

SHRI DIPANKAR MUKHERJEE (West Bengal): Sir, I also associate myself with the sentiments expressed by the hon. Member, Shri Mirza Abdul Rashid.

SHRI FALI S. NARIMAN (Nominated): Sir, I also associate myself with the sentiments expressed by the hon. Member.

DISCUSSION ON THE STATEMENT OF PRIME MINISTER

Recent summit-level talks held between India and Pakistan in Agra - contd

SHRI K.M. SAIFULLAH (Andhra Pradesh): Sir, with regard to the Indo-Pak Summit, there was a hot discussion in connection with its appreciation on the one side and its criticism on the other side. I would like to say that instead of appreciation and criticism of this Summit, there must be a common intention to safeguard Jammu and Kashmir. Whatever the Congress party has said, is not a wrong thing. They are also for the safety of J&K. They have pointed out some lacunae. So, I come to the conclusion that the entire House has a common intention to safeguard Jammu and Kashmir, which is part of India. Some people have appreciated the Indo-Pak Summit at Agra, some have criticised it. Whatever it may be, it was not that the Prime Minister or the Government of India had requested General Musharraf to pay a visit to India. He voluntarily came here. When he volunteered himself to come to India, the Government hesitated to some extent whether to invite him or not when terrorism is still existing. Finally, it looks that the Prime Minister was compelled to invite General Musharraf in order to send a message to the whole world that the Indians are not against the reformatory theory. We not only stick to the deterrent theory but also ready to accept the reformatory theory. There was nothing wrong in inviting him. The Prime Minister, on behalf of the Government of India, has invited General Musharraf with a bonafide intention. But General Musharraf has come here with a malafide intention for the Agra visit and other visits and has gone away after instigating the terrorists here. I would like to refer to what General Musharraf has said in India. He said: "It is not a dispute. It is a freedom struggle," and immediately he said, "let us forget it. It is not a post-mortem." When you say it is not a post mortem, you are not supposed to mention the earlier thing. He has gone a little further and said: "We are remembering Bangladesh. India has interfered in the internal matters of Bangladesh and supported them. We are hurt." That goes to show that he is still vindictive. He is not for a compromise. But we have

invited him just to give a message to the whole world that we are for the compromise. If Pakistan wants to fight, we are ready to follow the deterrent theory. But, whatever it may be, being a military man, General Musharraf talked about freedom in a democratic country like India, whereas, in Pakistan, one Prime Minister was executed, one other was excommunicated from Pakistan to Saudi Arabia, and you have no freedom in Pakistan. He made a laughing stock of himself by talking about freedom in India. We have got freedom in India. We can accuse the Prime Minister of India, we can accuse the President of India. We have got freedom of speech, guaranteed by the Indian Constitution, to express our views, but within the limits. So, when this freedom is there, General Musharraf was not supposed to talk about freedom and other things.

And, by and by, he has gone to the extent of saying "It is freedom for struggle!" Does it not amount to instigating abetment to the terrorists? Does it not amount to giving encouragement to the terrorists to fight against the innocent people, targeting a particular community? For being a true Muslim, Quran preaches non-violence. If you are a Muslim, you should not have instigated violence. Quran speaks, in Arabic words, "Rabbual Alamin". That means, He is God for all, not for one community. Quran never says He is a God of Muslims only. He is a God of all humanity. In such case, being a true Muslim, he was not supposed to say in India, on our soil, that that is a freedom struggle when the innocent people are being murdered. If they had got the guts, they could have fought with our Indian Army. Why should they go to the railway platforms and kill the innocent people? Being a true Muslim, being the Head of a true Islamic country, he never preaches that. We have to condemn it, all the political parties collectively. Irrespective of our political gains, let us fight in the elections, but not with this common intention. So, he is on the wrong side.

Finally, Sir, I only want to say that when the Prime Minister has called him, of course, there is some lacuna on the part of the Government. They should have made some preliminary exercise. What is that exercise? Exchange or release of some war prisoners or criminals, and for extinguishing the fire of terrorism in Jammu and Kashmir, a brief agenda should have been there to be looked into; then, we should have to sit for the Summit. That was a little mistake. By the by, we cannot say that the Summit failed. The newspapers reported: "The talks have failed." It is not that the Government of India failed, but the talks failed. You cannot interpret "the talks failed" as "the Government of India failed". It is only the

talks that had failed. It is quite natural. Even a common can presume the burning sensation of the Jammu & Kashmir problem. Can it be solved in one day? No, it cannot be solved. It is a perpetual thing. We are getting together in that sense. I make a request to the Government, I just submit to the Government, to follow three methods. One, you follow, as per jurisprudence, the deterrent theory, 2:2. That is the deterrent theory. The next is the reformative theory. If you come for friendship, we are ready for friendship. And the third is, you must have a propaganda saying that we are for freedom, we are for everything if you are not to interfere in our peaceful country.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, Sir, I want to point out a little mistake, irrespective of whether the Government has applied its mind or not, for the time being, that it was the duty of the Government to have called all the Muslim MPs of both the Rajya Sabha and the Lok Sabha and present all of us before the President of Pakistan so that, through the media, the whole world should have known that the Muslims who have 35 MPs do exist in India, and that they need not teach us freedom; and ours is the second largest Muslim population in the world. The first country having that is Indonesia, and the second is India. "You, Pakistan, are not like Andhra Pradesh that you will teach us. We are here. We are Muslims. We are more than the strength of Pakistan. You are talking about the freedom! All the Muslims who have settled down at Karachi, after leaving India, in 1947, are not happy. They are treated as second-class citizens there. I have got some of my relations in Karachi; they are not happy there. And you are talking about freedom! Whenever I telephone them, they say, "Being a Muslim, you have become a Member of Parliament, but we can't do anything here! You are happy over there!" We are very proud of being in India. We are not supposed to leave the State of Jammu and Kashmir. I say Mohammed Ali Jinnah had committed a wrong in bifurcating Pakistan from India. By doing all these things, he had created a separate nation. Now they are asking for the separation of Jammu and Kashmir!

