

[Prof. Sourendra Bhattacharjee]

which is a real danger to the security of India.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI R. R. MORARKA): The hon. Home Minister, Shri Makwana.

SHRIMATI PURABI MUKHOPADHYAY: How can he reply after the Prime Minister has spoken?

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI R. R. MORARKA): That may be your view. Please sit down.

SHRI LAL K. ADVANI: I understand that in the morning the Government made a commitment in the House that apart from the reply to the debate, they will make a statement.

SHRI YOGENDRA MAKWANA: I will make it.

Sir, the hon. Prime Minister has dealt with all the points raised here in the House. Practically she has replied to all the points raised by the hon. Members. Though she was not present, she has covered all the points. And it will be unwise on my part to reiterate the same thing. She has said what the Government is going to do and she has also explained the policy of the Government in this House. So I don't think I should add anything. I would request the House, after these clarifications, to pass the Resolution moved by me. Thank you.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI R. R. MORARKA): Now I put the Motion before the House. The question is:

"That this House approves the continuance in force of the Proclamation issued by the President on the 12th December, 1979, under article 356 of the Constitution, in relation to the State of Assam for a further period of six months with effect from the 12th June, 1980."

The Motion was adopted.

STATEMENT BY MINISTER

Arrest of some M.L.As. of Assam at Boat Club in New Delhi

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF HOME AFFAIRS (SHRI YOGENDRA MAKWANA): Sir, at about 10.45 A.M. on 11-6-1980, 28 persons were arrested at the Fafi Marg—Rajpath Crossing for violation of prohibitory orders under Section 144 Cr.P.C. A case FIR No. 326 under Section 188 IPC at Police Station Parliament Street has been registered.

Out of the 28 arrested persons, 17 are MLAs from Assam including Shri Golap Borbora, ex-Chief Minister of Assam, and Shri Dulal Chandra Barua. The remaining 11 persons are from the Yuva Janata. Their leader, who has been arrested, is Shri Vikram Singh. The 28 persons courted arrest peacefully.

It may also be mentioned that the 17 MLAs had been sitting on dharna since 9th June, 1980. This was converted into a 24-hour fast on 10th June. Today, they courted arrest. They are being produced before the Metropolitan Magistrate, Parliament Street today.

Sir, I have got the latest information that they were produced before the Metropolitan Magistrate who admonished them, after which they were released.

CALLING ATTENTION TO A MATTER OF URGENT PUBLIC IMPORTANCE—

The Chinese Military Tie-up with USA and Japan posing a Grave threat to Peace and Security of Asia in General and India in particular—

contd.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI R. R. MORARKA): The House will

now take up the Calling-Attention Motion remaining incomplete, I would call those hon. Members who were not called at that time. Shri Kalyan Roy...Not here. Shri Shahi.

श्री नागेश्वर प्रसाद शाही (उत्तर प्रदेश) :

श्रीमन्, मंत्री जी ने जो जवाब दिया था उसमें उन्होंने जो बातें कहीं उनके अलावा मुझे यह निवेदन करना है कि 1962 में चीन ने जब इस देश पर हमला किया था और जब हमारे देश की लगभग 20 हजार वर्गमील भूमि पर कब्जा किया था उस समय इस संसद् में पंडित जवाहरलाल जी के नेतृत्व में इस सदन ने यह पवित्र प्रतिज्ञा की थी कि हम अपने देश की एक एक इंच जमीन को वापस लेंगे और अपनी भूमि वापस लेने के बाद ही हम चैन लेंगे। श्रीमन्, मंत्री महोदय ने आज यह कहा कि हम तो एफर्ट कर रहे हैं।

"Making an effort for normalisation."
"Making an effort for normalisation is not normalisation." लेकिन श्रीमन्,

मंत्री मैं जी का ध्यान इधर दिलाना चाहता हूँ कि जब प्रधान मंत्री जी ने यह कहा कि हमारा और चीन के बीच में बातचीत की कोई प्री-कंडीशन नहीं है तो क्या इस संसद के लिये गये उस पवित्र प्रतिज्ञा का जो हमने की थी हम अपने देश की एक एक इंच भूमि को लिबरेट कराकर चैन लेंगे, उसका इम्प्लिमेंट नहीं होता है ? जब आप यह प्रतिज्ञा कर चुके हैं कि हम अपनी भूमि वापस लेंगे और देश की जनता से वायदा कर चुके हैं कि हम अपनी भूमि का एक एक इंच खाली कराएँगे उस समय आपका यह कहना कि हम बिना किसी कंडीशन के चीन से बातचीत करेंगे या करने को तैयार हैं, दोनों में कहां समन्वय है ?

SHRI G. C. BHATTACHARYA:
Surrender! Total surrender!

श्री नागेश्वर प्रसाद शाही : यह कंडीशन था और रहेगा। इस हाउस में हमने यह

रिजाल्ट किया है, यह प्रतिज्ञा केवल सरकार की नहीं है, यह जो पार्लियामेंट है, संसद् है, यह उसकी प्रतिज्ञा है कि हम अपनी एक एक इंच भूमि चीनी सेना से लिबरेट कराएँगे। ये कंडीशन रखकर ही चीन से बात हो सकती है और इसी कंडीशन पर आपकी सारी विदेश नीति आधारित है। इसी कंडीशन पर आप आज जो कहते हैं कि इजराइल से कि इजिप्ट की जमीन को खाली करो, आप जो कहते हैं कि रूस की सेना अफ-गानिस्तान से वापस जाय, किसी की भूमि पर किसी दूसरे देश की सेना नहीं होनी चाहिए, अगर आप यह कंडीशन छोड़ देते हैं तो आपकी सारी यह पालिसी कैंक हो जाती है, केश हो जाती है। इसलिए आपका यह कहना, प्रधान मंत्री जी का यह कहना कि बिना किसी कंडीशन के बात करेंगे ठीक नहीं लगता।

श्री श्याम लाल यादव (उत्तर प्रदेश) :

अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी क्या कहते थे जब आप जनता पार्टी में थे ?

