

[Shri Dinesh Goswami]
better position to talk unequivocally and clearly and express our own mind to the Soviet Union. Otherwise that friendship has no meaning. (Time bell rings)

Sir, I am concluding in two minutes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: But I have an announcement to make in those two minutes.

Business

1. Consideration and passing of the following Bills:—

- | | |
|--|---------------------------|
| (a) The Rampur Raza Library (Amendment) Bill, 1979. | 1 hour |
| (b) The Khuda Bakhsh Oriental Public Library (Amendment) Bill, 1979. | 1 hour |
| (c) The Constitution (Forty fifth Amendment) Bill, 1980, as passed by Lok Sabha—of which intimation will come to us. | 4 hours—January 25, 1980. |

2. Discussion on the President's Address.

3 days—
28th, 29th and
30th January
1980.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Now I suppose it is time for us to adjourn for lunch till 2.30 p.m. when Calling Attention Motion will continue.

SHRI DINESH GOSWAMI (Assam):
Sir, five minutes may be given to me so that I can conclude.

MR. CHAIRMAN: You will get time at 2.30. The House stands adjourned till 2.30 p.m.

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

The House reassembled after lunch at thirty-three minutes past two of the clock, Mr. Deputy Chairman in the Chair.

ALLOCATION OF TIME FOR DISPOSAL OF GOVERNMENT AND OTHER BUSINESS

MR. CHAIRMAN: I have to inform Members that the Business Advisory Committee at its meeting held today, the 24th January, 1980, allotted time for Government Legislative and other Business as follows:—

CALLING ATTENTION TO A MATTER OF URGENT PUBLIC IMPORTANCE

Serious Developments arising out of Decision of the Governments of the United States of America and China to extend Massive Arms Aid to Pakistan in the wake of Russian Intervention in Afghanistan—Contd.

SHRI DINESH GOSWAMI: Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, just before the lunch break, I was pointing out to the House that, though we are committed to the idea of non-alignment and we must work within the broad parameters of non-alignment, it does not mean that we must pursue a policy of equidistance between the Super Powers, nor does it mean that we will not distinguish between a friend and a foe, nor does it mean that we will not distinguish between a country which has always shown or exhibited

a tendency of aggression and expansionism, a tendency of desperation and destabilisation and another country which has stood by us in times of difficulty—not only by us but also by all the other developing nations. That does not mean that we will not make comments—justifiable comments—against one country because we have friendly relations with it. In fact, I pointed out that it is all the more necessary because we have got friendly relations with the Soviet Union—long standing relations with them—which have been extended to popular levels. As a friend we must deal with Soviet Russia if we feel that some of the Russian activities are unjustified or we feel that Soviet Russia is not doing something which is proper to the interests of our country, to the interests of Asia or to the interests of the world. Therefore, Sir, I feel that India has a duty to use its good offices not to leave the United States or even Soviet Russia in any doubt that it will regard involvement of any foreign troops in the sub-continent as hostile to our interests and the threat they pose to the stability and peace of the sub-continent. Sir, may I point out to the hon. Minister of External Affairs that neither in the speech at the United Nations by our permanent representative nor even in the President's address delivered yesterday have we clearly and unequivocally stated our position so far as this aspect is concerned? We have tried to be vague. But at the same time in international matters ambivalence some times does not pay. In this moment of crisis we must clearly and unequivocally state our position.

Sir, I do not want to take much time of the House. I come to some of my questions to the hon. Foreign Minister. As the important questions have already been dealt with by the previous speakers, I will ask some peripheral questions. Sir, my first question is: knowing full well that the situation in Afghanistan has placed contradictory or opposite demands on our foreign policy matters

in the light of the statements that have been made earlier, if we are to make certain things clear to the Soviet Russia we must also clearly tell them that our attitude to the Soviet Russia and America will not be the attitude of equidistance. Sir, knowing that there are such contradictory demands and also realising that in such matters ambivalence would not pay is the Government taking any steps to make it clear both to the United States and also to the Soviet Russia that their active involvement in Afghanistan is likely to pose a threat and a possibility of a cold war and a global conflict in South Asia and that our country will try to do its utmost to prevent such a possibility?

My second question is: Because of the developments in Iran and Afghanistan the American public opinion which was very much against arming Pakistan in 1965, to a certain extent has gone in favour of an aggressive stand by Pakistan, and this time the public opinion has not been to that extent vocal against the decision to pump arms to Pakistan. If that is so, what steps the Government, are taking to create universal public opinion and particularly to raise the conscience of the American public opinion against the threat to the stability of the region? And in this connection may I point out, Sir, from our experience of visits abroad that unfortunately the public relations of our External Affairs Ministry are of a very weak nature? We have not been able to project our case in many matters in a manner that we should project, and I hope the hon. Foreign Minister will agree to that proposition.

My third question is: Is it a fact that the Afghanistan public opinion has not taken kindly, as has been reported in some places, to the Soviet involvement in Afghanistan? If the answer is in the negative, I will be very happy. If the answer is in affirmative, is it also a fact that the Afghanistan public opinion has, to a

[Shri Dinesh Goswami]

certain extent, gone against India because of the rather confusing stand of India, and if so because there is a very long standing friendly relation not only with the Afghanistan Government but also the Afghanistan people and it is more important to have friendly relations at popular level, what steps is the Government taking to remove the doubts and misapprehensions in the minds of the Afghanistan people?

The fourth and the last question is: what steps is India taking at the present moment to make it clear to the involving nations that their incursion into Pakistan will put our friendship with that country under great strains and what steps are we taking to make this point clear to Pakistan also because I think it is very clear that we want an economically strong Pakistan based on popular Government to flourish not only for Pakistan's interests, at least for India's interests also.

Thank you.

SHRI P. V. NARASIMHA RAO:

Sir, so far as the definition of non-alignment mentioned by the hon. Member is concerned, we are in agreement with it. We have never taken non-alignment to mean equidistance. We have always understood and implemented the policy of non-alignment to mean in the sense of the independence of India to take a stand without fear or favour and work in pursuance of that situation. That is the essence of non-alignment, according to us and according to accepted opinion. (Interruption) Sir, I now come to the questions put by the hon. Member. In the first place, I would like to state categorically that there is no ambivalence of any kind in the stand taken by us. The stand we have taken is clear-cut. We have taken up this matter with all the countries concerned and we have left them in no doubt that our stand is going to be pursued by us and there is not going to be any relenting on the stand taken by us. What we have

to tell the Soviet Union, we have told them. What we have to tell the USA, we are going to tell them. We have told them already. Their representative is coming. So there is no question of any ambivalence in this matter and I am absolutely certain that we are going to be quite effective in all our talks with all these countries.

So far as Pakistan is concerned, I have already submitted, Sir, that we have told them that the latest in our relations is the Simla Agreement; so, let us get along with the Simla Agreement; let us, in pursuance of the Simla Agreement, start co-operating with each other in all possible fields so that the tension that has been created is eased, and the general atmosphere of goodwill then helps us in solving all the problems in the region, including this problem. This is the approach which we have taken and I am glad to say that so far the same approach has been to some extent reciprocated from the other side. But I am not jumping to conclusions on the basis of the present situation. We will follow the same line.

So far as the American public opinion is concerned, I cannot say that the American public opinion of recent time, that is within the last one week or so, is identical with what it was before. There has been a little shift. But at the same time, I have myself seen reports and articles, etc., in a section of the American press to show that they also think that arming of Pakistan is going to be counter-productive. That is what I have definitely seen and read, and I would like to share it with the House.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Counter-productive from what point of view?

SHRI P. V. NARASIMHA RAO: From even the American point of view. That is what they have said. Naturally it is their point of view they will be concerned about, not ours or yours. But about generally creating a universal public opinion, Sir, there has been some criticism that the working of our public rela-

tions personnel in our embassies, etc., leaves much to be desired. I am aware of this criticism. But I would like to assure the House that I would personally look into this aspect as soon as possible. I am not agreeing with all the criticism at this moment. But when criticism is made incessantly, it is reasonable to think that there may be some validity, some basis for the criticism. Beyond this I would not say anything now, except to assure the House that I would personally look into it at the proper time.

Now about the Afghan public opinion, I would like the hon. Member to appreciate that just at this moment, you cannot expect a crystallised public opinion of the same kind, a uniform crystallised public opinion in Afghanistan. In Afghanistan public opinion is bound to be divided. And just now it will not be possible for us to do much in that respect. In fact, we will have to attend to countries other than Afghanistan so far as public opinion is concerned. The public opinion within Afghanistan will naturally depend on the developments within that country and, therefore, we need not be too anxious, too eager to do anything or to say anything about public opinion within Afghanistan. Finally regarding what the honourable Member has said that we will explain our stand to everyone in the most effective terms possible—and this is what is possible through diplomatic channels much better than through other channels—I assure him that we are going to do it; we have in fact already started doing it and in the weeks to come it will be our endeavour to step up this persuasive pressure if I may call it that way, on all concerned in the interests of the entire region and in the interests of the individual countries also. Thank you.

SHRI SADASIV BAGAITKAR (Maharashtra): On a point of order. I am sorry to say that the honourable Minister has just now said in his answer that there is no manner of ambivalence in the position of the Government of India . . .

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: This is no point of order. Those who have given their names should have priority in this matter.

SHRI SADASIV BAGAITKAR: I am not speaking on the Motion . . .
(Interruptions)

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: But that is what you are trying to do.

SHRI SADASIV BAGAITKAR: The Minister is trying to mislead the through . . .

(Interruptions)

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: No, there is no point of order in what you are saying. And there is a long list of Members who want to speak, and there are two Bills to go through...

(Interruptions)

SHRI SADASIV BAGAITKAR: Sir, it is my duty to bring to your notice that the honourable Minister is trying to mislead the House. The Prime Minister's first statement said that it is at the invitation of the Afghan Government that the Soviet armies went there. Then she revised it and said that it does not mean that we approve of it. Whatever it may be, whether it is ambivalence or lapse on the part of the Government, but to say there is no ambivalence is not correct . . .

(Interruptions)

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Please sit down. Now Mr. Jagdish Prasad Mathur.

श्री जगदीश प्रसाद माथुर (उत्तर प्रदेश) : श्रीमन्, मेरे कई साथियों ने इस संबंध में सदन में ऐतिहासिक पृष्ठभूमि रखी है और विवेचन किया । मैं उनमें से बहुतों के साथ सहमत हूँ । लेकिन मेरी दृष्टि में इस समय कबल मध्य पूर्व की पृष्ठभूमि नहीं है । अफगानिस्तान आज से नहीं, सदियों से हिन्दुस्तान की सीमा रहा है । हम जब छोटे थे तो अपने बचपन में पड़ा करते थे कि कितने ही अफगानी राजा जो हमारी सीमा क्षेत्रों में राज्य करते थे, वे विदेशियों से

[श्री जगदीश प्रसाद माथुर]

लड़ा करते थे। उनके सामने एक ही उद्देश्य रहता था कि रणिया किसी भांति भी भारत की सीमा तक न आ सके। उन दिनों यद्यपि समुद्री सेनाओं का बहुत कम महत्व हुआ करता था, लेकिन फिर भी रूस अरब सागर के निकट तक न आ सका। मैं कहता हूँ कि अफगानिस्तान की इन घटनाओं की पृष्ठभूमि को कोई हम से समझे। यह ठीक है कि हिन्दुस्तान के बंटवारे के पश्चात् पाकिस्तान का अलग राज्य बन गया, लेकिन अगर कोई यह समझे कि हिन्दुस्तान की सुरक्षा की दृष्टि से सीमाएं भी सिमिट कर अमृतसर तक आ गई हैं तो मैं समझता हूँ कि वह भूल करता है। भारतवर्ष की आज भी, यद्यपि पाकिस्तान अलग हो गया है, सुरक्षा की सीमाएं अफगानिस्तान तक जाती हैं। मैं यह बात केवल इसलिए नहीं कहता कि यह बात सामरिक दृष्टि से आज आवश्यक है, बल्कि भाईचारे के नाते भी इसकी बहुत बड़ी आवश्यकता है। इसलिए जब मेरे साथी यह कहते हैं कि रूस बड़े निर्बाध तरीके से आ गया है तो मैं उनका ध्यान तीन-चार शताब्दियों पूर्व के काल की ओर ले जाना चाहता हूँ। रूस चाहे 'जार' के नीचे रहा हो या साम्यवाद के नीचे रहा हो, उसकी हमेशा से दृष्टि अफगानिस्तान के माध्यम से हिन्दुस्तान की सीमा और समुद्र तट तक आने की रही है। इतिहास इसका साक्षी है। मैं समझता हूँ कि मंत्री महोदय ने रूस को खुला समर्थन दे करके इस इतिहास को आंखों से ओझल कर दिया। उनके सामने रूस का पुराना इतिहास और आकांक्षाएं उभरनी चाहिए थी।

श्रीमन्, इन्हीं बातों से जुड़ा हुआ

एक दूसरा प्रश्न भी है। मिडिल ईस्ट के अन्दर जो कुछ हो रहा है और जिस प्रकार से दूसरे महायुद्ध के बाद से नौ सैनिक शक्ति की आवश्यकता बढ़ गई है और पिछले दो दशकों के अन्दर इंडियन ओशन के अन्दर शीत युद्ध जिस प्रकार से प्रारम्भ हुआ है उस सब को देखते हुए, मैं मंत्री महोदय से जानना चाहता हूँ कि क्या रूस अफगानिस्तान में आया है या नहीं? मुझे आश्चर्य हुआ, आश्चर्य ही नहीं बल्कि खेद हुआ जब हमारे एक साथी ने बोलते हुए यह कहा कि सवाल यह है कि अफगानिस्तान के अन्दर ऐसा राज्य चाहिए जिसमें मुल्ला न हों, मजहब न हो। मैं पूछना चाहता हूँ कि क्या हमारी सरकार इस बात को स्वीकार करेगी? क्या वह दुनिया के साम्राज्यवादी देशों को यह अधिकार देगी कि वे यह तय करें कि कहां पर मुल्ला रहें, कहां पर मौलवी रहें और कहां पर पंडित रहें या गिरजे रहें? हम यह अधिकार किसी साम्राज्यवादी देश को नहीं दे सकते। यह अधिकार पाकिस्तान का है, अफगानिस्तान का है और सारे अरब देशों का है कि वे यह तय करें कि वहां पर मुल्ला राज करेंगे या मौलवी राज करेंगे, या वहां पर क्या परिवर्तन हो? अन्य देशों को यह अधिकार देना हमने सिद्धान्त रूप में स्वीकार कर लिया तो हम रूस के भालू के पंजों और चीन के शिकांजों को दुनिया में बढ़ने से रोकने के लिये खड़े नहीं हो सकते। मैं इस बात का प्रतिवाद करना चाहता हूँ। अगर भारत सरकार इस धोखे में रहेगी कि रूस न्याय की इच्छा से अफगानिस्तान के अन्दर आया है तो मैं समझता हूँ कि यह समझकर वह बहुत बड़ी गलती कर रही है। अभी मंत्री महोदय ने वहां

पर अफगानिस्तान में जनमत का प्रश्न खड़ा किया है। बड़ा अच्छा किया है। मैं पूछना चाहता हूँ कि यदि अफगानिस्तान का जनमत रूस के पक्ष में है तो वहाँ लड़ कौन रहा है? अखबार जो बताते हैं, जो अखबारों में आ रहा है उससे तो यह लगता है कि सारा अफगानिस्तान रूस के खिलाफ लड़ रहा है। स्टेट्समैन के विशेष प्रतिनिधि वहाँ हो कर आये हैं उन्होंने लिखा है कि

"that it is nothing short of an aggression."

वहाँ के लोग गुरिल्ला युद्ध से अपना खून बहाकर अपने मुल्क के लिये लड़ रहे हैं। मैं सरकार से पूछना चाहता हूँ कि उसकी सहानुभूति उन लोगों के साथ है जो कि अपने देश की आजादी के लिये, अपने मजहब की आजादी के लिये खून बहाकर लड़ना चाहते हैं या उनके साथ हैं जो अपनी एक ऐतिहासिक इच्छा को पूरा करने के लिये हिन्दुस्तान की सीमाओं पर खड़ा होना चाहते हैं। असली सवाल तो यह है। यह सिद्धान्त का तो सवाल है ही लेकिन हमारी नीतियों का भी सवाल है। तो मैं जानना चाहता हूँ मंत्री महोदय से कि क्या आपने रूस से यह आश्वासन ले लिया है कि अमुक निश्चित तिथि तक उनकी फौजें वापस चली जायेंगी; या वह उस समय वापस जायेगा जब वह वहाँ अपनी कठपुतली सरकार बना देगा? यदि वह वहाँ पर अपनी कठपुतली सरकार बनाना चाहता है तो इससे बड़ी साम्राज्यवादी हरकत कोई नहीं हो सकती। साम्राज्यवादी आक्रांक्षाएँ अमेरिका की होंगी, चीन की होंगी, लेकिन रूस उससे बरी नहीं है, इस तथ्य से भी आपको सावधान रहना चाहिए। मैं आपसे यह भी पूछना चाहता हूँ कि पब्लिक ओपीनियन जानने

के लिये आपके पास क्या पैमाना है। हमारे जैसा सामान्य व्यक्ति जिसके पास कोई सरकारी मशीनरी नहीं है यह अनुभव कर रहा है कि सारा अफगानिस्तान रूस के खिलाफ लड़ रहा है। इसके साथ ही एक दूसरा प्रश्न भी जुड़ा हुआ है। मैं जानना चाहता हूँ कि क्या आप अफगानिस्तान के लोगों के साथ सहानुभूति रखते हैं। अपने भाषण में मंत्री महोदय ने कहा कि उनसे हमारी फेंडशिप रही है।

He did not say about the people of Afghanistan. Is it with the Government or the Sultan of Afghanistan?