Jammu and Kashmir goes. Pakistan goes. Everything goes. But the minorities will be negligent in India and their problem will be there. We must be united here. We must fight for India. We have got linguistic States. We have got different castes and religions. We fight each other, we compromise and we live together. Gen. Musharraf need not advise us. If the Government had invited the Muslim MPs, we would have told him that. You should have invited us. I don't know why you have not called us. Why

did you suspect us? You should have called us. It is not that you alone fought for independence. The Muslims also fought for independence. In the Indo-Pak war one Muslim, Shri Hamid, died. The Muslims also sacrificed their lives. You should have called us, all the Muslim MPs from Rajya Sabha and Lok Sabha, and we should have gone and projected our stand. Our Omar Abdullah was there. He was also not focussed on the TV. I didn't see him on the TV whenever I saw the TV. You must focus on the Muslim MPs. We are not satisfied. For the sake of India, we are not satisfied. The Muslim countries in the whole world would have seen through the media that the Muslims were safe here and whatever Pakistan was accusing of India was false. You should have availed of that opportunity. I request the Government, whoever rules the country, that they must focus on the Muslim MPs. You can have good bilateral relationships and good business relations with the Muslim countries, if you focus on the Muslim MPs. Why do you hesitate to focus on the Muslim MPs? I welcome the step taken by the Prime Minister by calling Gen. Musharraf for a visit. A good message has gone to the world that our Prime Minister was not adamant; he was ready for talks, and it was Gen. Musharraf who was adamant and went away in the middle of the night and he was wrong. Shri Manmohan Singh stated, "We recommend the continuation of talks". When the whole House authorises you to continue the talks and, if you are invited to visit Pakistan, go to Pakistan, sit with them and find out the possibilities to solve the issue. But don't get relaxed by these talks. Be alert in Jammu and Kashmir and send a much stronger force there. On the one hand, you follow the reformative theory and, on the other, you follow the deterrent theory. Under any circumstance, I think the whole House is one on this issue. We are not going to leave Jammu and Kashmir. There are five perennial rivers. We cannot leave such important States like Jammu and Kashmir, Punjab, etc., and live here without those States. I welcome the statement of the Prime Minister. There are some mistakes. I think the Government will rectify them in future. We authorise him, on behalf of our party, to carry on with the dialogue with hope, without caring for criticisms.

श्री दीनानाथ मिश्र (उत्तर प्रदेश) : समापति जी, भारत के प्रधान मंत्री श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी ने पाकिस्तान के सैनिक तानाशाह परवेज मुशर्रफ को शिखर वार्ता के लिए जब आमंत्रित किया, तब उसकी सराहना देश में सब पक्षों की ओर से की गई। देश में ही नहीं विदेशों में भी उसकी सराहना की गई। पाकिस्तान में तो उसका बहुत स्वागत हुआ और उसे साहसपूर्वक कदम बताया गया। इस निमंत्रण में एक आश्चर्य का तत्व था। भारत सरकार कहती रही कि जब तक "क्रॉस बॉर्डर टेररिज्म" समाप्त नहीं होगा, तब तक हम बात नहीं करेंगे। दूसरी तरफ पाकिस्तान की सरकार और वहां के सैनिक शासक बराबर यह कहते रहे कि हम कहीं भी बात करने को

तैयार हैं, कहीं भी बात करने को तैयार हैं। इसने ऐसा वातावरण बनाया, जैसे भारत बातचीत नहीं करना चाहता हो। दूसरी तरफ भारत ने एक के बाद दूसरी पहल कई बार की और हर बार उसे माकूल जवाब नहीं मिला। ऐसी पृष्ठभूमि में यह निमंत्रण-पत्र दिया गया था। चारों तरफ इसकी सराहना हुई थी। लेकिन निमंत्रण-पत्र देने के बाद से वार्ता तक जितने भी लेख डिप्लोमेट्स ने लिखे, संपादकों ने लिखे, विचारकों ने लिखे या यहां जो भी छपता रहा उन सबमें कहीं कोई ऐसी बात नहीं थी जो यह कहती हो या जिससे यह निष्कर्ष निकलता हो कि सफलता के बहुत चांसिस हैं, चमत्कारिक सफलता होगी बल्कि सभी लोग कॉशिश करते थे कि इससे बहुत ज्यादा उम्मीद नहीं करनी चाहिए। यह धारणा सभी लोग बनाना चाहते थे। भारत सरकार के प्रवक्ता, कैबिनेट के मंत्री भी यही कहते रहे कि इससे ज्यादा उम्मीद नहीं रखनी चाहिए। सभी लोग सावधान करने की कोशिश करते रहे लेकिन फिर भी, भारत और पाकिस्तान के बीच यह शिखर वार्ता थी, यह तथ्य इसे ज्यादा महत्वपूर्ण बनाता था। पहले आशंका यह की जाती थी कि वाजपेयी जी की सरकार परवेज मुशर्रफ से बात नहीं करेगी क्योंकि वे सैनिक शासक हैं, वहां लोकतंत्र नहीं है इसलिए ऐसी हालत में भारत सैनिक शासन से बात नहीं करेगा। समझ यही थी कि सैनिक शासन वहां बहुत समय तक रहा है। आधे से ज्यादा समय तक रहा है। इतना ही नहीं जब वहां पर नागरिक शासन होता है, चुनिंदा सरकार होती है तब भी सैनिकतंत्र का, वहां की आई.एस.आई. की, वहां के इस्लामिक गुटों की बड़ी निर्णायक भूमिका होती है और उनका बहुत दबाव होता है, वे ज्यादातर मामलों में निर्णायक होते हैं और यह हमने लाहौर घोषणा के बाद भी देखा है। लेकिन सरकार ने साहसपूर्ण फैसला किया। सरकार ने फैसला किया कि हम बातचीत करेंगे, कुछ रास्ता निकालेंगे क्योंकि गतिरोध है। बड़ी समस्या है। आतंकवाद की, "क्रॉस बॉर्डर टेरेरिज्म" की। इससे निपटना है तो निपटना दोनों तलों पर है - डिप्लोमेटिक और सुरक्षा बलों के माध्यम से। इसमें बातचीत से कहीं कुछ रास्ता निकल सकता है और इसकी गुंजाइश तलाशने की कोशिश थी यह वार्ता। पहले घरण में पाकिस्तान के शासकों ने जो संकेत दिये वे बड़े आशाजनक थे। परवेज मुशर्रफ कहते रहे कि हम शिखर वार्ता में खुले दिमाग से जाएंगे, हम खुले दिमाग से बात करेंगे। उन्होंने यह भी कहा कि वे लचीला रुख अपनाएंगे। उन्होंने यह भी कहा कि पुराने बयानों, पुराने स्टैंड को दोहराते जाने से बात नहीं बनेगी। उन्होंने यह भी कहा कि हमें इतिहास की तरफ नहीं बल्कि भविष्य की तरफ देखना चाहिए। ये वे बातें थीं जो उम्मीद पैदा करती थीं, खासकर उनके लिए जो पाकिस्तान की जटिलताओं को नहीं जानते थे उन सब लोगों को इस तरह की बातों से उम्मीद बंधती थी। लेकिन दूसरे दौर में जब वे हफ्ते डेढ़ हफ्ते बाद उनका रुख बदलना चालू हो गया। कल डा. मनमोहन सिंह जी ने एक हवाला दिया था, नाम नहीं लिया था, शायद दिलीप पडगांवकर ने वहां जाकर परवेज मुशर्रफ से एक लंबी बात की थी। दो पेज में छपा था। उसको अगर बहुत सावधानी से देखा जाए तो उस समय तक वहां इतना दबाव वहां के इस्लामिक तत्वों, वहां के आई.एस.आई. और कट्टरपंथी लोगों का बन गया था। उन्होंने अपना रुख क्रिस्टलाइज कर दिया और साफ बता दिया कि जब तक जम्मू-कश्मीर के सवाल पर बातचीत आगे नहीं बढ़ती है, तब तक दूसरे मामलों में हम बातचीत नहीं करेंगे। ये साफ-साफ बातें चार-पांच सवालों के जवाब में दिलीप पडगांवकर को परवेज मुशर्रफ ने डेढ़ हफ्ते पहले कही थी और इसको उन्होंने कम्पेन बना दिया। और आखिर तक वह कम्पेन ही बना रहा। बात यह है कि उनकी जिद थी कि यह कोर इश्यू है, मुख्य मुद्दा है और इस पर वे डट गए। क्या सचमुच यह कोर इश्यू है? वे कहते हैं कि जम्मू और कश्मीर पाकिस्तान विभाजन का बचा हुआ भाग है। हम सब जानते हैं कि भारत का विभाजन द्विराष्ट्रवाद के सिद्धांत पर हुआ था। हमने द्विराष्ट्रवाद को स्वीकार नहीं किया। हमने