(Interruptions)

श्री नागेश्वर प्रसाद शाही : यादव जी, वाजपेयी जी जब गये थे, इसी सदन में हम लोगों ने उनको कार्नेर किया था और जो सवाल आज मैं पूछ रहा हूँ वह वाजपेयी जी से भी पूछा था।

श्री पी० बी० नरसिंह राव : उन्होंने क्या जवाब दिया।

श्री नागेश्वर प्रसाद शाही : उन्होंने जवाब दिया कि हमने चीन से जो बात की उसमें यह कंडीशन थी। वाजपेयी जी ने यह जवाब दिया था कि चीन से जो हमने बात की उसमें यह कंडीशन और बातचीत के दौरान यह शर्त थी कि हमारी जमीन खाली होगी।

SHRI G. C. BHATTACHARYA:
We opposed it.

SHRI NAGESHWAR PRASAD
SHAHI Yes, we opposed it.

हमने वाजपेयी जी का चीन जाने के लिये विरोध किया था । इस सदन में सरकारी पार्टी में होते हुए हम लोगों ने वाजपेयी जी की चीन यात्रा का विरोध किया था और आज आपके प्रधान मंत्री जी का यह कहना कि बिना किसी शर्त के हम चीन से वार्तालाप करने के लिये तैयार हैं इसकी हम धीरे निन्दा करते हैं । हमारी यह कंडीशन है कि चीन के साथ कोई वार्तालाप बिना शर्त के नहीं हो सकती, कोई दोस्ती बिना शर्त के नहीं हो सकती । दोस्ती का पहला आधार होगा कि हमारी भूमि से उनकी सेना हटे और हमारी समूची भूमि खाली हो ।

हमको यह नहीं भूलना चाहिये कि यूनाइटेड स्टेट्स आफ अमेरिका ने पाकिस्तान को जो हथियार दिये वह सीधे तो बहुत कम दिये लेकिन तुर्की के माध्यम से, ईरान के माध्यम से ज्यादा हथियार दिये और पूरे पाकिस्तान को यू० एस० ए० ने असेनल बना रखा है । जब-जब पाकिस्तान ने इस देश के ऊपर हमला किया तब-तब उसने अमेरिकी हथियारों का इस्तेमाल किया । हालाँकि वहाँ की सरकार हमेशा कहती रही कि हम जो हथियार देते हैं इस शर्त के साथ देते हैं कि उनका उपयोग केवल कम्युनिज्म को रोकने के लिये होगा । जितने अमेरिकी राष्ट्रपति हुए और जिन्होंने पाकिस्तान को हथियार दिये उन्होंने हमेशा हिन्दुस्तान को यह आश्वासन दिया है कि हम जो हथियार दे रहे हैं पाकिस्तान को वे केवल कम्युनिज्म को रोकने के लिये दे रहे हैं । कम्युनिज्म का प्रसार रोकने के लिये दे रहे हैं लेकिन हमेशा हर लड़ाई में पाकिस्तान ने उन हथियारों

को खुले आम इस्तेमाल किया है । इस समय क्या हो रहा है ।

मैं विदेश मंत्री जी का ध्यान दिलाना चाहता हूँ कि आपकी सरकार ने भी स्वीकार किया कि असम में जो हो रहा है उसमें विदेशी हाथ छिपा हुआ है लेकिन मुझे आश्चर्य है कि उस विदेशी हाथ को ढूँढते हुए भी आप हिम्मत नहीं कर रहे हैं कहने का कि किस का हाथ है । चिटगाँव की बंदरगाह पर बंगलादेश में अमरीकी जहाज आ रहे हैं । गेहूँ के नाम पर हथियार उतर रहे हैं और वह हथियार जा रहे हैं असम में और त्रिपुरा में । चीन से जो सड़कें असम को जाती हैं उन सड़कों पर अपना इंतजाम है चैकिंग का इसलिये उधर से हथियार आरामना से पार नहीं हो सकते, हथियार बंगला देश के रास्ते पार हो रहे हैं । बंगलादेश का बार्डर त्रिपुरा और असम के साथ लगता है और वहाँ पर ब्रह्मपुत्र और मेघना नदी का अपना बार्डर है । नदी का फैलाव इतना ज्यादा है, जंगल का विस्तार इतना ज्यादा है कि जंगलों के बीच से और नदी में बोट के द्वारा हथियार आ रहे हैं । चिटगाँव बंदरगाह पर अमेरिकी हथियार अनलोड हो रहे हैं ।

श्रीमन् जब यहाँ पर बंगलादेश की बात की जाती है या गंगा के जल के बारे में बात की जाती है या दूसरी समस्याओं की बात की जाती है तो हम इस बात को भूल जाते हैं कि बंगलादेश से हमारे देश में हथियार क्यों भेजे जा रहे हैं । यह बात कही जाती है कि हमारे देश की यह जिम्मेदारी है कि बंगला देश को गंगा का पूरा जल मिले । ऐसी स्थिति में क्या बंगलादेश की यह जिम्मेदारी नहीं है कि हमारे देश में जो बग़ावत करने वाले हैं उनको बंगलादेश से या अन्य देशों से किसी प्रकार के कोई