तो मैं यह जानना चाहता हूँ कि आपके पास कौन सा यंत्र है जिसके आधार पर आप कह रहे हैं कि 'क्रिस्टलाइज' नहीं हुआ। यह बात सत्य है कि अफगानिस्तान हमारा मित्र रहा है। लेकिन यह मित्रता इसलिये रही है कि हमारी पाकिस्तान के साथ खिचावट रही है। लेकिन अगर पाकिस्तान के साथ यह खिचावट इतनी बढ़ जाये कि हम युद्ध के अन्दर कूद जायें तो हमारी मित्रता का कोई महत्व नहीं है। मैं आपको बधाई देना चाहता हूँ कि हमारे विदेश सचिव पाकिस्तान के निमंत्रण पर वहाँ जा रहे हैं। यह बहुत अच्छी बात है। आज मुख्य बात यह है कि हमें पाकिस्तान को कम से कम हिन्दुस्तान की बेहतरी की बैकग्राउण्ड में चीन और अमेरिका की जो धुरी है उससे बाहर निकालने की कोशिश करनी चाहिए। यही हमारी राजनैतिक कसौटी होगी। हमें अपने वक्तव्यों से, अपने कार्य करने के ढंग से ऐसी स्थिति पैदा नहीं करनी चाहिए जिससे पाकिस्तान के पास सिवाय इसके कोई चारा न रह जाये कि वह चीन और अमेरिका की गोद में बैठकर हमारे साथ लड़ने पर मजबूर हो जाये।

[श्री जगदीश प्रसाद माथुर]

हमने पाकिस्तान के साथ दोतीन लड़इयां लड़ी हैं। मैं मानता हूं कि पाकिस्तान के हुक्मरान और वहां की अवाम में यह गलतफहमी है कि हिन्दुस्तान उनका शत्रु है। सही बात तो यह है कि युद्ध के लिये पाकिस्तान ने पहल की थी हमने नहीं की थी। जो हमारे विदेश सचिव वहां पर जा रहे हैं, क्या वे इस बात का आश्वासन ले कर जा रहे हैं कि यदि पाकिस्तान को किसी प्रकार का खतरा होगा, रूस या अन्य कोई शक्ति उस पर हमला करेगी तो हिन्दुस्तान अपने उन बन्धुओं के साथ खड़ा रहेगा जो सन् 1947 के पहले यहां थे, और हम रूस के साथ नहीं जायेंगे? जैसे कि बंगलादेश का जिक्र किया गया है। बंगलादेश का सवाल एक शांतिपूर्ण तरीके से बंगलादेश का हमारा मित्र है। अगर सरकार यह सोचती है कि हिस्ट्री हम दोहरा सकती है, तो पाकिस्तान को अलग करके रूस का साथ दे कर हमें तब तक लड़ सकते हैं तो यह बात सही होगी। बंगलादेश युद्ध के लिये हिन्दुस्तान एक आवाज के साथ खड़ा था। मुझे इस प्रकार के कुचक्र हिन्दुस्तान पाकिस्तान के साथ नहीं लड़ना चाहिए, सरकार अलग खड़ी होगी और हम शीत युद्ध से खुलमखुला युद्ध को अपने द्वार पर खींच कर ले आयेंगे। आज आवश्यकता इस बात की है—जैसे कि मैंने पहले कहा, पाकिस्तान को हम इस एक्सेज से निकाल कर ले आएँ। डिप्लोमेसी इसी चीज का नाम है।

Diplomacy and war are two parts of the same sword.

जहां पर डिप्लोमेसी फेल हो जाती है वहां पर उद्देश्य को पूरा करने के लिए युद्ध करते हैं। अगर डिप्लोमेसी से पाकिस्तान

हमारी दोस्ती न पा सका तो मान लीजिए युद्ध निश्चित रूप से होगा। पाक को हथियारों पर जो कि संदेह किया जा रहा है जो अमरीका उनको दे रहा है, वह ठीक है हमारे खिलाफ उनका इस्तेमाल हुआ है। इस बारे में अमरीका दोषी है। तीन चार बार उसने धोखा दिया है। लेकिन अगर मेरा एक दोस्त है, मेरे पास हथियार है, तो मैं दोस्त पर हथियार नहीं चलाऊंगा आपने तो संदेह पैदा करने का मौका दिया है। शिकायतें दिलों के अन्दर हैं। यह शिकायतें, शिकवे मैं समझता हूं कि समाप्त करने का सब से अच्छा मौका हमारे पास है, जो सन् 47 से लेकर आज तक हम नहीं कर सके। अब हम पाकिस्तान के साथ दिली दोस्ती हासिल कर सकते हैं, जो न केवल हमारे लिए, न केवल पाकिस्तान के लिए बल्कि सारे रीजन के लिए लाभदायक होगा। इससे हम सारे रीजन के लिए स्थाई शान्ति प्राप्त कर सकेंगे। जहां तक अमरीका का सवाल है, अमरीका शस्त्र दे रहा है यह बिल्कुल सही बात है कि दे रहा है। मैं समझता हूं कि देने नहीं चाहिए। एक बार नहीं, दो बार नहीं अनेक बार उसने शस्त्र दिए हैं। बंगलादेश के वार के समय सातवां बड़ा ला कर खड़ा कर दिया। उसके बाद भी पाकिस्तान को वह हथियार दे रहा है। इतना ही नहीं पाकिस्तान के पास एटम बम बनाने की शक्ति आज हम से ज्यादा है। 110 टन उन्होंने फ्रांस और अलजीरिया के माध्यम से एनरिच्ड यूरेनियम प्राप्त किया है। अमरीका को मालूम है यद्यपि उन्होंने आर्म्स एंड इसलिए बन्द की थी कि अगर आप एटम बम बनायेंगे तो हम आपको यूरेनियम नहीं देंगे, सहायता नहीं देंगे। लेकिन उसके पश्चात् दूसरे तरीकों से पाकिस्तान ने प्राप्त किया है और आज भी शस्त्र वह प्राप्त कर रहा है। लेकिन हमें अमरीका के शस्त्रों का इतना खतरा नहीं है जितना कि चीन के शस्त्रों से है। अमरीका वियतनाम

में देख चुका है कि वहां पर उनके जवान लड़ नहीं सकते। 22 साल लड़ने के बाद पराजित होकर मुंह दिखाने के काबिल नहीं रहे। लेकिन चीन एक विस्तारवादी देश है, यह हम नहीं भूल सकते। आज भी हमारी हजारों मील भूमि उसके हाथों में है। इसलिए आवश्यकता इस बात की है कि जहां पर हम अमरीका से, पाकिस्तान से इस बात का आश्वासन ले सकते हैं कि आप वहां हवाई अड्डे नहीं बनायेंगे, फौजी अड्डे नहीं बनायेंगे क्या इसके मुकाबले रूस से भी सरकार यह आश्वासन लेने का प्रयत्न करेगी कि जब भी वे जायेंगे तो एक भी सिपाही, एक भी अड्डा, मिसाइल या फौज वहां नहीं रहेगी। यह आश्वासन रूस से साफ तौर पर ले लिया जाना चाहिए। मैं अब अपनी अन्तिम बात कह कर समाप्त करूंगा। आपने यह बताया कि रूस में हम जा रहे हैं, हम अमरीका के लोगों से बात कर रहे हैं लेकिन चीन का कहीं उल्लेख नहीं है। चीन के साथ इस डिप्लोमेसी में आप क्या कर रहे हैं ?

Either win them or wean them out.

3 P. M.

पहली बात यह करें कि पाकिस्तान को चीन-अमरीकी धुरी से बाहर ले आयें, और नहीं तो चीन से आश्वासन लें या उसको आश्वस्त करें कि जब आपके ऊपर खतरा आयेगा तो हम रूस का साथ इस मौके पर देने वाले नहीं हैं। आगे की बात हम नहीं जानते हैं। यही 2-3 सवाल हैं जिनका मंत्री महोदय से मैं उत्तर चाहूंगा।

श्री पी० वी० नरसिंह राव : उप-सभापति महोदय, मैं यह सोच ही रहा था कि एक तरफ से एक सिद्धांत सदन के सामने आया तो दूसरी तरफ से दूसरा सिद्धांत भी आयेगा. . . (Interruptions)

श्री रामानन्द यादव (बिहार) : वह तो आ ही गया।

922 R.S.—3.

श्री पी० वी० नरसिंह राव : आ ही गया. . . (Interruptions) । मुझे किसी बड़े राष्ट्र के मंसूबों से इस वक्त कोई संबंध नहीं है। मेरा संबंध आज की जो स्थिति है, उसको कैसे सुधारना है, इसकी तरफ है। ठीक है कि ये बातें कही जा रही हैं। हो सकता है कि एक सिद्धांत और दूसरे सिद्धांत में इतना विरोध हो कि कोई इधर झुके और कोई उधर झुके। लेकिन हम इस समय कहीं भी नहीं झुकना चाहते हैं। हम दोनों सिद्धांतों को अपनी अपनी जगह रखना चाहते हैं और आज की जो स्थिति है उसके बारे में सक्रिय रूप से कुछ करना चाहते हैं उसे सुधारने के लिए। अभी माननीय सदस्य ने यह कहा कि यदि यह सरकार सोच रही है कि किसी और सरकार से या किसी और राष्ट्र से मिलकर पाकिस्तान को तोड़ना चाहिए तो यह बड़ी गलती कर रही है। मैं माननीय सदस्य से बड़ी विनम्रता से कहना चाहता हूं कि यह बात कहकर वे बड़ी गलती कर रहे हैं क्योंकि हमारी सरकार का कभी यह प्रयत्न नहीं रहा. . . (Interruptions)

श्री जगदीश प्रसाद माथुर : यदि करेंगे तो गलती करेंगे यह मैंने कहा है।

श्री पी० वी० नरसिंह राव : यह प्रश्न कभी नहीं उठने वाला है क्योंकि शिमला एग्रीमेंट में सबसे पहले यह बात कही गयी है और सबसे महत्वपूर्ण बात यह है कि ये दोनों देश एक दूसरे की टैरीटोरियल इन्टेग्रिटी के बारे में, उनकी सलामियत के बारे में, उनकी सम्पूर्णता के बारे में, एक दूसरे को आश्वासन दे चुके हैं और उस आश्वासन के बाद यह प्रश्न उठना नहीं चाहिए। फिर यह कहना कि अफगानिस्तान के भीतर कौन सी सरकार आयी मुद्दाओं की आयी या मौलवियों की आयी उसमें हम कुछ हस्तक्षेप कर रहे हैं, यह भी सही नहीं है। हम मानते हैं कि हमारा नान एलाईनमेंट

[श्री वी० पी० नरसिंह राव]

का सबसे बड़ा सिद्धांत, एक बड़ा सूत्र यही है कि किन देश में क्या होता है, अन्दरूनी तौर में क्या होता है उसमें हम हस्तक्षेप नहीं करें। यह ठीक है कि हमारी लाईक्स एण्ड डिसलाईक्स हो सकती हैं लेकिन हम हस्तक्षेप नहीं कर सकते हैं और उस मामले में हम गिरकुल नहीं जानना चाहते हैं। मैं आपको यह आश्वासन देना चाहता हूँ जैसा कि माननीय सदस्य ने यह पूछा कि जो हमारे सांचव पाकिस्तान जा रहे हैं, इस्लामाबाद जा रहे हैं वे हमारे पास से क्या ले कर जा रहे हैं। मैं उनसे कहना चाहता हूँ कि वे हमारे पास से सद्भावना लेकर जा रहे हैं, उस सद्भावना को देशहित में लेकर जा रहे हैं। उस सद्भावना के परमुएं में वहां जो बातें होंगी यह उस पर निर्भर होगा कि क्या नतीजा निकला और उससे क्या कार्यक्रम बनायें। चीन के साथ, मैं कह चुका हूँ कि हमारी वार्ता हो रही है, अब यह ठीक है कि हमारी तरफ से कोई गया नहीं है और उधर से कोई आया नहीं है। ऐसी सम्भावना दिखाई नहीं दे रही है लेकिन यह आवश्यक नहीं है कि प्रत्येक वार्ता के सिलसिले में कोई उधर से चला जाये और कोई उधर से चला आये। हो सकता है ऐसा हो लेकिन आज मैं इतना कहना चाहता हूँ कि हमारी वार्ता हो रही है और पक्की हो रही है।

श्री रबी राय (उड़ीसा) : उपसभापति महोदय, मैं प्रश्न पूछने के पहले यह मानता हूँ कि हमारे नये विदेश मंत्री एक विद्वान आदमी हैं और ये जब हम लोगों के प्रश्नों का जवाब देंगे तो कुछ पार्टीवाजी से ऊपर उठकर—क्योंकि हम यहां देश की सुरक्षा के बारे में बात कर रहे हैं, जवाब देंगे। सवाल मैं यह पूछना चाहता हूँ कि अफगानिस्तान का जो सवाल है, यह कुछ सिद्धांत को लेकर हमने उठाने की कोशिश की है। अभी मंत्री महोदय ने जो जवाब दिया,

हमको लगा कि यह बहुत व्यावहारिक ढंग से सोचते हैं, कोई सिद्धांत को लेकर के आगे नहीं बढ़ते हैं जिसको अंग्रेजी में कहते हैं कि वे प्रेगमेंटिक ज्यादा हो जाते हैं, ऐसा हमें लगता है।

असल में यह जो चीज है, मुझे यह याद पड़ता है कि 1948 में जब तिब्बत के ऊपर चीन का कब्जा हुआ, उस वक्त भारत सरकार सुजरेनिटी और सोवरेनिटी को लेकर इतनी फंसी रही, तो आक्रमण को आक्रमण कहने के लिये वह पिछाहट हुई। इसलिये मैं आज भारत सरकार से जानना चाहता हूँ कि अभी अखबार में निकला है और हमें लगता है कि सरकार भी इस चीज को मानेगी कि करीब साढ़ डिवीजन रूसी सेना अभी भी अफगानिस्तान में मौजूद है और यह दिसम्बर 26 की तारीख से आ गये हैं और पिछले दो साल से जब हम अफगानिस्तान का सारा इतिहास देखेंगे तो उसमें दाऊद सरकार हट जाने के बाद जो तरकी सरकार बनी उनकी हत्या हुई। तत्पश्चात् अमीन साहब की हत्या हुई। अभी सरकार में कर्मल साहब आए हैं। तो वहां की जो अन्दरूनी कम्यूनिस्ट पार्टी है वह दो खेमों में बंट गई है—परचम और खल्क और इन दोनों में मुठभेड़ चलती है। इसकी रूसी सरकार की ओर से यह कोशिश हुई होगी कि वहां की कम्यूनिस्ट पार्टी को इकट्ठा रखें। लेकिन इसमें पिछले दो साल से वे असफल रहे हैं।

मेरा यह कहना है कि जब हमारा एक पड़ोसी देश जिसको हम चाहेंगे कि रूस और हिन्दुस्तान में वह एक आज़ाद राष्ट्र के नाते रहे जोकि अभी नान-अलाइंड कंट्री के नाते वह खुद को मानते हैं, तो इस तरह की चीज जब हम मानते हैं कि एक बफर-स्टेट के नाते हमारे दो देशों में अफगानिस्तान रहे, हिन्दुस्तान और रूस के। तो फिर जब इस तरह के पड़ोसी राष्ट्र में सात डिवीजन

एक विदेशी सेना के तैनात हैं, वहां की सारे तन्त्र व्यवस्था को हाथ में ले लिया है। अफगानिस्तान सरकार अगर कहती है कि रूसी सेना उसने खुद ही मदद के लिये बुलायी है एवं भारत सरकार अगर इसे मान लेती है तो यह एक जबरदस्त गलती कर रही है। हम उसके बारे में इक्वी-वोकेशन कर रहे हैं और उस चीज की निन्दा क्यों नहीं कर रहे हैं। असल में सात डिवीजन सेना वहां पर है जो अन्दरूनी सरकार में हस्तक्षेप कर रही है। वे अब सिर्फ सलाहकार नहीं हैं। वहां के सारे तन्त्र को हाथ में लिये हुए हैं। तो इसलिये आज मैं इस चीज को कहना चाहता हूं और मंत्री महोदय से खास तौर से जानना चाहता हूं कि इस महीने की ग्यारह तारीख को जो संयुक्त राष्ट्र संघ के असाधारण अधिवेशन में जहां एक प्रस्ताव आया था कि इमिजेट एंड अनकंडिशनल टोटल विद्‌ड्रावल आफ फारेन ट्रुप्स फ्रॉम अफगानिस्तान, 104 राष्ट्रों ने इसके समर्थन में वोट दिया, हिन्दुस्तान ने उससे एवस्टेन किया, तो क्यों?

मैं सरकार से जानना चाहता हूं कि क्यों ऐसा किया? और हमारे जो पड़ोसी देश हैं, जैसे श्रीलंका, बंगलादेश और नेपाल यह 104 देशों का साथ दिया और जो अठारह देशों ने विरोध किया और अठारह देश एवस्टेन किये, उनके साथ हम हैं। तो इसमें यह भी सरकार को सोचना चाहिये फिर जवाब भी देना चाहिये कि 104 देशों के साथ इस इमिजेट एंड अनकंडिशनल टोटल विद्‌ड्रावल के बारे में हम लोगों ने क्यों साथ नहीं दिया? असल में सरकार का शिफ्ट हुआ है, पिछले दस-बारह दिनों में सरकार की नीतियां शिफ्ट हुई हैं—क्योंकि जो हमारे स्थायी रिप्रेजेंटेटिव हैं श्री ब्रजेश मिश्र जी, तो उन्होंने एक बयान दिया—और मैं चाहूंगा कि वह बयान आपके जरिए मैं सरकार से जानना चाहूंगा कि वह सभा-पटल पर रखा जाए कि हमारे

जो परमानेंट रिप्रेजेंटेटिव हैं, उन्होंने क्या बयान दिया और उनका बयान जो अखबार में निकला है। उनके बयान के अनुसार अफगानिस्तान सरकार के अनुरोध पर रूसी सेना अफगानिस्तान गई है। भारत सरकार का इस पर विश्वास करने का खास कारण क्या है? यह जो बयान है यह बहुत खतरा-नाक है। मेरा यह कहना है कि इस सिलसिले में एक हमला हुआ है, हस्तक्षेप हुआ है। इसका हस्तक्षेप कहने में भारत सरकार को हिचकिचाहट हो रही है। मैं यह कहना चाहता हूं कि हिन्दुस्तान की सुरक्षा को मद्देनजर रख कर सरकार को इस तरह जो सात डिवीजन सेना वहां लगायी गयी है उसकी निन्दा करनी चाहिए। भारत सरकार के बयान में कहा गया है कि एक दिन भी रूसी सेना अफगानिस्तान में नहीं रहनी चाहिए। तो मैं यह पूछना चाहता हूं कि जब हम रूसी सेना की उपस्थिति को हिन्दुस्तान के लिए और अफगानिस्तान के लिए और पड़ोसी देशों के लिए खतरनाक मानते हैं तो ऐसा बहते क्यों नहीं हैं।

दूसरी चीज, उपसभापति महोदय, एक सिद्धान्त का सवाल आता है। हिन्दुस्तान की सुरक्षा को देखते हुए हम लोग इस इलाके में कोई चांस नहीं ले सकते। जिस तरह से अमरीका, चीन और पाकिस्तान की मौजूदा सरकार गुरिल्ला लोगों की सहायता कर रही है वह निन्दनीय है। उस को रूसी सेना की मौजूदगी के साथ नहीं मिलाना चाहिए। अगर इन दोनों बातों को मिलायेंगे तो हिन्दुस्तान की सुरक्षा के लिए ठीक ढंग से क्या कर सकें उस को हम नहीं देख पायेंगे। तो मैं यह कहना चाहता हूं कि जिस तरह से चीन के साथ हमारे सम्बन्ध हैं चीन ने डेढ़ लाख वर्ग मील भूमि हमारी हड़प ली है—उनकी बातों पर हमें विश्वास नहीं करना चाहिए। यह भी समाचार में आया

[श्री रवी राय]

है कि चीन भी गुरिल्ला भेज रहा है और उनकी कुछ सेना भी पहुंच गयी है। बंगला देश, हिन्दुस्तान और पाकिस्थान 32 साल पहले एक राष्ट्र थे, क्यों न हम आपस में सलाह-मशविरा कर के जो खतरा इस इलाके में आया हुआ है—एक तरफ अमरीका और चीन जिस तरह से साझेदारी से काम कर रहे हैं, दूसरी तरफ रूसी सेना की मौजूदगी, उन की सात डिवीजन सेना—उस के बारे में सोचें ? इन तीनों देशों का कोई ढीला-ढाला कानफेडरेशन होना चाहिए। ताकि आपस में साझेदारी रहे और हम लोगों की जो सीमा है उस का भी सम्मान रखा जाये। इसलिए मैं सरकार से पूछना चाहता हूं कि क्या सरकार के दिमाग में इस तरह का कानफेडरेशन बनाने की कोई सोच है जिस से कि इस इलाके में जो खतरा आने वाला है उस को मद्देनजर रखते हुए, अपनी सुरक्षा को मद्देनजर रखते हुए हम पड़ोसी लोगों के साथ सलाह-मशविरा कर के उन का सक्रिय सहयोग पा सकें ?

