

SHRI B. N. BANERJEE (Nominated): May I remove the misapprehension in the mind of Mr. Bhandari? In respect of papers which come from the Government, the List of Business mentions "in English and Hindi". In respect of the Rajya Sabha, it is not mentioned because invariably the Rajya Sabha Secretariat all along have been lying both the Hindi and English versions.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you. That clears the position.

SUPPLEMENTARY DEMANDS FOR GRANTS (GENERAL) 1979-80

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF FINANCE (SHRI JAGANNATH PAHADIA): On behalf of Shri Venkataraman, I beg to lay on the Table a statement (in English and Hindi) showing the Supplementary Demands for Grants (General) for the year 1979-80 (January 1980).

CALLING ATTENTION TO A MATTER OF URGENT PUBLIC IMPORTANCE

Serious development 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

MR. CHAIRMAN: Now the House will proceed with the Calling Attention Motion. Shri Devendra Nath Dwivedi.

SHRI DINESH SINGH (Uttar Pradesh): Mr. Chairman, Sir. Before you call on the hon. Member....

SHRI DEVENDRA NATH DWIVEDI (Uttar Pradesh): How can he rise, Sir? Under what rules he is rising, I do not know. I have been called to draw the attention of the Minister.

SHRI DINESH SINGH: I am making a submission.

SHRI DEVENDRA NATH DWIVEDI: Under what rule are you standing?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Dwivedi, let us hear him.

SHRI DINESH SINGH: Sir, I am making a submission that this matter being very important, is engaging the minds, I am sure, of all the hon. Members in the House. My submission to you is that you may consider allowing a full debate on this matter and not merely a Calling Attention.

SHRI MOHAMMAD YUNUS SALEEM (Andhra Pradesh): Sir, I also support the submission made by Shri Dinesh Singh. Sir, this matter is very important.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That is all right.

SHRI MOHAMMAD YUNUS SALEEM: Sir, it will be very kind of you if you instruct the Treasury Benches to find one day for this debate because, you know, Sir, that this matter is occupying our minds. Different statements have come from the Government. Some Ministers sometimes make different statements. Therefore, Sir, a full-day debate is required.

(Interruptions)

SHRI PILOO MODY (Gujarat): It will help the Government to clarify.

श्री शिव चन्द्र झा (बिहार) : श्रीमन्, मेरी एक सबमिशन है। आपको इस मामले पर पूरी डिबेट करानी चाहिए। अगर आप इस कॉलिंग एटेंशन को लेते हैं तो इसमें जो नाम दिये गये हैं उन सब को आप बोलने का मौका दें इसमें जो नाम दिये गये हैं अगर उन सब को बोलने का मौका दिया जाता है तो इससे दोनों बातें हो जाती हैं। इसलिए मेरा निवेदन है कि आप सबको बोलने का मौका दें।

SHRI L. R. NAIK (Karnataka): It is necessary to have a full debate.

SHRI N. P. CHENGALRAYA NAI-DU (Andhra Pradesh): We have given a different Calling Attention notice.

श्री सभापति : मैं आनरेबल मेम्बर से दबास्त करूंगा कि अगर वे एक-एक कर क हेंगे तो सब यहां सुनेंगे और अगर छ-सात मेम्बर एक साथ बोलेंगे तो कोई भा नहीं सुन सकेगा। इसलिए बेहतर यह होगा कि आप जरा तहम्मूल करें और बारा-बारा से कहें। वरना एक शेर मशहूर है,

मज्जा करने का जब है इक कहे और दूसरा समझे। अगर अपना कहा खुद आप ही समझे तो क्या समझे

SHRI A. G. KULKARNI (Maharashtra): Sir, I want to make a submission. You are very fortunate in that our friends have gone that side. Had they been here, you would not have been allowed to speak also.

SHRI N. P. CHENGALRAYA NAI-DU: Mr. Chairman, Sir, we have given a different version of the Calling Attention notice. We have mentioned Russian intervention in Kabul. That has been omitted here. I am very sorry, they cannot change the Calling Attention.

MR. CHAIRMAN: This matter was discussed in the Business Advisory Committee and it has been decided that even in a Calling Attention Motion Members will say whatever they wish to say and many more Members will be called to address the House. As to the summary which has been made of the Calling Attention Motion, it was very difficult to put everything. If you think that country 'A' is not to be blamed, you can clear that position. If you think that country 'B' is to be blamed, you can indict it. So, there is no difficulty about it at all.

SHRI MOHAMMAD YUNUS SALEEM: Sir, there should be a full-fledged debate. Then everybody will have a right to express his views

whereas in a Calling Attention Motion only such persons whose names have been given can speak.

MR. CHAIRMAN: No. There will be a more liberal approach to it. That will satisfy everybody.

SHRI MANUBHAI PATEL (Gujarat): How can such an important point be missed by summarising when already names of three countries are mentioned here? The root cause of the whole trouble is Russian intervention in Afghanistan. (Interruptions) Mr. Naidu says: Why eliminate while summarizing? I think this factor should be taken into consideration. (Interruptions).

MR. CHAIRMAN: May I request the attention of the House? When this Calling Attention Motion came up, I did not leave it to the Secretariat to summarize it. I had a difficult task and I can tell you that I proceeded about it with the greatest circumspection. I can tell you that the word 'developments' was used by Hon'ble Mr. Pande, honourable Dr. Dutt and honourable Mr. Goswami. Honourable Mr. Yadav used the word 'occupation'. Honourable Dr. Bhaji Mahavir used the word 'military occupation'. The word 'intervention' was used by honourable Mr. Naidu and Mr. Era Sezhiyan. The words 'penetration of Russia' and 'involvement' were used by Hon'ble Mr. Shiv Chandra Jha. Now, with these different varieties of words,.....