हथियार न मिले ? क्या बंगलादेश की यह जिम्मेदारी नहीं बनती है कि अमेरिका से जो हथियार हमारे देश में आते हैं उनको वह रोके ? आप जानते हैं कि गंगा के पानी की कमी के कारण पूरा कलकत्ता बन्दरगाह बेकार हो रहा है, लेकिन फिर भी हम बंगलादेश को पूरा पानी दे रहे हैं ।

यहाँ पर श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी जी की चीन यात्रा का जिक्र आया और मैंने यह बताया है कि हम लोगों ने श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी की चीन यात्रा की निन्दा की थी और इसीलिए वे वहाँ से भाग कर आए ।

श्री जी० सी० भट्टाचार्य : हमने इसको अपोज किया था ।

श्री नागेश्वर प्रसाद शाही : श्रीमन हम यह देख रहे हैं कि अमेरिका और चीन दोनों मिल कर इंडिया को एनसर्कल कर रहे हैं । यहाँ पर राव साहब बैठे हुए हैं वे अच्छी तरह से जानते हैं कि उनके कौन दुश्मन है । इनके दुश्मन इस बात को जानते हैं कि जो छोटे कार्यकर्ता हैं, इनके एसोसिएट्स हैं, उनको आसानी से पीटा जा सकता है । चीन कोशिश करके देख लिया कि वह रूस पर हमला नहीं कर सकता है और अमेरिका भी यह कोशिश करके देख लिया कि आर्म रेस के मामले में या ताकत बिल्ड अप करने के मामले में वह रूस का मुकाबला नहीं कर सकता है । अमेरिका ने यह देख लिया कि योरोप में रूस के मुकाबले में वह अपना बिल्ड अप नहीं कर पा रहा है, इसलिए अब उसने दूसरे रास्ते अपनाने शुरू कर दिये हैं । वह इस बात को जानता है कि हिन्दुस्तान की विदेश नीति और यहाँ के लोगों की भावनाएँ रूस के अधिक नजदीक हैं, रूस के पक्ष में अधिक हैं, इसलिए उसने

हिन्दुस्तान पर अपनी निगाह लगानी शुरू कर दी है । अमेरिका रूस को कोई क्षति नहीं पहुँचा सकता है और न ही चीन और अमेरिका रूस को किसी प्रकार की क्षति पहुँचा सकते हैं लेकिन वे रूस के मित्र देशों को परेशान कर सकते हैं । इसीलिए हमारे देश के नार्थ ईस्टर्न स्टेट्स में इस प्रकार की स्थिति हो रही है । यह स्थिति हिन्दुस्तान को बताने के लिए ही हो रही है कि अगर तुमने रूस के साथ दोस्ती रखी तो हम यहाँ पर बाल-केनाइजेशन कर सकते हैं, नार्थ ईस्टर्न एरिया को हिन्दुस्तान से सेपरेट कर सकते हैं और वहाँ पर हथियार पहुँचा कर बगावत कर सकते हैं । इन तमाम बातों की परस्पेक्टिव में मैं विदेश मंत्री जी से यह जानना चाहता हूँ कि जब वे चीन से या बंगलादेश से बात करते हैं या यु० एस० ए० के मिशनस से या एम्बेस से बात करते हैं तो क्या बातें करने हैं ?

आखिरी बात मैं यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि उनका कहना है कि हम अपने हथियार घटा रहे हैं, लेकिन आप जानते हैं कि वे अपने बेस बना रहे हैं और उनका यह भी कहना है कि ये बेस रूस के खिलाफ बना रहे हैं । मगर आजादी के बाद से आज तक जितने भी हमले हिन्दुस्तान पर पाकिस्तान की साइड से हुए हैं उन्होंने यह साबित कर दिया है यह सारा बिल्ड अप रूस के खिलाफ नहीं बल्कि हिन्दुस्तान के खिलाफ होता है । इसलिए मैं यह जानना चाहता हूँ कि जब आप इन देशों से बात करते हैं या प्रधान मंत्री जी से बात करते हैं तो इस परस्पेक्टिव में क्या बात करते हैं ?

श्री पी० बी० नरसिंह राव : श्रीमन, अभी अभी जो शर्तों की बात कही गई वे शर्तें वार्ता के लिये नहीं हैं, वे शर्तें पूरे नार्मलाइजेशन के लिये हैं । मैंने

[श्री पी० बी० नरसिंह राव]

स्पष्ट शब्दों में कहा कि जिसको हम नार्मलाइजेशन कहते हैं वह एक प्रक्रिया है वह एक प्रोसेस है । वह तब तक पूरा नहीं होगा जब तक कि जो अवनार्मल रिलेशंस हमारे हो गये हैं उनके कारणों को नहीं हटाया जाता । उन कारणों को हटाने की यही प्रक्रिया होगी कि जो जो बातें उनके और हमारे बीच में झगड़े की हैं . . .

श्री नागेश्वर प्रसाद शाही : क्षमा करेंगे मैं एक बात कहना चाहता हूँ कि आपने उनके साथ व्यापार शुरू कर दिया है ।

श्री पी० बी० नरसिंह राव : व्यापार की बात नहीं है ।

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI R. R. MORARKA): Order please. Kindly listen.

SHRI NAGESHWAR PRASAD SHAHI: Sir, I seek your protection.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI R. R. MORARKA): If there is any point. .