तीसरी चीज। यह समाचारपत्रों में निकल चुका है—लेकिन सरकार की तरफ से इस का कोई खंडन नहीं हुआ है—कि हमारे चार भारतीय पत्रकार वहां गये थे, उन के साथ रूसी सेना ने अच्छा बर्ताव नहीं किया, लेकिन डा० तेजा, जो हिन्दुस्तान के राजदूत हैं, ने कुछ किया नहीं। दूसरे राष्ट्रों के जो पत्रकार थे उन के राजदूत वहां उन की देखभाल करते थे, लेकिन इन चार पत्रकारों का कहना है कि बावजूद इस के कि हिन्दुस्तान के एम्बेसेडर, डा० तेजा को, हमारे अफसरों को पता था, हिन्दुस्तान के जर्नलिस्टों की देखभाल करने का या उन को जो तकलीफ

हुई उस का निराकरण करने की कोई व्यवस्था क्यों नहीं की गई ? यह ठोस सवाल मैं मंत्री महोदय से पूछना चाहता हूं। अन्त में उपसभापति महोदय, जैसा कि मैंने शुरू में कहा था कि यह एक ऐसा सवाल है कि जो देश का सवाल है, राष्ट्र के हित का सवाल है और इसलिये मैं माननीय मंत्री जी से कहना चाहता हूं कि जब वे जवाब दें तो इन सारी चीजों को देख कर राष्ट्र के हित में जो बात हो, राष्ट्र की सुरक्षा को ध्यान में रख कर हम लोगों के प्रश्नों का जवाब दें।

श्री पी० बी० नरसिंह राव : श्रीमन्, मैं सहमत हूं इस बात से कि यह जो प्रश्न है यह कोई दलगत प्रश्न नहीं है और दलगत विचारों से ऊंचे उठ कर हम को इस का हल ढूंढना चाहिए। मुझे ऐसा लगता है कि माननीय सदस्य केवल एक बात पर बहुत चिन्तित दिखायी देते हैं कि जिन शब्दों में वह चाहते थे कि निन्दा की जाय वह क्यों नहीं की गयी। मैं तो उन से यह विनती करूंगा कि हम एक जिम्मेदार सरकार हैं। आज की राजनीति में केवल निन्दा करने से कोई समस्या हल नहीं होती और हम ने जो कुछ भी कहा है वह इतना स्पष्ट कहा है कि उस से अधिक कहने की कोई गुंजायश नहीं है जब तक कि हम उस निन्दा के क्षेत्र में न पहुंच जायें। वहां हम नहीं पहुंचे हैं और हम ने यह फैसला किया है कि हम को उस क्षेत्र में नहीं पहुंचना चाहिए।

मैं आप का ध्यान आकर्षित करना चाहता हूं उस प्रस्ताव की तरफ जो जनरल असेम्बली में आया था। अभी हम से पूछा गया कि आप ने वोट क्यों

बहीं दिया । मैं बड़ी विनम्रता से कहना चाहता हूँ कि वह जो प्रस्ताव आया था, एक तो वह एकांगी था और आप जानते हैं कि जो स्थिति अफगानिस्तान में आज उत्पन्न हुई है वह अचानक ही उत्पन्न नहीं हुई है । उस के आगे पीछे एक इतिहास है, एक बैकग्राउण्ड है, एक पृष्ठभूमि है । तो इन सब बातों का उल्लेख हमारे प्रतिनिधि ने उस प्रस्ताव में नहीं पाया और इसलिये उस प्रस्ताव पर पूरी तरह से अपनी सहमति देना हमारे प्रतिनिधि के लिये संभव नहीं पाया गया ।

दूसरी बात, आज जो हम बड़े प्रभावशाली ढंग से इन सभी देशों से बार्ता करने की स्थिति में हैं, ऐसी स्थिति में हम नहीं होते यदि हम उस बक्त वोट देते और एक पक्ष ले लेते । फिर इस के बाद, जो हमारा इनीशियेटिव है, डिप्लोमैटिक इनीशियेटिव है, वह बहुत कम हो जाता । हम नहीं कहते कि वह समाप्त हो जाता, लेकिन वह बहुत कम हो जाता । आज जो इनीशियेटिव है या आज जो बात है उस में हम उस इनीशियेटिव का पूरा-पूरा उपयोग कर रहे हैं और इसी लिये हमें ऐसा नहीं लगता कि संयुक्त राष्ट्र जनरल असेम्बली में जो हमारे प्रतिनिधि ने किया और कहा उस में कोई कमी रह गयी थी या कोई गलती थी ।

दूसरी बात जो माननीय सदस्य ने उठायी वह एक कांफेडरेशन की बात थी । वह पूछ रहे हैं कि ऐसे किसी कांफेडरेशन का कोई चित्र हमारे सामने है क्या ? मैं उन से कहना चाहता हूँ कि ऐसा कोई चित्र नहीं है और इस लिये यह बड़ा विचित्र होगा अगर ऐसी

बात हम आज कहें । ऐसी कोई बात नहीं हो सकती है । हम अपने सारे मित्र देशों से मैत्री बनाये रखेंगे और जो भी हमारे बाईलैटरल रिलेशन्स होंगे उन को आगे बढ़ाने की कोशिश करते रहेंगे । यह कांफेडरेशन की कल्पना ही ठीक नहीं लगती है ।

आखिरी बात उन्होंने कही कि यहाँ से कुछ पत्रकार गये थे । उन से ठीक तौर से बर्ताव नहीं किया गया । मैं नहीं जानता कि उस में क्या सत्य है । यदि वह कोई प्रश्न पूछें या मुझे बतायें और कोई तफसील उन के पास हो तो मैं अवश्य उस की छानबीन कराने की कोशिश करूंगा ।

SHRI NARASINGHA PRASAD NANDA (Orissa): Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, it is a very difficult and delicate situation on which we have called the attention of the Government so that the Government remains aware of the situation and is not caught unawares. Let us have some clear perspective about the situation and the stand taken by the Government of India on the Afghan issue. As I find, a problem of this dimension which has reached our doors cannot be solved by rhetoric. Such problems can never be solved by taking completely divergent views. I feel that it is an evolving situation. Even now, the Government of India cannot say that a clear picture has emerged or the public opinion in Afghanistan has actually crystallised. It is a developing situation. Hence, this situation should be considered in its proper perspective, in the perspective of the past events, in the perspective of the events that are taking place now and in the perspective of the events that are likely to take place in future. I personally feel that here, we should not speak in a manner which would give the impression that either we

[Shri Narasingha Prasad Nanda]

hold brief for A country or for B country. We stand for ourselves. We are India first, India last and India for ever. Our primary interest should be our own national interest. I honestly feel that the kind of pronouncements made by the Government of India so far on the Afghan issue has been in a large measure what was the desire of the largest section of the people of the country. There may be some differences of opinion here and there. Let us not try to show our differences merely by our approaches, by the manner in which we try to present our case, by the manner in which we lay emphasis on one aspect and try to play down the other dangerous aspect. The whole thing should be considered in our national interest. If that is the position, we have to consider why this thing had happened. Personally, I feel that all these things, probably, would not have happened and would not have been played upon by one section of the Super Powers, had not an election been in the offing in one of the countries. Kindly see this. When an election comes, people are interested in grabbing power. We have also passed through an election recently. People try to make all kinds of promises and I personally feel that the Carter Administration having totally failed in Iran, having lost its base in Iran and having to face an election, is behaving in the manner it is doing now. They are now thinking of 400 million dollars of arms aid, which is in the pipeline. As the election comes near, perhaps, there will be billions and billions of dollars of aid. Let us not forget this aspect also. I for one do not support any kind of foreign intervention in any country. I stand for sovereignty, territorial integrity of any other country. If I value my own sovereignty, I do value the sovereignty and territorial integrity of any other country, but in the guise of protecting sovereignty and territorial integrity of a country certain designs, certain international conspiracies,

certain imperialist designs should not be allowed to function and we must point our finger at that kind of conspiracy.

Now, Sir, kindly see what was happening in Iran, what was happening in Vietnam. Who was fighting in Vietnam? The Vietnamese people were fighting for themselves. Hundreds and thousands of people died in Vietnam. For whom did they die? Shall we forget the history? Shall we forget the past conduct of certain Governments and certain people? We have to see for what purpose the arms were supplied to Pakistan in the past and for what purpose they were used. I am not going to elaborate this point. It is no use elaborating the issue in this delicate situation. What is called for is 'restraint', but the point that I am trying to make is, we have to judge a country's attitude in the context of its past conduct. If we forget the past, we cannot judge the present. We cannot formulate our policy properly and correctly. Therefore, I personally feel that while we do not approve of the presence of the Soviet army in Afghanistan, though we know that they came on the invitation from the duly established Government of Afghanistan, not from the point of view as some of our friends are criticising their presence, but from a totally different point of view, that is, we feel that their presence will create a situation of escalation rather than defusing the situation.

Now in the pretext of the presence of the Soviet army in Afghanistan, America is trying to find new bases in Pakistan. May I tell you, it is not that America is trying to find new bases in Pakistan, it already had bases even before the Soviet army entered into Afghanistan? If they did not supply uranium directly to Pakistan, they did it through France and other countries and that is how uranium found its way to Pakistan and that is how they have the atom bomb now though our Tarapore plant is going without any uranium.

Similarly, Sir, when we judge a country, should we not take into account the events that took place after our country became independent? Immediately after we became independent, we were confronted with the Kashmir issue. When the matter was taken to the United Nations, who stood with us as our friend? I am just trying to remind you. The point is that at every point of our national crisis, who has stood with us as our friend? Shall we put the friend and the foe on the same scale? I am not holding a brief for any country, but should we hold both, the friend and the foe, on the same scale?

What was the behaviour of America in the United Nations in the Kashmir days? Therefore, Sir, the point that I am trying to make is, in an evolving situation the Government of India could not have done anything more than saying that they are interested in defusing the situation and this could be done not by inciting or using words, mincing words of condemnation against a friendly country. If we say that you must vacate unequivocally, that should be considered enough by a friend. Words of condemnation in international corridors do not carry us anywhere.

The other point that I would like to make to the External Affairs Minister—which is equally important—is that international affairs cannot be isolated from domestic affairs. You cannot seek stability and defusion of a situation in international affairs while destabilising internal affairs of a country. Mr. Narasimha Rao, who has taken over the charge of the Ministry of External Affairs to the good luck of this country, should consider this thing very seriously. People are going from State to State to destabilise democratically established governments. I do not know, if you want to establish democratic norms and at the same time go on destabilising State Governments and create a situation of confrontation inside the country, how you are

going to face this grave danger to the country. (Interruptions) The part of the statement which was alright for you, you agreed with that. The other part also, you kindly accept. At least give me the right to differ from you. So this is the angle. I hope Mr. Narasimha Rao who is a very sensible person and has the reputation of being a sensible person will give serious thought to this aspect of the question and advise the storm-troopers of his party not to create a situation of destabilisation in the country. Thank you, Sir.

SHRI P. V. NARASIMHA RAO: So far as the hon. Member's speech pertains to foreign affairs, I do not think that any answer is called for because what he has said is reasonable. And that portion which does not pertain to foreign affairs—although he has tried to establish a link which is called "Badarayana Sambandha". I do not think that the parallel he has tried to draw is valid. Therefore, I would prefer not to say anything about it.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Sir, I was a little intrigued by the manner in which the discussion was going on. I should have thought that this discussion on the Calling Attention Motion would be concentrated on arms supplies to Pakistan by the USA and China which, according to the Notice, threatened the security of India. But it seems that we are more interested in discussing the internal affairs of Afghanistan in order, obviously, to push certain political ideas and viewpoints and, perhaps, also to sell certain propaganda that is going on outside. But, Sir, I believe in confining myself to the subject. I have no objection to Afghanistan being discussed separately. The developments in Afghanistan, you can discuss. Developments anywhere in the world—even on some other planet—you can discuss; I have no objection to that. But at the moment we are concerned with the serious developments arising out of the decision of

[Shri Bhupesh Gupta]
the Governments of the USA and China to supply arms to Pakistan.

Sir, first of all, I wish to make it clear that this is nothing new. Arms supplies under one cover or another from this quarter—particularly from the USA—has been going on for a long time ever since the US-Pak. military pact was signed in 1954. Sir, as far as we are concerned, whatever may be the provocation and whatever may be the machination of U.S. imperialism to involve Pakistan into an entanglement, military or otherwise, we always stand for friendly relations between our two countries. We stand by the Simla Agreement and the Simla spirit. Therefore, Sir, these principles in our relations with Pakistan and the people of Pakistan are non-negotiable. In fact, any representative of the Government of India who goes to Pakistan would be well-advised to speak in that spirit that is, the Simla spirit, keeping in view that it has been the traditional policy of this peace-loving country to extend the hand of friendship and co-operation to our brothers and sisters in Pakistan.

We have often been, unfortunately, the victims of plots and conspiracies engineered by U.S. imperialism, abetted by certain reactionary circles within Pakistan itself. Sir, therefore, we must speak on the subject with some restraint and circumspection because nothing must be allowed to disturb our effort to rebuild the bridges of friendship and co-operation between the two neighbours.

Sir, we have all goodwill for the people of Pakistan and I have no doubt in my mind that the people of Pakistan have goodwill towards us. But one of the objects of the American arms supply has been, as Jawaharlal Nehru used to point out time and again, to disturb Indo-Pakistan relations, create misunderstanding and ill-feeling between our two countries. Therefore, in tackling this problem we must bear in mind that provocative aspect apart from the fact that *ipso facto* the arms

supply to Pakistan by the USA constitutes a grave threat to our country ~~not~~ because the Pakistani people want to threaten us but because American imperialism, aided by some reactionary rulers in Pakistan, want to threaten us. But that game has not clicked. It has been costly for all of us and certainly for the people of Pakistan. So I am sure the people of Pakistan will see the dangerous game that has been renewed on a vigorous scale by the U.S. imperialists with Chinese rulers joining lately.

Now what do I find? In this connection, hon. Minister, I saw how wonderfully you played into the propaganda gimmick when you dealt with the developments in Pakistan. In fact, Sir, this Motion says, "Massive arms aid to Pakistan in the wake of the Russian intervention in Afghanistan". Sir, the author of this Motion does not even know historical facts, if I may say so with all respect. Arms supply to Pakistan was going on long before the Afghan situation arose. It has been going on all the time. The Americans are now, having engineered a situation in Afghanistan of direct armed intervention in order to destroy the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan in pursuance of their global strategy against the whole region, using this as an alibi to cover up the criminal resumption, on a large scale, of arms supplies to Pakistan. That is the essence of it. And unless we know, unless we all assess this aspect correctly, we shall be going wrong. Well, arms have been given in the wake of what has happened in Afghanistan. Arms have come because this arms build-up is needed by the United States of America whether in Diego Garcia or in the gulf area or in the middle eastern countries or in Pakistan or in other parts of the world with a view to threatening international peace and security and, above all, the peace-loving nations in our region like India. That is all. It is one aspect of their global strategy and we must see the connection between the two. What they are doing in Afghanistan is that they are using Pakistan as a spring-board in

the intervention, armed intervention, with the help of counter-revolutionaries against the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan. And in this connection I am reminded of intervention by Hitler and Mussolini before the Second World War in Spain when they wanted to destroy the glorious Spanish Republic. We heard in those days the so-called slogan of non-intervention. We saw all kinds of things when some people wanted to come to power. What was demanded was that the League of Nations should intervene under the covenant in order to stop that war by proxy by Hitler and Mussolini in Spain. That was not done and we had to pay in blood and tears in the Second World War unleashed by the fascist forces. Had Spain been defended at that time, as was sought to be done, under the covenant of the League of Nations, perhaps the world history would have been spared the slaughter of 22 million people and such terrible destruction in human life and property. Sir, I am not going into that. Here what I find is that the Government is trying to sermonise to everybody. Why should you sermonise to everybody when you know very well what happened? I should like to know what happened in our country in 1971 when the Americans sent a task force to threaten our independence and security and they were advancing towards the Bay of Bengal, when they were brandishing their weapons in Washington and threatening our security. When they were doing so, we entered into a treaty of friendship and co-operation with the Soviet Union, and in that treaty there is a clause, clause 9, which provides for collective defence and help from the Soviet Union all types of help in order to meet the challenge to our security. That was all right at that time. We hailed it—all of us hailed it—because it was needed. We did not think in these terms. Sir, international law provides for such assistance being sent for from a friendly power. Are we not aware of it? I think you are all aware of it. Article 51 of the UN Charter provides

for collective defence, which enables, which empowers, a State, in order to defend its sovereign rights, to seek assistance from a friendly State, including military assistance. Why is article 51 being forgotten now, when we remembered it some years ago, when the treaty was signed by us in the past and by the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan in 1978—in December 1978 actually—with the Soviet Union? It was considered in accordance with article 51 of the UN Charter; it was considered consistent with the purposes and principles of the UN Charter. Why are these things forgotten today? Now, Sir, America does not like to mention this thing because it does not suit them. These American imperialists who have got 300 major military bases all over the world, nearly five lakh troops all along the world, who are today building up arms in the arms race and equipping themselves with a new type of missile to destroy production, even feared by some western countries, have now become the champions of freedom, independence and security; Well, Sir, do not believe in such things. I am told that somebody is coming here. What is his name? Mr. Clifford, the former Defence Secretary. Mr. Narasimha Rao, you are a good friend. Be careful with the Americans. Be careful. They are Mafia. They belong to international Mafia in politics, double-talkers, thugs. Their hands are dripping with the blood of the people whom they have butchered in Latin America, Vietnam and other parts of the world with whom this great nation has always stood. When the former Defence Secretary Clifford comes here, put him in his place. Tell him to get off where he should get off. Ask him to go home. If he is in trouble, in getting an air ticket, give him one. We may subscribe to the fare. He is coming here to pressurise, to blackmail, to exploit some of the weaknesses. At the same time there is some propaganda coming from those quarters. You will hear Mr. Clifford's voice. It will be heard not only in the monopoly press in our

[Shri Bhupesh Gupta]
country but in some sections of those who sit with me on this side of the House, in the Opposition. Therefore, I say you be careful about it.

As far as Afghanistan is concerned, I do not want to discuss about it. Please understand it. My friends seem to be very much exercised over Afghanistan. The situation in Kabul is causing them, some of them, sleepless nights, it seems. But you should know that arms to Pakistan are coming in huge number and quantity. Modern weapons. Side by side, they would get nuclear capability in order to mount vicious, monstrous, pervasive threat to our country and to all the countries in the region in the interest of American imperialism. That you must know. That is why Mr. Harald Brown, the U.S. Defence Secretary, had been to Peking in order to ask China to supply arms to Pakistan in case it is difficult for him to convince the American Congress to remove the embargo on arms supplies that exists at present. Sir, these techniques, we also know.