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA (West Bengal): Sir, you have not mentioned that we also gave a notice. We never mentioned the Russian intervention and all those things. Our names are not there, Our motion should also have been listed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: It is no use our trying to put in every word into the Calling Attention summary. You can see that the matter was dealt with the greatest care possible; and anybody who is speaking on the Calling Atten-

tion Motion, as I said, can blame country A or country B or all countries from A to Z—it will be open to him.

SHRI DEVENDRA NATH DWIVEDI: Sir, I call the attention of the Minister of External Affairs to the serious developments arising out of the decision of the Governments of the United States of America and China to extend massive arms aid to Pakistan in the wake of the Russian intervention in Afghanistan, thereby threatening the security of India.

THE MINISTER OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS (SHRI P. V. NARASIMHA RAO): Mr. Chairman, Sir, according to report that have come to the attention of Government, the U.S. Government has decided to expedite military supplies to Pakistan worth \$ 150 million as part of cash sales already in the pipe-line. The U.S. Government has further announced a package aid \$400 million for the next 20 months—\$ 200 million in economic aid and the other \$ 200 million in military aid. Further, following the recent visit to Peking by the American Defence Secretary, Mr. Harold Brown, and the just concluded visit to Pakistan of the Chinese Foreign Minister, Government have seen press reports that China also may be considering increasing the supply of military equipment to Pakistan.

Government fully shares the serious concern of this House over the moves to augment Pakistan's military capability. It is our apprehension that induction of arms into Pakistan could convert the South-Asian region into a theatre of great power confrontation and conflict and threaten the security of India. Government have also expressed their concern that the induction of arms has a potential of decelerating the process of normalisation which the Governments of India and Pakistan have fostered in the spirit of the Simla Agreement. These views have been

impressed upon the Governments of USA, China, Pakistan and other concerned countries.

Sir, the developments in the region around us in the last few months have rightly given rise to much concern in this country, which is shared by the Government. The underlying causes are not far to seek. Tensions and problems have existed between neighbours, and even inside nations. A dangerous dimension is added when the great powers start using these nations in their quest to gain advantage in their global strategy, or to seek to secure their perceived interests, or again when governments in the region render themselves amenable to this strategy for some short term gains and in the process defeat the very objectives they are seeking to achieve. The need of the hour is to stem this ominous process and return to the tried and tested path of settling problems in an environment free of great power influence or confrontation.

In this context, Sir, recent developments in Afghanistan have naturally been engaging the serious attention of the Government. India has close and friendly relations with the government and people of Afghanistan and we are deeply concerned and vitally interested in the security, independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity of this traditionally friendly neighbour of ours; and we believe that they have every right to safeguard them.

It is our hope that the people of Afghanistan will be able to resolve their internal problems without any outside interference. As the Prime Minister has clearly indicated, we are against the presence of foreign troops and bases in any country. We have expressed our hope that Soviet forces will withdraw from Afghanistan.

Our entire stand is consistent with our commitment to peace and non-alignment. All the countries in the

[Shri P. V. Narasimha Rao]

South Asian region are members of the Non-aligned Movement and, consistent with the principles of non-alignment, it is our hope that the entire area will be free of tension.

The induction of arms into the region and the introduction of great power confrontation would further threaten the peace and stability of the region including the security of India. In this evolving situation our effort has been to take steps to defuse it rather than permit its further escalation. The Government of India has been in touch with the countries of the sub-continent, the Soviet Union, USA, China and other countries to stress that no action should be taken that could lead to an enhancement of the dangers and heightening of confrontation as we feel no worthwhile solution is otherwise possible. In this context the Foreign Minister of the USSR and the representative of the President of the United States are expected to visit India in the near future. The Foreign Secretary of India will also visit Islamabad shortly at the invitation of the Government of Pakistan.

We deem it important to have a continuing dialogue with Pakistan as indeed with other countries of the region to ensure that this region does not become the theatre of great power confrontation. It is vitally important that the Governments of India and Pakistan have a clear understanding of each other's perceptions and that nothing is done in the meantime that could damage the interests of our region or cause a set back to the process of normalisation between India and Pakistan.

We welcome President Zia-ul-Haq's reference to the Simla Agreement in his message to the Prime Minister. This Agreement, in our view is the basis of the efforts to normalise relations between India and Pakistan. The Agreement states that relations between the two countries shall be

governed by the principles and purposes of the Charter of the United Nations. Both countries have further committed themselves to peaceful co-existence and respect for each other's territorial integrity and sovereignty. There are, in our opinion, positive and obvious advantages in cooperation between our two countries through the process of normalisation. It must be our hope that we will jointly be able to travel further along this path of reason.

Mr. Chairman, Sir, our region and our neighbourhood have been in turmoil for some time. Working together in harmony and cooperation we can do much to establish a climate of peace and stability in order to promote development for our collective benefit. Let it be clearly understood that in pursuit of this vision, we will steadfastly oppose all attempts by any power to turn the clock back and revert to an era of confrontation and cold war. Government is confident that the House and the people of India stand united behind it in support their efforts to gain these objectives.

Thank you, Sir.

