तुम्हारा समझौता हो सकता है। इस तरह फूँक फूँक कर के कदम रखना होगा। मैं सीमा वाली बात पर इतना ही कहना चाहता हूँ। जहाँ तक हिन्दुस्तान के तट का सबाल है तट हमारा नंगा है। धरती भी नंगी है। साथ ही साथ मैं एक बात कह देना चाहता हूँ वह यह है कि ...

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री सवाई सिंह सिसो-दिया) : निगम साहब, समय का भी खयाल रखें।

श्री लाडली मोहन निगम : बस एक मिनट। मेरे साथ हमेशा बर्दाश्तमती से अन्याय होता है। आपका बड़प्पन है जो आपने मुझे एक मिनट का समय दे दिया।

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री सवाई सिंह सिसो-दिया) : आपके साथी ने सब समय का उपवाग कर लिया।

श्री लाडली मोहन निगम : मैं एक ही बात कहना चाहता हूँ। मेरा कहना यह है कि हमारी कोई भी सीमा महफूज नहीं है। यह भी बता देना चाहता हूँ कि इसके साथ कुछ

[श्री लाडली मोहन निगम]
व्यापारिक, राजनीतिक उद्देश्य जुड़े हुए हैं। वह तो कल मैं कंसलटेंटिव कमेटी में आपको अर्ज कर चुका हूँ। मैं इतना ही कह देना चाहता हूँ कि सारे देश का भौगोलिक चित्र उस के साथ जुड़ा हुआ है, इतिहास उसके साथ जुड़ा हुआ है और दूसरी चीजें भी जुड़ी हुई हैं उनको ध्यान में रख कर चलें। एक बात अंत में यह कहता हूँ कि यह कभी मत भूलियेगा कि दुनिया बहुत तेजी से बदल रही है। हिन्दुस्तान जब आजाद हुआ था तब काले और गरी दुनिया का अनुपात तीन एक का था और आज वह घट कर दो एक का हो गया है। इस वास्ते मैं कहना चाहता हूँ, कल भी मैंने अर्ज किया था, सदा से यह कहता हूँ कि अब दुनिया बाईपोलर नहीं है दो ध्रुवों की नहीं है। दो नई दुनियाएँ बन चुकी हैं। एक दुनिया टोकियो से वाशिंगटन तक और दूसरी दुनिया होनोलूलू से काहिरा तक। हमको अपना दिमाग बना लेना चाहिए। नान-अलाइन्मेंट, ब्रिज लगाव वाली नीति कैसी है: लचर है मैं इस बहस में अभी नहीं पड़ना चाहता। मैं आज इस पर बहस नहीं करना चाहता। लेकिन मैं इतना कहना चाहता हूँ कि अपने अजीज अपने नजदीकी, अपने भाइयों में बिरादरी का वातावरण पैदा करें। आखिर में एक बात कहूँगा और अपनी बात खत्म करूँगा। हमारा बिलकुल निष्कर्ष का पड़ोसी भाई पाकिस्तान है। इधर बंगलादेश है। पाकिस्तान के साथ क्या रिश्ता होगा इस मामले में तात्कालिक निर्णय से कोई फायदा नहीं है। कल पाकिस्तान ने क्या किया, क्या-क्या गालियाँ दी, भुट्टो ने हजार वर्ष की गाली दी थी, इस सब को मन में रख कर न बैठ रहें। मैं यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि यह कभी मत भूलियेगा कि सरकारें कहीं न कहीं दुश्मन करती हैं लेकिन सरकारों के अलावा भी देश में जनता दुश्मन करती है। आज गैर सरकारी स्तर पर क्या आप कोशिश करेंगे कि हिन्दुस्तान और पाकिस्तान के लोगों में कम से कम संस्कृति का आदान-प्रदान हो। जितने कलाकार हैं, लेखक हैं उनको बिना वीसा, पासपोर्ट के

पाकिस्तान आने-जाने की सुविधा दे दो, खेल-खिलाड़ियों को आने-जाने की सुविधा दे दो।

हम 1982 के एशियाई देशों के खेल 6 P.M. आयोजित करना चाहते हैं। आपसे इतना ही निवेदन है कि अगर रिश्ते कुछ अच्छे बन सकें तो मेरा सपना एक ही है कि 1982 के एशियाई खेलों के मैदान में हिन्दुस्तान पाकिस्तान की सम्मिलित टीम उतरे और 1984 के ओलम्पिक में हिन्दुस्तान और पाकिस्तान की सम्मिलित टीम अमरीका जाकर खेले। तभी मैं समझता हूँ कि हमारी विदेश नीति का दायरा बड़ेगा और आप हिन्दुस्तान को एक नया आयाम देने की कोशिश करेंगे। आपका बहुत शुक्रिया, ज्यादा कहना चाहता था पर कह नहीं पा रहा हूँ। इतना ही कहना चाहता हूँ कि चमड़ी को बचाने के लिए अपनी आत्मा को मत बेंचे। चमड़ी तभी बचेगी जब आत्मा मजबूत बनी रहेगी।

SHRIMATI HAMIDA HABIBUL-LAH,
Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, at the very outset, I would like to congratulate our External Affairs Minister for following a policy which is not only unanimously accepted by most of the parties in our own country, but also lauded by the majority of the nations all over the world.

The spirit of Bandung which is being kept alive, and active by our foreign policy has influenced the freedom struggle of the oppressed peoples and has strengthened the non-aligned movement and efforts to achieve peace both by the United Nations and regional organizations such as ASEAN, that is, Association of South-East Asian Nations, with its basic idea of the establishment of peace, freedom and neutrality in South-East Asia.

I remember very well, Sir, that when the lion. Minister declared his Government's policy about Afghanistan, there was difference of opinion amongst some vested interests and some of our political parties, but very soon these misunderstandings were removed and it was realized

that our Government's bold stand about Afghanistan was the only way to view the problem. We were told that such a policy would isolate us, but now it has been realized by one and all that it was the correct policy and it is being appreciated by the people of Afghanistan, their Government and also by many countries all over the world.

I have attended a U.N. Conference in Copenhagen, I discussed this matter with a lot of people from different countries. Most of the countries felt that our foreign policy in this matter has been correct. They sympathised with us. They understood us and they admired us.

Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, our foreign policy can lead to success or ruin effecting the lives of millions of people in our country and in other countries. Therefore, we are happy to see that this country has stood for non-alignment since we attained freedom. With us, this matter of non-alignment is not a policy only because we can keep the see-saw of world rivalry in a state of balance. The basis of non-alignment in our country has been and must be enlightened self-interest as well as a forward look to eliminate reasons and attitudes which go to create wars which have always been catastrophic for the losers and which today will be catastrophic for losers and winners.

Through non-alignment we can certainly exercise a positive control of political atmospherics, and more important than that is that the Third World countries can conserve their search for qualified man-power and wealth to serve in the upgrading of their own peoples and for increasing the span of their own qualitative needs. Therefore, we find that the whole world is grateful to our great leader Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru for initiating this policy of non-alignment which is fortunately being followed in every detail by our country even today.

Sir, our stand on apartheid has been very consistent since the "days of Mahatma Gandhi and we are happy at the success of Zimbabwe. But, Sir, there are still many countries that are still suffering under the minority rule of the Whites. It is our duty to carry on with this support. The policy of non-alignment that we have always carried on has shown result. Sir, it is being appreciated by the people of Zimbabwe and they are thankful to India for all that it has done for them.

It is our Government and our Prime Minister who have shown the greatest concern for the two and a half million Palestinian people. These people have been suffering under the most diabolical and arrogant theocracy which equals the actions and ruthlessness of Adolf Hitler. It is India that is stretching a helping hand towards the Palestinian people. It is India that has appealed to the U.N. for maximum help of every kind to these suffering humanity.