Sir, the Afghanistan people will look after themselves. And I am sure, well armed with the treaty of friendship, good-neighbourliness and co-operation with the Soviet Union, they will also get perhaps the help of their friends in the Soviet Union. Look after yourself. Let us look after ourselves now. With so much of arms piling up, despite the fact that Pakistan wants to live in peace, the present regime in Pakistan hanged Bhutto. You know very well that protests were made from all parts of the Muslim world. We also protested despite our very strong opinion against Bhutto's regime because it was a plain conspiratorial murder. This regime is sought to be bolstered by arms supplies, and this has been noted by the American authors. They have questioned why it is giving arms to Pakistan to bolster this regime, the military regime. This military regime is a danger. Divorced from democratic way, unconcerned

about the feeling of the people, capable of killing one of the former Prime Ministers of the country in this manner, when arms fall into their hands with American, Chinese and others around, there is a danger signal to which you must pay attention, not because of anything being wrong with the Pakistani people.

Sir, who does not know that they are using Pakistan? The CIA camps have been set up on the Pakistan-Afghanistan border where the so-called rebels are being trained, equipped and financed by the United States of America and others. Well this is happening. Now this is one aspect of the offensive that has been launched against us by the Americans and their allies, against the whole sub-continent and the region. So, Sir, that is the view we should take. As far as the arms supply is concerned, we should fight the arms supply—don't fight the Pakistani people or Pakistan. We should try to stop the Americans from giving the arms supply. We should mobilise international opinion against these arms deliveries to Pakistan. Arms worth 2.5 billion dollars had already been supplied. Now there is a plan to pump almost half a billion dollars worth of arms, some already in the pipeline. Well, Sir, we should take serious note of that and I think we should be concerned a little more about it and seek the goodwill of even the people of Pakistan as to how jointly we can stop this arms build-up in Pakistan.

Sir, finally I should only like to say that my friend, Mr. Rabi Ray is also very much concerned with it and in the last part of his speech, he brought in Dr. Lohia's ideas of a confederation. I am very glad he remembered Dr. Lohia in this matter. But that will not be possible at the moment. We certainly want good relations between all the countries he has mentioned—Pakistan, India and Bangladesh. But, Sir, interference in Afghanistan by international reaction and imperialism started almost on the morrow of the Afghan democratic revolution in April

1978. Is it not known that the Shah of Iran, now living in Panama somewhere, invited Mr. Vajpayee to go to Teheran for mutual consultation on the Afghan development? And like a good boy, at the beck and call of the Shah, Mr. Vajpayee rushed to Teheran for the so-called consultation. And what was the consultation for? Surely, as everybody knew, it was for dealing with the Afghan situation. Now, Sir, this Afghan situation business is something which has come to the limelight, which has been forced into the limelight in this manner by the American imperialists and their friends. There was no such situation at that time except that the revolution took place which should be hailed. But Mr. Vajpayee went there. Mr. Narasimha Rao, don't follow in his footsteps—not that you have a danger of going and fighting election in New Delhi again. But if you follow in his steps of rushing to Teheran—in Teheran nobody will invite you for that—or elsewhere, you will be falling into the American trap. That is what I say. Sir, this is what is going on. (*Time bell rings*) It is a matter of concern that in this country some people deliberately, viciously, calculatingly, have unleashed a vicious campaign against the friendly Soviet Union because it has been the imperialists' policy to disrupt our friendship and co-operation between the two friendly countries. That is what they want. And they think, it is a God-sent thing that has come here; pounce upon it in order to disrupt and disturb the relations between the two friendly countries, Sir, that also is a dangerous trend. I hope, Sir, the Government of India will do or say nothing that would encourage this dangerous, disruptive trend which has always been the objective of American imperialism—to disrupt the relations—which is unfortunately and to our shame, shared by some political circles in this country, not to speak of the "jute" press. (*Time-bell rings*) I do not wish to say much Sir, you are ringing the bell. This bell will not be heard in Afghanistan.

But I can tell you that the Afghan revolution has come to stay. Soviet troops, limited contingents, are there at the invitation of the Afghan Government in terms of article 51 of the U.N. Charter and in conformity with international practices and law. There is nothing illegal or immoral about it. There does come a time when small nations are attacked by big imperialist powers. Here it has been made clear to you by the Soviet authorities—we read it in the papers—that they will leave as soon as the Afghan Government asks them to go, and there is no need for all this here. That they have said. I do not understand why then all this talk goes on here. We should leave it at that. It is an internal matter of Afghanistan to be tackled by the Afghan Government with the cooperation of such friends as they have under treaty obligations as may be applicable in the situation. Look after your national interests and your foreign policy; give it a more anti-imperialistic character and ask your External Affairs Ministry officials to properly prepare the brief rather than produce the kind of stuff that you have read out. Mr. Foreign Minister, you are new on the subject. You are an intelligent, learned man. But I do hope you ponder over the brief that you have prepared. I would advise you to write it yourself. It will improve your writing and clear up your own thoughts. It will improve your own writing and clear up your own thinking and bring better judgement. It is perhaps under the impact of the people who prevail upon you that you speak in this manner. Do not eat out of the hands of the officers. Some officers are good, some are bad. I do not blame them at all. I do not wish to tar them with the same brush. Perhaps it is better for our Ministers to do the homework themselves. And this is an elderly advice given to a relatively young man. Thank you.

SHRI P. V. NARASIMHA RAO: At the outset I would like to point out that the subject-matter of the Calling

[Shri P. V. Narasimha Rao]

Attention is very, very limited. It does not say anything about the flow of arms to Pakistan which had taken place long ago and which has been taking place. What it refers to is the decision of the Governments of the United States of America and China to extend massive arms aid to Pakistan in the wake of Russian intervention in Pakistan. This is the limited scope of the Calling-Attention...

SHRI L. R. NAIK: No, it covers all aspects.

SHRI P. V. NARASIMHA RAO: Yes, all aspects...

SHRI A. G. KULKARNI: In the morning the Chairman pointed out that there were different types of Calling Attention Notices and he summarised and brought them into one. The Calling-Attention does not say this or that. The Chairman himself said that it was a generalized question.

SHRI P. V. NARASIMHA RAO: I am sorry my point has been missed. When the honourable Mr. Bhupesh Gupta started saying that it is not only now that arms flows have started, these have been going on for a long time, I just wanted to point out that it has been going on for a long time but the subject-matter of this Calling Attention as it is couched, is concerned with a certain point of time, and that is "in the wake of the intervention...", as the Calling Attention says. So my statement also was confined to the ambit of that time-frame.

SHRI P. RAMAMURTI (Tamil Nadu): Would you yield for a minute? I think Mr. Narasimha Rao was not present here when we were discussing it in the morning. When we were discussing it in the Committee, we wanted to convert the Calling Attention into a regular debate. I am sorry you have not been briefed properly. At that time it was decided

that this Calling Attention Motion itself can go on and all aspects of the question can be brought though we do not call it a regular debate...

SHRI A. G. KULKARNI: That is true.

SHRI P. RAMAMURTI: It was decided that we need not convert it into a debate but that all aspects of the question can be gone into. This was what was decided in the Business Advisory Committee. On that basis the Chairman also made his announcement.

SHRI P. V. NARASIMHA RAO: I have not objected to anything being based on the past, present and future. I have only said that my statement pertains to a particular time-frame. That is what I wanted to submit.

About the other aspects of the 4 P.M. speech delivered by hon. friend, Shri Bhupesh Gupta, it was very significant that he counselled restraint and circumspection in the very first part of his speech. If he had not been such a revered and senior Member, I would have the temerity to ask him whether this advice was meant only for others. So far as sermonising is concerned, we have never done any sermonising. We have placed before the House the exact position of the Government and only on the basis of that the debate is taking place. We are prepared to take any suggestion coming from the hon. Members. In any case, Shri Bhupesh Gupta being a very senior Member, we are prepared to take his advice, whether we need it or not.

SHRI HARKISHAN SINGH SURJEET (Punjab): Mr. Deputy Chairman, everybody agrees that the developments in this region are of great importance from the point of view, of security and peace in the region. There are different views expressed as to who is responsible for these developments. Some tried to make out that it is the Soviet Union which is responsible

for the present state of affairs. They are only repeating the propaganda being done by the American, the British and the Pakistani press. There are others who feel—and rightly too on the basis of our own experience—that the U.S. imperialists and their policies in this region are responsible for the present state of affairs and for all that is happening in the region. We are seeing the American imperialism is very active in this region. Visits are being organised and it was only a few days back the British Foreign Secretary, Lord Carrington was arguing the case of insurgents and in favour of Pakistan. How can it be denied that only the day after tomorrow in Pakistan the Islamic Conference is being held to support what they call the struggle of insurgents in Afghanistan? This is in spite of opposition from important countries like Syria and Palestinian Liberation Organisation who have demanded not to hold the Islamic Conference because it will divert the whole attention. They argue that the Islamic Conference is being held when Egypt is going to establish diplomatic relations with Israel. All these issues are connected. The developments in Afghanistan cannot be separated from what has been happening to this region during the last so many years. Now, one cannot argue with those who cannot differentiate between the Czarist imperialist Russia and the Socialist Soviet Union. One cannot argue with those who would refuse to see the geography that there cannot be any buffer between the Soviet Union and India when there is a separate country like Pakistan in between. I do not want to go into all that. I only want to go into the question who has been doing what in this region itself? Leave aside the other parts of the world because everybody knows that it is not the Soviet Union who had organised conspiracies against the established Governments. Everybody knows who did what in Chile and what the CIA has been doing—everything has been exposed now—to topple the

established government, in various countries. Even in our region, since our Independence, what is happening? It is clear. In 1954 who came to an understanding with Pakistan? Who organised intervention in Korea? Who intervened in Vietnam for 25 years against their independence. What part did the Americans take in the liberation struggle of Bangladesh? Not one country. You go to any country. It is known to everybody what role America has been playing for years. Now the Shah took shelter somewhere. In Iran the people overthrew the Shah regime. Now the American imperialism is very much interested in intervening in the same region after having set-backs and set-backs during the last full decade, and they are trying to make Pakistan a base not only to interfere against Afghanistan but also in the whole region. The Pakistan Government is helping them. It is a military dictatorship there, and they are isolated from the people; they want some diversion, and for that they are trying to do everything at the behest of American imperialists. They are supplying arms and they are training everybody, although they are denying openly by saying that theirs is a humanitarian work. In this context we cannot equate the role of the Soviet Union and that of America in this respect. Who does not know of the American policy? Of course elections in America are one factor. In this context, I would like to quote from an interview on the 22nd January with Zbigniew Brzezinski, Assistant to the President for National Security Affairs, in which he said:

“Q. Is it important in that context that the insurgent movement in Afghanistan stay alive?

A. I think from a moral and political point of view one has to be extremely sympathetic to the strivings for independence of any peoples and particularly those peoples who are willing to shed blood on behalf of their freedom.”

[Shri Harkishan Singh Surjeet]

Then about the arms aid the change in policy, he said:

"The President, in the course of the last three years, has responded very firmly and purposefully to the strategic challenge that we face. After eight years of sustained Republican neglect for the requirements of defence, the President reversed the trend and in three successive years increased defence spending. He pushed for NATO modernization and initiated a long-term NATO modernization program. He obtained a commitment from our allies to increase their defence budgets by three per cent and he is now increasing ours by more than three per cent."

For whom? It has been mentioned by Comrade Bhupesh Gupta why so much money being spent for armaments and for having bases in the world. If even after that somebody tries to confuse the public opinion in the country, he would not be able to mislead our people. Even today in the Times of India there is a news-item—it is a PTI despatch—"U.S. finalises strategy against Soviet Union". It says:

"While CENTO set up by the Eisenhower administration established formal military alliances of pro-western countries in the region, the new strategy will seek to forge 'security ties' with Israel, Pakistan, Saudi Arabia and Egypt. The U.S., besides supplying arms to these countries, will be ready to arrange visits by American forces and joint military exercises."

I do not want to go into details. What is the reaction of the people in Afghanistan? How do they react to it? Shall I believe what the Press is saying or the American propaganda? I am going to believe not this propaganda but what the true representative and leader of the people has said. I want to quote from an interview which Khan Abdul Ghaffar Khan, the esteemed leader of our United National Movement, gave to

the Press. While asked by the Press in the Press interview in Afghanistan.

AN HON. MEMBER: He has contradicted this.

SHRI HARKISHAN SINGH SURJEET: Contradiction is sent to you. The following is the text of the interview. Haqiqate-Inqelabe Saur-O asked:

"How do you look at the changes that occurred in December last affecting the Saur Revolution qualitatively?"

The answer was: "I was at Jalalabad at the time. The people very warmly welcomed the changes that occurred last December saying this augury was a festive occasion for them. They were happy about the Soviet aid. However, after a few days, propaganda was launched against the Soviet Union and I was astonished where these originated from. Evidently, these propagandas were circulated by the Americans, the British and their lackeys."

Then Bakhtr-O asked about his opinion about the traditional friendship between Afghanistan and the Soviet Union.

The answer is: "If you look at Afghan history, you will find that the British do not allow us to make progress. Whenever there arises among us a progressive man, they call him an 'infidel' and drive him out of the country. When the 'Khudai Khidmatgars' and the Congress Party won in India and expelled the British, Afghanistan was eventually rid of them. When Afghanistan was located between the two big powers, the British and Russia, the British always contributed to Afghanistan's destruction. They did not allow us to make progress. However, the Soviets not only did not interfere in our internal affairs but also helped us."

This is what Khan Abdul Ghaffar Khan has said. After that also we go on arguing that what is being done there is not at the instance of the people. They call it 'intervention' and not 'help'. Some people even go to the extent of calling it occupation. Perhaps they do not know what the imperialists have been doing there for the past one year. They do not say what has been happening for the last one year. They were supplying arms to the insurgents and training them. Then they were sending them inside Afghanistan to destabilise the Government. Nobody can say that it was the Soviet Union who was doing all this. It was done by the imperialist. This thing cannot be delinked from the Soviet aid required by the Afghanistan Government. These insurgents were trained by the American imperialists. Taking this into consideration, I think the Government is still very hesitant. The earlier Government was bungling and this Government is also not forthcoming. After taking a stand at the U.N.O., many things have been said perhaps taking the pointer from the Indian press here. They are vacillating on this question. They are not coming out with a forthright stand. I would like to ask the External Affairs Minister whether he is going to take a stand and whether he will make it clear in this House that for the last one year, the armed forces being trained at the soil of Pakistan were being armed by the Americans and being sent into Afghanistan to create trouble. Is this not the logical result that the Afghanistan Government, in order to protect itself when intervention had come from American imperialism, has sought the Soviet help on the basis of 1978 treaty? Has the Afghanistan Government not assured that the Soviet army will not stay there a day more when peace is established and when the intervention is stopped? Will the External Affairs Minister clearly state this? Have we asked the Pakistan Government to stop the use of its soil for this type of activities because this is

going to harm not only the internal situation of Afghanistan, but of the whole region? Are we prepared to help the Afghanistan Government and to assure them help against any foreign intervention? Has it not come to the notice of the Government what the US imperialism is aiming at? As I have quoted earlier, it is clearly stated from the PTI report. I would like the External Affairs Minister to throw light on this question. This is not a question which should concern only the divisions inside various parties. It concerns the whole country. It concerns the whole history of the national movement—what the American imperialism has been doing to us, what the Soviet Union has been doing to help us in the crucial hours of our history when any trouble was there, instigated by the imperialism. Keeping that in view, keeping our foreign policy of non alignment in view, we should not hesitate. This is no argument that 104 votes were there on one side and why we have not voted with 104. Tomorrow Islamic countries' conference will take some decision. Are you going to vote basing on that whether it is a correct or an incorrect decision? We should take a decision on the basis of our fundamental policies of non-alignment, non-interference, standing by the liberation forces and standing against the imperialist intervention. I would like the External Affairs Minister to answer my questions.

SHRI P. V. NARASIMHA RAO: Sir, almost all the questions have been answered already in my statement and also later on. We have said very clearly that recent developments in Afghanistan cannot be viewed in isolation. We have said categorically that there has been something going on before these incidents took place, these developments took place. And, therefore, they have to be viewed in their totality. It is true that for the first time in 1978, there were changes in the governmental set-up in Afghanistan. At that time, they were not viewed at all with any concern or

[Shri P. V. Narasimha Rao] alarm by anyone from any quarter in the whole world. They were taken as internal matters. And if there has been some escalation and if there have been very quick developments within the part fortnight or a little more, we feel that we have to take all of them together, and taking cognizance of the situation as it exists today and as it has developed, we should try our utmost to defuse the situation. That is the very constructive role we are playing, and that is the attitude that we have taken.

So far as the speech of our Permanent Representative in the General Assembly is concerned, we have not resiled from it. We have not really said anything against it. If anything, there might be some amplification later on. But there is nothing that we have said later which goes against anything which was said by him in the General Assembly. That is the position, Sir.

SHRI HARKISHAN SINGH SURJEET: My question has not been answered. My specific question was whether it was not a fact that since one year, the insurgents were being trained on the soil of Pakistan. The Minister has said that the development relates to only two-weeks' period. I have specifically asked whether since one year they were being trained and instigated and sent into the Afghan territory.

SHRI P. V. NARASIMHA RAO: What I have said is this, namely, the recent developments in Pakistan cannot be viewed in isolation. They have to be taken in their totality, viewed in their totality, including what happened before. And that is a reference to the insurgency that was going on. We have some information about the activities of insurgency going on. And, as a result or as a result of one thing leading to another, we are faced with a situation as it exists today. This is what I have said and this is the essence of the stand taken by the Government.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: A large number of hon. Members including leaders of parties and groups have participated in this Calling Attention Motion which has taken the form of discussion. We can still accommodate some more Members but not the whole list in any case. Our only request is that the hon. Members may be brief so that more and more Members could be accommodated. Shri Ramanand Yadav.