SHRI NAGESHWAR PRASAD SHAHI: I seek your protection.

चाइनीज आर्मी हमारी जमीन पर मौजूद है और हमारा व्यापार उनके साथ है ।
It is contravention... (Interruptions)

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI R. R. MORARKA): Order, please. Kindly listen.

श्री पी० बी० नरसिंह राव : नार्मलाइजेशन की एक प्रक्रिया होती है और उस प्रक्रिया में वे सभी बातें आती हैं । जिन पर उनका और हमारा मत-

भेद है उन बातों को हटाने पर ही नार्मलाइजेशन पूरा हो सकता है । जहां तक हमारी दोस्ती का सम्बन्ध है किसी और देश के साथ होने का सवाल है, वह अपनी जगह पर बना हुआ है । उस पर किसी दूसरे देश का कोई प्रभाव नहीं पड़ेगा । अगर किसी एक देश से हम अपने संबंधों को नार्मल करना चाहें तो इसका यह मतलब नहीं है कि उसका असर दूसरे देश पर, जो कि हमारा मित्र है पड़े । इस बात को हम कई बार स्पष्ट कर चुके हैं और यही मैं पुनः कहना चाहता हूँ कि जो हमारे दोस्त है वे अपनी जगह पर हैं और हमारे देश के लिये जो खतरा है उसको हम पूरी तरह से पहचानते हैं ।

We are not friendless and that is one thing that makes us strong and confident. We are completely...

SHRI G. C. BHATTACHARYA:
They want to isolate you.

SHRI P. V. NARASIMHA RAO:
They cannot. That is what I am saying. We have made it clear time and again that this process of normalisation with country 'A' will not be allowed to have any adverse effect on our abiding friendship with country 'B'. That is the general proposition which we have announced several times. So there should be no doubt on that. इसमें कोई संदेह हो नहीं सकता ।

जहां तक वार्ता का सवाल है वार्ता तो इससे पहले शुरू हो चुकी है । अब सवाल यह है कि क्या हम उसको बन्द कर दें जो कि श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी ने शुरू की थी । या तो हम उसको बन्द कर दें या उसको ठीक ढंग से चलायें जिससे हमारे इंटरैस्ट को हमारे हितों को कोई नुकसान न पहुंचे ठेस न पहुंचे । इसके बारे में हम पूरी तरह से जानकारी रखते हैं और इसी को ध्यान में रखकर हम आगे बढ़ेंगे यह मैं कहना चाहता हूँ ।

इसलिये जहां तक वार्ता को बन्द करने का सवाल है वार्ता तो चलेगी दोनों तरफ से । वन वे ट्रैफिक वार्ता हो नहीं सकती । इससे पहले मैं कह चुका हूँ कि उधर से कुछ संकेत आ रहे हैं और हम भी इधर से संकेत भेज रहे हैं और हम फूक फूक कर कदम रख रहे हैं । इस सम्बन्ध में इससे ज्यादा और क्या कहा जा सकता है ।

SHRIMATI PURABI MUKHOPADHYAY: Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, I would in the beginning congratulate Mr. Bhattacharya for drawing the attention of the Government and the Foreign Minister to a very vital issue, this is, the arms build-up and the US-China axis and its role. I do not think any of us will try to minimise the arms build-up and the tie-up that is now very much there between the United States and the Chinese leaders. And it has been a threat to the security and peace not only of Asia, of this region, but I think the peace-loving people all over the world are concerned about it. To minimise this aspect and to take a complacent view of the whole thing will only be suicidal for our country. So, in this context Mr. Bhattacharya has timely drawn our attention. I was listening to what the Foreign Minister wanted to say. But we came a little late and so we could not hear the first part of his statement. I do not think the Government of India will try to minimise the thing. Now Diego Garcia is a fact. It has come to stay. The Indian ocean, the military base of the United States and other foreign countries, they have come to stay. There is no attempt on behalf of any foreign powers, specially the warmongers, to withdraw or to demilitarise this zone or to dismantle their base. Prof. Rashiduddin Khan said about Dr. Bhair Mahavir that he brought about the issue of Pakistan or it may be he did it out of context—Dr. Bhair Mahavir—to project the very genuine non-

alignment that the Janata Party Government wanted to project. We are all concerned about what is happening. We know 400 billion dollars is the actual expenditure only on arms by the United States Government. They are annually spending 400 billion dollars on purchasing arms, for building up arms. Along with that take the example of the Chinese Government—the Chinese axis with United States and Japan by the side. In Diego Garcia and other places on the Indian Ocean even France has come and joined them. And that is why it is all the more the reason why we should be very alert, that is all the more the reason why we should be conscious about our responsibility. I know the Foreign Minister personally. He is alert to the situation. But that does not mean that we will not, in his own diplomatic language, castigate those powers, we will not protest against those powers who are out to see that the whole region is destabilised. They are out to see that the peace in this region is somehow or other thwarted so that with their own warmongering attitude they can spread their tentacles and they can throttle the lifeline of the people of these countries and this area. When we speak about our full confidence in reopening the dialogue and our relationship with China—of course, we cannot live with a hostile neighbour for all times to come—let us also be a little cautious about their ulterior motive behind it. Why are they all of a sudden sending signals? On the one hand they are building their arms in collusion with the United States Government, the Pentagon, and on the other hand giving us a signal to be very friendly. It is like the old Hindi-Chini Bhai-Bhai. We do not want to be cheated again and back-stabbed again. But that does not mean that I do not want the Government of India to open a dialogue, to open a neighbourly relationship with China, but in all our attitude we should be very careful. I am one of those who take keen interest in