Sir, the disgraceful news of Moshe Dayan's visit during the Janata rule was a great setback to our relationship with the Arab world. But I would again thank and congratulate our Foreign Minister for having not only saved the situation but completely regained the full confidence and gratitude of the Arab people by India's policy towards the Arabs. I witnessed the display of this affection and admiration at the World Conference when Leila Khalid of the PLO rushed up to greet the Indian delegation by saying that India was the best friend of the Palestinian Arab people.

Sir, we are spending 17 per cent of our budget on defence although ours is a vast country and we have many problems. We are told that certain neighbouring countries are being supplied arms and armaments by the Western powers. This, Sir, is very disturbing. Therefore, our policy to do everything possible to be friends with our neighbours is of great signi-

[Shrimati Hamida Habibullah] fllance. As far as Afghanistan is concerned, it is being appreciated fully by everyone and "I am happy that during our Foreign Minister's visit to the USSR, he impressed upon the USSR to withdraw some of the armies. This process, as we all know, has been started by the Soviet Government already.

Sir, one of the most alarming factors in the present situation is the presence of the Big Powers in our area. It seems that they have chosen Asia and Africa for settling their issues. A military base has been established in Diego Garcia. We are glad to hear that there is a demand that Diego Garcia should be restored to Mauritius as it was handed over to the USA by the British. Now Mauritius itself is demanding that it should be restored to their country. This has been supported by the African countries as well as France. This is a good opportunity for our Government to take the initiative in this matter and try to have the threat removed from the Indian Ocean.

Sir, we hear that Pakistan is spending 45 per cent of its budget on defence apart from the help they are getting from other countries. This is very alarming. But, Sir, Pandit Jawahar Lai Nehru and Indiraji have always taken the attitude of goodwill and friendship towards Pakistan. This must be stressed so that all suspicion in the minds of a neighbouring country, the suspicion which is very often injected by outside forces, can be removed. Some world forces do not want India and Pakistan to be friends and live in peace. But our country cannot develop or solve its problems unless we have peace. Therefore, it is essential to make Pakistan and China understand that it is in their own interest and our country's and our people's interest to be friends and to help each other in solving the problems. Sir, when people asked us if we had any trouble, I said we have to wage wars in our country, but our

war is against poverty, our war is against illiteracy, our war is against communal disharmony" and disease. These are the wars in which we want to fight. These are the wars in which we want to help the world to fight. These are the wars in which we want to co-operate and help everybody all over the world.

Sir, the question of Jerusalem has come up. The hon. Foreign Minister's statement in the UN was very clear and encouraging. India's stand for assistance to the Palestinian people inside and outside their territory is based on justice and fair play. India's stand has the support of the UN as well as almost all the countries of the world. Sir, when this amendment was brought in the UN Conference in Copenhagen, 85 per cent of the countries supported India's stand and lauded its policy. That is why I am saying that India has the support of the majority of the countries of the world in its foreign policy, specially in this matter. Sir, we must be firm in our decision to assist the people of the Palestine in every way possible.

Sir, I would like to bring to the kind notice of the Minister that our embassy—about some of our national issues—in Jeddah is considered to be rather in a shabby condition. Reports have come in that the staff is inadequate and inefficient. While about 200 people visit the embassy every day for visas and extension of visas, they seem not to get enough attention. I would be very grateful to the hon. Minister if he looked into this matter.

Sir, one other important point has come to our notice and that I would like to bring to his kind notice and that is that during our visits to various foreign countries we have often felt that is that during our visits to various countries in total agreement with our policies. I feel that it is very important that our representatives in foreign countries realise the significance of every aspect of our foreign policy and propagate it because that is what they are supposed to do.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI SAWAISINGH SISODIA): " Will you please conclude now?

SHRIMATI HAMIDA HABIBUL-LAH: I would like to conclude by congratulating the hon. Minister and our Government again on their brave decision to recognise the present Kampuchean Government of Mr. Heng Samrin. We are fully conscious of it and a lot has been said about it and therefore as I know that the time is short I won't go over into this matter. We are fully conscious of the pressures that we resisted and will have to be resisted by our Government. Not only is the hon. Minister correct in his policy but he has also shown to the world that India's non-alignment means standing by the right cause and not adopting a posture of equi-distance, as the hon. Member, Mr. Bhupesh Gupta has said.

Sir, these are the policies that are making India's image so high in the comity of nations, that we felt proud to be standing amongst 135 nations of the world where there was this Women's Conference, because it is the policy of India, the foreign policy of India, though we may be a poor country, but we have shown that we can stand on principles, that we stand on firm policies of equality, development and peace. These are the motives that are always guiding us and I think with our own eyes we are seeing the success of these great principles that we have adhered to. Sir, this is the reason that we are holding our own level and our honour is going up and up day by day. We are being respected and loved. This is what I want to stress. We are not only respected but also loved by the developing countries, by the downtrodden nations of the world and that is what we have to be proud of. I think it does not matter what party anybody belongs to but I know everybody is happy with the policy that our Government and the hon. Minister is pursuing, and that is why I would like to end by a small couplet in Urdu

because I know the hon. External Affairs Minister certainly follows it extremely well.

“कुछ बात है कि हस्ती मिटती नहीं हमारी
सदियों रहा है दुश्मन दौरे जमा हमारा।”

Thank you, Sir, very much.

PROF. RASHEEDUDDIN KHAN (Nominated): Sir, the value of listening to many illuminating speeches by one's compeers is sometimes outweighed by the limitation of time which is available to a person to make his own submission. Sir, it has been my dubious distinction almost to be the last speaker for the last ten years in this august House. It is, Sir, none of your fault. I only pity my categorisation as such. That unfortunate categorisation persists because for reasons of independence of judgment and freedom of expression, I have voluntarily abjured the pleasure of belonging to one Or the other party. Therefore, one has to pay some price. Among the lower prices probably which I pay is to be heard at the end. But since I have in Mr. Nara-simha Rao a Minister who has known me in and out of office as a good old *Hyderabadi* subscribing to the values of composite culture which is so exemplified in his own personality and part of which I think is reflected in mine as well, I need not take more time to emphasise some of the points.

Sir, I think, parliamentary system is a system by discussion. But the logic of parliamentary system does not stop there. Discussion unless it becomes an input into the policy formulation, becomes an academic exercise worth a university but not worth the Parliament. Therefore, I do hope that the many positions which have been articulated by the distinguished Members of Parliament belonging to many ideological hues and shades will be taken note of by the Minister.

Sir, the annual discussion on the working of the Ministry affords one an opportunity to highlight, what I would like to submit, the new, the

[Prof. Rasheeduddin Khan]

different and the specific aspects of international policy as of now. No purpose will be served by harping on the historic background; no purpose will be served by articulating an essay on what should be the normative basis of foreign policy. I do not propose to do anything of the sort. What I propose to do to start with is to submit for the consideration of this distinguished Foreign Minister and the Ministry what are the new aspects which appear to me as worthy of being considered as larger framework within which foreign policy postures and operations have to be worked out.

Ten important events mark the beginning of the decade of eighties. May I attempt to briefly enumerate them.