श्री रामानन्द यादव : उपसभापति जी, आज भारत वर्ष की सीमायें अमरुक्षित हो गई हैं उपसभापति जी, अफगानिस्तान में जो कुछ हो रहा है और उसकी प्रतिक्रिया में पाकिस्तान को जिन महाशक्तियों ने हर तरह से सहायता देने की कोशिश की है, उनको हम ताक में रख कर इस समस्या को टैकेल नहीं कर सकते। तीन महाशक्तियाँ एशिया में अपनी गोल्वल स्ट्रेटजी के आधार पर अपना प्रभाव कायम करना चाहती हैं। यह बात ठीक है कि रूस ने वहाँ की कानून बनी सरकार को आमंत्रण पर अपनी सेना को अफगानिस्तान में भेजा। यह बात भी ठीक है कि अफगानिस्तान के लोग अपनी मन पसंद की सरकार को वहाँ कायम करना चाहते हैं। यह सर्वविदित है कि दाऊद की सरकार जो पहले थी जिसको वहाँ की मिलिटरी ने उखाड़ फेंका था वह एक फ्यूडल सरकार थी, एक दकियानूसी सरकार थी। उसके बाद तरक्की की सरकार आई। उसने बड़ा ही अच्छा लैंड रिफार्म शुरू किया, प्रगतिशील कदम उठाये। परन्तु लोगों को भया नहीं और उनका भी मर्डर हुआ। फिर अमीन आये। अमीन निश्चित रूप से अमेरिकन कैम्प के पक्षधर बन गये। जिन लोगों ने वहाँ रेवोल्यूशन, परिवर्तन की खाहिश की थी, दकियानूसी ताकतों को खत्म करने में योगदान दिया था, समतावादी और लोकतन्त्रवादी थे, उन लोगों को हजारों हजार की संख्या में अमीन ने जेलों में बन्द कर दिया। देश का प्रशासन चलाना अमीन के बूते के बाहर की बात हो गयी। अमीन ने यही नहीं

किया बल्कि उसने अमेरिकन अम्बेसेडर को बुला कर अफगानिस्तान में एक महीने तक राजकीय स्तर पर उन्हें मेहमान बनाया और कहा कि अमीन की सोने की स्टेच्यू बना कर काबुल में रखेंगे। निश्चित बात थी कि रूस को यह बात भाई नहीं। उपसभापति महोदय, आपको याद होगा कि जो आज रूस को इस इंटरवेंशन के लिये दोषी ठहराते हैं उनको मालूम होना चाहिए कि तरक्की ने पहले ही रूस को पत्र लिख कर के इंटरविन करने का आग्रह किया था। लेकिन रूस आया नहीं। अमीन ने भी एक पत्र इंटरवेंशन के लिये भेजा परन्तु बीच में एक घटना घट गई और अमीन की हत्या हो गई। उसके बात करमाल आये। यह बात अमेरिका और चीनियों को भाई नहीं। आज स्थिति यह है कि रशियन सेना अफगानिस्तान में आई हुई है। अफगानिस्तान की सरहद हिन्दुस्तान की सरहदों से मिली है और हमारी सीमा पर भी वे हैं। अब हमें यह देखना है कि क्या रशियन सेना की उपस्थिति से हिन्दुस्तान की सरहदों पर कोई खतरा हो सकता है। हमें इस बात को भी देखना होगा कि अमरीका जो कि पाकिस्तान को आधुनिक हथियारों और रुपये पैसे से, यहां तक कि अपनी सेना को वहां उतार कर उसकी मदद करने को तैयार है उसके इस काम से हिन्दुस्तान की सुरक्षा को खतरा है या नहीं। हमें यह भी देखना है कि चीन जो आज पाकिस्तान की मदद कर रहा है और हर तरह से मदद कर रहा है उसकी मदद करने से और उसके ऐसे कामों से हमारे देश की सुरक्षा को खतरा है या नहीं। इन बातों पर विचार करने के लिये हमें पिछले इतिहास पर जाना होगा। हमें देखना होगा कि अमरीका ने हिन्दुस्तान के साथ आठे दिनों में, जब कि काश्मीर का मामला यू० एन० ओ० में था, कभी भी हमारा साथ नहीं दिया। अमरीका बराबर इस विश्व में दकियानूसी ताकतों का पक्षधर रहा है। रूस ने बराबर दुनिया के लोकतन्त्री शक्तियों, स्वाधीनता प्रेमी शक्तियों

की सहायता की। हिन्दुस्तान की आजादी की लड़ाई में इतना योगदान अमरीका का नहीं है जितना कि रूस का है। अमरीका का योगदान नगण्य मात्र है। आपको याद होगा जब पाकिस्तान के साथ हमारी लड़ाई चल रही थी, अमरीका का सातवां बड़ा वे आफ बंगाल में हमें डराने के लिए घूम रहा था (Time Bell Rings) भूपेश गुप्त बोलेंगे तो चार-चार घंटे लेकिन मुझे तो अभी पांच मिनट हुए हैं इस पर आप विचार कर लीजिए ... घंटी सोच विचार करके बजाइये ...

श्री उपसभापति : आर भी माननीय सदस्य बोलने वाले हैं।

श्री रामानन्द यादव : इसी लिए अमरीका डियोगो-गाशिया में अड्डे कायम कर के अणु शस्त्रों से सुसज्जित हवाई अड्डे वहां पर रखे हुए है। यही नहीं आज अमरीका पाकिस्तान को हर तरह से आधुनिक अस्त्र-शस्त्र दे रहा है, फ़ौज भी दी है। उन्हीं हथियारों को पाकिस्तान ने दो लड़ाइयों में हमारे विरुद्ध इस्तेमाल किया है। यही नहीं आज अमरीका पाकिस्तान में हर तरह के अणु परीक्षण में दूसरे देशों के माध्यम से, पास के माध्यम से सहायता करता है। यह हमें देखना है किस तरह से चीन व्यवहार कर रहा है। हमारे मित्रों ने चीन के संबंध में कुछ नहीं कहा, भूपेश बाबू ने कुछ नहीं कहा, न हमारे सी०पी० एम० के मित्र श्री सुरजीत जी ने कुछ कहा। आज चीन को भी हालत वही है। चीन क्या कर रहा है? चीन हमारी सरहद के किनारे पर कराकोरम हाइवे बना चुका है। उसने चारों तरफ हमारी सरहद से 40 मील पूर्व और पश्चिम दोनों तरफ रोड बनाया है सड़कें बना ली हैं। इतना ही नहीं एक मिलियन सेना वहां पर जमा कर के रखे हुए है। चीन हमारे साथ क्या कर रहा है? चीन बंगलादेश के चितगांव जिले में जो हमारे नागालैण्ड, मिजोरम त्रिपुरा तथा मणिपुर के विद्रोही

[श्री रामानन्द यादव]

हैं, बगावती हैं जो दूसरे ढंग की बातें सोचते हैं उनको अपने लोगों के माध्यम से प्रशिक्षण दे रहा है। यहाँ नहीं जब हम उसके साथ मैत्री की भावना प्रकट कर रहे थे तो चीन चुपके से हमारी सरहद पर हमारे खिलाफ कांसपिरेसी कर रहा था, सड़कें बना रहा था। ब्रह्मा में, नागालैंड में जो विद्रोही हैं उनकी हर तरह से प्रशिक्षित करने के लिए चीन ने अस्त्र-शस्त्र दिए हैं। चीन की यह योजना है कि पूर्वांचल को काट कर एक इन्डिपेंडेंट स्टेट बना दिया जाए और हम से अलग कर दिया जाए। वहाँ पर चीन आज पाकिस्तान की मदद करने के लिए आया है। क्या उसके मन्सूबे हमारे लिए अच्छे हैं? मैं कभी नहीं मानता। मैं तो समझता हूँ कि चीन जो कुछ कर रहा है अपने स्वार्थ के लिए कर रहा है। हमारी राष्ट्रीय पालिसी का मुख्य अंग होना चाहिए कि हमारे देश की सुरक्षा कैसे होगी, हमारे देश का इंटेरेस्ट क्या है। चीन पाकिस्तान की मदद करे, हमारे विरुद्ध कांसपिरेसी करे और अमरीका भी पाकिस्तान की मदद करे तो क्या हम रूस को कंडम करें कि रूस ने क्यों दखल दिया है। मैं पूछना चाहता हूँ कि चीन यह कह सकता है क्योंकि उसकी सीमा रूस के साथ लगी हुई है। उसके कुछ इंटेरेस्ट हैं लेकिन अमरीका का क्या इंटेरेस्ट है? रूस का इंटेरेस्ट है क्योंकि वह एक बार्डर स्टेट है लेकिन अमरीका का क्या इन्टरेस्ट है? अमरीका का ग्लोबल इंटेरेस्ट कौन सा है, अमरीका चाहता है एकसप्लाइमेंटेशन। कौन सा एकसप्लाइमेंटेशन? वह वहाँ के जो मिनरल्स हैं, आयर्न हैं, गल्फ कंट्रीज के समुद्र में अमरीका का पांचवाँ बेड़ा घूम रहा है। यही नहीं अमरीका इस ढंग से इस सारे देश में अपना प्रभाव जमाने के लिए आज पाकिस्तान को हर तरह से मजबूत बनाना चाहता है।

यह हमारे इन्टरेस्ट के खिलाफ जायेगा ?

यह इस बात के लिए अपने फारेन मिनिस्टर से चाहूंगा कि वे पहल करें। पिछली सरकार ने

क्या किया? पिछली सरकार ने जब चरण सिंह प्रधान मंत्री थे तब सोवियत एम्बेसेडर को बुलाया लेकिन अमेरिकन एम्बेसेडर को नहीं बुलाया। सुरेन्द्र मोहन जो लोकदल के जनरल सेक्रेटरी हैं, उन्होंने कहा कि अमेरिका को कर्स किया जायगा परन्तु पिछली सरकार ने अमेरिका को इस बयान पर कि वह पाकिस्तान को मिलिट्री हांड वेयर और अच्छे सामान लड़ाई के लिए देसी, कोई स्ट्रांग प्रोटेस्ट नहीं दिया। हमारे प्रतिनिधि जो यू० एन० ओ० में हैं बोले, जिसकी चर्चा होती है, उन्होंने क्या कहा? यही कहा कि भारत की सरकार किसी फारेन देश की फौज की प्रेजेंस नापसंद करती है, यह भी नापसंद करती है कि कोई फारेन कंट्री किसी देश के लोगों को प्रशिक्षण लेकर तोड़-फोड़ का काम कराये। यह कौन सा गुनाह है, क्या फारेन इन्टरवेंशन होगा। आज अमेरिका की यह बात छिपी हुई नहीं है कि उनके प्रतिनिधि या चीन के प्रतिनिधि जो तय्यकथित रिफ्यूजी कैम्प हैं, सेना को प्रशिक्षण देने के लिए इस्लामाबाद के आस-पास, काबुल की सरहद पर या दक्खिस्तान में खोले गये हैं उनको देखने के लिए जाते हैं कि किस तरह से ट्रेनिंग दी जाती है। वे इसके लिए जाते हैं। वहाँ पर रिफ्यूजी कैम्प खुले हुए हैं, दूसरी तरह के कैम्प सहायता के केन्द्र खुले हुए हैं आप इस बात से इन्कार नहीं कर सकते हैं कि यह एक बहाना मात्र है। आज अमेरिका जो कुछ पाकिस्तान में इस देश की सीमा पर कर रहा है, वह भारत देश के इंटेरेस्ट के खिलाफ कर रहा है। इससे हमारी आजादी खतरे में है, सुरक्षा खतरे में है। भारतवर्ष ने बराबर लोकतंत्रीय शक्तियों को, स्वतंत्रता प्रेमी शक्तियों को मदद की है और धड़ल्ले से की है। अमेरिका ने उन शक्तियों की जो अपने देश की स्वतंत्रता के लिए लड़ रहे थे, उन प्रजातांत्रिक देशों को जहाँ के लोग एकाधिकारवाद के खिलाफ लड़ रहे थे उनके खिलाफ मदद की। आज अफगानिस्तान के लोग अपने देश की आजादी और उस देश

में समतावादी आन्दोलन लाने के लिए लड़ रहे हैं, इस बात से इन्कार नहीं किया जा सकता है कि फ्यूडलिज्म को खत्म करने के बाद तरक्की ने जो लैण्ड रिफार्म शुरू किये उसका नतीजा था कि उनका मर्डर हुआ, फिर अमीन ने अमेरिका के लोगों को इन्वाइट किया तो उनका खात्मा किया गया। तो क्या आप चाहते हैं कि उन दकियानूसी ताकतों की मदद हिन्दुस्तान करे, खुल कर करे, कभी नहीं। मैं हिन्दुस्तान से चाहूंगा कि दुनिया के वे देश, वे शक्तियाँ जो प्रगतिशील होती हैं जो उन देशों में समाजवाद समतावाद, लोकतंत्र और बराबरी के लिए लड़ाई करती हैं उनकी मदद करे उसको करनी चाहिए और हिन्दुस्तान ने सदा ऐसे देशों की मदद की है। परन्तु अफसोस है कि रिलीजियस माइन्डेड धार्मिक शक्तियों को मदद करने के भय से बहुत सी पार्टियाँ और लोग भूल जाते हैं कि हम उनकी मदद करते हैं। यही रूस, आज क्या हालत है? ईरान से जब अमेरिका के पैर उखड़ गये, साऊदी अरेबिया में जब मास्क पर आक्रमण हुआ, वहाँ पर उसके पैर उखड़े। दूसरी मुस्लिम कंट्रीज में जो अरब देश हैं वहाँ पर प्रगतिशील आन्दोलन चल रहे हैं, वहाँ के नौजवान मुसलमान जो प्रगतिशील हैं वे अमेरिका को बुरी नजरों से देखते हैं और आयल इंटरेस्ट को लेकर जिसमें उनका एक्सप्लाइडेशन होता है उनसे घणा करते हैं। आज वही अमेरिका किसी न किसी तरह से उनके पीछे रह कर अरब देशों के मुसलमानों की मीटिंग बुला रहा है। हमें कभी भी जो धार्मिक संस्थाएँ हैं जो धार्मिक ताकतें हैं उनकी मदद नहीं करना चाहिए। हमारा देश चूँकि सेक्यूलर है इसलिए जो सेक्यूलर ताकतें हैं उनकी मदद करनी चाहिए। मुझे अफसोस है कि पिछली सरकार के नेता मोरारजी देसाई ने जब भुट्टो को फाँसी हुई तो जवान तक नहीं हिलाई, दोनों सदनों में लोगों ने कहा कि आप अपील कीजिए। भुट्टो एक प्रगतिशील व्यक्ति थे, सुधार लाना चाहते थे, गरीबों के नेता थे, सेक्यूलर थे उनके साथ हमारे मित्रतापूर्ण संबंध थे, उनसे

कहा गया कि आप अपील कीजिए कि उनको फाँसी न दी जाय लेकिन मोरारजी देसाई की जुवान तक नहीं हिली... (Interruptions) इसका असर यह पड़ा कि दुनिया की जो दकियानूसी ताकतें हैं उनको मदद मिली और पिछली सरकार ने भी यही किया। चाहिये था अमेरिकन एम्बेसेडर को बुला कर भी कहना कि तुम क्यों चाहते हैं पाकिस्तान को आर्म करना? तुमने दो बार आर्म किया। हमारे साथ दोनों बार उसकी लड़ाई हुई। लेकिन श्री चरण सिंह की हुकूमत की हिम्मत नहीं हुई कि अमेरिकन एम्बेसेडर को बुलाएँ।

तो मैं चाहूंगा अपने फरेन मिनिस्टर से कि निश्चित रूप से दुनिया के प्रगतिशील ताकतों के साथ हमारी फारेन पालिसी झूझनी चाहिये और उसी की मदद करनी चाहिये। मैं यह जानना चाहता हूँ कि भारत सरकार ने भारत की सीमा की सुरक्षा के लिये कौनसा डिप्लोमेटिक कदम उठाया है? मैं यह भी जानना चाहता हूँ कि अमेरिकन कैम्पस इस्लामवाद के आस-पास और दिलोचिस्तान के आस-पास जो अफगान रिबेल को ट्रेन्ड करने के लिये और मशीनरीज अमरीका से और यूरोपियन कंट्रीज से मंगवाई जा रही हैं, उनके खिलाफ आपने कौन सी डिप्लोमेटिक कार्यवाही की है? मैं यह भी जानना चाहता हूँ कि जो पूर्वांचल में हमारी सीमाएँ थ्रोटंड हैं, वहाँ जो पूर्वांचल से सम्बन्धित मुल्क हैं, उनके साथ आपने कौन सा डिप्लोमेटिक रुख अपनाया या पत्राचार किया है या बात की ताकि इस तरह की घटना न घटे?

इन्हीं शब्दों के साथ मैं समाप्त करता हूँ।

श्री पी० वी० नरसिंह राव : श्रीमन्, भारत की सुरक्षा का प्रश्न इस सारे प्रान्त की सुरक्षा से और इस प्रान्त को एक शान्तिपूर्ण प्रान्त बनाने के प्रश्न से जुड़ा हुआ है। इसलिये भारत की सुरक्षा का कोई अलग प्रश्न नहीं है। हमने इसको एक श्रृंखला की कड़ी मान करके कार्यवाही शुरू की है और मैं सदन को आश्वासन

[श्री पी० वी० नरसिंह राव]

दिलाता हूँ कि भारत की सुरक्षा और भारत का हित यह दोनों हमारे ध्यान में सब से अधिक हैं, सर्वोपरि हैं और जो कुछ हम कार्यवाही कर रहे हैं, जो कुछ हमारी बार्ता हो रही है, उसमें भारत का हित और भारत की सुरक्षा अन्तर्वलित हैं और इमरजेंसी की बात माननीय सदस्य ने जो उठाई, वह भी जैसा कि मैंने अभी कहा यह कोई अलग बात नहीं है।

यह भी इस सारे मामले से जुड़ी हुई है, उसमें एक कड़ी है और जब कोई उसका हल ढूँढ़ा जायगा तो इन सभी बातों पर वह हल हावी होगा। वह किसी एक बात पर हावी नहीं होगा और सब को मिला कर ही वह हल आयेगा, ऐसी हम आशा करते हैं।

SHRI DINESH SINGH: Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, may I take this opportunity, first of all, to extend my congratulations to the Foreign Minister to wish him every success in his endeavours and hope that he, like his predecessors, will try to evolve a consensus in the conduct of foreign relations? Sir, if you recall, at the very beginning I had made a submission that we should separate the two issues we are discussing. It is most unfortunate that the two rather important issues have been linked together in this very short discussion and I do not know whether it has been possible for the House to do justice to these very two important issues. Had they been taken up separately, I am sure a better and more useful contribution would have been made. May I say, Sir, that I am terribly disappointed with the statement that the Foreign Minister has made in the House today? I am disappointed because it lacks substance, there is nothing in it which could give indication either of the background which the Foreign Minister has taken into consideration or the future course of action which the Government proposes to follow both in respect of the American and the Chinese military supplies to Pakistan, or the situation in Afghanistan.

It is at best a document of good intentions, a desirable code of behaviour which, if followed by all nations, we would have no reason to discuss foreign relations at all. But that is not what the world does.

Let us take Afghanistan first. Afghanistan is very friendly country so far as India is concerned. We have had traditional friendship with Afghanistan. It has stood by us in our days of difficulty. Also Afghanistan is a non-aligned country. It is a part of the non-aligned movement. What is it that we have done really to assist Afghanistan, both as a friend and as a member of the non-aligned group? What has happened in Afghanistan is not a sudden development. The Foreign Minister himself said that it is the result of what has been happening there for quite some time. Now I am not going into the time beyond the period since this Government came into power. But let me take up the question merely in terms of the time since this Government has come into power. The only thing that one might have expected in a situation like this—particularly of Afghanistan and the arms supplies to Pakistan—would have been to try to consult with the national parties as well as to consult with Governments outside. May I remind the Foreign Minister that in a situation like this when Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru was head of the Ministry over which he is now presiding, there was always an effort to try to consult with friendly and concerned powers? We have had the distinction of even holding an Asian Conference to discuss Asian affairs. Today, instead of consultations, we see rather contrary statements being issued by the Government. May I draw the attention of the Foreign Minister to the *Hindustan Times* report of 7th January, 1980, in which an interview was given to the American correspondents and in which the Prime Minister said:

“For a long time there has been foreign interference in Afghanistan of one kind or another.”

"Of course, there is no excuse for Soviet troops going in, and the more direct intervention, the more we are against it, especially bringing in troops...."

Now this is on the 7th of January. On the 13th, on behalf of the Government, even before the Government had taken oath of office, a statement was made in the United Nations by our representative at the instance of the new Government where an entirely different picture was presented. Then again on the 18th of January the Prime Minister, speaking to the press in Trivandrum, had said that it was a case of action and reaction. Now if you look at these statements, they are contrary to one another. It merely shows that not sufficient thought had been given to this matter in evolving an Indian approach to it, nor was there any indication of any kind of consultation that was likely to have been held either with foreign powers, or with the political parties at home.