[Shrimati Purabi Mukhopadhyay.]

the affairs around the world, what is happening around the world, and I am shocked to see that no big powers which are threatening to be big powers are saying anything with regard to the destabilisation process that they threatened India with, and they have again started. Look at our own borders. Who said that China is not interested in destabilising India? Who said that China has not built up new avenues, new centres of power, round about us? Even the road they have built, even the destabilising forces they are trying to help in the north-eastern border, in Nagaland, in Manipur, in Mizoram, somewhere in Tripura and now in Assam, what do all these indicate? We are not opposed to the idea of having some sort of opening borders to the Chinese leaders and their Government. But if it goes a little farther than believing and trusting them, I really do not think the time has yet come for that. I know there is a section in the Ministry of External Affairs who are very much opposed to our very progressive policies; the policies of Mrs. Indira Gandhi's Government in the erstwhile Congress Party and the policies of the present Government, I want to make a comparison. How long did we take to send our fraternal delegates all over the world for the freedom fighters, those countries which are undergoing their own liberation movements? This time Kampuchea Government has not yet been recognised. Why? Why, on what ground? We recognised PLO. Where is the headquarters of PLO? Which are the countries under PLO? These questions were not raised. Now they say that part of Kampuchea is still under Vietnam. They do not have proper headquarters. They do not have their hold on Kampuchea and so we are not recognising it. This is a feeling that interested Pentagon administration is trying to have in order to have a foothold even in the External Affairs Ministry of this country. I have no

doubt that our External Affairs Minister is able enough to withstand any pressure from this section or that section. The Janata Government, to promote their genuine non-alignment, sent their External Affairs Minister to China, maybe because of the American-Chinese axis. I know during our last regime in 1977 and prior to that, the CIA agents who were working here spread themselves out throughout the country to destabilise our Government and change the whole social structure. I know that those people who were here did not have excess even to our Ministries. Then the Janata Government came and we saw American officials going round everywhere. They had excess to any Ministry and went and saw whomsoever they wanted to see. Their remnants may be left behind. So, be careful about your advisers who are trying to hold you up. We are concerned, we are anxious because of these massive arms build up. We are concerned about what is happening in Pakistan. Our Foreign Minister and our Prime Minister sent out messengers and delegates to different countries to explain the position vis-a-vis India's stand. Those who have gone have categorically stated about our very good relationship with Pakistan with regard to Simla agreement. Even then, Pakistan refused to sit with the Government that is running Afghanistan now. So, a little caution on the part of the External Affairs Minister is called for. By opening our doors we should not let in manipulators and manoeuvrers of world powers.

SHRI P. V. NARASIMHA RAO: I once again say that we are cautious and at the same time we welcome suggestions to be more cautious.

SHRI KALYAN ROY: I will briefly confine myself to only what is being discussed today and what is admitted, namely, Chinese military tie-up with USA and Japan. I do not entirely agree with what the hon. Foreign

Minister has stated. First of all, now-a-days non-alignment is being talked about by everybody. Is it not a fact that since Dulles till Brzezinsky, the United States Government has never accepted non-alignment as a policy? It was never friendly to non-aligned countries. As a matter of fact, the Dulles theory was to roll back and those who are not allied with them are hostile to them. That theory has been revived today after the departure of Mr. Vance. Mr. Brzezinsky—that Brzezinsky whom we saw a few months back aiming American rifles to our Afghan soldiers—has taken over the entire Foreign Affairs. So, the mask of America has fallen and now, Sir, America is in search of allies who can not only encircle the U.S.S.R., but can also encircle the important powers who are the pillars of the non-aligned movement which means India. It is unfortunate, Sir, that some honourable Members today only spoke about the Soviet army presence in Afghanistan, completely forgetting that it is the US which sent the powerful military fleet in order to intervene in the Bangladesh war which was not possible for two reasons: one, the Soviet fleet also was pursuing the American fleet and, two, the Bangladesh war was over. So, Sir, I find the echoes of those who were opposed to the Indian intervention in the Bangladesh war from the speeches of Mr. Shahabuddin. But the fact remains, as I was mentioning, that unfortunately America today has found an ally in China and their joint aim or, the aim of both these two countries, unfortunately, today is, as mentioned by the External Affairs Minister, to have common strategic aims. These common strategic aims are now not only against India, but are also to create conditions where the both can expand the influence and domination throughout South-East Asia and up to Iran because none of the speakers, unfortunately, Sir, from the other side, the Janata and the other Janata, even referred to the desperate act by the American

brigands in Iran where they tried to kidnap the revolutionary leader, but miserably failed. Sir, the External Affairs Minister should have spoken to whether he is so innocent that he does not know that the "Newsweek", one of the most popular journals published from the United States, in very close collaboration with the Pentagon, published a map in which a big chunk of the Indian territory, including Assam, Sikkim, Arunachal Pradesh, Mizoram, etc. were shown as parts of China.

SHRI P. V. NARASIMHA RAO:
There is a question on that and I am answering it.

SHRI KALYAN ROY: But I am mentioning this only to point out that these are not isolated incidents. (*Interruptions*). These are not isolated incidents. This is a big game and there is a purpose. Otherwise, why suddenly "The Newsweek", which is a very well-informed journal, shows a big chunk of the Indian territory as a part of China? Why? What steps has the External Affairs Minister taken regarding that? I would like to know whether he has taken it up seriously with the American Government.