विभाजन को स्वीकार किया। मजबूरी थी। हमने कभी भी द्विराष्ट्र के सिद्धांत को स्वीकार नहीं किया लेकिन वह द्विराष्ट्र के सिद्धांत पर आज भी कायम है। इस कारण वह जम्मू-कश्मीर को विभाजन का बचा हुआ एजेंडा मानता है। हमारे हिसाब से जम्मू-कश्मीर के महाराजा ने जैसे ही विलय-पत्र पर अपने हस्ताक्षर किए, वैसे ही यह बात खत्म हो गई, समस्या खत्म हो गई और विलय पूरा हो गया। हमारे संविधान के अनुसार जम्मू-कश्मीर भारत का अंग हो गया, जैसे दूसरे राज्य हुए। लेकिन उनके हिसाब से द्विराष्ट्रवाद के सिद्धांत के कारण जम्मू-कश्मीर आज भी बचा हुआ एजेंडा है। यह उनकी धारणा है, यह उनकी मुख्य समस्या है। ये जो इस्लामिक एजेंट हैं, कल परसों भी उन्होंने कहा, परवेज मुशर्रफ ने कहा कि पाकिस्तान इस्लाम के लिए ही है, इस्लाम का है। इस तरह की लंबी बातें उन्होंने कल परसों भी कही हैं। लेकिन यह गुत्थी बड़ी भयानक है। बात यह है कि हम तो एक राष्ट्र में विश्वास करते हैं। हमारे यहां कोई प्राबलम नहीं है। छोटी-मोटी प्राबलम है उनको हम सुलझाते रहते हैं। हमने एक राष्ट्र की धारणा के लिए एक बड़ी लंबी छलांग इन 54 वर्षों में लगाई है। लेकिन वह दो राष्ट्र की बात करते हैं और करते-करते उनके दो राष्ट्र हो गए, बंगलादेश और पाकिस्तान। मैं सोचता हूँ कि अगर वह इसी रास्ते पर चलें, इसी तरह संकीर्ण रास्ते पर चलें तो उनके बचे हुए पाकिस्तान के चार राष्ट्र बन जायेंगे। मेरी यह आशंका अकारण नहीं है। इस तरह के विभाजन की यहां बड़ी संभावना है। दूसरे दौर में, मैंने पाकिस्तान के पीटीवी पर दो दौर की बातें सुनी। मैं उस समय पीटीवी को फॉलो करता था। उसमें एक बात तो यह थी कि भारत ने यह निमंत्रण-पत्र इसलिए दिया है, परवेज मुशर्रफ को इसलिए बुलाया है कि भारत की सेनायें थक गई हैं और उनकी समझ में अब यह आ रहा है कि कॉस्ट बहुत ज्यादा है, इसलिए अच्छा है कि समझौता कर लिया जाए। वहां के पैनल में यह एक सदाबहार विषय रहा है, पिछले दौर में लगभग दो-तीन हफ्तों में यही विषय उनका रहा है। लेकिन इसके अलावा भी एक और धारणा है, जो वहां के अखबारों में छपती रही है कि भारत अपनी एकता कायम नहीं रख सकता है, भारत टूटेगा। वहां के एक मंत्री थे, कुछ वर्ष पहले यहां आए थे। उन्होंने कहा था कि भारत खंड-खंड हो जाएगा, टुकड़े-टुकड़े हो जाएगा। यह उनकी एक तरह की सोच है। मैं ऐसा मानता हूँ, मान लीजिये, हम कश्मीर की समस्या को उनके हिसाब से स्वीकार लें, दो मिनट के लिए मान लीजिये, तो भी आप मानकर चलिये कि भारत के प्रति धृष्टा और भारत के खिलाफ आतंकवाद का यह सिलसिला बंद नहीं होगा। उनकी तैयारियाँ हैं, बहुत तैयारियाँ हैं और वह आतंकवाद को उसके बावजूद भी चलाए रख सकते हैं। इसलिए हमें मुगलते में रहने की जरूरत नहीं है कि कश्मीर की समस्या हल हुई नहीं कि भारत और पाकिस्तान के बीच संबंध ठीक हो जाएंगे, सामान्य हो जाएंगे। जब तक वहां का इस्लामिस्ट माइंड सेट खत्म नहीं होता, जब तक भारत इतना शक्तिशाली न हो जाए कि वह ज्यादा हिम्मत न कर सके और इस तरह की हरकतों से बाज आने लगे। वहां की मानसिकता धीरे-धीरे यह बने कि भारत के साथ मिलकर, व्यापार करते हुए और साझेदारी करते हुए, हम तरक्की कर सकते हैं, यह माइंड सेट अगर बनना चालू हो तब संबंध थोड़ा सुधर सकता है। लेकिन बाकी इस्लामिस्ट ग्रुप जो वहां पर है, आई.एस.आई. में, आतंकवादी संगठनों में, जिहादी संगठनों में, वहां की सेना में जो हैं, वह बहुत हावी रहते हैं। यह कितने हावी रहते हैं, इसकी थोड़ी बहुत कल्पना कुछ बातों से की जा सकती है।

अभी आगरा में बहुत चर्चित ब्रेकफास्ट प्रेस कान्फ्रेंस में एक सवाल दूसरे मुद्दों पर बातचीत करने के बारे में उनसे पूछा गया तो उसके उत्तर में मुशर्रफ ने कहा कि अगर मैं दूसरे