12 Noon

SHRI DEVENDRA NATH DWIVEDI: Sir, the events in the past few weeks in this part of the world, the happening in Afghanistan and the manner in which the United States and other countries of the West and China have responded to the Afghan situation, have created a dangerous situation, a situation which threatens the peace of this region and also causes a threat to the security of this country. Sir, it is ironical that this crisis should have erupted at a time when India is hosting an international conference, a conference which is devoting itself to working out a plan of action for industrialisation of the developing countries. Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru had taught us that one of the great threats to world peace is the continuing disparity between the deve-

loped and the developing nations. Therefore, at a time when we are trying to find ways in which that threat, a permanent threat, to world peace could be removed an immediate threat, a threat of a more serious nature has been thrust on us. Sir the only mitigating factor from the point of view of this country is that today we have at the helm of affairs leaders who have a vision of the international situation and who have a certain perception of the overall national interests of the country. We are not being governed today by leaders for whom foreign policy was a foreign language, something which they did not understand and something which they were too old to learn.

Sir, before I make a few submissions and before asking a couple of questions of the hon. External Affairs Minister, I want to make two preliminary observations. First, in formulating our response and approach to the crisis, we must be guided by two overall considerations: first, the principles which govern our foreign policy and secondly, the requirements of our national security. These are the two basic factors which we have to keep before ourselves. Therefore, Sir, it will not help to think of what has happened in terms of ideological shibboleths, nor will any approach of sentimental moralism help us. We have to look at the whole problem primarily from the point of view of the security of this country. This is my first submission. And the second submission is that this crisis has several dimensions and there are different components of the situation. We have to look at this crisis in its entirety and we should not try to isolate a certain aspect and then mentally respond. This is exactly what has happened unfortunately in certain circles. Therefore, I have taken the liberty of stressing these two points at the very outset.

Sir, let us begin at the beginning. It is the Afghan situation which has

led to a series of events and a chain of reactions, which is causing concern to us. Sir, what has happened in Afghanistan is something about which there cannot be two opinions. I think this country is more or less united and the Prime Minister and the Foreign Minister have captured the mood of the country and they have expressed themselves accordingly. Sir, the Prime Minister at the very outset said that there is no question of supporting the Soviet action in Afghanistan, and India is opposed to any country sending its troops into another country. The Prime Minister also said that the Afghans should be left to solve their own problems. And the Prime Minister also has expressed her hope that the Russians will withdraw from Afghanistan. Our representative at the United Nations also more or less took a similar stand. He said in clear terms that the sovereign, the territorial integrity, the independence and the non-aligned status of Afghanistan is something for which we have the greatest respect. Our representative also said in the United Nations that we expect that the Soviet Union will respect the independence of the Afghan people. Our representative also expressed the hope that the Russians will withdraw their forces . . .

SHRI VIREN J. SHAH (Gujarat):
Like the British did from India after 150 years.

SHRI DEVENDRA NATH DWIVEDI: The trouble with some of these honourable friends is that they do not understand that when our representative is speaking in the United Nations, his viewpoint, his approach is a problem-oriented approach. The Prime Minister of India or Mr. P. V. Narasimha Rao is not a professor of international relations or a journalists who can afford the luxury of indulging in academic exercises. His is a business approach. His is an approach to find solutions to a certain problem . . .

SHRI VIREN J. SHAH (Gujarat):
How?

SHRI DEVENDRA NATH DWI-
VEDI: You don't understand it.

The approach of our representative is to find a solution, how to diffuse the situation, how to prevent the situation from escalation, and this is something which unfortunately Members of the Opposition do not understand. This is the background . . .

SHRI VIREN J. SHAH: With a hundred thousand Soviet troops, do you mean to say they are intervening?

SHRI DEVENDRA NATH DWI-
VEDI: Sir, how is it that he is asking questions? This is very unfair.

MR. CHAIRMAN; Honourable Member, either you raise a point of order or do not please interrupt. It wastes time.

SHRI DEVENDRA NATH DWI-
VEDI: Sir, this is the background of the beginning of the present crisis. But from the point of view of India's security I would ask Members opposite what is of greater concern to us: The presence of Russians in Afghanistan or the response of the United States, the response of China, the response of some of the other countries, to the Afghan situation? And what has been their response? Their response is to induct massive arms into this subcontinent. They have responded, they have tried to find a military solution to what is essentially a political and socio-economic problem. What is the West doing?

SHRI VIREN J. SHAH: How is it a socio-economic problem?

SHRI DEVENDRA NATH DWI-
VEDI: It is ultimately a socio-economic problem. That is something which you will never understand. You have never understood the crisis . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: May I request you to address the Chair and not enter into dialogue with the Opposition?

SHRI HAREKRUSHNA MALLICK (Orissa): Sir, I rise on a point of information. The speech made by Mr. Brijesh Mishra who spoke on behalf of the country in the United Nations, should be placed on the Table of the House. The honourable Member is quoting from the speech of Mr. Brijesh Mishra and he is quoting something which Mr. Mishra never spoke. So I demand that the speech of Mr. Brijesh Mishra should be placed on the Table of the House. Before the change in Government took place in this country, all our emissaries abroad switched over their loyalty. I question the *bona fides* of the Government in making a stand on this.

SHRI DEVENDRA NATH DWI-
VEDI: I would beg of you, Sir, not to allow anybody to interrupt me. If he wants to speak, he can speak when he gets an opportunity. But he cannot interrupt like this

MR. CHAIRMAN: The honourable Member will get his chance later.