Now, I would not wish to go into any details so far as the Afghan situation is concerned, largely because a geo-political discussion on the subject has already been taking place in the House and various points of view are already before the House. I would only say that Afghanistan is in a difficult situation and the only way we can assist them is to try to build up a consensus in favour of a peaceful solution in Afghanistan. Our first duty should be—and I believe the Foreign Minister has taken some initiative in that—to have some consultations in the national capitals of the countries which we think might be concerned about it and then attempt to at least evolve a non-aligned approach to the situation in Afghanistan. What do we see in the United Nations? An overwhelming majority of the non-aligned countries have taken a view contrary to that taken by India. Are we getting now isolated from the non-aligned? Are we trying to evolve a consensus in the

non-aligned? Are we trying to evolve an Indian opinion, an Asian opinion or any opinion at all so far as Afghanistan is concerned? I should leave Afghanistan at that.

Coming to Pakistan, Sir, Pakistan is a country with which we have had very difficult times. It is a country with which we have been very closely associated emotionally and it is a very happy situation that has been developing in the last few years in trying to build bridges between the two countries. Now, I entirely agree with what the Foreign Minister has said, that induction of arms in any country in the large quantities that the Americans or the Chinese may be thinking of is not good for that country itself. One of the problems of Pakistan has been that they have been getting arms instead of other economic assistance which might have helped to build the country.

SHRI K. V. REGHUNATHA REDDY (Andhra Pradesh): Mr. Deputy Chairman, my good friend has made out a case. Having been a very experienced Foreign Minister, we would like to be enlightened as to what exactly his impression is, his judgment is, in relation to the matter of Afghanistan.

SHRI DINESH SINGH: I am grateful to the hon. Member for seeking my opinion, Mr. Deputy Chairman, but I see that the hon. Member is alone in seeking my opinion. I shall be very glad to give it outside but not in the time of the House.

SHRI K. K. MADHAVAN: I also agree with my colleague, Mr. Reddy.

SHRI DINESH SINGH: Thank you very much. I was speaking about the situation in Pakistan and I was saying that it is a country with which we hope to establish very friendly and co-operative relations. Therefore, we should not do anything which will either hamper this process of normalisation or damage it altogether. And a serious discussion is called for

[Shri Dinesh Singh]

with Pakistan to find out what are their fears. Some of their fears may be genuine and we have to see that they are removed. There may also be fears which may not be genuine and, perhaps, it may be possible in discussions to give them a greater feeling of security.

I am surprised that in this statement which the Foreign Minister has made, he was at pains to emphasise that our Foreign Secretary is going there at the invitation of the Pakistani Government. I should have thought that he would have taken the initiative himself. Why did you wait for an invitation all this time? The Foreign Secretary should have taken the first...

SHRI P. V. NARASIMHA RAO: There was no waiting for an invitation. It so happened that there was an invitation and we are going. We would have gone even without an invitation because we are interested in solving the problem. It is only a factual statement. Nothing more.

SHRI DINESH SINGH: It was the emphasis on "invitation" that bothered me. Anyway, I am glad that you are going anyhow, with or without an invitation. I think the sooner he went there the better it would be so that we could get a direct and highest possible level of view of the Pakistan Government and their fears and apprehensions and then, in consultation with other Governments see how best we can help to relieve them. They say that the Foreign Minister has already made interventions at Moscow, Beijing and Washington and that in a short period of time we will know what his reactions have been. And, perhaps, even before this House rises at the end of the session if the Foreign Minister would be kind enough to give us some indication as to what the next course would be, it would assist us very greatly to go back more relieved after the session

of the House, knowing that some positive steps are being taken in this matter. And I say this because now there is a greater danger of the enlargement of this conflict not merely in terms of arms supply to Pakistan which, as we have seen in the past, has always been a kind of danger and a kind of tool which the Government of Pakistan has tended to use against India in order to divert attention from its own difficulties but also, apart from that, there is an effort to revive CENTO, to build up a new kind of CENTO. There is also the news of large-scale naval movement, both of the United States and the Soviet Union. All this can only increase tension in this area, while our effort should be to try to decrease tension. I hope that before the session ends, we will have a more constructive, a more concrete and perhaps a more cheerful statement from the Foreign Minister on this subject.

Thank you.

SHRI P. V. NARASIMHA RAO: Sir, I am grateful to the former Foreign Minister for his very polished speech, but in effect he seemed to complain about consultation with leaders of other parties.

SHRI MOHAMMAD YUNUS SALEEM: No, he never said that. He said about consultation with other countries.

SHRI P. V. NARASIMHA RAO: So far as the other countries are concerned, that was the point I was coming to.

SHRI DINESH SINGH: Since you mentioned it, may I say that the main point I was making was that the Government of India rushed into making certain statements and taking certain actions before consultations at the international level, for which there was really no need. Had the consultations been taking place, perhaps he would have been in a position to take a more constructive approach. Just now, the Foreign Mi-

nister himself said that we do not want to use strong language because it might pre-empt our action. But he has already done that by his actions.

SHRI P. V. NARASIMHA RAO:

No, Sir, we have not used any harsh or strong language in any of the statements. In fact the complaint seems to be that we have not done it. So it is the other way round. And, so far as the consultations with other countries are concerned, we are in touch with them. I have already stated in what manner we are in touch with them, how we have consulted them and how we are going to consult them further.

SHRI MOHAMMAD YUNUS SALEEM: You should tell us the result of that. You have been consulting other countries. You should tell us the result of that.

SHRI P. V. NARASIMHA RAO:

Sir, I have already stated that consultations are going on. We are trying to put across our view and they are trying to put across their views. We find there is an area of agreement and there is also an area of disagreement. It is a constantly evolving situation. The hon. Member said that I should be able to take the House into confidence and be a little more specific by the end of this session. I would certainly be happy to do so if there is anything that transpires between now and the adjournment of the House. But, as I have said before, the slated consultations and meetings with representatives of the other Governments—not all—are likely to take place before the end of this sitting and, therefore, I am not quite sure whether I will be able to say anything more definite before the House adjourns. But, if I am able to do so, I would certainly like to take the House into confidence. So far as Pakistan is concerned, I feel that he has endorsed the efforts of this Government. We are certainly going to tell them what our view is, what our apprehensions are, what

our formulations are, and if we could allay the fears, if any, on the other side and get on with the strengthening of bilateral relations, we will certainly do that.

SHRI V. B. RAJU (Andhra Pradesh): Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, much ground has already been covered, and I would like to arrest the temptation of repetition and confine myself to some points which have not already been touched upon. I would like to pursue the line of approach that Mr. Dinesh Singh has taken. The Minister has not answered directly to what has been pointed about.

Sir, firstly, it has been our great tradition and we were fortunate that our foreign policy has always been a national policy, never a partisan policy. As recently as the last year when there was aggression on Vietnam, when China sent troops there, the whole nation was one in condemning it. We have shown our solidarity when our foreign policy matters do concern us and when our national interests are also involved.

[The Vice-Chairman (Shri U. K. Lakshmana Gowda) in the Chair].

I think, Mr. Dinesh Singh is correct when he said that there had been some sort of hastiness or what I call not well-considered approach by the Government. Sir, Governments are not continuous, but the administration is continuous. And we have got a certain procedure, practice that the Ministers take, even the Prime Minister takes, advice from the Ministry. Here as far as the approach is concerned, as the Minister has tried to propound, we are with him and we all support the Government in its effort to defuse the situation. There cannot be any other opinion. But the approach that has been taken by the Government in trying to express itself has to be reviewed so that the same mistake may not be committed again.

[Shri V. B. Raju]

As early as 31st December, the then Prime Minister, it was reported, had called the Soviet Ambassador in Delhi to his residence and said that Moscow should immediately pull out all its troops from Afghanistan. This was that was reported. I think it was correct. I think the Prime Minister must have been advised by the Ministry, and he must have acted according to that. We were in the midst of elections. I do not know whether the then Prime Minister consulted the leaders of the parties. Has the then Prime Minister, Mr. Charan Singh, taken the trouble to consult them? We do not know, and we need to be informed because as I said there is a tradition, a very healthy tradition, of the foreign policy being a national policy and not a partisan policy. Then on 6th January when we were in the midst of the election, Shrimati Gandhi made a statement. It was reported like this: "She condemned Soviet intervention in Afghanistan with the charge that western powers had also been guilty of meddling in the area. For a long time there has been foreign interference of one kind or another." And subsequently also she tried to come out with the view that attempts are being made by super powers to have pliable governments in certain areas. I do not know why she was tempted to make that statement. Why was she tempted to actually communicate when we were in the midst of the elections and a new Government was to come? She could have actually overcome that temptation. But this was not the case. Our representative at New York in the United Nations had been advised to speak in a particular way. Sir, was it necessary or were we under obligation to say something at that time?

SHRI P. V. NARASIMHA RAO:
We were.

SHRI V. B. RAJU: We were in transition. We had a very very convenient time not to say anything at

that time. It was not in the best interest of the nation. It is not a question of making a point. It is not a question of intellectual argument and winning a point. No. It is not a question of debate. Even here today it is not an occasion to use some harsh words against anybody. We are not sitting in judgment here to say who is at fault and who is right. That should not be our approach. The basic question today is our future security. Not only a cold war but a hot war is coming into our region, into our neighbourhood and we are going to be threatened with this situation. Do we have the strength? Do we have the necessary preparation? So, it is not a mere academic debate here. It is not scoring a point here. It is not trying to find fault with the Soviet Union or America. That is a very easy matter and that I can do and you can do. What was the contact of our representative at New York with other countries? A non-aligned country came into trouble, as Mr. Dinesh Singh has pointed out correctly. Our neighbour in the region is in trouble. And there is not only the Soviet-American confrontation today in the world. Don't limit it to that. A new dimension, China, has come in. Another dimension, a fourth dimension, the Islamic world has come into the picture. You must take into view the totality, as the hon. Minister has been saying. You must take the total picture. It is not the same world, the same region, as it was 10 years ago or 20 years ago. It is changing. Why was the statement necessary? Our representative in the U.N. did not participate in the voting. When he has expressed his view, he should have participated in the voting. India did not participate in the voting. We belong to the nonaligned group. The friends who are with us, the promoters of the non-aligned movement, Yugoslavia and Egypt, what were they thinking? Did our representative consult them and communicate to the Ministry here? Then, did we consult our neighbours? Our security de-

pend upon the goodwill of our neighbours. You know what Kautilya said. "Who is your worst enemy"? He said, "Your immediate neighbour". Therefore, you must be more friendly with your neighbour. You must take care of him because any day you may get into a clash with your neighbour. Fortunately we have been able to maintain the best relations with our neighbours. What was Nepal thinking? What was Sri Lanka thinking? What was Bhutan thinking? What was Bangladesh thinking? Did the Government care to know? You never cared for your neighbours. You did not care for the non-aligned group. You did not care for the Islamic world. You did not care for the Group of 77. And you make a statement on the floor of the General Assembly. Who compelled you? What was the sanction behind it? The hon. Minister just intervened to say "No, it was necessary." Why? Whose voice was it. And what was the statement? It is so funny. Sir, we want the full text of the statement to be placed on the Table of the House. It is not a small matter. It is not a procedural matter. It is a matter of life and death for this nation. And if we see the magnitude of the danger that is now before us on the horizon, we are getting frightened. Unwittingly we made the Western European powers, China, the United States of America, the Asiatic powers and the Islamic world come together. What an unwitting thing this has been! What an impolitic thing this has been! You made them come together and differ with us. Can you say that they have not differed with us? Our representative has said:

"We are against the presence of foreign troops and bases in any country. However....."

Why this "however"? Why could you not stop there? This is all intelligence, playing with words. "However, the Soviet Government has assured our Government that its troops

went to Afghanistan at the request of Afghan Government." Did the Soviet Government ask you to speak for them, to plead for them? Romania did not do it. Romania is a member of the Soviet group. It has not done that. It has not voted in favour of the Soviet Union. It has taken an independent attitude. Then, "The Soviet Union has assured us that it would withdraw its troops when asked by the Kabul Government". All right; but you could have stopped there. "We have no reason to doubt an assurance particularly from a friendly country like the Soviet Union." So you are going to establish that there are certain countries who are not friendly to you. Why this wording? Why this "assurance from a friendly country"? Why all this explanation? It is not necessary. We are not to condemn the Soviet Union. The Soviet Union is our best friend. It has stood with us in thick and thin and I do not think in this House anybody would intend eroding our friendship with the Soviet Union. But it does not mean when you find that the Soviet Union has overdone something, you should not advise them to correct himself in fact, a real friend should advise that friend to correct it. So you must be clear first of all whether the Soviet Union has overstepped or not. Do not keep us in confusion. And I would advise the Government not to say anything just now, at this time. We do not want to condemn anybody. You have missed the bus. And it is not our intention to place the Government in an embarrassment. When you are making an effort to diffuse the situation, we must stand by the Government. It is in our national interest. But do not say anything which is not necessary. Sir, I would not like to enter into a debate at this moment, the time is short. I would only place before the House these two issues. One is Afghan issue. That is a regional issue. The second is Pakistan issue, arming Pakistan. It is the second issue we are concerned with more, relatively, if I put

[Shri V. B. Raju]

it that way. We do not want to go into any controversy at this moment as to who is right or who is wrong. Secondly, this is not a thing that has happened overnight. The Minister himself said that it has been going on over the last one year. Could not the Ministry anticipate such a contingency? Could we not get prepared much earlier? . . .

SHRI P. V. NARASIMHA RAO:
Which Ministry?

SHRI V. B. RAJU: Could we not prepare ourselves for a situation like this? Could we not anticipate that a situation like this was developing? Could we not have maintained a contact with our friends as to what should be done. As Mr. Dinesh Singh has said, much earlier, before the Soviet intervention had taken place, we could have taken up this matter with our friends on the developments in Pakistan which affect peace in this region. I am not placing this blame on this Government. As I said, administration is a continuing institution. So to sum up, to diffuse the gathering crisis in and around Afghanistan, instantly it is not possible, but let us mentally be prepared. This tension will be there for a long time. Don't think you can perform miracles with a magic wand, that you can set things right. Even if the Soviet Union withdraws its troops, what is the assurance that China and America would not continue to arm Pakistan? Because, bigger interests are involved. It is not India alone that is in the picture, but the whole area is threatened by a depression and it is turning into a cyclonic storm. I do not want to go into details. But the situation is not so simple. Don't try to paint to us an optimistic atmosphere; no. The situation has become complicated. The only thing that we can do is we shall not be partisan and we shall not be seen to be partisan. Lord Carrington had the check to say, when a newsman put a question to him that a new axis of US-China-Pakistan is developing, there is also

an impression that Indo-USSR axis is developing. He had the cheek to say, standing on our soil that there is an "Indo-USSR axis". Nobody has answered him back. Not even the spokesman of the External Affairs Ministry has rebutted this. It is most unfortunate.

Secondly, today what is the position? Pakistan is not demanding weapons. Pakistan is not making any claim to that effect. Let us not put Pakistan in the wrong. It is countries like China and America and the Western Europe which are dumping their arms in Pakistan, Mr. Aga Shahi has not gone there to secure weapons for Pakistan. It is the Foreign Minister of China who has gone to Pakistan and it is the United States and China who have assured Pakistan of supply of weapons. So, the game is deeper. Let us not come to confrontation with Pakistan. Let the Simla spirit be kept up. If the Government resources are not sufficient and if it is necessary, I would suggest a Parliamentary delegation going to Pakistan and Bangladesh because we should take these countries into confidence. We should build up the strength of this region, when super-powers are getting involved for bigger things.

Therefore, let me put it to you that as far as your dealing with Pakistan is concerned, we have to take care to see that we and Pakistan should not come to confrontation when Russia and America are getting involved in the region. Pakistan has been making so many proposals. I do not know what has been our response to these proposals. Even people in Pakistan are not going to be very receptive to the American weapons being dumed there. Mr. Kissinger has made a suggestion that America should acquire a base there. I think, we have to be very considerate to the Islamic world. Use the best of your wit and the best of your wisdom.

In the end, I would appeal to the Minister of External Affairs to take

leaders of opposition into confidence. He need not make it public. Do not give anything to the Press. As Shri Dinesh Singh has said, you must build up bridges and you must establish more contacts with our neighbours and with non-aligned countries.

SHRI P. V. NARASIMHA RAO: So far as our relations with Pakistan are concerned, I am very glad that all the hon. Members have endorsed the direction in which this Government is moving and I assure them that we shall move in the same direction and we shall see to it that apart from the involvement of other powers, between us, India and Pakistan, Simla agreement will be the guiding factor and we shall make every effort to see that India and Pakistan come together on all matters, so far as that is possible.

Mr. Raju has been very kind to say that I should not say anything beyond this for the rest because it is an evolving situation. As I said, since we are going to have talks with all these countries shortly, it will not be proper on my part to anticipate the trend of these talks, nor to make any pointed reference to any of the nuances that may come up while we carry on talks with them.

Mr. Raju has referred to one very important factor, namely, that Pakistan itself might not be very keen to receive all these arms aid. While I have no way to completely confirm it or totally contradict it, I have myself seen reports to the effect, particularly in the American press, that this may be the case to some extent. In fact we all know from newspapers that the day this massive arms aid was announced by President Carter, Pakistan perhaps knew about it only along with other countries. In any case it had not asked for such a thing to be done. That happens to be the case. Therefore, whatever other nuances will come into the talks, we need not refer to them. But these nuances are known to us, and I assure him that we shall take them into con-

sideration, and while having all these talks we shall see that we disentangle all these matters and take it that so far as Indo-Pak relations are concerned they are on a different footing. So far as the deeper game referred to by Mr. Raju is concerned, again, we are conscious of it. So far as it is possible, the national policy in foreign affairs will be continued, will be maintained. I cannot possibly answer for what Mr. Charan Singh said earlier on. But I can certainly answer for this Government and say that this continuity, as far as it is possible, will be maintained.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI U. K. LAKSHMANA GOWDA): Still there are three more speakers. We will have to restrict the time. Mr. Nigam.