मुद्दों पर बात करूंगा तो इससे अच्छा है कि मैं नाहरवाली हवेली खरीद कर यहीं रहने लग जाऊँ। इस जवाब को समझने के लिए किसी भाषा-शास्त्री की जरूरत नहीं है। यह जवाब समझा जा सकता है। ऐसा करने के बाद कोई भी शासक पाकिस्तान जाकर वहाँ सही सलामत नहीं रह सकता है। ऐसा एक और उदाहरण है। अयूब खान के खिलाफ ताशकंद समझौता करने के बाद नारे लगाए गए कि हिन्दुस्तान के हाथ कश्मीर को बेचकर आ गये। यह नारे लगे। जब वह रिटायर हुए तो उनको रहने के लिए इस्लामाबाद में मकान तक नहीं दिया गया यह अच्छा था कि उनके साथ ज्यादा बुरा सलूक नहीं हुआ। लेकिन मैं आपको एक दूसरी बात बताता हूँ कि कितने खौफज़दा रहते हैं पाकिस्तान के शासक उन एलीमेंट्स से जो वहाँ पर बाहर से सत्ता को बहुत अच्छी तरह नियंत्रित करते हैं। दूसरे स्तर पर जो राजनीति चलती है, उसके एक सज्जन की बात मैं कहना चाहूंगा। वह सज्जन पहले पूर्व प्रधानमंत्री नवाज़ शरीफ से मिले थे। नवाज़ शरीफ से उन्होंने बात की। बात-बात में एक बात नवाज़ शरीफ ने कह दी। नवाज़ शरीफ ने कहा कि आप लोगों का क्या भरोसा, आप लोग तो अपने प्रिय मुजीबुर रहमान की जान नहीं बचा सके। सही है वह नहीं बच सके। जब सूचना मिली थी, उस समय बहुत कम समय बचा था। अगर दो चार घंटे पहले सूचना मिल जाती तो तब की प्रधान मंत्री श्रीमती इन्दिरा गांधी उनको जरूर बचा लेतीं, मुझे पूरा विश्वास है। नवाज़ शरीफ ने उनसे कहा कि मुझे को फांसी लग गई, आप लोग कुछ नहीं कर सके, आप लोग मुझे भी नहीं बचा सकते। उनके कहने का अर्थ यही था। यह वाक्य जो अन्तिम कहा है, वह उनके शब्द नहीं हैं लेकिन उसका निहित अर्थ यह है। मतलब क्या निकला? यही कि वहाँ पर सब से ताकतवर प्रधान मंत्री भी कितना खौफज़दा रहता है। और वही बात परवेज़ मुशर्रफ साहब प्रकारान्तर से कह गये, अगर ऐसा होगा तो हमको नाहरवाली हवेली में रहना पड़ेगा, मैं पाकिस्तान में नहीं रह सकता। यह वहाँ का घरेलू है। ऐसे में बातचीत हुई, किसी को भी उम्मीद नहीं थी कि वह सफल होगी। ऐसा ही हुआ। बहुत सारे लेखकों ने अंत में यह लिखा, निष्कर्ष में यह लिखा था कि यह बातचीत हो रही है, यही अपने आप में बहुत बड़ी सफलता है। यह भी लिखा कि बातचीत जारी रह जाए यही बहुत बड़ी सफलता होगी। ऐसा करने की कोशिश की गयी। उस बातचीत को बचा लिया गया। बातचीत जारी रहेगी। शिखर-वार्ता के इस दौर में पाकिस्तान के शासक ने राजनयिक अशालीनता करने में कोई कसर नहीं छोड़ी। मैं सबसे बड़ी दो राजनयिक अशालीनताओं की बात करूंगा। भारत सरकार ने उनके आने के पहले यह कहा था कि सरकार को यह पसंद नहीं होगा कि काजी साहब के यहां हुर्रियत नेताओं को निमंत्रित किया जाए और परवेज़ साहब उनसे मिलें। भारत की ओर से यह बात दो बार कही गयी। इस बात पर बहस भी चलती रही। एक बार पाकिस्तान की ओर से संकेत आया कि वह मेजबान की भावनाओं का ख्याल रखना चाहते हैं। मगर उन्होंने रखा नहीं। हुर्रियत के बारे में उनका दावा यह है कि वह कश्मीर का प्रतिनिधित्व करती है। भारत सरकार के प्रवक्ताओं ने कई मौकों पर यह कहा कि हुर्रियत जम्मू-कश्मीर का प्रतिनिधित्व नहीं करती - न जम्मू का प्रतिनिधित्व करती है, न लद्दाख का प्रतिनिधित्व करती है, न घाटी का करती है। वहाँ चुनिन्दा सरकार है। सरकार का भी प्रतिनिधित्व नहीं करती है। वहाँ कुछ जमातें इकट्ठी हो गयी हैं। उनकी एक आवाज़ है। उसका थोड़ा बहुत जो महत्व है सो है। उनका कोई प्रतिनिधि कभी चुनाव में जीता नहीं। ये सब बातें भारत सरकार के लोग कहते रहे हैं। पाकिस्तान हुर्रियत को पाल-पोसकर महत्व देता रहा है और उसे प्ले करने की कोशिश की। ऐसे समय में जब परवेज़ जिद्द पर आ गए तब भारत सरकार के पास क्या विकल्प था? या तो वह यह करती कि उनको गिरफ्तार करती तीन दिन के लिए, या इस घटना को होने देती - महत्वहीन जैसा बनाकर रखती। लेकिन गिरफ्तार करते तो

1.00 P.M.

सारा शिखर वार्ता की इस विफलता का भांडा इस गिरफ्तारी पर फूटता। भारत सरकार ने यह फैसला किया कि इसको वैसे ही दरगुजर कर दिया जाए, महत्वहीन बनाकर रखा जाए।

दूसरी जो अशालीनता थी उसके बारे में कल सुषमा जी बोल चुकी हैं। ब्रेक फास्ट पर जो कुछ उन्होंने कहा, जिसका प्रसारण किया गया। जिस तरह की भाषा का प्रयोग किया, एक तरह से वह शिखर वार्ता की विफलता की घोषणा थी, एक तरह से तमाम अपने तथ्यों को कहकर, अपना संदेश देकर वे जाने के मूड में आ गए थे।

हम लोग भारत में जिस कोर इश्यू को देखते हैं वह क्रॉस बॉर्डर टेरेरिज्म है। वह भी उनके इस्लामिक कैरेक्टर के कारण निकला है। अभी जो भाई बोल रहे थे किस तरह से हम लोग एक राष्ट्र हैं, किस तरह से रहते हैं, इस तरह की कुछ बातें कहीं। पिछले स्वतंत्रता दिवस पर प्रधान मंत्री ने लालकिले की प्राचीर से एक कविता की पंक्तियां सुनायी थीं - पंक्तियां साहिर लुधियानवी की थीं, वह मैं सुनाना चाहता हूँ, वह इसलिए कि यहां यह प्रासंगिक है -