Marked decline in the atmosphere of detente which has been mentioned by almost everybody in the House between the two major global powers and generation of a new process of cold war marked by confrontationist approach, increase ' in misperception, misrepresentation and mistrust in diplomacy coupled with new spurt in arms' race, accumulation of nuclear warheads and increase in defence budgets all over the world at a time when inflation and stagflation is also there. Secondly, within the context of the decline in the atmosphere of detente, emergence of what I would call plurality of policy postures within the ranks of western alliance system as exemplified by the overtures of France and the Federal Republic of Germany; in other words, monolith of western power alliance does not exist. Plurality of posturing is also there. Thirdly, despite all this, an increasing congruence of the interest of trilateral commission in the comity of nations which is increasing year after year. I have been submitting for the consideration of the Foreign Ministers of India year after year that a very careful study of the working of trilateral commission is called

for. The trilateral commission today representing North America, the U.S.A., Canada on the one side, Western Europe on the other side and Japan, has almost become the main convergence point of multi-national operation on the one side and different policy perspectives on the other side. Much of the work of this trilateral commission is known, but a large part of it is not known. Our intelligence, our diplomatic intelligence ought to be called in question in order to work it out. This convergent interests sometimes take a global commercial operation and concomitant diplomatic postures which can only be analysed when you see certain congruence of interests between the U.S.A., Canada, Western Europe and Japan.

The fourth aspect which I would like to briefly mention is the unquiet situation in Iran and Afghanistan possessing alarming propensity for destabilisation in the whole region. I will leave it at that.

The fifth aspect is the dichotomy in the foreign policy articulations of Pakistan, a dichotomy reflected in the body politic of Pakistan, which is reflected by forces and impulses which want regional peace and progress and forces and impulses within Pakistan which still cling to old prejudices, old myths and habitual dependence on obsolete alliances. Hot and cold is being blown from Pakistan which makes difficult for us to know as to how do we stand vis-a-vis Pakistan. I would yield to nobody in my anxiety to work out a cohesive pattern of mutually beneficial relations, bilateral relations, with Pakistan, as with China. But is it possible for us to own the fact that when we speak of Pakistan, we are not speaking of one Pakistan, because, Pakistan in the morning is different from Pakistan in the afternoon and Pakistan in the afternoon is different from Pakistan in the evening and so on?

The sixth aspect I would mention is the new attempts to create chaos and problems in South-East Asia, especially, the attempts to generate a proxy war again by converging on the unfortunate, but heroic land of Vietnam, Kampuchea and Laos. It is in this context our recognition of the Heng Samrin Government of Kampuchea, about which I also had the privilege of speaking to the Foreign Minister and also to the Prime Minister, is most welcome, because, you have rendered help to a country which is today fighting against the forces of destabilisation. It is a country which has been the cockpit of regional rivalry. The main problem in Kampuchea is vacuum. An authentic, indigenous and stable rule by the Kampuchean people is not there. Hence, this vacuum has to be filled in either by a power which is inclined towards Peking or by a power which is inclined towards Hanoi. It is a fact that the Heng Samrin Government is inclined towards Hanoi. But are we not also friendly with Hanoi? Hence, is it not in our larger national interests to rather support a regime which is inclined towards Hanoi rather than a regime which is inclined towards Peking or towards the crack-pot regime of Pol Pot?

The seventh aspect I would like to mention is that the increasing collaboration between the U.S.A., China, and Japan has almost acquired grave regional dimensions and, of course, grave global dimensions. All the overtures are made, because, the U.S.A., especially, under the Breznev-ski perception of foreign policy, finds China as the kingpin of the alliance and Japan, as the largest industrial Asian power, as an old ally. There is a clear deadlock in the dialogue—I would emphasise the words 'clear dead-lock'—in the North-South dialogue, as exemplified in the unfortunate failure of the UNIDO III, which met in New Delhi, under the distinguished Chairmanship of our Foreign Minister. This was symptomatic of a point which has been

reached where the industrialised countries of the North are incapable of accommodating the genuine and legitimate demands of the countries of the South. A stalemate, an unfortunate stalemate, in the role and effectiveness of the non-aligned movement is also to be noted. This point, I am afraid, has not been made by any Member. I would like to emphasise that the non-aligned movement has remained a structure without action. It has remained a repository of hope without effectiveness. Its increase in number is not concomitantly underlined with its major role. A large number of members of the United Nations are its members.

The last aspect of this specific situation is decline in the entire security atmosphere, specially in the Indian Ocean, decline in the security atmosphere in the Indian Ocean region by increasing naval movement of U.S. nuclear fleet, expansion of Diego Garcia base and reported preparation of an offensive strategy worked out by the Pentagon for the U.S. of rapid deployment forces for the occupation of the Gulf region, in the eventuality of the increase of energy crisis on the one side and decline of Western interest on the other side. May I here read out what the U.S. Secretary of Defence Harold Brown had to say? I quote:

"The chaos in Iran and the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan, Brown said, have emphasized that the challenges to U.S. vital interests and security are not 'confined' to Europe.

To deal with contingencies in the Persian Gulf-Indian Ocean-Southwest Asia region, Brown pointed out, ships are now being prepositioned in the Indian Ocean with enough equipment and supplies to support a marine amphibious brigade and several air force fighter squadrons. "Ultimately," he said, "we will expand this to a capability sufficient to support three such brigades for four weeks."

[Prof. Rasheeduddin Khan]

Noting that the U.S. Naval presence in the region has been increased, the Defence Secretary said the U.S. Naval forces currently in the Indian Ocean are 'by far the strongest over to sail those waters.'

This is from the United States 'Background' of the International Communication Agency, dated July 30, 1980, which yesterday I got. So, this is the aspect they have given.

Therefore, within these ten specific developments we have to analyse the relevance of the India's foreign policy. I will here take two minutes to show that we have to have clarity of major assumptions and I will very briefly mention four of them.

Firstly, non-alignment is not a substitute for a foreign policy. Non-alignment is a framework of perception only. Therefore, we should not confuse between foreign policy and non-alignment as such. Non-alignment, of course, is not neutrality, it is not non-involvement, it is not non-commitment, it is not non-engagement in major issues, it is not isolation, it is not insulation from global or regional problems. On the other hand, I would call it 'new alignment' based on positive values of international life, like, peace, security, justice, equality, mutual benefit. It is new commitment to values of new international order. It is commitment, of course, to anti-imperialism, anti-colonialism, anti-racialism, anti-domination, anti-hegemonism, but above all, it is an approach for assertion of sovereignty in international politics and for the capacity not to play a pre-aligned role to any military or power bloc. That should be the only perception within which we should speak about non-alignment—whether they are genuine or not. Adjectives here and there, sometimes here and there, are enemy of the noun. In this case I find any adjective prefixed or suffixed to the term 'non-alignment' weakens its intensity in its real sense.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI SAWAISINGH SISODIA): Professor, there are still two hon. Members to speak. Please conclude now.

PROF. RASHEEDUDDIN KHAN: The Minister is willing to hear. The hon. Members are willing to hear. I am sure, you are also willing to be indulgent to me.

Then, Sir, bilateralism, sometimes, was over-emphasized. Shri Atal Bi-hari Vajpayee used to take pride in saying that it was one of the achievements of the Janata Party, that we have bilateralism. Bilateralism, yes, but not bilateralism contra multilateralism. Some hsnogover of Janata Party's aberrations, sometimes, one detects in foreign policy articulation even now. Of course, it is a big strain on the otherwise able bureaucracy, capable and skilful in its mind to attune to the changing political orientation. Therefore, bilateralism should not be over-emphasised to the total oversight of regional compulsions, hemispheric compulsions and multilateralism.

Thirdly, I say, Sir, my friend Mr. Shahabuddin is not here. I am happy that now he is a Member of Parliament. Sometimes it is better to externalise confusion rather than have it internalised in the Ministry, because if it is externalised it is ridiculous; if it is internalised, it takes long years to find out where it has gone wrong and the poor Minister has to be answerable for all the aberrations of an otherwise able member of the Ministry. Therefore, I am happy that Mr. Shahabuddin is a Member of a distinguished and democratic Parliament. But is it possible to talk of an equidistant view between any two powers? I will start from the philosophical position as such.

FJHRI P. V. NARASIMHA RAO: He was speaking for his party. He did not carry anything from the MEA.

PROF. RESHEEDUDDIN KHAN: j
He speaks not only for his party but

he has imprisoned his party into this wrong picture.