श्री लाडली मोहन निगम (मध्य प्रदेश) :

उपसभाध्यक्ष जी, इस सवाल के करीब-करीब सभी पहलुओं पर सदन के सदस्यों ने अपनी चिन्ता व्यक्त की है। मैं उन सबकी चिन्ताओं के साथ अपनी एक और चिन्ता जोड़ देना चाहता हूँ। असली सवाल यह नहीं है कि पड़ोस के साथ क्या रिश्ता होगा, बल्कि हमारा सवाल यह है कि अगर रोटी और आजादी के बीच मुझे चुनना हो तो मैं आजादी को प्राथमिकता दूंगा। अगर कहीं मुल्क की आजादी खतरे में आ जाए तब फिर चाहे कोई समाजवाद हो या किसी तरीके का कोई दूसरा वाद हो वह मुझको कबूल नहीं होगा। आजादी का खतरा तो हिन्दुस्तान के आजाद होने के साथ ही शुरू हो चुका था। दूसरे महायुद्ध के बाद दुनिया का बटवारा दो बड़ी शक्तियों ने आपस में मिलकर कर लिया और उसके लिए मुझे गिरफ्तारी की नज़ीर देने की ज़रूरत पड़ी। कोई ईमानदाराना तर

है उसको पढ़े तो पता चल

दुनिया ने आपस में बैठ कर सारा सारा था बावजूद इसके कि साम्यवाद और पूँजीवाद में जमीन आसमान का फ़र्क है कहने के लिए,

[श्री लाडली मोहन निगम]

लेकिन इन दोनों ने वह अपना लिया जहां गोरी दुनिया के हित के साधन के लिए एक दूसरे के यथार्थ और एक दूसरे के वजूद को कबूल किया था । । हमारी बदकिस्मती यह रही है कि पिछले 32 वर्षों में हम अब तक यह नहीं तय कर सके कि हम किस देश के साथ खड़े होना चाहते हैं । जहां तक मेरे जैसे आदमी का सवाल है , मेरा दिमाग साफ़ है । आज दुनिया दो हिस्सों में बंटो हुई है । एक दुनिया है टोकियों से लेकर वाशिंगटन तक और दूसरी होनोलुलू से काहिरा तक । हिन्दुस्तान की गुजिश्ता सरकार, मौजूदा सरकार या बीच की दरमियानी सरकार, जो भी रही है, सब से बड़ी मुसोबत तो रही है वह यह है कि हम आज तक नहीं तय कर पाये हैं कि किस दुनिया की नुमाइंदगी करेंगे या साथ देंगे । अगर हिन्दुस्तान के लोग इस वक्त का फ़ैसला कर लें कि हमारा रिश्ता जमीन का, संस्कृति का, इतिहास का नहीं बल्कि खून का रिश्ता है, और खून का रिश्ता जब मैं कहता हूं तो वह और रिश्तों से सबसे ज्यादा बड़ा रिश्ता होता है और इस बास्ते जितने हम काले मुंह वाले लोग हैं, हम सब एक हैं वनिस्वत गोरे मुंह वालों के । मैं आगे नहीं जाना चाहता हूं, मैं सामान्य स्तर पर दोनों को रखना चाहता हूं कि चाहे वह अमेरिका हो या रूस, दोनों के समान हित हैं, दोनों की समान दौड़ चलती रहती है । दोनों दुनिया की गरीबी के लिए जिम्मेदार हैं, दुनिया में जहां-जहां उनका असर है, उस असर का उन्होंने फ़ायदा तथा वहां का शोषण अपने हथियारों को बढ़ाने के लिए किया है, और आज दो महायुद्ध हो जाने के बाद अब तो बिल्कुल निश्चित हो चुका है कि गोरी दुनिया की घरती पर युद्ध नहीं हो सकता है । युद्ध के जखम अभी तक वे भूल नहीं हैं । लेकिन यह जो हथियारी दौड़ शुरू हुई है उसके कहीं न कहीं असर तो पड़ेंगे ही और उससे कहीं न कहीं शिगाफ़ तो लगेगा ही , और यह पहला मौका नहीं है ।

वैसे वे रंगीन दुनियां को लड़ाते रहे हैं । लेकिन यह पहला मौका है कि जब यह कोशिश की जा रही है कि रंगीन दुनियां में खास करके वह देश, और मुझे घमण्ड है कि हमारे मुल्क ने जो रहनुमाई की दूसरे देशों को आजादी और आगे चलने में । उन देशों के अन्दर आपस में फ़र्क पैदा करने की कोशिश की, यह हमारा दुर्भाग्य भी है कि हमारा पड़ोसी देश जो आज हथियारों की अंधाधुंध दौड़ में लग गया है या यह कहिए कि उन राष्ट्रों के पास आज अपने हथियार रखने के लिए जगह नहीं है उनके पास अपने असलहे को रखने के लिए कोई जगह नहीं है कि जहां पर वे उसे रख सकें और इसके लिए चाहे वह अरब राष्ट्र हो, चाहे वह पाकिस्तान हो, चाहे कोई और देश हो, वह वहां अपने हथियार रखना चाहते हैं । लेकिन वह अपने हथियारों का इस्तेमाल भी करना चाहेंगे । सवाल यह है असली, और इस बास्ते जो मैं कहना चाहता हूं वह यह है कि पाकिस्तान जो हमारा पड़ोसी ही नहीं, मैं तो उनको भाई मानता हूं, और जिस देश की सीमाएं मेरी सीमा से जुड़ी हैं वह मेरा भाई और मेरे भाई को सीमा के साथ जो देश जुड़े हैं, वे मेरे पड़ोसी हैं और अगर हमारा यह दिमाग बना, तब हो सकता है कि हम दीर्घकालीन दोस्ती की तरफ़ एक नये हिन्दुस्तान को ले जा सकते हैं ।

हथियारी दौड़ पाकिस्तान में हुई और उसका सबब भी यह है कि यह उसकी बदकिस्मती है कि कल से जो हम बिछड़े हुए भाई हैं आज 32 वर्षों में सिर्फ़ एक मर्तबा पाकिस्तान में आम चुनाव हो पाए और इस वक्त जो मौजूदा हुकूमत है वह भी फ़ौजी हुकूमत है और उसके साथ ही साथ वहां अपने अन्दरूनी झगड़े हैं । कौन नहीं जानता कि आज से पांच वर्ष पहले पाकिस्तान ने बलूचियों को खत्म करने के लिये किन साधनों और रास्तों को अख्तियार किया था । यह कभी न भूलियेगा कि बलोचिस्तान के लोगों

को खत्म करने के लिए, वहाँ के जन-आन्दोलन को खत्म करने के लिए कितन शक्तियों ने सहारा दिया था। (समय की घंटी) मैं दो तीन मिनट में ही अपनी बात समाप्त करूँगा।

दूसरी चीज, इसी तरह से पख्तुनिस्तान की है और उसके बारे में मैं घमण्ड के साथ कह सकता हूँ कि गाथा हमारे राष्ट्रपिता एक अब न हों, लेकिन हमारा दूसरा बाप अभी भी जिन्दा है, खान अब्दुल गफ्फार खाँ। उनको हम भूल नहीं सकते। लेकिन अगर उनकी बात को भी हिन्दुस्तान के अखबार तोड़-मरोड़ कर के कहें, तो क्या कहा जाये उस आदमी को जिसको हम पनाह न दे सके, उसको अगर हमारा पड़ोसी देश पनाह देता है तो फिर उसके साथ, जैसा कि मैंने शुरू में अर्ज किया कि जो खून का रिश्ता है, उस रिश्ते के साथ अफगानिस्तान के रिश्ते को देखना होगा और इस वास्ते अफगानिस्तान पर किसी तरीके का भी हमला, किसी तरीके की कार्यवाही किसी बड़ी ताकत से की गई हो, उसके ऊपर तो हमको अलग से सोचना पड़ेगा वनिस्वत इसके कि हम अफ्रीका या दूसरे देशों के लिये सोचें।

आज हिन्दुस्तान की सारी सीमाएं नंगी हैं, सारा पूर्वांचल है, हमारी सारी पश्चिमी सीमाएं नंगी हो चुकी हैं, खुदा न-खास्ता मान लीजिए कि कल अगर जिस तरीके से बलौच जो कि ठीक है कि उनके साथ जुलूम हुआ है, कल खुदा-न-खास्ता, मान लीजिये पख्तुनिस्तान के लोग जिनकी संख्या एक करोड़ चालीस लाख है, अगर वे भी वदजन होते हैं पाकिस्तान से तो जिस तरीके से अन्दरूनी झगड़े का सहारा लेकर अफगानिस्तान में रूस घुसा है, तो कल पाकिस्तान में अगर उसके झगड़े को लेकर अमरीका खड़ा हो जाता है, तो क्या होगा? सवाल यह नहीं है कि रूसियों को अफगानिस्तान के लोगों से या वहाँ के निज़ाम से मुहब्बत या दोस्ती है। उनके सामने सो एक ही सवाल है कि आज उसके पास समुद्र का कोई रास्ता

नहीं है और यह कभी नहीं भूलना चाहिये कि हम लोगों की निकम्मी विदेशी नीतियों को वजह से ही, मैं तो आज इस मामले में साफ़ कहूँगा कि इस वक्त अमरीका सातवें बेड़े के अट्ठाईस जहाज भारत महासागर में घूम रहे हैं तो फिर कोई न कोई उसको वचाने के लिये आयेगा या फिर उसके साथ जुड़ेगा। यह लड़ाई ठंडी हो नहीं है लम्बान की लड़ाई हो गई है। अगर हमारी यह लड़ाई लम्बान की हो गई है तो हमको दृष्टि भी लम्बान की बनानी पड़ेगी तात्कालिक हल कुछ दिनों के लिये दोस्ती, की बराबरी के आधार पर हो मैं आपसे इतना ही निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि और खास कर के विदेश मंत्री जी आपसे कि कुछ समय का हल हमको मर्घट की शांति की तरफ़ ले जायगा और वह दिन न आने पावे कि हमारे निकम्मेपन से या हमारी गलत बयानी से सारा मामला हो चौपट हो जाये।

2 जनवरी को प्रधान मंत्री क्या बयान देती हैं, 12 जनवरी को क्या बयान देती हैं, 26 दिसम्बर को क्या बयान देती है। मैं उन बयानों का जिक्र नहीं करूँगा जिनका जिक्र राजू साहब ने और अन्य लोगों ने किया है। मेरे लिये और चीजें गौण हैं, सर्वोपरि है देश की आजादी। जो लोग इस सदन में बैठे हुए हैं उन में आधे से ज्यादा ऐसे लोग हैं जिन्होंने या जिनके खानदानों ने आजादी के लिए कुर्बानी की है अपना सब कुछ कुर्बान किया है। देश की आजादी का सौदा नहीं किया जा सकता। जो सरकार अपने तात्कालिक लाभ के लिए, वोट के लिए अपने विचारों को बदल कर आजादी का सौदा करने के लिए खड़ी होती है मैं ऐसी सरकार को एक क्षण भर बर्दाश्त करने के लिए तैयार नहीं हूँ। (समय की घंटी) आपका बहुत-बहुत शुक्रिया। इतना ही और निवेदन करूँगा कि पाकिस्तान और अफगानिस्तान के साथ पड़ोसी और भाई का रिश्ता, खून का रिश्ता रहा है— इन सब को मदे-नजर रख कर हमको पहल करनी चाहिए। काली दुनियाँ और बिना लगाव के देशों को

[श्री लाडली मोहन निगम]

पहल करनी चाहिए और उन में भी हिन्दुस्तान को आगे बढ़ कर अगुवाई करनी चाहिए कि अब गोरी दुनियां वाले काली दुनियां वालों का ज्यादा दिन शोषण नहीं कर सकते । अगर यह नीति हमारी बनी, इस दृष्टि से आप चाहेंगे तो आपकी विदेश नीति में जो भी खामियां रहीं वे सब सुधारी जा सकती हैं, इसका मुझे पूरा इत्मीनान है ।

श्री पी० बी० नरसिंह राव : श्रीमन, यह जो नया नक्शा हमारे सामने आया है गोरी दुनियां, रंगीन दुनियां और काली दुनियां का मैं नहीं जानता कि कहां तक कोई इससे सहमत हो सकता है । मैं तो ऐसा जानता हूं कि इस दुनियां में बड़े सम्पन्न देश हैं जो मालामाल हैं और कई ऐसे देश हैं जो अभी-अभी उभरने की कोशिश कर रहे हैं, जद्दोजहद कर रहे हैं, छटपटा रहे हैं ।

श्री लाडली मोहन निगम : उनकी सम्पन्नता हमारी विपन्नता पर है मंत्री जी ।

श्री पी० बी० नरसिंह राव : लेकिन आपने जो विभाजन किया मानवता का उसके बारे में मैं यह कह रहा हूं कि वह हमें स्वीकार्य नहीं है । यह ठीक है कि जो देश सम्पन्न हैं और जो देश सम्पन्न नहीं हैं, अभी उभरने की कोशिश कर रहे हैं उनमें भी कई भेद हैं, कोई थोड़ा सा सम्पन्न है, कोई बिल्कुल गरीब है । तो इन देशों में ऐसे-ऐसे ग्रेडेशन हैं जिनकी बिना पर हम दो खंड नहीं कर सकते हैं । लेकिन यह अवश्य होना चाहिए कि इन देशों में आज जो समस्याएं हैं उनको देखते हुए कुछ देशों की जो कोशिश चल रही है कि अन्य देशों को अपने विस्तारवाद के लिये इस्तेमाल किया जाये उन प्रयत्नों का खंडन होना चाहिए । जिस-जिस क्षेत्र में यह हो रहा है उस क्षेत्र के शान्तिप्रिय और नान-एलाइन्ड देशों को इकट्ठा होकर इस की कोशिश करनी चाहिए । हम आपको यही

आश्वासन देना चाहते हैं कि यह जो क्षेत्र है हमारे सारे नान-एलाइन्ड देशों का क्षेत्र है । जितने देश हैं सब नान-एलाइन्ड ब्लाक में शामिल हो चुके हैं और हमें ऐसा लगता है कि नान-एलाइन्ड देशों के जो आपसी मामले हैं उनको तय करना और आसान हो जाएगा क्योंकि कम से कम नान-एलाइनमेंट की हद तक वह सहमत हैं । वे सहमत हों एक दूसरे से यही कोशिश हम कर रहे हैं ।

जहां तक हिन्दुस्तान की आजादी का सौदा करने का सवाल है, मेरी समझ में नहीं जाता कि सम्माननीय सदस्य यह क्यों कह रहे हैं और किस बुनियाद पर कह रहे हैं । ऐसा तो कभी हो ही नहीं सकता और मैं इसका पूरा-पूरा खंडन करता हूं कि ऐसी कोई बात हो रही है । हमारे वक्तव्यों में कोई अन्तर्विरोध है, एक दूसरे के खिलाफ हैं, ऐसी बात मुझे कोई नजर नहीं आई । हो सकता है कि आज मैं जो कह रहा हूं कल इससे अधिक कुछ कहूं, लेकिन उसके खिलाफ कुछ नहीं कहता हूं, यह बात ध्यान देने योग्य है । बाकी जो बातें उन्होंने कही हैं उनका हमारी नीति से कोई सम्बन्ध नहीं है । इस लिए मुझे और कुछ कहना नहीं है ।

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI U. K. LAKSHMANA GOWDA): Prof. Bhattacharjee. Please take only five minutes. It is already half past five.

PROF. SOURENDRA BHATTACHARJEE (West Bengal): Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, I will naturally have to keep in mind the constraint of time because it is our lot to come at the fag end of the day or after that, so to say.

Sir, I came across a writing in a foreign journal wherein it was stated that a West German Government spokesman when questioned on the U.S. Government's request to stop supply of food to the Soviet Union

said that if there was to be a war, why not over Berlin, why should we go to war over Kabul. Now, I do not know whether we should take pride in the fact that we are in the midst of the epicentre of international world. That is what this total region has been converted into of late, very lately I should say, after a period of detente between the two super-powers of the world. Suddenly the things have warmed up and warmed up to such an extent that the security of our country is very much endangered. It is not just a question of justification of the presence of Soviet army in Afghanistan or offer of U.S. Aid to Pakistan. The question of the old Domino Theory has come up again. The Foreign Minister referred to comments in a section of the U.S. press that apprehension has been expressed that arms race to Pakistan may be counter-productive. Another part of the same news is that after Iran they are trying Pakistan as their last prop. It is U.S. imperialism after Chile, after Vietnam, after Korea after the role in Bangladesh, like devil quoting scriptures, is talking of freedom, independence and liberty. If we are talking of establishing the friendliest of relations with our neighbours even if it is under a military ruler who is trampling underfeet all the democratic rights of the people there so far so good, but the global strategy of the U.S. imperialism and its possible consequences are very prominent and its significance cannot be lost sight of.

In his speech to the U.S. Congress, in his State of the Union Message, President Carter just today talked of further extension of the various steps being taken by him against the Soviet Union. We do know that Afghanistan has become a victim of its geography, and it is now a question whether India would equally be a victim of the geo-political situation. My question to the Government of India would be, what steps are we taking—In Parliament naturally all the things cannot be discussed—for

ensuring our independence, independence in every sense of the term and whether adequate steps are being taken and whether India will have to look forward to a friendly power, to the army of a friendly power, for the maintenance of its independence, as has been the case in Afghanistan? Will we be able to stand on our own legs. I am a bit apprehensive. A strong Government, we are told, has emerged at the Centre. But the impression that I have formed during this period by the various statements and various utterances of Mrs. Gandhi is that it speaks of indecision. My impression may not be correct. I would like to be corrected. In the presence of Lord Carrington, Mrs. Gandhi made certain statements which were significantly different from her earlier stand. Then there is the role of our representative in the General Assembly. I do not know whether it was so because there was a period of interregnum but the contradiction was very apparent. And in such a situation this thing must not be there if our national security, national independence has to be guaranteed.

There is another aspect to which I would request the External Affairs Minister to make a categorical statement. In the *Times magazine*, I found a comment wherein it has been stated with regard to the U.S. arms aid to Pakistan to which protest has been made. The remark is: "...But Indian diplomats have privately told the Carter administration that New Delhi understands the immediate need to bolster Zia militarily and indicated that the new Indira Gandhi Government would not object provided the equipment Zia receives is not oversophisticated" Whether any one of our diplomatic missions is trying to subvert our foreign policy, I would like to know. This is a comment which must be satisfactorily replied and the position of the Government of India must be unmistakably stated—whether any one in the diplomatic

[Prof. Sourendra Bhattacharjee] missions of India has done any such thing. From the proceedings of the U.N. General Assembly it seems to me and to many of us that advantage of the uncertain political situation within the country was taken by representatives who are voicing Indian viewpoint there. On that question I would request the Minister of External Affairs to reply. On another question I am myself uncertain. It is a very lamentable ignorance on my part but I think the position has to be clarified whether the Government of India has extended any formal recognition up till now to the Afghanistan Government of Mr. Karmal. The point has not come up as yet but I think from the course of events that I followed, at no stage I found this thing clarified. The position in this regard should be clearly stated by the hon. Minister. Thank you.

SHRI P. V. NARASIMHA RAO: Sir, I would, at the very outset, like to say that there is no indecision whatsoever in the policy pursued by this Government on this question. We have been very clear in what we said and we have been thinking of our steps one after the other and our direction is clear and there is no question of indecision in any particular aspect.

So far as the portion read out by the hon. Member from the *Time magazine* is concerned, I would take this opportunity of denying it totally. There is no truth in that report and no one has ever suggested anything from our side which is even at the slightest variance with our stand taken publicly.

PROF. SOURENDRA BHATTACHARJEE: I asked whether it came to your notice...

SHRI P. V. NARASIMHA RAO: So far as the new Government of Mr.

Karmal is concerned, our Foreign Office is dealing with that Government. Actually, at the moment, the question of formal recognition does not arise because we are already dealing with that Government...

PROF. SOURENDRA BHATTACHARJEE: Sir, the question I raised about the formal recognition has not been answered. We are dealing with many governments, but I specifically asked whether formal recognition has been given.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI U. K. LAKSHMANA GOWDA): He has clarified it by saying that we are dealing with that Government. Yes, Mr. Maran now.

SHRI P. V. NARASIMHA RAO: There is no question of formal recognition. Even if we write a letter, that is tantamount to recognition.