"वह वक्त गया वह दौर गया, जब दो कौमों का नारा था
वह लोग गए इस धरती से जिनका मकसद बंटवारा था,
अब एक हैं हम हिंदुस्तानी, अब एक हैं हिंदुस्तान
यह जान ले पाकिस्तान।

ये साहिर लुधियानवी के शब्द हैं। हो सकता है लोगों को मामूली लगें।

महोदय, मैं एक मिनट में समाप्त करता हूँ, मुझे एक बार घड़ी भी दिखला दी गई है और मैं ज्यादा नहीं बोलने के लिए भी जाना जाता हूँ।

मैंने अभी कुछ पंक्तियां कही थीं, जोकि मामूली पंक्तियां नहीं हैं। ये एक बहुत बड़ी सच्चाई है। मैं इस एक राष्ट्र की बात को एक पके चावल के नमूने के तौर पर रखना चाहता हूँ। उसके बाद मैं अपना स्थान ले लूंगा। हम सब लोग जानते हैं कि भारतीय फिल्मों में आज आमिर खान, शाहरुख खान, सलमान खान जैसे लोगों को टिकट की खिड़कियों पर दसियों करोड़, पचासों करोड़ वोट मिलते हैं। आज के दौर में उन मुसलमान बड़े कलाकारों को नाम बदलने की जरूरत नहीं पड़ती, पहले के दौर में पड़ती थी। यह एक चावल है। मैं जानता हूँ बहुत सारी खटास है हिन्दुओं और मुसलमानों के बीच में लेकिन बड़ी बातें भी हैं। हम इन 45 वर्षों में एक राष्ट्र के रूप में कई कदम आगे बढ़े हैं। दूसरी तरफ पाकिस्तान मुहाजिरों को देख ले और मुहाजिर पाकिस्तान को देख लें, तब उन्हें समझ में आ जाएगा।

MR. CHAIRMAN: Just one minute. Hon. Members, we have 22 speakers on the Discussion. The list of speakers is to be completed today so that the Prime Minister may reply tomorrow on the 10th August, 2001 after the Question Hour. Today the House may sit through lunch and continue with the discussion and resume it at 4.00 p.m. and conclude it today itself after the statement by the Home Minister on Jammu and Kashmir at 2.00 p.m. Is it all right?

SOME HON. MEMBERS : Yes, Sir.

[THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI SURESH PACHOURI) in the Chair]

SHRI P.N. SIVA (Tamil Nadu) : Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, I thank you for this opportunity. Sir, at the outset, I am compelled to disagree with the views expressed by the Opposition Parties that Agra Summit was a failure on charges that the Government was not prepared and it went with an unstructured agenda to the Summit. Sir, a match that ends in draw cannot be declared as a victory or advantage to any one side as our Opposition leaders described yesterday. One must realise that the ice was frozen in the relationship between the two countries after the Kargil war. There was a need for beginning the talks. I feel the Agra Summit broke the ice by way of beginning talks and that too by bringing in the person who was the architect of the Kargil war and the wrecker of the Delhi-Lahore bus diplomacy thereby making known to the world that India is interested in settling the issues through peace process. In the course of upholding the national interests, there is no room for individual egos and false prestige. Sir, I want to emphasise two things. The first is that India did go to the Summit well-prepared. It was General Musharraf who changed his stand subsequently. The team which accompanied the Prime Minister comprised the Minister of External Affairs and Defence, the Finance Minister, and the Commerce Minister, which itself implied that the Government had the intention of discussing with Pakistan all things relating to finance, military operations, trade and even, of course, the cross-border terrorism. But it was General Musharraf who changed the entire situation. Our Government also showed encouraging gestures even before the Summit by the ceasefire initiative, releasing the prisoners who were in the Indian jails and by appointing Mr. K. C. Pant as interlocutor.

But General Musharraf, contradicted his earlier statements. And I would like to quote what Pakistan's High Commissioner Ashraf Jahangir Qazi, has said, at New Delhi. He said, "The meeting would be a good beginning of successful relations between India and Pakistan. It is going to be a successful summit, I promise." So also, General Musharraf, in Pakistan, at a press conference, had said, "South Asia must come out of the pit of poverty and learn to live in peace and harmony. It is in this spirit that I have accepted the invitation of the Indian Prime Minister." Sir, when and where did he contradict his statement? It is not a new thing for him to contradict or act against his own statement. You may recall that during his visit to India, India very magnanimously, friendly and even with sentiments understood, repainted the *haveli* near Golcha Cinema in old Delhi from

where General Musharraf and his family migrated after Partition in 1947. But, actually, the General has abiding and inspiring memories from his school days in the Turkish capital, Ankara. After the coup in 1999, in his first press conference, General Musharraf has idolised Kamal Ata Turk and also hoped to emulate him. The Jamat-e-Islam, in Pakistan, opposed the secular nature of Ata Turk. That is a different thing. In November, 1999, during his one-day visit to Ankara, General Musharraf, had lunch with the chief of protocol, who was his schoolmate, but was an unwelcome guest. He was not entertained. The Turkish Daily 'Times' said that it was an untimely and an unnecessary visit. Moreover, it said that no coup had helped any country to solve problems; rather, it had complicated the issues. Why I am saying this is, because, his role model, Ata Turk, was born in Greece and his family came from Macedonia; Musharraf was born in Delhi and his family came from old Uttar Pradesh. His role model, Ata Turk, even neutralised his own old, nationalist, comrades to fulfil his destiny of establishing a secular republic in Turkey. Whereas, I am sorry to say, General Musharraf is riding on the fundamentalist tiger. I should say that the outcome of the Summit may not be in the form of a declaration or a joint statement, but, surely, there have been areas in which the two countries have converged, and this convergence could form the basis for negotiations in the future. High expectations were inherent in the circumstances in which the Summit was held and it also reflected the longings of the people from both the sides of the border - not only in India, but also in Pakistan. Pakistan's highly respected human rights activist and former Chairman of the Human Rights Commission, Shri A. Rahman, had a definite view on the Vajpayee-Musharraf Summit. He had said, "Both the leaders must give a serious thought to signing a 'no-war' declaration to reduce tension in the region. This would be the best confidence building measure between the two neighbours which have fought, so far, three wars since independence in 1947." Earlier, the PML's spokesman Mr. Mushahidhan Khan, had said, "The people of Pakistan and India sincerely desire a peaceful solution to the Kashmir issue, and the Lahore Declaration was a practical step towards achieving this goal. But General Musharraf sabotaged it through the military revolt of October 12, 1999." The people in Pakistan as well as the people in India are for peace, and it was the ambition or intention of our Government to achieve the goal. The sudden insistence of Pakistan that progress in all other areas will be held hostage to the progress in solving the Kashmir problem made India to stiffen its position.