Is it possible to only speak of two super powers by emphasising one dimension of the fact, which is, of course, that the Soviet Union and the USSR are super powers in terms of power capability? But apart from the power capability, in terms of orientation, in terms of perspective, one need not be a Marxist, one need not be a member of the Communist Party; one has only to be a realist and patriotic to understand that you just cannot equate divergent powers like the Soviet Union and the United States. There may be aspects which appear to be similar. There may be convergence of the policy operation as well—as far example the NPT. But when you do a clear analysis, to say that non-alignment can only be authenticated if there is equi-distance between the United States and the USSR is a ridiculous simplification of a highly complex international phenomenon I will leave it at that.

Therefore, Sir, I will say that we have to be very careful about the pathological obsession of certain parties and individuals. By speaking of the USA and the Soviet Union in the same breath and thereby appearing as a fair-minded, just balanced and unimpeachable person is not unimpeachable.

Lastly, they need to work out a clear framework of accord and discord between each of the larger powers, the regional powers and the world powers and India. Therefore, I say that divergence and conflict of interest's lead to divergence and conflict of perception of world forces and the international situation, which in turn, leads to differentiation in assumptions, formulations and postures. Therefore if there is divergence and conflict of interests between the Soviet Union and the United States, between the USA and France, between FRG and the USA, between China and the Soviet Union and between Vietnam and China, that has to be carefully analysed. Any attempt

to put in ideological strait jacket the powers which are ideologically similar, which in terms of arms capability are similar is highly simplifying and it should be avoided. In this framework we have to realise how do we harmonise and reconcile our interests in terms of national security, in terms of national development with other powers. Sir, is it possible to own up that the process of destabilisation is on? Still the world is moving towards a position where confrontation is making developing countries stagnant and marking time. The whole process of destabilisation is working in a manner that—I may be allowed to advance a hypothesis—it appears to me—I hope I am not over-emphasising, but even if I am over-emphasising, it is only for your consideration—that India is being encircled. And let me point out that the encirclement of India from 1971 is almost becoming a fact. We find that it is not possible for us to generate development. A large chunk of the national budget, which anyhow is upset by inflation, is diverted to defence structuring, of course, in terms of per capita requirement, our requirements of defence is many times higher than that of Pakistan or anybody. Any argument either of Pakistan or any country that your total Defence outlay is far in excess of ours is also a fact but it is due to the fact that you have to defend a very large frontier. Hence, Sir, encirclement of India is weakening the largest non-aligned power, is weakening the largest participatory democracy in the world, is weakening a new experiment, a new strategy that is attempting to reconcile the open society principle on the one side with planning on the other side for a freer society. Is it only by accident that the United States always supports dynastic regime or static regime or non-democratic regime? Is it again by accident that the Soviet Union is interested in the stability of India? The interest of the Soviet Union in the stability of India is also in its own national interest. The destabilisation of India, it appears to me—and I am

[Prof. Rasheeduddin Khan]

very unhappy to say so—is in the interests of the United States of America. It is an attempt of weakening India.

Let all of us remember that parties come and parties go. Machinations from outside, supported by subversion from inside, are not allowing India to become a stable power. When Nixon had come to India when Jawaharlal Nehru was the Prime Minister, Nixon asked Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, "What do you think is the major requirement of India?" And Jawaharlal Nehru said: "Two generations of uninterrupted peace is the major requirement of India." Alas! not even one generation of uninterruptedness. Our neighbours in the east and the north and others also have to see what are the powers we can harmonise. But our attempt to normalise relations does not mean we own up these basic divergencies.

Lastly, I would say in the Indian Ocean India will have to take initiative. There is no doubt that with the increase of ballistic missile technology starting from IRBM to ICBM and from IOBM to SLBM in which Polaris and Poseidon submarines today are capable of striking with nuclear warheads in a circumference of 2,500 nautical miles and more, we have to take a certain position there. You just cannot avoid it because the Indian Ocean on the one side has Africa and the Gulf; on another side is South Asia and on the other side are South-East Asia and Australia. I think some efforts should be made to stop the increase of naval presence attuned to war. Of course, it is an international highway. Maritime powers come and go, facilities are as possible. But one has to draw a distinction between building and expanding of a naval base as in Diego Garcia under the auspices of Britain and U.S. and naval facilities enjoyed by others.

India also has a role to play in the non-aligned movement. Non-aligned movement, after the Havana Summit

is just marking time. Cuba probably is handicapped for a variety of reasons which are international, but India is not handicapped. You have to play your role and probably the forthcoming congress of 1981 might be an occasion when India can articulate an authentic position on behalf of the whole non-aligned movement. So, initiative should be taken. In initiative I would say, caution—yes, hesitation—no. I said this earlier also. The feeling is that sometimes India does not take the initiative because it is afraid its initiative might fail. So what? If it fails, it fails. Good things also fail in life. But only if success or failure is the yardstick, when you take the initiative, initially be very clear.

China's perception of the world today, I would like to make it very clear, runs counter to our national interest. Bilateralism with China, yes—but not on China's terms. I have submitted a map of China to you sometime back, which you also possess, published in 1954, which China has not withdrawn. The Kuomintang regime has withdrawn but the historical set of Contemporary China published in 1954 includes areas like Kirgizia and Kazakhstan in the Soviet Union, Aksai Chin, parts of Kashmir, Nepal, Sikkim, Bhutan, NEFA, Burma, the Andaman and Nicobar Islands, Kampuchea, Thailand, Nagaland, Haiphong island, Korea, Mongolia, etc. This is an alarming position. When we sit with China, we do not speak of ping pong game, we do not speak of folk-lore or that over 5,000 years China has developed a great civilization. We have also developed a great civilization. We have to take China as it is today. And China as it is today is the world's biggest splitting power—a power which is attempting to radically change the situation—a movement is going on—on one side and weaken India on the other. I have no doubt in my mind that China's postures towards India had been the biggest factor in destabilisation. Therefore, it is not possible to overlook that? The main adversaries are

China and Pakistan among our neighbours and the United States among the global powers. Again I would like to add that I would like you to work out intimate contacts with Pakistan, especially because of the cultural and ethnic ties and not treating Pakistan as a garrison State and making it impossible for the people of Pakistan to live peacefully.

I would only end by saying that these are the matters to which the other Members have also drawn your attention and which we have to work out. Unless they are worked out in a specific manner—generalities will not do—it is not going to help us. I am glad the stand on foreign policy has always been one of national consensus. I may add here that for the first time we have a Foreign Minister for whom there is considerable national consensus because Mr. Nara-simha Rao is a person with a sense of composite culture, he has a sense of balancing and a sense of non-partisanship. This is a happy augury but this may not last for ever. You should not be content with the encomiums paid to you because the encomiums can turn sour after some time. The Members of Parliament are hard task masters and they are reflecting the mood of the people. You are today riding the crest of popularity and with proper understanding by Mrs. Indira Gandhi of the exigencies of the international situation you are very well placed. Take initiative now on the questions of the Indian Ocean, South-East Asia, South Asia and work out a policy which should be not only responsive to the needs of the world but should be a pioneering policy which is able to bring peace, prosperity and justice to the world.

Thank you, Mr. Vice-Chairman. I have no words to thank you for your patience. You have borne with me more than I expected you to be capable of bearing with me.