SHRI MURASOLI MARAN (Tamil Nadu): Sir, this has not been the first time that a big power has intervened in the affairs of a small State. Recently, we have had several interventions or invasions. Firstly, Vietnam invaded Cambodia. Secondly, China invaded Vietnam. Thirdly, Tanzania invaded Uganda. Fourthly, France invaded the Central African Empire. Now, we have the Afghanistan phenomenon. It is very interesting to note that all these interventions or invasions took place during the year 1979 alone. Except in the case of the Chinese marching into Vietnam, the aim of the powers that be had been to replace a bad Government with not so a bad Government. In one case, the invading troops have withdrawn. China pulled out of Vietnam. Sir, what is happening in Afghanistan is yet another example of Super Power interventionism. It is not a tribute to the Soviet Union that in the last 22 months, they have changed three Governments in Afghanistan. It seems that the two Super Powers are inter-

ested in proving world that they can make and unmake any Government. If America can overthrow Allende and bring another Government, if American imperialism can do it, the Soviet Union can also do it. It appears, Afghanistan has become another Vietnam of Soviet Union. We understand, Russian intervention in Afghanistan was carried out under the pretext of the Afghan-Soviet Friendship Treaty. We also have a Treaty with the Soviet Union. I am not against it. We have derived a lot of help under this Treaty. It has been commended and approved by the people of India and the Soviet Union. I have not read it, like my friend Mr. Bhupesh Gupta. Hence, I would like to know from the hon. Minister whether there is any provision by which such treaties can become instruments of interference in the internal affairs of our country. I am raising it because some Bombay citizens have issued a statement in no less a paper than the Economic and Political Weekly asking the question whether our Treaty also contains such a provision. My first question would be whether there is such a provision in it and I would like to have an assurance from the hon. Minister that he would see to it that this Treaty would not be used to snatch away from us our sovereignty and freedom.

Sir, regarding the Afghanistan intervention, we may have some differences of opinion. Some may call it intervention and some may call it invasion. But on the other part of the question, namely, the arming of Pakistan, there is no question of any difference, both inside as well as outside this House. Sir, I would like to remind what the former British Prime Minister Callaghan has said. He has said that India is the pre-eminent power in South Asia. Now, the problem is, there is an emerging China-US-Pakistan military alliance. Mr. Kissinger has gone to the extent of saying that the United States would establish military and naval bases in Pakistan. It is our misfortune that our previous Governments did not foresee such a

situation. Mr. Raju was asking the question as to what were the previous Governments doing. He should have put the question to Mr. Mishra or Mr. Vajpayee. There was a time when we occupied a pre-eminent position in foreign policy matters. But we have lost it because the previous Governments followed an erroneous policy. The foreign policy of the Janata or the Lok Dal Governments was an essay in misadventure. It is good that the new Government has created a lot of hope among the people. It is illuminating to note that on the day on which Mrs. Indira Gandhi forced ahead in the elections, Bangladesh stopped firing across the frontier. So, you have generated a lot of hope among the people, among other friendly nations. Here there is a very difficult question. Afghanistan is our true friend, so is also the Soviet Union. Moreover, very soon Pakistan will have its own bomb. We know the military regime in Pakistan with scant popular support or non-Panjabi support will accept arms and aid in the name of containing Soviet power only to use against India.

Moreover there is another question. When is the Soviet Union going to vacate aggression or withdraw the troops? They may say, until we establish stability in Afghanistan we cannot go out. But when are they going to attain stability; Unless the Soviet troops are withdrawn, they may not be able to establish stability. Therefore this problem may continue to be there for a long time.

There is another view that Chinese anti-Sovietism is meant to get U.S. technology and arms and once China gets them, it may not oblige the USA by fighting Americans' war against the Soviet Union. But it may use its newly acquired muscle power for South-ward expansion.

Sir, we have affirmed our faith in the sovereignty and territorial integrity of Afghanistan. The hon. Minister has said that we should defuse the situation. This may be the immediate goal, but we should have

[Shri Murasoli Maran]

a long-term goal also. We should have a concept of a 'tension-free Southern Asia'. We should strongly oppose arms race in South Asia. While we press for withdrawal of Soviet troops, while we reaffirm our faith in the territorial integrity and sovereignty of Afghanistan, we should also see that Pakistan gives a guarantee that no part of its territory would be used by any third country against any of its neighbours. That is why the hon. Minister has said that his Government is indulging in a multi-pronged approach. I want to know, as part of its multi-pronged approach is the Government thinking in terms of the concept of a tension-free southern Asia. We should work to achieve this concept. Having that long-term goal in mind, I would like the hon. Minister or even the hon. Prime Minister to write to all the heads of Governments, asking them to extend support for creating a tension-free southern Asia. My second question is whether the hon. Minister is envisaging this idea and whether he is moving in this direction.

SHRI P. V. NARASIMHA RAO:

Sir, as the hon. Member know only two days ago the President of Bangladesh was here. We had wide-ranging talks with him. I also had talks with my counter-part, the Foreign Minister of Bangladesh. We covered a great deal of ground—both bilateral and regional. In the same way we are in touch with the Government of Nepal. The Nepalese Ambassador met me only yesterday. The King of Bhutan is likely to visit India shortly. So, I would like to assure the hon. Member that we are in touch with all these Governments with a view to creating conditions wherein the entire zone will become a zone of peace. We are not taking any matter piecemeal or in isolation and this I have said many a time during this debate.

So far as the Indo-Soviet Treaty is concerned, about the point raised by the hon. Member I would like to categorically assure him that the con-

tingency which he has referred to is never going to arise under that Treaty and that is all I think I can say on this.

श्री बुद्ध प्रिय मौर्य (मध्य प्रदेश) :

माननीय उपसभाध्यक्ष जी, राष्ट्र की सुरक्षा को दलों के रंगीन चश्मों से नहीं देखना चाहिए। दलों की दलगत नीति से राष्ट्र की सुरक्षा को अलग रखना चाहिए और इसी सिद्धान्त को ज्यादातर सभी नेताओं ने चुनावों में सामने रखा भी था। लेकिन देखा गया कि बाद में देश की सुरक्षा या विदेश नीति जिस पर सभी एकमत थे, वह दलगत दलदल में फँस गई। श्रीमन्, मैंने भी कालिंग अटेंशन मोशन दिया था। लेकिन दुर्भाग्य से वह कुछ देरी से पहुँचा। तब तक आप फैसला ले चुके थे। यदि समय पर मेरा कालिंग अटेंशन मोशन पहुँच जाता तो मैं यह महसूस करता हूँ कि बहस कुछ और ही ढंग से होती। मैंने अपने कालिंग अटेंशन में जो कि आपकी सेवा में देरी से पहुँचा कहा था कि :

"The cold war in Afghanistan and South West Asia and expansion of US Naval base in Diego Garcia which is 1600 kilometres from our coast, the decision of the USA Government to make massive arms supplies of most modern and sophisticated weapons to Pakistan, Washington, in active collusion with Communist China, going to conclude an arms aid agreement using the developments in Afghanistan as a convenient cover—all these developments are going to change the cold war in the region into a hot war".

लेकिन श्रीमन्, दुर्भाग्य रहा कि मेरा यह मोशन समय पर नहीं पहुँचा। मेरा निवेदन है, पहला यह कि जैसा कि माननीय विदेश मंत्री जी ने स्वयं कहा भी है कि जो कुछ अफगानिस्तान में हो रहा है आज की परिस्थिति में उसको आइसोलेट करके नहीं देखा जा सकता। उसके पीछे एक भूमिका रही है। पहले मैं यह कहना चाहूँगा कि

जहाँ तक भारतवर्ष का प्रश्न है, भारतवर्ष के सांस्कृतिक संबंध अफगानिस्तान से ईसा मसीह से भी पहले के हैं, अशोक के जमाने से रहे हैं। अंग्रेजों के जमाने में भी जब कि यह देश अंग्रेजों का दास था, तब भी अफगानिस्तान ने एक विशेष भूमिका निभाई है, हमारी आजादी की लड़ाई में। इसी तरह से अफगानिस्तान के ताल्लुकात, सम्बन्ध, कल्चरल रिलेशंस सोवियत यूनियन के साथ जार के जमाने से रहे हैं, इसके पहले से रहे हैं। बल्कि सोवियत यूनियन में जो रिवोल्यूशन हुआ, जो क्रान्ति आई, उसका इम्पैक्ट अफगानिस्तान पर रहा है। यह बात सही है कि अफगानिस्तान एक नान-अलाइन्ड कंट्री है, यह बात सही है कि अफगानिस्तान एक तटस्थ नीति पर चलने वाला राष्ट्र है। लेकिन यह भी सही है कि अफगानिस्तान की तटस्थ नीति में उसका झुकाव हमेशा सोवियत यूनियन की तरफ रहा है। इस सत्य को हम भूल नहीं सकते। यहाँ पर माननीय सदस्यों ने कुछ शब्दों को इस्तेमाल किया है। स्वयं कालिग अटेंशन में इस तरह के शब्दों का इस्तेमाल हुआ है "इन्टरवेंशन" एक माननीय सदस्य ने शब्द इस्तेमाल किया है "इनवेजन", एक माननीय सदस्य ने शब्द इस्तेमाल कर दिया है, लोक दल के सदस्य ने जिसमें कल तक मैं स्वयं था—उन्होंने 'हमला' शब्द का इस्तेमाल कर दिया, एक माननीय सदस्य ने "अंग्रेशन" शब्द का इस्तेमाल कर दिया। मेरा कहना है कि इन शब्दों का प्रयोग बहुत सोच कर करना चाहिए; क्योंकि इनका अपना एक महत्व है। आज हम युद्ध के कगार पर खड़े हुए हैं। यह युद्ध अगर वास्तव में आ जाता है तब भारत की नीति और रीति और उसका तालमेल किसके साथ चल सकता है इस बात को भी अपने दिमाग से अलग नहीं रखना चाहिए। पाकिस्तान हमारा

मित्र है, हमारा भाई है। एक तरह से हमारा और पाकिस्तान का एक ही कल्चर है। अंग्रेजों के दिमाग और कुछ नेताओं की जिद से पाकिस्तान बन गया। हमारी यह कोशिश रही है कि पाकिस्तान के साथ हमारे सम्बन्ध मैत्री के रहें। लेकिन हमेशा अमेरिका और खासतौर से पार्टिशन के बाद अंग्रेजों की यह कोशिश रही है कि वे पाकिस्तान को हमारे खिलाफ लड़ाते रहें। 1954 में उन्होंने उससे सैनिक समझौता किया, पाकिस्तान को हथियार दिये गये, यह कह कर दिये गये कि ये हथियार हिन्दुस्तान के खिलाफ इस्तेमाल नहीं होंगे। पंडित जवाहरलाल नेहरू ने ऐतराज किया था कि ये हथियार हिन्दुस्तान के खिलाफ इस्तेमाल होंगे। उस वक्त युनाइटेड स्टेट आफ अमेरिका ने कहा था कि ये हथियार चीन की एक्सपेंशन की नीति के खिलाफ इस्तेमाल होंगे, आप इससे चिन्तित न हों। लेकिन अन्त में वे हथियार हमारे खिलाफ इस्तेमाल हुए। जिस चीन के बारे में यू० एस० ए० ने यह तर्क दिया था कि उसकी एक्सपेंशन-थ्यैरी को, उसकी विस्तारवादी नीति को हम रोकना चाहते हैं, उसको आगे नहीं बढ़ने देना चाहते, आज वही अमरीका चीन से मिल कर फौजी समझौते कर रहा है।

आज वही यू० एस० ए० चीन को हथियार दे रहा है। यह हथियार अकेले सोवियत यूनियन के खिलाफ नहीं इस्तेमाल होंगे। यह हथियार भारतवर्ष के खिलाफ इस्तेमाल हुए हैं और आगे भी हो सकते हैं। तो यह जो एक एक्सेज बना यू० एस० ए० का पीकिंग के जरिये से हमारे मित्र पाकिस्तान, हमारे पड़ोसी पाकिस्तान को अपने फौजी अड्डे बनाना उसको भी ध्यान में रखना पड़ेगा।

[श्री बुद्ध प्रिय मौर्य]

यू० एन० के रिजोलूशन की बात यहां पर माननीय सदस्य श्री रबी राय जी ने कही। यू० एन० के रिजोलूशन का इतना महत्व है। वे अपने दोस्त अमरीका वालों को यह समझाएँ कि यू० एन० का यूनेनीमस प्रस्ताव था कि हिन्द महासागर को शान्ति का जोन बनाया जाए, इंडियन ओशियन को पीस जोन रखा जाए। इस यू० एन० रिजोलूशन का किसने खण्डन किया, किसने अवहेलना की? डिगोगाशिया के अन्दर बेस किस ने बनाया? यू० एन० के रिजोलूशन की बात करते हैं। मैं अगर भूल नहीं करता तो टैक्निकली जब हिन्दुस्तान एबस्टेन हुआ उस समय प्रधान मंत्री चौधरी चरण सिंह थे। उस समय तक वे प्रधान मंत्री थे और आज अपनी ही बात का वे खण्डन कर रहे हैं। उनको कम से कम अपनी बुद्धि से काम लेना चाहिए। उन्हें यह बताना चाहिए कि यह जो कुछ हुआ जो कदम लिए गए उसका हम समर्थन नहीं कर सकते उसके साथ हम वोट नहीं कर सकते, कुछ समाजवादी राष्ट्रों ने किसी और कारण से समर्थन किया। उनकी अपनी-अपनी समस्याएं हैं। क्यूबा की अपनी समस्याएं हैं और दूसरे यूरोपीय देशों की अपनी समस्याएं हैं, सोवियत राष्ट्रों, समाजवादी राष्ट्रों की अपनी-अपनी समस्याएं हैं उसके साथ भारत की समस्याओं को मिलाने का क्या अर्थ है, यह मेरी समझ में नहीं आया? यू० एन० के रिजोलूशन को इतना महत्व देते हैं। मैं अध्यापक के रूप में अपनी रूढ़ि से बताता रहा हूं कि इसी यू० एन० के रिजोलूशन का खण्डन किया गया था, हिन्दुस्तान का अपमान किया गया था और हिन्दुस्तान को पाकिस्तान के ऊपर पूर्वी पाकिस्तान के ऊपर हमलावर बताया

गया था तो किस ने वीटो किया था सिक्योरिटी कौंसिल में? जब अमरीका ने कहा था कि हिन्दुस्तान पूर्वी पाकिस्तान पर हमलावर है तो किस ने वीटो किया था? उस समय सोवियत यूनियन ने वीटो किया था तथा हिन्दुस्तान को अपना पूर्ण समर्थन दिया था। हमें इन तत्वों को भूलना नहीं चाहिए। काश्मीर के बारे में बहुत से मित्रों ने कहा। मैं यह पूछना चाहता हूं जब कभी भी षडयंत्र करके काश्मीर को भारत से छीनने की कोशिश की गई तो किस ने वीटो किया? हमारा परम मित्र जिसकी हम संकट में आज देख चुके हैं वह साये की तरह से हमारे साथ खड़ा रहा। सोवियत यूनियन ने वीटो करके हमेशा सही दिशा देकर काश्मीर जो भारत का एक अटूट अंग है, हमेशा हमारा साथ दिया है। मैं यह निवेदन इसलिए कर रहा हूं क्योंकि हम यह जो पीछे एक जमाना गुजर गया है उसको भूल नहीं सकते। किस तरह से अमरीका का वह सातवां बेड़ा, खूनी बेड़ा जिसने वियतनाम में मानव का खून बहाया था, जिस समय बंगलादेश की लड़ाई लड़ी जा रही थी, बंगाल की खाड़ी में आ गया था, उस समय कौन महा-भारत के शिखंडी की तरफ खड़ा रहा था, किस के बल पर वह बेड़ा खड़ा रहा था? क्या वह अपने बल पर खड़ा रह गया था? क्या वह किसी दूसरे के बल पर खड़ा रह गया था? क्या वह चीन के बल पर खड़ा रहा था? मैं यह कहना चाहता हूं कि वह हमारे परम मित्र सोवियत यूनियन की शक्ति के बल पर शिखंडी बना खड़ा रहा था। मैं निवेदन करना चाहता हूं तथा माननीय विदेश मंत्री जी से पूछता हूं कि अमीन की सरकार को आपने मान्यता दी थी या नहीं? मैं तो माननीय विदेश मंत्री जी से यह भी पूछना चाहूंगा कि आपने

कारमल की सरकार को मान्यता दी है या नहीं ? जहां तक मेरी जानकारी और विश्वास है आपने मान्यता दी है । अगर आपने मान्यता दी है तो फिर उनके साथ हमारे डिप्लोमेटिक रिलेशंस हैं । उनको हमने मान्यता दे रखी है । जब उनके न्याते पर संधि की नीति में कुछ फौजी दस्ते आते हैं तो उसको इनवेजन नहीं कहा जा सकता, इंटरवेंशन नहीं कहा जा सकता । इसको डिस्पेच आफ ट्रप्स कहा जा सकता है । इसलिए माननीय विदेश मंत्री जी कल हम सब संकट में पड़ सकते हैं । इसलिए आपको मजबूती से इस बात को

6 P.M.

साफ कर देना चाहिए । अपने शब्दों के जाल में न फंसे । जो मित्र हैं वे मित्र हैं और जिन पर हमें शक है उन पर शक बनाये रखें । माननीय सदन का ज्यादा समय न लेते हुए मेरा निवेदन है कि जो मैंने छोटी सी बात कही है, अंत में प्रार्थना करना चाहूंगा कि जहां आपने अपनी बात कह दी है कि रुस से हमने कहा है कि वहां से फौजी दस्ते हटाये जायें, वहां क्या यह भी आप कृपा करके कहेंगे कि डियगो-गासिया जो 1600 किलोमीटर की दूरी पर है जहां मिलिटरी एक्सपेंशन हो रहा है, लगातार हो रहा है, वहां एक्सपेंशन न हो, क्या इसके लिए आप कहेंगे कि जो मोस्ट सोफिस्टिकेटेड वेपन दिये जा रहे हैं जिनका उपयोग या तो पाकिस्तान की जनता के खिलाफ होगा या अफगानिस्तान की जनता के खिलाफ होगा या वह हिन्दुस्तान के खिलाफ होगा, उन हथियारों को न दिया जाये, इस पर रोक लगा दी जाये । क्या आप इस पर उनसे विचार करेंगे यह मेरा निवेदन है ।

श्री पी० बी० नरसिंह राव : मैं माननीय सदस्य से यह विनती करना

चाहता हूं, उनसे कहना चाहता हूं कि जब विचार होगा तो किसी एक विषय पर नहीं होगा बल्कि सारे विषयों पर विचार होगा । क्योंकि वे एक दूसरे से ऐसे जुड़े हुए हैं कि उनमें किसी को अलग नहीं किया जा सकता है ।

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI U. K. LAKSHMANA GOWDA): What about the Bills? There are two Bills.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: No Bills. The House should be adjourned.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI U. K. LAKSHMANA GOWDA): All right. The Minister is not moving those Bills. So I will ask the Secretary-General to read out the message from the Lok Sabha.

MESSAGE FROM THE LOK SABHA

The Constitution (Fifty-fifth Amendment) Bill, 1980.

SECRETARY-GENERAL: Sir, I have to report to the House the following message received from the Lok Sabha, signed by the Secretary of the Lok Sabha:

"In accordance with the provisions of Rule 96 of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in Lok Sabha, I am directed to enclose herewith the Constitution (Forty-fifth Amendment) Bill, 1980, which has been passed by Lok Sabha at its sitting held on the 24th January, 1980, in accordance with the provisions of article 368 of the Constitution of India."

Sir, I lay the Bill on the Table.