Sir, we should think another reason for the disappointing outcome is that Pakistan's refusal even to recognise the cross-border terrorism, which was abetted and assisted by it; and let alone taking any action to reduce or to stop it.... We know it very well that the Pakistan's support to the Kashmiri cause is not out of its interest or genuine concern for human rights. It is an irony that Pakistan's military establishments talk about self-determination of the Kashmiri people, while they are not letting their 160 million people not to determine their own will in their own country. It is highly ridiculous. To begin with, India is not a foreign power in Kashmir. I would again like to quote, Owen Dickson and Jose Cobalus, Members of United Nation's Committee on India and Pakistan, that is, the UNCIP, said, "The mere technicality of holding a plebiscite seemed beyond scope of reality." And, on whether a plebiscite offered a solution to the Kashmir problem, the UNCIP representative said, "They were discouraged by the experiences in Europe with plebiscite." Moreover, it is also said that the UN General Assembly believed that the right to self-determination upheld only to the people under colonial domination by foreign countries. Sir, where comes the question of self-determination. India is not a foreign power in Kashmir. The accession has never been doubted internationally. Rather, accepting the complaint of India in 1948, the UN had adopted the first part of the Security Council resolution and accepted the accession of Kashmir with India - and nobody can deny the right - Kashmir is an integral part of India, in which neither Musharraf nor the APHC, which claims to have a hold on it, or having a representation quality, can have a say in this because India and Kashmir are one. I would like to recall, during 1947, when an army was set in force on road to Srinagar from Pakistan, Pandit Nehruji, in those days, got aroused and fuelled with emotions, told Mt. Batten, "As Calais is carved in the heart of Queen Mary, so Kashmir is in our heart". I saw the same note, when Dr. Karan Singh spoke here yesterday. And it is a common note which all of us are having here. I think, there can be no doubt, cutting across all party lines, we all have to stand in one line. Moreover, what I would request to the Opposition parties is, "Kindly don't see who is in Treasury Benches. Just see the problem, which is the main issue. Who are affected? Just remove the political glasses and see with the natural vision of national interest. Then, you would be able to see and realise the real scene." Sir, apart from being exploited, the people of Kashmir are being secured with article 370 of the Constitution, which accords the State a special status. In fact, this is the real situation. Jammu & Kashmir stands as a symbol of secularism, where there are three

major religions and four major languages. Sir, the Tashkent Pact was signed in 1966 between Lal Bahadur Shastriji and Ayub Khan after giving up the strategic heights in Jammu & Kashmir and the seige of Lahore. The Simla Agreement was signed in July, 1972 between Mrs. Gandhi and Bhutto, by way of releasing 90,000 prisoners of war. The Lahore Agreement, signed in February, 1999, between Atalji and Nawaz Sharief, opened a new chapter. The 'bus diplomacy' between Delhi and Lahore started a new era in the relationships of India and Pakistan. The Agra Summit, which was named as a 'retreat', was not understood by many, in its real sense.

It was a retreat after the Kargil war to the quiet state of discussion and that was a steady path. Sir, I had my own doubts about the word 'retreat'. Even our External Affairs Minister, who knows much about it, has spoken about it. I referred the dictionary. The word 'retreat' generally means, a person getting back from his position. How can it be? Even during the Republic Day parade, the second day parade is called as a retreat parade, that means, the army during the sunset plays a music which is called a retreat music - so also, anybody who retreats from a place of confusion or something else to a quiet place; and, so also, the Agra Summit was called as a retreat. It was misunderstood rather not understood properly by many people. All summits, even when they succeed, are only a partial success. The degree of success depends only on the follow-up of actions. No single summit can solve all the issues between the two countries. India has not yielded; it has not given up its position. Thanks to the diplomacy of our hon. Prime Minister and our Minister for External Affairs - thanks to his efforts which he took during the Kargil war. He convinced the whole world that incursion was only because of Pakistan. That helped us to come out successfully and made Pakistan to get out of the Kargil. That is why, we still repose our confidence in them. Kashmir, which just evoked strong emotions today, - 'the paradise on earth' - has almost gone into a hell. I would like to submit to the Minister of External Affairs, who is here as a representative of the whole Government, that Kashmir, of which we hear much, is dying an untimely death though it took hundred years to evolve. If we delve deep into the history, we would realise how that Valley was converted into a paradise on earth by the sufis and the saints; but now, what we see there. This place, this Valley, this paradise is in the hands of fanatics and terrorists and we have to save the people. All these measures and having talks with Pakistan without shedding a drop of blood, were attempt to solve the issue - they are welcome - but, at the same time, I would say that a prolonged thinking will not help the people of

Kashmir. I would like to say only one thing said by the Shakespeare in Hamlet, the great Hero in his famous soliloquy: To be or not to be; that is the question, whether it is nobler to face the slings and arrows of the outrageous fortune or to raise arms against a sea of troubles! That procrastination led Hamlet into a tragic hero. I expect this Government to act fastly, to take stern decision and you can take, and I hope the Congress Party or any other opposition party, not only in this House, but also all over the country, will extend their support in settling the issue, the burning problem in Kashmir to save the lives of the people, to settle the dispute between Pakistan and India. I, on behalf of my party and as an ally affirm our faith in you and owe our allegiance to you in this regard. Thank you.

SHRI KAPIL SIBAL (Bihar) : Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, it is my privilege to participate in this Short Duration Discussion on the Agra Summit. Sir, when I think of Lahore and Agra, I am reminded of the fact that today, we live in a world of images. Substances always left far behind and it is the image that is before us; that leaves an indelible mark on our memory. And, when I think of Lahore, I think of a wise statesman with a sense of generosity, goodwill, riding a bus to Lahore. At Waga, getting off in the hope that the hands of friendship will be clasped.

Then, there is the image of a big hug by the Prime Minister and a statement at the Minar-e-Pakistan that, 'we would like a prosperous Pakistan be to our neighbour.' That is the spirit with which our hon. Prime Minister went to Lahore. His mindset was not attuned to the mindset of those on the other side. And what did we get in return? Instead of friendship, we got betrayal; instead of clasping our hands, they stabbed us in the back. Those are the images of Lahore, and I am sure, they are etched equally in the Prime Minister's mind. But, at Lahore, at least, somebody stabbed us in the back. At Agra, we have the image of the Prime Minister being stabbed openly. What happened at Agra? The mindset of the other side continued to be the same. The rhetoric that was uttered by President Musharraf before he came to Agra reflected the mindset of the other side, and yet we continued with a sense of ignorance, in the hope that something will come about, and it is that that I am saddened by. In fact, Shri Dina Nath Mishraji has just accepted it in his statement. He said 'there was no expectation of anything coming out of it; that it was a success, because nothing happened'. That is what he said. "Before Musharraf came", he said, "We knew nothing would happen, and after he left, nothing happened." Whereas, Sushmaji yesterday talked about