شہری شریف الدین شارق (جموں و

کشمیر): جذاب وائس چیرمین صاحب۔

اپنے ملک کی وزارت خارجہ کی کارکردگی کے بارے میں جو ہمارے یہاں صبح سے بحث چل رہی ہے جناب وزیر خارجہ کو میں مبارکباد دیتا ہوں کہ بہت دھیان اور بہت صبر سے وہ یہاں بیٹھے ہوئے ہیں اور ہمارے خیالات سن رہے ہیں۔ خارجہ پالیسی کی مقبولیت کا ایک امتحان ہوتا ہے اور اس کا معیار ہوتا ہے۔ جس وقت ہم اپنی خارجہ پالیسی کی مقبولیت کو دیکھتے ہیں تو قریب ترین ہمسائیگی کو ہم دیکھتے ہیں۔ ہمارا قریب ترین چین ہے۔ جس کے زندہ باد کے نعرے پتھ شیل زندہ باد کے نعرے ہندی چینی بھٹی بھائی کے نعرے دیتے دیتے ہمارا گلا پک گیا تھا آج اس کے ساتھ ہمارے تعلقات اچھے نہیں ہیں۔ پاکستان دوسرا قریب ترین ہمسایہ ہے۔ اس کے ساتھ تعلقات میں کوئی پیس رفت نہیں ہوئی۔ بلکلہ دیس کے ساتھ ہمارے تعلقات ہیں لیکن جس حد تک ہم نے بلکلہ دیس کی مدد کی جس حد تک ہمارے تعلقات ہونے چاہیئے تھے بالکل وہ نہیں ہیں۔ اب ایک ہمسایہ ہمارا تھا افغانستان۔ جس کے ساتھ ہمارے بہت قریبی تعلقات تھے اور مشکل اوقات میں ان کی آواز بھی ہمارے حق میں اٹھتی تھی لیکن لگتا ہے جس وقت اس کو مشکل درپیش آئی اس کے بارہوس کی خلاف ورزی کی گئی ہے

[شری شریف الدین شارق]
 تو ہم سیاسی گورکھ دھندے کے جواب
 دیتے ہیں - اس کے بارے میں واضح
 طور پر بات نہیں کہتے کہ روسیوں
 کو وہاں سے نکالنا چاہیئے - اور ہر
 صورت میں نکالنا چاہیئے - ہم جواب
 دیتے ہیں کہ دیکھو جی روس کی
 موجودگی تو اچھی نہیں ہے لیکن
 روس کی موجودگی کو موجودہ
 بین الاقوامی حالات سے دیکھنا چاہیئے -
 یہ تو الفاظ کا گورکھ دھندہ ہے - جہاں
 ہم تبت میں چین کی موجودگی
 کی مزمت کرتے ہیں جہاں ہم ویت نام
 میں امریکہ کی مزمت کرتے ہیں
 وہاں ہمیں کہلے دل سے روس کی
 مزمت کرنی چاہیئے اور کہنا چاہیئے
 کہ اس کو وہاں سے جانا چاہیئے -
 کیونکہ ہماری خارجہ پالیسی کو
 بنیاد اخلاقی بنیادوں پر کھڑی کی
 گئی ہے - اور ہم نے یہ وعدے کئے
 ہیں کہ ہم کمزوروں کی مدد کے لئے
 آواز اٹھائیں گے اور کمزور کون ہے ؟
 جتنے بھی دنیا میں ہیں گلوب میں
 ہیں جن کا راستہ صحیح ہو ہم
 ان کی مدد کریں گے ان کو سہانتا
 دیں گے ان کی موری حمایت کریں گے -
 لیکن یہاں خارجہ پالیسی کی غور
 جانبداری کی بات تو کرتے ہیں لیکن
 بدقسمتی سے خود روس کی گود میں
 چلے گئے ہیں - اس چھڑ کو ہم
 جتنا چھپانے کی کوشش کر لیں
 چھپے گی نہیں - وہاں روس کی

فوجیں بچوں پر اور عورتوں کے اوپر
 ہم برساتی ہیں لیکن ہم اخلاقی طور
 پر جیسے کمزور پڑے ہوئے ہیں یہ
 نہیں کہتے ہیں کہ ان کو واپس
 نکالنا چاہیئے - یہ انٹرنیشنل غلط
 کردی کرتے ہیں بین الاقوامی غلط
 کردی کرتے ہیں - اسی وقت یہ کہا
 جا سکتا ہے کہ ہم نے اپنے ہمسائے کے
 ساتھ وفا کیا ہے - جس وقت اس کو
 مشکل درپیش آئی - بتصر حال
 ہمیں اپنے وزیر خارجہ پر پوائنٹ منسٹر
 پر دوراندیشی پر ان کے معاملہ فہمی
 پر مکمل اعتماد ہے اور یقین ہے کہ
 اس بات کو وہ یوری طرح توجہ کے
 ساتھ اب یہ اس بات کو یقینی بنائیں
 گے کہ اپنے ہمسائیوں کے ساتھ قریب ترین
 ہمسائیوں کے ساتھ ہمارے تعلقات
 عزت آبرو اور مساوات کی بنیاد پر
 درست ہوں صحیح ہوں - کیونکہ ہم
 ایک ترقی پذیر ملک ہیں - ہمارے
 لاکھوں غریب عوام جو اس وقت کھڑا
 روٹی اور مکان کے لئے محتاج ہیں
 اگر ہمارے ہر اپنے ہمسائے کے ساتھ
 تعلقات ٹھیک ہوں تو نتیجہ کے طور
 پر ہمارا کروڑوں عربوں روپے جو ہم
 ڈیفینس پر خرچ کرتے ہیں اس میں
 کمی کرے ہم اپنے ترقی کے پلان کو
 زیادہ اچھی طرح سے آگے لے جا
 سکیں گے -

ایوان میں امریکہ کی مداخلت
 کے بارے میں بھی ہمیں واضح طور

پر اپنی پالیسی اپنانی چاہیے - یہ تو بڑی طاقتوں کا کھیل ہے جو غریب ممالک میں مختلف چالاکیوں سے ان کے وسائل پر قبضہ کرنے کے لئے جہ-ے کہیں تھل ہے کہیں کڑا ہے کہیں کچھ ہے اس پر قبضہ کرنے کے لئے اپنی دھونس جانے کے لئے اس کو سیاسی کھیل میں پھاساتے ہیں۔ تو فور جانبداری کا تقاضہ یہ ہونا چاہیئے کہ ہم قہر کی چوٹ سے ان سے یہ کہہ دیں کہ ہم سمجھ جاتے ہیں تمہاری چالاکیوں کو اور اب ہم ان چالاکیوں میں پھنسنے والے نہیں ہوں چاہے وہ کوئی ہو یا نہیں کہ کوئی ہمیں پسند ہے تو اس کی فائدہ دہی کو ہم پسند کرتے ہیں خالص مرشد رہتے ہیں اور کوئی ہمیں ناپسند ہو اس کی فاطی کو ہم اچھالتے ہیں یہ ہمارا معیار نہیں ہونا چاہیئے۔

میں جناب وزیر خارجہ کو اور گورنمنٹ آف انڈیا کو اس بات پر مبارکباد دینا ہوں جو انہوں نے کمپوچیا کو تسلیم کر اس کی سرکار کو تسادم کر کے ایک انقلابی قدم اٹھایا اگرچہ دیر سے اٹھایا لیکن ہندوستان کی لاکھوں عوام کے دلوں کی صحیح ترجمانی کی ہے - اس کے لئے یہ لوگ مبارکباد کے مستحق ہیں۔