SHRI DEVENDRA NATH DWI-
VEDI: Sir, I was saying that our immediate concern is induction of arms. It is not only a question of America giving aid. America is taking a lead in arranging a consortium of nations of the world who could be asked co-operate in their efforts to supply arms to Pakistan. And Pakistani leaders also are talking not in terms of millions of dollars but billions of dollars worth of arms. And Mr. Agha Shahi said that the help that we get should be commensurate with the threat. And naturally the threat is what Mr. Agha Shahi or what Mr. Carter's representative thinks. Now, we are confronted with a very dangerous situation. What has been our experience of arms aid to Pakistan. Arms aid was supposedly given in the '50s to combat communism. But no Government in

Pakistan was interested in fighting communism. The only use which the arms were put to was to attack India. This has been our experience. Now, this is not a question of academic discussion. Time and again those arms have been used and there have been occasions when the United States did not have the guts even to protest against the use to which those arms were put. President Zia has said that the arms being given by the United States are just peanuts. Guns and tanks are not peanuts. They may be peanuts for an Army General. But people get killed by these guns and tanks. Therefore, we cannot allow this kind of peanut business to go on. We must do whatever we can to prevent the situation from escalating further.

It is not merely a question of America giving arms worth 200 million dollars to Pakistan. We are a big country, we are a matured country. We should not get panicky just by their giving these arms to Pakistan. We should look at the totality of the situation. It is a question of geo-political reality. It is a question of the manner in which South Asia is being turned into an arena for pursuit of global strategy by the super powers, particularly by the United States. It is a question of the United States' strategy in the Gulf. It is a question of their strategy in the Indian Ocean. It is a question of the United States' Strategy in South Asian countries. It is a question of background of the manner in which the United States and China are adopting a paralld policy in South Asia. We have to view the present emergent situation against the background of Chinese intrusion in South Asia. We have to view it against the background of the manner in which a kind of Washington-Peking axis is being formed. We have to guard against the danger of Islamabad joining that axis. I believe, so far, Islamabad has not joined that axis. Should they do so, it will not only be against the interest of this country, but it may be against the interests of Pakistan

itself. Therefore, we have to view what has happened against the background of the totality of the situation. There is frustration of the United States in Vietnam and Iran. There is need, therefore, for the United States to have a new base of operation against Soviet Union and also against India.

Sir, Soviet Union is our friend. We have friendly relations with Soviet Union as well as the United States. The United States and India are sister democracies. The United States of America believes in certain values in which we also believe. But our experience has been very bitter. In the name of combating Communism, the United States, over a period of time, has supported regimes which have nothing to do with democracy. The Soviet Union has been our friend in need. Our friendship with the Soviet Union has stood us in good stead. It is not a question of joining the chorus of denunciation against the Soviet Union in the United Nations. It is a question of quietly working out a strategy which could defuse the situation. And this is exactly what we have tried to do and what our Government have tried to do. Unfortunately...

DR. BHAI MAHAVIR (Madhya Pradesh): Is he asking questions, or is he giving explanations himself?

SHRI DEVENDRA NATH DWIVEDI: The Chairman has already given a ruling that he will allow Members to express their opinions on this Calling Attention. Our convention is that we do not discuss Calling Attention as they do in the Lok Sabha. We have discussed Calling Attention for a whole day and Members have expressed their views on all the dimension of problems... (Interruptions).

MR. CHAIRMAN: May I again remind the hon. Member that if he begins to answer any shouts from the other side or any objections or remarks, there will be no end to this discussion? There are others wanting to speak. Therefore, I would allow you to go on and you should ignore the remarks from the other side.

SHRI DEVENDRA NATH DWIVEDI: I was trying to make a submission to the effect that this House should look at the arms aid being given to Pakistan against the background of the totality of the situation and against the background of the manner in which the United States is trying to turn the Islamic revivalism against the Soviet Union. Sir, what has happened in West Asia? Sir, there is the question of Islamic revivalism, and, by and large, it is going against the interests of the United States. But the Afghan situation is being seized by the United States. The United States has a vested interest. I submit, Sir, with all the force at my command that the United States has a vested interest in the aggravation of the Afghan problem. The United States has a vested interest in creating a situation in which there is a deterioration in the relations between Afghanistan and Pakistan. And the United States is trying again to use Pakistan—a country which claims to be non-aligned, which has denounced time and again the defence pacts, and yet that country is being used as a pawn in the chess-board of international diplomacy.

Sir, the representative of the President of the United States has said that there need not be a new Defence pact, for the 1959 pact will do. Sir, that pact has already been denounced by Pakistan. But here is a case of somebody trying to be more royal than the king. The United States is interested in giving aid to Pakistan more than Pakistan is really interested in. Therefore, we have to look to the designs of the United States. Therefore, the foremost task before this country is immediately to provide leadership. We must try to find a sub-continental solution to the sub-continent problem, and we must try to diffuse the situation a manner that the super-power conflict does not affect this country.

How do we do it? Sir, there are a number of ways in which we have to take steps to prevent escalation. First,

we must talk to Pakistan. We must talk to Pakistan. I am glad that the Foreign Secretary of India is visiting Pakistan shortly. We shall have to tell Pakistan: Do not allow yourself to be used as an operation base of the United States. The security of Pakistan lies in good-neighbourly relations and in raising the standard of living of the people of Pakistan. We must impress upon President Zia that he should not allow the designs of China, the designs of USA, and of some other countries to operate in a manner that Pakistan is used as a pawn to advance their interests against the Soviet Union and, ultimately, against this country. I have no doubt that in the past few years a good climate has been generated between our two countries under the leadership of our Prime Minister by negotiating the Simla Agreement and subsequently the policy of improving our relations with our neighbours which was started by Mrs. Indira Gandhi, for which much credit is taken by the subsequent Government, which followed the policy of Mrs. Gandhi at that time. So when that climate has already been created, I hope our representative who visits Pakistan will definitely talk the matter over with Pakistan.