SHRI P. V. NARASIMHA RAO:
Very very seriously.

SHRI KALYAN ROY: What is their reaction? I do not consider it, and he also does not take it, as a kind of an innocent mistake.

Then, Sir, there is the question of this armament pact or armament treaty. The latest issue of "The Far Eastern Economic Review" has brought out the whole thing in a very clear way. So, the agreement was signed in Washington by Mr. Brown the Defence Secretary, and the Chinese Vice-Premier, Geng Biao. It has two parts, one is the open part and the other is the secret part. After the publication of the report on the

[Shri Kalyan Roy.]

agreement, the terms of the agreement, a senior State China Policy Aid stated:

"My jaw hit the desktop when I read the estimate."

In other words, even taking the agreement on its face value, according to the Senators, it would signify a major restructuring of the Chinese military capability. That is what the State Department China Policy aid told the "Review".

I quote:

"Such a volume would signify a major re-structuring of the Chinese military capability. It would imply even greater outlays internally and it is beyond their current capability to absorb..."

Mark the words "beyond their current capability to absorb." I further quote:

"...or ours to deliver, that amount now or in the foreseeable future..."

Then, Sir, it would include not only transport equipments of all kinds, such as heavy trucks, mobile repair shops, and so on. It goes on further:

"...It is the high technology equipment that the Chinese will benefit most from..."

And this will lead to total imbalance in the entire area. My first question on this basis is this. Certainly the United States will straightway supply these. The most serious part of it is this:

"The real significance of the agreement is that American manufacturers of both military and civilian technology items previously had no chance of getting a licence from us...."

In other words, the General Motors and big multi-national companies, who

made fabulous profits out of exporting arms, would get licences and have collaborations with them to produce sophisticated armaments. You are now opening the floodgates for all types of American arms, which they have no capacity to absorb. If they do not have the capacity to absorb, may I know where these arms will go?

Sir, in reply to my question on the 27th March, 1980, Mr. Yogendra Makwana, Minister of State in the Ministry of Home Affairs, stated:

"According to the information available, some Nagas and Manipuri undergrounds had gone to China and returned with arms during 1976 and 1977. The matter of Chinese assistance to the underground was taken up at a high level with the Chinese Government."

Again, Sir, on the 21st March, 1980, Mr. Rao himself, in reply to a question said:

"Regarding the training of the underground Nagas Mizos and others in China, the matter has been taken up at a high level with the Chinese Government."

Subsequently they assured that this could be looked upon as a thing of the past. Is it really a thing of the past? How is it then that we are getting all kinds of latest armaments, small arms, machine-guns, etc., throughout Nagaland, Mizoram, Arunachal Pradesh and Manipur? The arms which they cannot absorb are being sent outside. This is one attack. The other attack is making Diego Garcia the most powerful naval base in the whole world. There is a deal between China, Japan and the United States to standardise arms, to standardise their weapons, so that in times of crisis arms can be interchangeable. This is the dimension of the danger. The statement of Mr. Rao is disappointing. This is what I want to say. Please do not minimise it. Now you are saying that this is transport equipment and not real weapons. You are trying to minimise the whole thing.

SHRI G. C. BHATTACHARYA: Only toys!

SHRI KALYAN ROY: My question is this: Have the Government of India lodged a strong protest or have at least taken it up with the Governments in Peking, Japan and Washington regarding this latest arms deal? Secondly, have the Government of India also taken action against this perpetual smuggling of arms with the connivance of the Government in Peking in these areas. These arms cannot fall from the sky. The training is also going on. What is very bad is that the Government of India is not going to take a very strong stand. Then this destabilisation by the Americans continues. There is no doubt about it. Even Mr. Kennedy who is contesting has said that a war psychosis is being created in the United States. That is one of his main slogans in the elections. I find that that kind of seriousness and urgency is not being given by the External Affairs Ministry. The result is that the people are not being immobilised. What you need is the actual mobilisation of the Indian people to stand unitedly against any foreign intervention and to be aware of the danger which is coming. On the other hand, I find the monopoly press, along with the reactionary elements, are giving maximum possible publicity to what is happening in Afghanistan. What is happening in Afghanistan is the preservation of Afghanistan against intervention by Pakistan, China and the United States which want to topple a progressive regime. The issue is very clear. Their slogan is that Islam is in danger. They want to get rid of all the reforms which have been brought about. Their own journalists have been sent. So, I appeal to Mr. Rao not to minimise the dimension of the danger and to give the facts to the people so that the people can be rallied behind the Government and we can counteract the sinister propaganda of the Chinese and the United States and also be prepared for any eventuality which may come any time.

SHRI G. C. BHATTACHARYA: They will lose their jobs if they do so.

SHRI P. V. NARASIMHA RAO: I have already stated and I wish to state again that we have not minimised the importance nor the seriousness of this problem. In my statement, I have given a sober, not a very vocal, deliberately vocal, account of what is happening there. Still I have given an accurate account. So far as our borders go, I have already stated in my previous reply that we have taken this up with the Chinese Government at the highest level. What I had said was what they had told us. On that I did not say that we had taken the matter as closed. We have taken it up with them.

SHRI KALYAN ROY: Are you satisfied with their reply.

SHRI P. V. NARASIMHA RAO: That is what I say. I have not said anything about our satisfaction. That is what I would like to submit. I have said something and left much unsaid which is equally meaningful.