† [آئی شریف الدین شاریک (جمنم آئی کاشمیر) : جتنا بائیں چہرے میں ساہو،

سر، ہمارے ملک کی بیزارتے خوارجا کی کارکردگی کے بارے میں ہمارے یہاں سوچ سے بھرا ہوا ہے۔ جتنا بڑی خوارجا کو میں مبارکباد دیتا ہوں جو کہ بہت دھیان سے اور بہت سہر سے یہاں بیٹے ہوئے ہیں اور ہمارے خیالات میں رہے ہیں۔ خوارجا پالیسی کی مقبولیت کا ایک امتحان ہوتا ہے اور اسکا معیار ہوتا ہے۔ جس وقت ہم اپنی خوارجا پالیسی کی مقبولیت کو دیکھتے ہیں تو کریب ترین ہمسایگی کو ہم دیکھتے ہیں۔ ہمارے کریب ترین چین ہے جس کے جینداواہ کے نادرے، پانچولی جینداواہ کے نادرے، ہندی-چینی بائی-بائی کے نادرے دتے-دتے ہمارا گلا پک گیا تھا آج اس کے ساتھ ہمارے تاللوکات اچھے نہیں ہیں۔ پاکستان دوسرا کریب ترین ہمسایہ ہے۔ اس کے ساتھ تاللوکات میں کوئی پش رفت نہیں ہوئی۔ بائنگلا دیش کے ساتھ ہمارے تاللوکات ہیں لیکن جس حد تک ہم نے بائنگلا دیش کی مدد کی اس حد تک ہمارے تاللوکات ہونے چاہیئے تھے گالیبن وہ نہیں ہیں۔ اب ایک ہمسایہ ہمارا تھا آفغانستان جس کے ساتھ ہمارے بہت کریب تاللوکات تھے اور مشکل آکات میں ان کی آواز بھی ہمارے ہک میں آئی تھی لیکن لگتا ہے جس وقت اس کو مشکل درپش آئی اس کے باؤرنج کی خیلاف ورنج کو گئی تو ہم سیاسی گورخ دھ کے جواب دتے ہیں۔ اس کے بارے میں بائیا تیر پر یہ بات نہیں کہتے کہ روسیوں کو وہاں سے نکلنا چاہیئے اور ہر سورت میں نکلنا چاہیئے۔ ہم جواب دتے ہیں کہ دیکھو جی روس کی موجدگی تو اچھی نہیں ہے لیکن روس کی موجدگی کو موجد بائن ایلکوامی حالات سے دیکھنا چاہیئے۔ یہ تو ایلکاج کا گورخ دھ ہے جہاں ہم تیوقت میں چین کی موجدگی کی موممت کرتے رہے جہاں ہم ویننام میں امریکا کی موممت کرتے رہے وہاں ہمیں خولے دل سے روس کی موممت کرنی چاہیئے اور کہنا چاہیئے کہ اس کو وہاں سے جانا چاہیئے۔ کیونکہ ہماری خوارجا پالیسی

[श्री शरीफुद्दीन शारिक]

की बुनियाद एखलाकी बुनियादों पर खड़ी की गई है। और हमने यह वायदे किए हैं कि हम कमजोरों की मदद के लिए आवाज उठाएंगे और कमजोर कौन है? जितने भी दुनिया में हैं, ग्लोब में हैं, जिनका रास्ता सही हो हम उनकी मदद करेंगे उनको सहायता देंगे, उनकी मोरली हिमायत करेंगे। लेकिन यहां खारजा पालिसी की गैर जानिबदारी की बात तो करते हैं लेकिन बदकिस्मती से खुद रूस की गोद में चले गये हैं। इस चीज को हम जितना छुपाने की कोशिश कर लें छुपेगी नहीं। वहां रूस की फौजें बच्चों पर और औरतों पर बम बरसाती हैं लेकिन हम इखलाकी तौर पर जैसे कमजोर पड़े हुए हैं ये नहीं कहते हैं कि उनको वापस निकलना, चाहिए। ये इन्टरनेशनल गुंडागर्दी करते हैं, बैनअलकवामी गुंडागर्दी करते हैं। इसी वक्त यह कहा जा सकता है कि हमने अपने हमसाथे के साथ वफा किया है जिस वक्त उसको मुश्किल दरपेश आई। बहरहाल हमें अपने वजीरे खारजा पर, प्राइम मिनिस्टर पर, उनकी दूरदेशी पर उनके मुआमला फहमी पर मुक्कमल एतमाद है और यकीन है कि इस बात को वह पूरी तरह तबज्जो के साथ अब इस बात को यकीनी बनायेंगे कि अपने हम साथों के साथ, करीब तरीन हमसाथों के साथ, हमारे तालुकात, इज्जत आबरू और मसावात की बुनियाद पर दुरस्त हों, सही हों क्योंकि हम एक तरक्की पजीर मुल्क हैं। हमारे लाखों गरीब आबाम जो इस वक्त कपड़ा, रोटी और मकान के लिए मोहताज हैं अगर हमारे हर अपने हमसाथे के साथ तालुकात ठीक हों तो नतीजे के तौर पर हमारा करोड़ों अरबों रुपये जो हम डिफेंस पर खर्च करते हैं उसमें कमी करके हम अपने तरक्की के प्लान को ज्यादा अच्छी तरह से आगे ले जा सकेंगे।

ईरान में अमरीका की मदाखलत के बारे में भी हमें वाजे तौर पर अपनी

पालिसी अपनानी चाहिए। यह तो बड़ी ताकतों का खेल है जो गरीब मुमालक हों मुख्तलिफ चालाकियों से उनके वसायल पर कब्जा करने के लिए। कहीं तेल है कहीं कोयला है कहीं कुछ है उस पर कब्जा करने के लिए अपनी धाँस जमाने के लिए उसको सियासी खेल में फंसाते हैं। तो गैर-जानिबदारी का तकाजा है, यह होना चाहिए कि हम डंके की चोट से उनसे यह कह दें कि हम समझ जाते हैं तुम्हारा चालाकियों को और अब हम इन चालाकियों में फंसने वाले नहीं हैं चाहे वह कोई हो या नहीं कि कोई हमें पसंद है तो उसकी गुंडागर्दी को हम पसंद करते हैं खामोश रहते हैं और कोई हमें नापसंद हो तो उसकी गलती को हम उछालते हैं यह हमारा मयार नहीं होना चाहिए।

मैं जनाब बजीरे खारजा को और गवर्नमेंट आफ इंडिया को इस बात पर मुबारकवाद देता हूँ जो उन्होंने कम्पूचिया को तसलीम कर उसकी सरकार को तसलीम करके एक इन्क्लाबी कदम उठाया, अगरचे देर से उठाया, लेकिन हिन्दोस्तान की लाखों आबाम के दिलों की सही तरजुमानी की है। इसके लिए यह लोग मुबारक बाद के मुस्तहक हैं।

उपसमाध्यक्ष (श्री सदाई सिंह सिसौदिया) : जनाब, टाइम का ख्याल रखेंगे।

شری شریف الدین شارق : بالکل

بالکل جواب - یہ تو میں آخر میں آیا ہوں -

†[श्री शरीफुद्दीन शारिक : बि.कुल बि.कुल जनाब। यह तो मैं आखिर में आया हूँ।

उपसमाध्यक्ष (श्री सदाई सिंह सिसौदिया) : एक साहब को और बोलना है।

†[] Devanagari transliteration.