Then, there are other things which we must do. Sir, we must talk privately also to the Soviet Union. Soviet Union has been a great friend of ours, and we do not want to embarrass Soviet Union in public forums. But at the same time, the dictum that there cannot be military solutions to national problems is applicable as much to Soviet Union as it is applicable to the United States. We must impress upon the Soviet Union the fact that ultimately it is the Afghans who will find a solution of their problem.

SHRI A. G. KULKARNI: But how can the Government talk privately?

SHRI DEVENDRA NATH DWIVEDI: Governments always talk privately—not through the Press, not through issuing statements. The negotiations are always conducted without the presence of Mr. Kulkarni or Devendra Nath Dwivedi.

SHRI A. G. KULKARNI: How can a Government talk privately for the object in view? Do not say something which... (*Interruptions*).

SHRI K. K. MADHAVAN (Kerala): Sir, on a point of order. Mr. Dwi-vedi made the statement that the security of Pakistan depends on good neighbourly relations with India. I am quoting what exactly he said. Am I to presume, as an ordinary prudent man, that he presupposes that the danger is from India? It is wrong. He has made a statement which is quite inconsistent with the policy of India.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The opinions expressed by one hon. Member are not necessarily binding upon the other Members. Also, he is not a speaker on behalf of the Treasury Benches. You will soon have the chance of hearing the Minister of External Affairs.

SHRI PILOO MODY: He has left nothing for him to say.

SHRI DEVENDRA NATH DWI-VEDI: I am amazed that my good friend, Mr. Madhavan, has drawn such erroneous conclusions from my remarks. (*Interruptions*) The point that I was making is, that the Russians must realise that ultimately they will have to withdraw and they should withdraw sooner rather than later. This is what I want to repeat. Secondly, we must impress upon Pakistan that they should stop supporting the insurgents. Ultimately, participation of Pakistan in what may be termed as civil war in Afghanistan will not be in the interest of either Pakistan or Afghanistan. Therefore, we must impress upon our Pakistani friends not to support the insurgents which is being done also with the help of China. Then we must take initiative and do whatever we can to ensure that the inflow of arms stops. Once Pakistan sees reason and realises and understands where India's destiny and Pakistan's destiny lie, I think Pakistan itself will

feel a little discouraged to take the risk of allowing this inflow of arms into Pakistan.

Before concluding, I want to ask one or two questions. My first question is about the Government's assessment of the full scope and nature of the armaments that Pakistan is likely to receive either from the United States or from the United Kingdom or from other western countries. This is my first question. My second question is about the Government's understanding of the Chinese role in the matter of giving arms. I feel that the Chinese role is more dubious and one does not know what is really going on. The United States' representatives do announce what they are doing, but China does not do so. Therefore, in the long run, what China does is of greater concern to us than what the other western countries do because China is our next-door neighbour. What is China's role in the whole thing, particularly in regard to the arms that are likely to be given. Lastly, I wonder if the hon. Minister will take this House into confidence and share some of his thoughts with us as to how he is going to go about and how he is going to evolve a strategy to defuse the situation. If he spells out the approach of the Government a little in detail, I think that this House will be benefited. Thank you, Sir.

श्री शिव चन्द्र झा : सभापति महोदय, मेरा प्रॉपर्ट आफ़ आर्डर है। यह विषय बहुत गम्भीर है। सारा देश जानना चाहता है कि भारत सरकार की क्या नीति है, क्या स्टैंड है। इस सम्बन्ध में चूंकि इस कालिंग एटेंशन नोटिस में केवल विदेशी मामले की बात नहीं है, आर्म्स सप्लाई टु पाकिस्तान भी है, सुरक्षा का भी मामला है तो सुरक्षा मंत्री को भी यहां रहना चाहिए और डिफेंस प्रधान मंत्री खुद ही हैं, इसलिए दस्तावेज से इस सवाल का जवाब, इस कालिंग एटेंशन का जवाब प्रधान मंत्री को देना चाहिए, वह खुद सफ़ाई दें ताकि सारा देश, राष्ट्र जान सके कि भारत सरकार का क्या स्टैंड है। मंत्री

[श्री शिव चन्द्र झा]

महोदय को जवाब लिखा-लिखाया आता है, वह कह देंगे लेकिन भारत का प्रतिनिधि यू० एन० ओ० में कुछ बोलता है और प्रधान मंत्री कुछ बोलती है, दोनों में कांसिस्टेंसी नहीं है। तो प्रधान मंत्री को आप यहां बुलवाइये और इसका जवाब प्रधान मंत्री को डिफेंस मिनिस्टर के नाते भी देना चाहिए।

श्री सभापति : यह कोई प्वाइंट आफ़ ऑर्डर नहीं है। प्राइम मिनिस्टर खुद चाहें तो जवाब दे सकती हैं। यहां एक्सटर्नल अफ़ेयर्स मिनिस्टर मौजूद हैं।

श्री शिव चन्द्र झा : वह जवाब न दें लेकिन यहां बैठी रहें।

श्री सभापति : दोनों सदन में वह एक साथ बैठ नहीं सकतीं। वहां भी वह जवाब दे रही होंगी। यहां एक्सटर्नल अफ़ेयर्स मिनिस्टर मौजूद हैं।

Yes, Mr. Minister.

SHRI P. V. NARASIMHA RAO: Sir, I am grateful to the hon. Member for a largely realistic approach to the situation. So far as the Government has concerned, I would like to mention one, that this Government in regard to the quantum and the level of supply of the arms that are being given to Pakistan right now is very much different from the past. We are concerned that arms are being sent into Pakistan. And while we think that this instalment of arms by itself would be a very great threat to India, we do feel that the overall trend of bringing arms into that country is much more important than the precise quantum of arms given at a particular time. As I have said earlier, we are in an evolving situation and we are trying to defuse the situation so that the trend is reversed at the earliest. That is the position, Sir.