SHRI P. RAMAMURTI (Tamil Nedu): Sir, it is very unfortunate that the Chinese Government in its Russo-phobia is colluding with the Americans whom they described in 1962 as the gendarme of the entire world. Today, this collusion of the Chinese with the United States poses a danger of American imperialism and threatens the entire Asian region with their building up of bases in Diego Garcia and other places. Therefore, it is not going to be in the interest of the Chinese themselves. In the ultimate analysis, it is the Chinese themselves who will suffer seriously on account of this. But in their Russo-phobia, they are doing this. I would like to ask the Foreign Minister—when he takes up the discussions with the Chinese people, will he place before them the real danger posed by the American imperialism not only to India but to the entire Asian countries and will try to disengage the Chinese people from this kind of encirclement

[Shri P. Ramamurti]

that is taking place here? It should be our effort,—through diplomatic effort, through our conversation and all these things—to pose this to these people. I hope the Chinese today have woken up to the fact that their internal policies were wrong, and I hope the time will come when they will realise that their external policies are also equally wrong. But the Government of India can assist in this process so that the process of their disentanglement from this American imperialism will be quickened. Will the Government of India, in their talks with the Chinese Government and with other Governments, pose this problem of encirclement of the entire Asian countries, the littoral countries, by the American imperialists—they are actually aiding American imperialism in encircling the entire Asia—and about the danger posed to peace and stability of these Asian countries, and try to get them out of these things? This is the kind of talk that I want you to carry with them.

SHRI P. V. NARASIMHA RAO: Sir, the dialogue really has not started.

SHRI P. RAMAMURTI: When you start it.

SHRI P. V. NARASIMHA RAO: When it does start, naturally our perceptions of the region, our perceptions of the Asian continent, our perceptions of the global situation—all these things are going to come in the discussion and I have no doubt about it.

SHRI P. RAMAMURTI: That is all I want.

PROF. RASHEEDUDDIN KHAN (Nominated): Mr. Vice-Chairman, sir, many questions have been asked and I am happy my friend, Mr. Bhattacharya, has called the attention to a very major development, and I should say a development whose seriousness I don't think is lost sight of either by the Minister or the Ministry. My assessment

is that the statement which the Minister read is a very sober, realistic and subtle statement which should be undisputed by the distinguished Members of the Parliament.

SHRI G. C. BHATTACHARYA: You are a professor, I know.

PROF. RASHEEDUDDIN KHAN: Don't think that it is an under-statement. And there is no need for the Republic of India to over-state. I entirely agree. But, Sir, the fact remains that even from the statement which was made, we have to take cognizance of the new developments that took place at the beginning of the decade. I would only draw the attention of the hon. Minister to only two things. The first thing is that the United States has acquired a confrontationist posture in the wake of the development in Afghanistan. I mean, the whole shift earlier, at the time President Carter has taken over was alternating between co-operation and confrontation with the Soviet Union. The East-West detente was going on. There were some areas of co-operation which I emphasised earlier and there were some areas of confrontation. And I would like to submit that the speech which Mr. Carter has made at the Indianapolis Naval Academy in 1977 is a very significant speech. And people at that time, analysts at that time said that part of it was drafted probably by Cyrus Vance and part of it was drafted probably by Brezezinski. Whatever it might be, it showed a reconciliation of the two postures. Duality of posturing in international politics is permissible and it is also manifest. But the thing that is a little alarming is this. After the development in Afghanistan and even before that, when the NATO meeting was there, the confrontationist overtone was there. There is a difference of opinion about it and I do not want to go into that. But the fact is, as of now, the confrontationist overtone of the American policy *vis-a-vis* the Soviet Union, *vis-a-vis* the East is becoming more and more pronounced

with the rapid increase of deployment of forces, with the increase of the RDS which has been very elaborately worked out by the Pentagon in the Gulf areas, with the increase of the energy crisis and the strengthening of the Diego Garcia base. It is of public knowledge. Happily, Sir, the US being an open society, whatever the Pentagon does is exposed by the US journalists themselves. No Communist or Marxist is able to do any of these investigations. Our friends here have gone. None of them is here. This is all done by the American press, by the American academics, America being an open society. We must recognise the strength of the US that way also. But that exposure has come. Diego Garcia has been made a big base. The R. D. F. is there. The confrontation posture is there and they have been talked between Mr. Harald Brown and Mr. Ling Piao. 'Common Strategic Assessment' is, the very right phrase which the Foreign Minister has used, and not 'common strategic assessment of U.S. and China' as Mr. Kalyan Roy has said, which is somewhat alarming, alarming for two reasons. Firstly, as the regional power, we cannot be unmindful of the stability of South-West Asia in which Afghanistan, Pakistan and Iran fall and in which the ASEAN countries, Vietnam, Laos and Kampuchea fall. We are talking of international interdependence which all of us adopt. Here I am borrowing a pregnant phrase from Mr. Zbigniew Brezezinski. Mr. Brezezinski in his book used the term 'management of international interdependence is one of the major concerns of American global policy.' In a highly inter-dependent world are we taking cognizance of these things? Is the Ministry working out alternative strategies as to what happens if US-China collusion reaches a point where it will militate against our national interest and regional interest and then what are we to do? That is my first question. Then, secondly, while bilateral relations with China ought to improve and that is beyond any doubt,