شری شریف الدین شارق : بہر حال

جس سلسلہ میں ہمارے وزیر خارجہ اور ہمارے گورنمنٹ پاکستان کے ساتھ تعلقات اچھے بنانے کے لئے دور دھوپ کر رہی ہے تبہ دورہ کر رہی ہے اس بارے میں ہم کو یقین ہو جانا چاہیئے کہ ساری قوم سارے ملک کی عوام ان کے ساتھ ہیں۔ پاکستان کے حکمران تک کے ایک طرف چھوڑ کر وہاں کے جتنے بھی غریب عوام ہیں ان کے دلوں میں ہندوستان کے لئے ان کے عوام کے لئے کافی عزت ہے کافی احترام ہے اور وہ بھی ایک مصیبت میں تلک آگئے ہیں اور وہ بھی چاہتے ہیں کہ ہندوستان کے ساتھ ہمارے تعلقات اچھے ہوں۔ اس سلسلہ میں گزارہ کروں گا کہ پاکستان نے کشمیر کے ایک حصہ پر بڑے عرصہ سے قبضہ کر رکھا ہے۔ بات چیت کرتے وقت اس بات کو ضرور مد نظر رکھا جائے۔ کہ وہ حصہ ہمیں کم سے کم واپس دلوا دیا جائے اور اس بات چیت میں کشمیر کے نمائندوں کو شامل کیا جائے تو زیادہ بہتر ہے۔ یہی حال کراکورم کا جو ہائی وے پاکستان نے چین کے ساتھ مل کر بنایا ہے اس میں بھی کشمیر کا بہت سا حصہ اپنے نیچے لے رکھا ہے۔ اس سلسلہ میں جس وقت بھی آپ چین کے ساتھ بات کریں گے اس وقت آپ اس بات کا ضرور خیال رکھیں گے۔

تو ہمارے یہاں دوسری دقت ہے جو میں آپ کی موجودگی کا فائدہ اٹھاتا ہوں۔ پاسپورٹ اور ویزا کے سلسلہ میں پچھلی سرکار نے پاسپورٹ کا ایک آفس سرینگر میں رکھا تھا لیکن اس کے وہ مقاصد پورے نہیں ہو رہے ہیں۔ میں محترم وزیر خارجہ سے گزارش کروں گا کہ کشمیری عوام ہندوستان اور پاکستان کی تین جنگوں میں ملک میں سب سے زیادہ متاثر ہو گیا اور تقسیم ہو گئی ہماری مالیات - ہماری پریشانیوں پر بھی ہیں۔ ماں سرحد کے پار ہے تو بیٹی اس طرف - بیٹی کی شادی ہو رہی ہے تو اس کا باپ نہیں آسکتا۔ بھائی ایک باہر ہے تو ایک بھائی بہن یہاں ہیں۔ باپ وہاں ہے تو بیٹا یہاں ہے۔ تو یہ انسانی مسئلہ ہے۔ اس انسانی مسئلہ کو آپ حل کر سکتے ہیں کیونکہ آپ میں گاندھی جی کی چھاپ دکھائی دیتی ہے۔ تو ہم سمجھتے ہیں کہ آپ پورا زور اس بات پر لگا دیں گے کہ جو بھی ویزا اور پاسپورٹ کی ٹفیکلٹیز کشمیر میں ہیں خصوصاً اور ملک میں بالعموم ہے اس کو دور کرنے کے لئے آپ قدم اٹھائیں گے۔ بلکہ جہلم ویلی میں سے جو آمد و رفت کشمیری عوام کا ہے کیونکہ ہمارا ایک حصہ پاکستان اوکھوپائینڈ ہے وہ جہلم ویلی روتہ کے بارے میں بھی آپ پاکستان کے ساتھ بات کر کے آمد و رفت کے راستوں کو

[شری شریف الدین شارق]

کہلا چھوڑ کر گئے - تاکہ ایک دوسرے کے نزدیک آسکیں اور تجارت ایک دوسرے کے ساتھ ہو یہ آپ کر سکتے ہیں اور آپ اس لئے زیادہ اور بھی کر سکتے ہیں کہ ایک تو آپ کو کرنے کی لگن ہے دوسرا یہ ہے کہ قوم نے مکمل طور پر یہ مسائل حل کرنے کا آپ کو اختیار دے دیا ہے -

تو باقی بہت سی باتیں جو بھی یہاں کہی گئی ہوں آپ کی وزارت کی کارکردگی کے بارے میں میں ان سب کی تائید کرتا ہوں اور چاہتا ہوں کہ زندگی کے ہر لمحہ میں ہمارا ملک ترقی کرے - کامیابی ہو اور ہماری لیڈر شپ ان مشکلات پر قابو پائے - ہم دو چار سو رہے ہیں -
شکریہ -

†[श्री शरीफुद्दीन शारिक : बहरहाल जिस सिलसिले में हमारे वजीरे खारजा और हमारी गवर्नमेंट पाकिस्तान के साथ ताल्लुकात अच्छे बनाने के लिए दीड़घूप कर रही है उस बारे में हमको यकीन हो जाना चाहिए कि सारी काम सारे मुल्क की अवाम उनके साथ है । पाकिस्तान के हुक्मरान तक के एक तरफ छोड़ कर वहां के जितने भी गरीब अवाम हैं उनके दिलों में हिन्दुस्तान के लिए उनके अवाम के लिए काफी इज्जत है काफी एहताराम है और यह भी एक मुसीबत में तंग आ गये हैं और वो भी चाहते हैं कि हिन्दुस्तान के साथ हमारे ताल्लुकात अच्छे हों ।

इस सिलसिले में मैं गुजारिश करूंगा कि पाकिस्तान ने काश्मीर के एक हिस्से पर बड़े अर्से से कब्जा कर रखा है । बातचीत करते वक्त इस बात को जरूर मद्देनजर रखा जाये कि वह ऐसा है कि हमें कम से कम वापिस दिलवा दिया जाये और इस बातचीत में काश्मीर के नुमाइंदों को शामिल किया जाये तो ज्यादा बेहतर है यही हाल कराकुरम का जो हाइवे पाकिस्तान में चीन के साथ मिलकर बनाया है उसमें भी काश्मीर का बहुत सा हिस्सा अपने नीचे ले रखा है । इस सिलसिले में जिस वक्त भी आप चीन के साथ बात करेंगे उस वक्त आप इस बात का जरूर खयाल रखेंगे ।

तो हमारे यहां दूसरी दिक्कत है जो मैं आपकी मौजूदगी का फायदा उठाता हूं । पासपोर्ट और वीजा के सिलसिले में पिछली सरकार ने पासपोर्ट का एक आफिस श्रीनगर में रखा था लेकिन उसके वो मकासद पूरे नहीं हो रहे हैं । मैं मोहतरम वजीरे खारजा से गुजारिश करूंगा कि काश्मीरी अवाम हिन्दुस्तान और पाकिस्तान की 3 जगों में मुल्क में सबसे ज्यादा मुतासर हो गया और तकसीम हो गई हमारी मालियात । हमारी परेशानियां बड़ी । मां सरहद के पार है तो बेटा इस तरफ । बेटा की शादी हो रही है तो उसका बाप नहीं आ सकता । भाई एक बाहर है तो एक भाई बहन यहां है । बाप वहां है तो बेटा यहां है । यह एक इंसानी मसला है । इस इंसानी मसले को आप हल कर सकते हैं क्योंकि आपमें गांधी जी की छाप दिखाई देती है । तो हम समझते हैं कि आप पूरा जोर इस बात पर लगा देंगे कि जो भी वीजा और पासपोर्ट की डिफिकल्टी काश्मीर में हैं और मुल्क में हैं उसको दूर करने के लिए आप कदम उठावेंगे । बल्कि जेहलम

वजो में जो आमदोरफ्त काश्मीरी आवाम का है क्योंकि हमारा एक हिस्सा पाकिस्तान ओक्यूपाइड है वो जेहलम वली रोड के बारे में भी आप पाकिस्तान के साथ बात करके आमदोरफ्त के रास्तों को खोल दें ताकि एक दूसरे के नजदीक आ सकें और त्रिजारत एक दूसरे के साथ हो। यह आप कर सकते हैं और आप इसलिए ज्यादा और भी कर सकते हैं कि एक तो आपको करने की लगन है दूसरा यह है कि कौम ने मुकमल तीर पर यह मसायल हल करने का आपको अख्तियार दे दिया है।

तो बाकी बहुत सी बातें जो यहां भी रुहीं गई हैं आपकी विजारत की कारकुर्दगी के बारे में मैं उन सबकी ताईद करता हूं और चाहता हूं कि जिल्दगी के हर शोबे में हमारा मुल्क तरक्की करे। कामयाबी हो और हमारी लीडरशिप उन मुश्किलात पर काबू पाये जिनसे हम दौ चार हो रहे हैं। शुक्रिया।]

SHRI R. RAMAKRISHNAN (Tamil Nadu): Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, I am very happy that the foreign policy of India enjoys much more support than what is witnessed in the treasury benches today, with the hon. Minister alone, out of courtesy, staying here with one other hon. Member. Now, all the Members today have spoken about Kampuchea, about Afghanistan, about Diego Garcia, about the whole gamut of India's foreign policy. The hon. Minister would surely have taken note of the views expressed in the House. I do not want to add to his boredom. But definitely I would like to say one or two things about our foreign policy and also about some of the tired officials of the South Block who have suddenly disappeared now. They were sitting there the whole of the day and during the last half an hour,

one by the one they were disappearing. I am happy that the Minister is setting an example to them. When an important issue like External Affairs is being discussed, it is only proper that they should be present. That is why I am bringing it to the attention of the Minister.