Then, Sir, in regard to the Chinese role, it is well-known that in the

past, China has given assistance to Pakistan, both economic and military. The exact quantum and break-up is anybody's guess. But it is well known that assistance has flowed into Pakistan from China in the past. In the present context, however, since the visit of the Chinese foreign Minister to Pakistan has just been concluded, at the moment, as of today, we do not have any confirmed reports of what happened there except press reports. That is why in the first paragraph of my statement I have clearly stated that we have had press reports to the effect that as a result of his visit, China also may think in terms of joining in this assistance to Pakistan with military equipment. We are not absolutely sure about it. We do hope that it may not be as serious ultimately as is made out or as we think. But, that is why we have taken the earliest opportunity to get in touch with the Chinese Government also through diplomatic channels which is what Mr. Dwivedi presumably meant when he said "privately". It is not private; it is through diplomatic channels. And we talked to other Governments more effectively than by making use of other public forum. Sir, I have already listed out the attempts of this Government to defuse the situation with all the clarity that is possible at the moment. In a developing situation, in an evolving situation, what all could be spelt out is the position as it stands at that moment. And as I have already submitted, our Foreign Secretary is visiting Islamabad on the 4th of February. Between yesterday and today there has been some more definiteness brought into the situation. The dates have been fixed. The Foreign Minister of U.S.S.R. is likely to visit, rather is going to visit, India between the 12th and 14th of February. So, I would submit to the House that we have not lost any time in taking initiatives in the right direction and we hope that these initiatives will bear fruit.

DR. V. P. DUTT (Nominated): Mr. Chairman, Sir, our hon. Foreign

Minister has just taken over and he has taken over at a time when the country is suddenly faced with a very serious situation. I would like to convey to him my good wishes and the good wishes of all my colleagues here in meeting this threatening situation. I would also like to appeal to the hon. Members on both sides, particularly my friends on my right, and say that we must rise above party politics on this issue. We must rise above party approaches because the matter is too serious to play around or to make it a party issue. There is no doubt that the country is facing possibly the grimmest and the most sombre situation that it has faced since independence. Unfortunately, some of my friends would like to stand on the mountain top and shout moral platitudes. But we must remember that if another attack comes on us, and I would like to caution that the threat of another attack has increased very considerably, many of them will be scurrying around and watching who will come and help (*Interruptions*). Therefore, we must also be careful in knowing where our national interests lie and who our friends have been and who our friends are likely to be and evolve our responses accordingly in that situation. I would like to submit that I believe foreign intervention is unpleasant, most unpleasant, I am glad that we have always stood against foreign intervention and I am glad that we are against foreign intervention now not only of one kind but of all kinds and, therefore, while I would suggest that an early withdrawal of Soviet troops from Afghanistan should be on the agenda of the Indian foreign policy, it must be subject to certain well-defined conditions. Otherwise we are only talking of one kind of foreign intervention. Therefore, despite what my friend, Mr. Dwivedi, said, the professor of international relations will have to give a brief lecture, a very brief lecture, on the realities of the political situation, not an academic

exercise, but on the realities of the situation. For that we must go into the background, into the sequence of events, at which point did the foreign intervention begin, the regional developments, the strategic calculations of various States, the global scene, all in the context of our national perception. Sir, to begin with there was this Afghan revolution. There is no doubt about that. I think we have been ignoring this aspect. For the last ten or fifteen years in Afghanistan the forces of reform, revolution and social change have been locked up in an increasing conflict with the forces of *status quo* with the forces of religious theocracy and with the forces of economic vested interests and, Sir, let us remember, that when the monarchy was overthrown in Daud's *coup d'état* in July 1973 this was one of the first indications of this increasing confrontation that was beginning between social change and stratification. Let us also not forget that the movement for reform had been very considerably strengthened and that thousands of mourners marched on the streets of Kabul on April 17, 1978, shouting anti-American slogans at the murder of a leading leftist intellectual. Why? Because they felt that one power was standing for the forces of change; the other power was standing for the forces of *status quo*, of religion, theocracy and it was then that those social revolutionaries took over in Kabul and they looked towards the Soviet Union. Nobody said anything at that time. They asked for Soviet assistance; at that time nobody said anything. But on the other side, those who were affected by the land reform measures, the landlords, those who were affected by the curtailment of powers of the mullas, of the religious theocracy, they combined and they began a rebellious movement, a movement of insurgency. It so happens unfortunately that whenever the base of the revolutionary elite is small, it is overlaid by power struggles and personal power problems. That is what happened there also, when there was