the masterstroke of diplomacy. How? She said -- and it is very interesting what she said -- "The message sent to President Musharraf was polite language, tough message." I wondered what she was talking about because, throughout the proceedings of the Agra Summit, we never heard the Prime Minister speak. What was that language? Maybe, it was body language, which we are not aware of. And, what was that message? While Musharraf, the garrulous Musharraf, was making one statement after another, our side was quiet for 48 hours. I wondered what that political, tough, message was that Sushmaji was talking about. But, anyway, let me tell you of the mindset of Pakistan, which should have been known to the Government. I go back to the mindset, as reflected in a statement by Sheikh Abdullah in the Security Council on 5th of February, 1948, and then I will give you the mindset of today. And you are talking about Kashmir. He said, "Pakistan had no interest in our liberation, or, it would not have opposed our freedom struggle movement. Pakistan would have supported us when thousands of my countrymen were behind bars, and hundreds were shot to death. The Pakistani leaders and Pakistani papers were heaping abuse upon the people of Kashmir. Then, suddenly, Pakistan comes before the Bar of the world as the champion of the liberty of the people of Jammu & Kashmir. I had thought all along that the world had got rid of Hitlers and Goebbels. But from what has happened and what is happening to my poor country, I am convinced that they have only transmigrated their souls into Pakistan." This was the mindset of the Pakistanis in 1948.

And see what is the mindset today? Just before the Summit took place, a former ISI Chief, Hamid Gul, said in a Pakistani newspaper. and I quote:

"I believe that India cannot live as a political entity, as it is today. It has to be fragmented."

The mindset of the Pakistanis has not changed for the last 50 years, and there is no expectation that their mindset would change. Then why this innocence? Why this inefficiency? It is in that context that the Congress Party had been saying, 'knowing them you ought to have had a dialogue before you called the Summit.' The Leader of the Opposition raised that issue. You were totally unprepared. You don't have a summit unless you have a dialogue. And the response was: "No, no, Gen. Musharraf did not want it. In fact, the Ministry of External Affairs wrote saying: what should be our agenda? There was no response from

President Musharraf. And, yet he was allowed to come and have a field day at Agra!

Sir, Agra was the fourth peace initiative of this Government, starting from Lahore; and each peace initiative has resulted in failure. The first one was at Lahore. You know that. I do not have to tell you about it. And that resulted in Kargil. The second was the secret talks with the Hurryat. If you remember, this Government decided to have a secret talks with the Hurryat. What happened? They failed. Then came the talks with the Hizbul Mujahideen. If you remember, our Home Secretary flew to Srinagar, shook hands with people with masks and tried to negotiate. And when Salaluddin made a public statement in Pakistan saying "we have nothing to do with these talks", the talks fell through.

Then suddenly, on the 19th of November, this country declared a unilateral cease-fire during Ramzan. That was extended on the 20th of December; extended again on the 23rd of January and, again, on the 20th of February, 2001. It continued for three months. And what was happening in the meantime? Innocent lives were being lost in Jammu and Kashmir. In fact, if you look at the number -- the Home Ministry has those numbers -- the spurt of killings of innocent people in the years 1999, 2000 and 2001, ever since this Government came to power, have never been so much in the history of Kashmir. Who is responsible for it? And the hon. Foreign Minister says at the end of the Summit: "The caravan of peace will continue to run." A caravan loaded with dead bodies of innocent people; a caravan splattered with the blood of children! Is that the caravan that you want to continue without thought and without preparations? At least, the Opposition will not be a party to this.

We want you to have a dialogue with Pakistan. We want you to resolve the problem with Pakistan. But you must first ensure what are going to be the parameters of the talks. You must ensure what the agenda is going to be. You must have talks at the official level first. Then, at the Secretaries-level, then at the Foreign Ministers-level, and only then you should invite somebody for a summit or go for a summit.

Generosity, munificence, simplicity are not necessarily virtues in diplomacy. So far, all our questions remained unanswered because the hon. Foreign Minister has mastered the art of not speaking. On 23rd May what made turn around and lift the unilateral ceasefire that you had imposed? What happened on the 24th May, when four honourable men -- I won't call it

the gang of four -- met and decided to lift the ceasefire without any consultation with any political party. You have lifted the ceasefire and on that very day decided to extend an invitation to Gen. Musharraf. Please disclose to us, what has suddenly happened on 23rd May, when you did this turn around, made this 'U' turn? So far, you have not told us anything. Well, when you did it, you never consulted anybody. And four days before President Musharraf came to India, you called the Opposition parties to tell them, "In fact, there is no agenda." What did you expect the Opposition to do? Did you expect the Opposition to say, "Withdraw your invitation." Is that the kind of consultation that you want on a matter in which there has been a bi-partisan policy throughout the history of this country?

Yesterday, Sushmaji very strangely said, "During the talks while President Musharraf was talking about Kashmir being a core issue, we wanted to tell the world that Kashmir was not a core issue because that is the policy of this Government." May I remind Sushmaji what the Prime Minister himself said in his musings in Kerala? I quote : "Our country is facing many problems that are a legacy of our history...One is the long-standing problem with Pakistan over Jammu and Kashmir." The core issue was stated by our Prime Minister in Kerala.

SHRI SANGH PRIYA GAUTAM (Uttaranchal) : That is one thing.

SHRI KAPIL SIBAL: No. In Kerala he talked of two issues which are outstanding on which there should be a resolution. The one was Ram Janmabhoomi, Ayodhya. I quote: "One is the long-standing problem with Pakistan over Jammu and Kashmir and the other is the Ram Janmabhoomi-Babri Masjid dispute at Ayodhya." Who has stated that Jammu and Kashmir was the core issue? It was not said by President Musharraf. It was said by the Prime Minister of India in Kerala. Then, he goes on to say, "India is willing and ready to seek a lasting solution to the Kashmir problem..."

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI SURESH PACHOURI): From which paper are you quoting?

SHRI KAPIL SIBAL: I am quoting from the Tribune, dated 2nd January, 2001. It is an article written by Shri Atal Behari Vajpayee. I quote : "India is willing and ready to seek a lasting solution to the Kashmir problem." Kashmir problem, admission by the Prime Minister of India that there is a Kashmir problem; not admitted in Tashkent, not admitted in Shimla, not admitted in Lahore, but admitted by the Prime Minister of India, here, you are the one who are changing the agenda. You are the one who

are weaning away from the bi-partisan policy of Kashmir. He said, I quote : "Towards this end, we are prepared to recommence talks with Pakistan at any level ..." If you yourself tell Pakistan that Kashmir is the problem, we are willing to talk to you, what do you expect President Musharraf to say? Naturally, President Musharraf will say, "Please come, I want to talk about Kashmir." When he talked about Kashmir, Sushmaji says, "No, no, why talk about Kashmir? There was no talk about Kashmir." Gen. Musharraf said, "Ninety per cent of the talks was about Kashmir." The Prime Minister said, "He had a fauji mindset. He was only talking about Kashmir." In Kerala, Vajpayeeji said, "That is the problem." Sushmaji says, "No, no, where is the problem? There is no Kashmir problem. The real problems are other problems." ...*(Interruptions)*... Let me state the facts.