5 P.M.

cognise the strength of the US that way also. But that exposure has come. Diego Garcia has been made a big base. The R. D. F. is there. The confrontation posture is there and they have been talked between Mr. Harald Brown and Mr. Ling Piao. 'Common Strategic Assessment' is, the very right phrase which the Foreign Minister has used, and not 'common strategic assessment of U.S. and China' as Mr. Kalyan Roy has said, which is somewhat alarming, alarming for two reasons. Firstly, as the regional power, we cannot be unmindful of the stability of South-West Asia in which Afghanistan, Pakistan and Iran fall and in which the ASEAN countries, Vietnam, Laos and Kampuchea fall. We are talking of international interdependence which all of us adopt. Here I am borrowing a pregnant phrase from Mr. Zbigniew Brezezinski. Mr. Brezezinski in his book used the term 'management of international interdependence is one of the major concerns of American global policy.' In a highly inter-dependent world are we taking cognizance of these things? Is the Ministry working out alternative strategies as to what happens if US-China collusion reaches a point where it will militate against our national interest and regional interest and then what are we to do? That is my first question. Then, secondly, while bilateral relations with China ought to improve and that is beyond any doubt,

if relations are abnormal, unless the causes of abnormality are over, the dialogue cannot be started. It is a very subtle statement and I hope the Chair will also understand it. The point I am making is precisely this. Are we not conscious of the fact that China is also playing a dual game. On the one hand, it is talking of bilateralism and on the other hand, there is the map of 1954, a copy of which I have sent to the Prime Minister. I have also shown it to the Foreign Minister. The Prime Minister told me that China has not disowned that map. It specifically shows parts of Aksai Chin, part of Uttarakhand and even some parts of Arunachal, NEFA and Nagaland specifically as parts of China, which had been taken over by imperialist power "between 1840 and 1919". When Mr. Chou-En-lai came here that map was openly published. Panditji brought it to the notice of Mr. Chou-En-lai when he came here but he said that these were old Manchu maps which would be corrected, 'you don't bother.' Panditji was a gentleman and he believed what Mr. Chou En-lai said. These are alarming developments. I feel very sad on seeing some of these things. I have been a great supporter of India-China friendship. I have been a great admirer of the revolution of China. I must say that I have been a great admirer of Mao Tse-tung once upon a time. When I have to take a position against it now, I feel very uneasy. But, is it possible for us to overlook the realities of this situation? It is not a question of being left or right. As conscious intelligent beings should we not learn from experience? China has taken a positive anti-Soviet line on non-alignment. Biggest setback to the progressive movement comes from China.

The anti-Afghan movement is supported by China. Vietnam is attacked by China and dual game is played by China because they know that it was from India that Buddha came and therefore while they talk of all the outside world as barbaric world, India they speak of as the other

[Prof. Rasheeduddin Khan]

world because Gautam Bhuddha went from here. They are highly respectful. Their being respectful of us should not be overlooked. Therefore, the second question is that while negotiating with them, the whole thing, including China's attempt not to interfere in the internal affairs of our North-Eastern Frontier, because that is an alarming area, should not be overlooked. These are the two things which I would like to say and I hope the Minister will take them in the spirit in which I have said.

SHRI P. V. NARASIMHA RAO: Sir,...

SHRI KALYAN ROY: One thing I would like to say here. The Minister should reply to the question of the publication of the map in the *Newsweek*.

SHRI P. V. NARASIMHA RAO: I said about the map in the *Newsweek* that there is a question tabled either in this House or the other House—I do not remember exactly—and I am giving a full answer to that question. I do not remember all the details; otherwise, I would have said it here even now.

SHRI KALYAN ROY: But you take it up.

SHRI P. V. NARASIMHA RAO: We have taken it up and something very desirable has happened. That is contained in the answer.

Now, I have just said that the real dialogue has not yet started. I would certainly welcome any suggestions for inclusion of important topics in the dialogue. As it is, the topics already touched upon are there before us and they are a part of the process of normalisation and part of the basket of issues that will be taken up, that will have to be taken up for

normalisation. But I would not anticipate anything further than this because we are still at the stage where a dialogue properly so-called has not yet started. That is the position.

REFERENCE TO THE REPORTED LETHAL POLLUTION OF THE RIVER GANGA

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI R. R. MORARKA): The House will now take up special mentions. Shri Prakash Mehrotra.

श्री प्रकाश महरोत्रा (उत्तर प्रदेश): शादरणीय उपसभाध्यक्ष जी, हमारे देश की सब से पुनीत और श्रेष्ठ महानदी गंगा जी जिसके शुद्ध जल की चर्चा अनादिकाल से चली आ रही है। जिसके किनारे हमारे कई तीर्थ स्थान हैं जिसमें से लाखों लोग आचमन लेते हैं; जिसमें लोग नहाते हैं। उस नदी की, गंगा नदी की यह स्थिति आज हो गई है कि उसने एक गंदे नाले का स्वरूप ले लिया है। आपने समाचार पत्रों में देखा होगा दो-तीन दिन पहले कि स्मर इंडस्ट्रीयूट के 50 सदस्य वाराणसी में गंगा पर कूज करने गये। एक घंटे के अंदर ही अंदर, वह जब कूज करके आ रहे थे तो 35 बाँडीज तो पूरी जल गई और कुछ अधजली प्लोट कर रही थी। कुछ बाँडीज किनारे लगी हुई थी जिस पर बल्चर घूम रहे थे।

श्री रामेश्वर सिंह (उत्तर प्रदेश): उस स्थान का नाम तो बता दीजिए।

श्री प्रकाश महरोत्रा: मैं उसका नाम बता दिया है वाराणसी। वहाँ बदबू भी आ रही थी। 30 सेम्पल्स पानी के अलग अलग जगहों के लिये गये। उस सेम्पल्स में उन्होंने देखा कि इंडस्ट्रीयल