Everybody talked about India's foreign policy. Just to refresh our memory, here is what pandit Jawhar-lai Nenru said in 1943 about our foreign policy:

"Let us not be frightened too much of the military might of this or that group. I am not frightened and I want to tell the world, on behalf of this country, that we are not frightened of the military might of this power or that power. Our policy is not a passive policy or a negative policy."

This should be the foreign policy of India even today.

Sir, there is no time to go into the history. Although we condemned Dutch attempts to get back Indonesia, in 1956 when Israel invaded Egypt we took a particular stand. But we woke up rather late to the fact of communist aggression in Korea in 1950. And we all know what was India's position on Hungary. Again in the words of Panditji:

"It is a positive and vital policy which flows from our struggle for freedom. When man's liberty or peace is in danger, we cannot and shall not be neutral. Neutrality would then be a betrayal of what we have fought for and what we stand for."

Similarly, there are so many ticklish issues with which I do not want to embarrass the Minister now. He is quite aware of all these things. But let me say just one or two things.

If India wants to take up the leadership of the third world, particularly after the demise of Marshal

[Shri R. Ramakrishnan.]

Tito, the mantle will definitely fall on Mrs. Indira Gandhi and our excellent Foreign Minister here. There should be no big brother attitude shown by India. Even to small countries like Bhutan, Nepal or Sri Lanka we should not show the patronising attitude of might is right, if we take them into confidence, we can attain this third world leadership and show something to the super powers.

After Pokram explosion and Rohini, the world now knows that we are a nuclear power and here I am saying something very radical. I want that India should go nuclear. In fact K/ should go nuclear not only for peaceful purposes. Let it be known to the nations of the world that India can detonate a hydrogen bomb or atom bomb of one megaton or kiloton. When China, particularly with its big arsenal and with the strategic advantage of Tibet can send short-range nuclear missiles into important Indian cities whereas we cannot do it. We have to develop medium range and long range missiles. Even if it means 3 per cent or 4 per cent more in our defence budget, this has got to be done. I am sure the External Affairs Minister, will impress on the Prime Minister that the nuclear policy of India needs a radical change, whatever may be the attitude of the super powers. Then only they will know what we are:

Another point is that this country has very ancient cultural ties with some other countries. For example, in Thailand we still can see Hindu temples. Similarly our cultural ties with Sri Lanka and Malaysia are steeped in history. Our External Affairs Minister should see that cultural activities are promoted so that fraternal ties can be established with these countries.

Now some administrative points on the working of the Ministry. The Minister himself admitted that there

are 18 posts vacant because this has been mentioned in the report. Others have also referred to this. I will draw the attention of the Minister to one thing. While posts in USA and UK can wait, what about small countries like Somalia and Thailand? These can be filled up easily. I do not know why the officials in the Ministry are sleeping over this matter and not putting up the list to the Minister.

Now about the famous or infamous RAW. I do not know whether it is under the External Affairs Ministry or not. It was under the External Affairs Ministry and then it went to the Prime Minister and has probably come back. I do not know where it is now. There is no mention of it in the annual report probably for reasons of secrecy. I suggest that this Research and Analysis Wing should be completely revamped. Just like in the Bhagvat Gita when Arjuna saw in the whole army pitas, putras, matulas, etc. the RAW consists of so many in-laws and relations of some individuals. The Minister should look into it personally and see what is going on there in the RAW. You have to see that the RAW gives us news about the Chinese views on McMahon Line and that we do not have to know what the Chinese think about it through our Delhi magazines. This is of very great significance which I am sure the Minister will take note of.

Then there is a very small matter, but it is to me a very big and sad matter. This is about the languages known to our foreign service officers. It is given in Appendix XII of our report. From this I find that three languages—Burmese, Pushtu and Czech—are not known to even a single officer. Are these such difficult languages? I wish to ask: What is the Secretary of the External Affairs Ministry doing? Can he not ask his officers to learn these languages? We have so much of trade contacts with Czechoslovakia. We have even a Czech trade represen-

tative in Madras. He speaks very fluently Tamil, English and Hindi. Why can't some of our boys in the Ministry learn these languages?

In the report it is said that the Indian Council of Cultural Relations has opened its fifth regional office in Varanasi. There are so many foreign students studying in India. But the Indian Council of Cultural Relations does not do any good work in the cultural field, whereas even non-official organisations such as Rotary Club and Lions Club are doing much more work in establishing cultural contacts. I am sure the Minister will kindly look into this.

Thirdly _____

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN <SHRI SAWAISINGH SISODIA>: Thirdly 'and lastly.

SHRI R. RAMAKRISHNAN: In this House only a crying baby gets milk because I have seen some Parties getting more than the time allotted to them. Therefore, I will seek your indulgence.

My next point is about the treatment meted out to Indians by our Embassies and Ambassadors. They should not consider themselves as holding pension posts attending cocktail parties and so on. If they had attended to the Indians living in those countries, what is happening in Dubai and in London would not have reached such a serious situation as it is now. I 7 p. M. would request the honourable Minister to send three or four people at random, send them incognito, to these embassies in the various countries, and see what is happening there so that he will get a first-hand knowledge of all these things.

Finally, Sir, I would like to say that to the foreign policy planning much more importance should be given rather than having sporadic consultations which some of the officials in the External Affairs Minister will reply tomorrow, The

that an expert advisory committee, consisting of 20 to 30 people, experts drawn from the various walks of life, is set up. This body can also include some retired diplomats who are desirable and not those who are undesirable, and we must see that this advisory body will not be the policy-making body, but it will definitely go into three important matters which, I would say, are:

- (1) to obtain an objective and critical assessment of policies with those who are involved in policy-making,
- (2) to get various policy alternatives suggested and considered in the light of their implications, and
- (3) to seek clarification? in the light of the lessons of history and the theories of foreign policy and international relations.

Sir, in England, in 1960, the Plowden and Duncan Committee were appointed at an interval of five years- and these Committees established that the Government could definitely improve their foreign policy to be relevant to the modern times.

One last thing, Sir, and then I will conclude.

Sir, the Report on the IFS has not been fully implemented. In fact, the Committee has said that our Foreign Service officers are not fully equipped. Some of them come from the IAS and are selected for the IFS. These people should be given some more training. This has not been implemented and this should be implemented. In fact, they have said that they lack the knowledge of history of the country and of what is going on. They have suggested refresher and short-term courses even for officers who are already in service. All these things can be considered by our Foreign Minister who can make India's foreign policy quite strong and who can help in keeping our head high in the comity of nations. Thank you. Sir.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI SAWAISINGH SISODIA): The Ministry are having. It is necessary House now stands adjourned till 11-00 A.M.

The House then adjourned at two minutes past seven of the clock till eleven oi the clock on Thursday, the 7th August, 1980.