[Shri P. V. Narasimha Rao]

a split among radicals, between Parcham and Khalq, then within the Khalq and subsequently this uneasy combination of Parcham and Khalq and the coming of the Soviet troops. But during this period, there was another kind of foreign intervention that began apart from the Soviet assistance to Kabul. There is no doubt that at that time Pakistan became a sanctuary for the rebels for rest, recuperation and replenishment of arms and this is no secret history. Western newspapermen and Western journalists have reported in ample measure what was happening there. I do not have the time and I know that you will soon call me to order. Therefore, I would like to mention two reports in the New York Times of as early as February 1978. The New York Times correspondent sent a report from a base in Pakistan—that is entitled “Base in Pakistan”—about the insurgency. But much more revealing was the report from Peshawar by Robert Trumbull in New York Times on June 25 which says: “Guerilla bands slip into Afghanistan from the camps in Pakistan which are stretched along the Afghanistan frontier from Chitral in the north to the province of Baluchistan in the south-west.” Therefore, there can be no doubt about the fact that foreign intervention was taking place. And I am also equally certain that whatever may have been the situation in the beginning but as the insurgency developed, Pakistan, United States and China co-ordinated their strategy and they began to support the movement through regulated co-ordination of their agencies concerned in the matter. We can see that for Pakistan, the prize was obvious, that for the first time they hoped that in Kabul they will have a pro-Pakistan Government, a Government friendly to Pakistan for having a conservative Government. The Mujaheddin-dominated Government, that, they hoped, would take care at least for the time being of the problems of Pakhtoons

and Baluchis and others. For Washington and China, the stakes were much higher. They were not bothered about Afghanistan so much. They were bothered about the gulf region. They were bothered about Iran. They were bothered about Saudi Arabia. They were bothered about Oman. They were bothered about the U.A.E. and they were bothered about all those countries and they felt that with this US-China-Pakistan combination—and let us make no mistake of it; there is in the offing this combination, this US-China-Pakistan combination—and with a pro-western regime in Kabul, they would be able to meet the challenges they were facing in this sensitive gulf area.

They would be able to put pressure on the new forces in Iran. Either this presence, this combination would be used to strike a deal with the new forces in Iran or to pressurise them into coming to an agreement. They would restrain and contain the Soviets from that position of strength and, much more, they would be able to decisively influence the events in the Gulf area. These have been the major calculations and it was expected that the United States-China-Pakistan combination would play a decisive strategic role in the Middle-East, for which India, of course, will have to pay the price. This is because, all this pumping of arms into Pakistan would bring the possibility of a war much nearer than it seemed even six months ago. This combination is now threatening to turn into an axis. Certainly, it is a situation in which we could either be subjected to blackmail or be squeezed in a pincer-like confrontation. I have mentioned about these strategic calculations of the United States and China. But at the same time, nobody needs any clairvoyant perception to realise that for Pakistan, this heavy induction of arms, pouring of arms into Pakistan means something else. This would be, first of all, utilised to bolster the unpopular regime there against the people of Pakistan. Unfortunately, these

arms would be used against the people of Pakistan and we all know this. Since I am not in the Government, I can speak freely. The people of Pakistan are only tolerating the regime in Pakistan because they have not yet got the opportunity to do anything else. We know all this. I have talked to American scholars, British scholars, American diplomats, Western diplomats and so on. All of them have been unanimous on one thing that the present military ruling junta in Pakistan has no popular base. But now, these arms will be used to bolster this military regime. Secondly, these arms would be used against India. Let us make no mistake about it. Pakistan has no intention of fighting the Soviet troops. In fact, I would say, even the United States knows about it. If the Soviet troops were really to invade Pakistan, all this arms aid would be useless, they would not be able to stand a day. Therefore, it is ridiculous to suggest that this arms aid would strengthen Pakistan to meet the Soviet threat. If the Soviet Army were to invade Pakistan, unless the Americans send their troops, all this arms aid would be useless. They are not bothered about this. They are not even thinking about this. If these arms were used at all, they would be used against India and they have been used in the past. Therefore, the question before us is this. I can understand the mental anguish the exercise, that there should be foreign troops anywhere near our borders. But I would like everyone to keep this in mind that there have been various points of foreign intervention. Let us not forget one while talking of the other. Also, is it in our interest, or was it in our interest that there should have been in Kabul, a pro-Pakistani, a pro-West, a theocratic and a Mullah-dominated Government imposed from outside? Or, was it in our interest that there should be a more radical and a progressive Government there which answered the social needs? We know there had been a split in the revolutionary movement there and there

have been power struggles. That was unfortunate. I agree with the previous speaker. I do not think social change can be continued and finally consolidated by any foreign presence. It should be an internal process. But for us, we should consider the entire situation in order to evolve our responses. I would like to ask the hon. Minister. Does he agree with this framework? Does he agree that this is the sequence of events, because if that is the understanding then naturally, responses will be in accordance with that understanding? So, I fully agree that we must have intense diplomatic activity with the United States, with the Soviet Union, with Pakistan. (*Time Bell rings*) Sir, I am concluding. They should come together to.....

MR. CHAIRMAN: Hon. Member, order, order. (*Interruptions*) You will kindly attend to me also. If I were in court I would have said, you are repeating yourself, but I am not there.

May I request you, because there are many other Members who are wanting to speak on this important subject to be as brief as possible so that the points of view expressed by you are before the hon. Minister to reply? It is not necessary to go on with the same points over and over again.

DR. V. P. DUTT: I would have ended by now.

I am asking now: Do you agree with this framework of analysis that I have given? Would you then agree to evolve a framework in which the early withdrawal of Soviet troops from Afghanistan would be contingent on the following preconditions? Firstly, that Pakistan would not be used as a sanctuary for assistance to the insurgents, for rest and replenishments of arms. Secondly, there will be no large-scale pumping of arms into

[Shri V. P. Dutt]

Pakistan. Thirdly, that the improvement of relations with China would be contingent on China keeping out of the sub-continent's affairs and not giving massive military assistance. Would you agree with this framework and take steps in pursuit of this?

SHRI P. V. NARASIMHA RAO: Sir, the analysis just unfolded by the hon. Member is very well known to the Government. It has come under the consideration of the Government, but I do not think that this is the occasion for a cut and dry answer as to whether the Government *in toto* accepts it or does not accept it. I am glad that the analysis has been brought before the House and all I can say is, we are aware of it.

Now, Sir, in order to defuse the situation which item is contingent on which other item is something very difficult to spell out. As I said, the situation is fast developing, fast evolving and, therefore, it has to be a multi-pronged approach. We are approaching all the powers concerned, all the Governments concerned and we feel that whatever defusing of the situation is going to happen, hopefully it will be more or less on all the fronts, not making one contingent on the other, which may not be practicable. But if it does happen, you would be happy to know that at the moment we are proceeding on all the fronts and this is the submission I would like to make.

SHRI DINESH GOSWAMI (Assam): Mr. Chairman, Sir, much ground has already been covered by the two speakers and, therefore, I will try to be as brief as possible. Sir, a clear picture of South Asia has been depicted by the hon. Minister.

There has also been an effort made by many, particularly by my friends from the other side who have intervened in this debate, to equate the involvement of Soviet Russia in Afghanistan with the supply of arms by America to Pakistan. Sir, if we equate both these issues, I think we

will be losing the perspective of political history. The fact remains, Sir, that long before the present development took place in Afghanistan, as early as on 14th June, 1979, the then President, Mohd. Tarakki, warned Pakistan against the internal aggression over Afghanistan and also interference in the internal matters of Afghanistan. The then Kabul regime provided sufficient evidence to prove that Pakistan was giving help militarily by way of guns, missiles and other armaments to the rebels.

It is also a fact of history that America and China from the very beginning were against the development of Afghanistan. The development in Afghanistan was a great setback to their global designs.

Sir, the Janata Party should not also forget that when Prime Minister Morarji Desai went to Soviet Russia, Afghanistan was a subject matter of long discussion. On the conclusion of his visit, in the joint statement it was said that the aspirations of the Afghan people must be respected. Sir, it is often said by America that they have involved themselves by way of military aid to Pakistan because of the Russian involvement in Afghanistan. But the fact also remains that this decision of arming Pakistan by America is not a development following the take-over by Babrak Karmal as the new President. Shri Karmal took over towards the tag end of December 1979, but one Washington report as early as on 7th August 1979 referred to the plea by U.S. Congressmen that aid should flow in ample measure to Pakistan despite threat of nuclear armament as Iran is no longer a big US pop in the region. So the ground work was prepared. The decision of America to arm Pakistan is not because of the developments in Afghanistan alone but because the American foreign policy had to suffer set-backs one after another right from Vietnam to the developments in Iran. The international view was that America could not be taken as a trust-

ted ally. If we try to equate the supply of arms to Pakistan by America with the developments in Afghanistan. I think we will be losing the perspective of political developments. Sir, I am not at all in support that Soviet Russia should be there for long. In fact, I would like the Foreign Minister to tell the Soviet Union in categorical terms that they should withdraw as early as possible. Sir, today India has to play a very positive and diplomatic role. However, we should not take an alarmist view. We must review the whole situation in an atmosphere of calm deliberations. Sir, unfortunately, the last Government acted very hastily and made pronouncements after the developments in Afghanistan in a hasty manner. No wonder because the last Prime Minister's vision could not go beyond the frontiers of Uttar Pradesh. It is unfortunate that immediately such remarks were made by the Government. Also, it is equally true that Mrs. Gandhi, during her election tours, made some remarks which were also hasty in their very nature. But the thing has changed after she has come to power. I think the Government has now taken a much more pragmatic view of the situation. That is why one could see a change in the stand of the Government. That the shift has been visible in the speech of Mr. Brojesh Misra, our permanent representative in the United Nations, who made a five minute speech, and his speech evoked mixed reaction in the United Nations. But the diplomatic missions, as is reported hastily procured the copies of his speech to find out what he said in between the lines.

Sir, I also know that even the then ruling party was not very happy even with the pronouncements of the then Prime Minister and we could see it from a pronouncement by our colleague, Mr. B.P. Maurva, when he said a completely different thing from what was said by Mr. Charan Singh. I do not know whether that is one of the reasons why we find Mr. Maurya in the company of our group today. Sir, we cannot

ignore this fact. The fact remains that India is pursuing a policy of non-alignment. But non-alignment does not mean that we will pursue a policy of equidistance. Non-alignment does not mean that we will judge by scales as to at what distance we are from America and try to be at the same distance with Soviet Russia or other Power. This type of concept was brought in by the Janata Party when they suddenly introduced a new concept of "genuine non-alignment".

Sir, if we have the policy of non-alignment, we have decided to pursue this policy because it serves our national interests. At the same time it serves global interests also. No country can afford to pursue a foreign policy which does not serve its national interests.

SHRI LAKSHMANA MAHAPATRO (Orissa): That was because the party was adulterated.

SHRI DINESH GOSWAMI: The best foreign policy is the foreign policy which serves national interests. But we made it very clear because Jawaharlal Nehru with his vision could see that in the context of the then global situation, it will not be fair to join either bloc and it will be proper and just for newly emerging and developing nations to express their own views judging on merits of the issues involved. Therefore, we pursued the policy of non-alignment. But while pursuing the policy of non-alignment we must distinguish between a friend and a foe. we must distinguish between a country which has an inherent tendency of aggression, a country which has the ambition of imperialistic hegemony and a country which has stood by the developing nations in moments of stress and strain. Therefore, in that context I feel that we must not equate the involvement of America in Pakistan and Afghanistan with that of Soviet Russia. But would like to emphasize this point that because we believe in non-alignment and because we know that Soviet Russia has been one of our trusted friends as friend to friend, probably, we are in a much

[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

Time Allotted

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