Then, what does he say? Again, I quote : "Towards this end, we are prepared to recommence talks with Pakistan at any level, including at the highest level, provided Islamabad gives sufficient proof of its preparedness to create a conducive atmosphere for a meaningful dialogue." Again, I quote: "In our search for a lasting solution to the Kashmir problem both in its external and internal dimensions, we shall not traverse solely on the beaten track of the past." Surprising. Sushmaji says, the Foreign Minister says, the Prime Minister says, "The track of the past is the Shimla Agreement, the Tashkent Declaration, the Lahore Declaration. We can go forward only on that path." That is what they say to the public. What is this? They don't want to traverse only on the beaten track of the past. What is the new path that you want to adopt? Certainly, the path to failure which you have adopted. Now, if you yourself call Kashmir as the core issue, the problem on which you want to talk, you cannot blame President Musharraf on that.

Then, what happens after the talks are over? The hon. Foreign Minister says that the caravan of peace must go on. What does the spokesperson of the External Affairs Ministry say? He said, "The Summit should be rubbished in the dustbin of history." Who was talking for whom? In fact, if I remind you, the moment, the Agra Summit collapsed, the spokesman claimed that was a great disappointment. The following morning, the Minister says, "It was a success." He further says, "We must pick up the threads from where the President of Pakistan, Gen. Musharraf left." Later on, the Government feels that the Summit failed. There was no Agra declaration. There was no joint declaration. Then, they say, "Okay, we will go back to the Shimla Agreement, we will go back to the Lahore

[9 August, 2001]

RAJYA SABHA

Declaration." The fact of the matter is, Sir, -- this is something which I want to state on the floor of the House --

(THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN in the Chair)

if I have not got the dates wrong, I think, it was on Monday, 18th June, 2001, that Mr. Fleischer, the official spokesman of the White House said in the White House, and I quote : "The United States fully supports the upcoming July 14th meeting between India and Pakistan." At this time, Vajpayeeji was in the hospital. The dates have not been fixed. Mr. Fleischer said that he supports the upcoming July 14th meeting. The world did not know about it. We were told by the United States. On 19th June, the next day, which was Tuesday, the Prime Minister came out of the hospital. We had prayed to God that he had a successful operation which he had. When he was asked a question on this, what did he say? He said, "It will take me a couple of days to finalise the Summit dates."

Now, we know, Sir, why on 23rd May you made a 'U' turn.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Now, it is Madam.

SHRI KAPIL SIBAL: Sorry. I apologise.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Coup takes place very quietly.

SHRI KAPIL SIBAL: So, Madam, now we know why a 'U' turn took place on 23rd May. You have been prodded, you have been told. In fact, the MEA spokesperson in a report published in Rediff dot com said, "The United States was wanting to lift sanctions." Then, I quote: "Conditional to verifiable forward movement by the two sub-continental neighbours on Kashmir."

This was the scenario. You had no choice in the matter. You were pressurized by the international community, particularly, the U.S., that look, show some forward movement. I am not saying that the Pakistanis were not. They too were. That is why both of you talked of the beaten track. Sir, in any talk at this level, there must be something you can give; there must be something that the other side can give. But look at it from your own point of view. The Foreign Minister has said that कश्मीर हिंदुस्तान का अटूट अंग है Under the Constitution, Kashmir is a part of India. How can I think of the Constitution? Yes, he is right. So is Kashmir an integral part of India, which it is. What do you want to negotiate? And I would like to refer to what President Musharraf has said. " If I accept the Line of Control as the border,

I will have to stay in my haveli at Delhi. I cannot go back to Pakistan." This is the mindset of two sovereign nations, who want to come together, to find a solution. The problem is, if you go into a solution like this, without a change of mindset, then not only will there be failure, but the failure will be at the cost of the people of Kashmir. I don't mind, and I think that it is good that despite everything, Musharraf came. It is fine, and hopefully, you will go to Lahore, though, on that, I am going to say something just now. But the fact is that in the process, you are sacrificing the lives of those people, who have no communication with you in Jammu and Kashmir. They are pawns in your hands. I am sorry to say so. You are using them, without understanding the ground reality. You had the Tehelka episode here. You have the economic downturn, you have spurt of terrorism, you have domestic problems facing you within the coalition partnership. You knew that the Session was going to start on July 23rd, 2001. You knew it. You said: "Let us hope for something, just a few days before the Session, so that the attention of the whole nation can be diverted away from the real issues that face us." And see the double talk. The Prime Minister says that he is going to go back to Lahore, because, President Musharraf has extended an invitation, and he will go back to Lahore. And immediately thereafter, in the National Executive meeting of the BJP, what does he say? What is the point of going back to Lahore if there is going to be cross-border terrorism? You satisfied the hawks in your party. You play around with the lives of the people of Kashmir and you call Agra Summit a success. If you call the increasing violence and the loss of innocent lives, because of the failure of talks, a success, then, let it be a success. But history will never forgive you for the inaptitude, lack of thought and the lack of foresight that you have shown in this particular matter. Madam, I want to make a very important statement here, connected with the statement of the US Spokesperson. If you remember, Mr. Mishra and the Foreign Minister were in the United States. They were going to and fro before the announcement of these talks.

And, Madam, despite the Agra Summit failure, the United States Department spokesperson, Richard Bush, said this--and I quote:

"We strongly support sustained engagement at the senior level between India and Pakistan as the best way to address long-standing bilateral disputes and make real progress towards the reduction of tension and resolution of their differences through peaceful means."

Immediately after the talks failed! Then you have the Assistant Secretary of State for South Asian Affairs, Miss Christina Rocca's message to New Delhi and Islamabad to continue the political level dialogue! And, as you know, Richard Armitage, the Deputy Secretary of State, came to Delhi just before the talks took place, just before the invitation! So, we seem to be moving towards a particular methodology of resolving issues at the instance of somebody else! As a sovereign power, we have never done that in the past. In fact, Madam, I am pained that we are talking about cross border terrorism on a daily basis. And I am pained. Why? You look at our Resolution of 1994, the Resolution of Parliament, on the whole issue. The moment you talk of cross border terrorism, which is the border you are talking about? That phrase has come about only after 1994, because in the Resolution passed by this House on 22nd February, 1994, this is what we said:

"This House condemns strongly the continued support and encouragement Pakistan is extending to subversive and terrorist activities in the Indian State of Jammu and Kashmir."

Because, we do not accept the LoC as our border. Pok is a part of India. It is a misnomer to call it cross border terrorism. It is subversion of the Indian Union by an outside power. That we will never tolerate. Let that message go. But, unfortunately, Madam, we have been falling into this trap and negotiating on the inclusion of the phrase 'cross border terrorism' with Musharraf! The issue is not cross border terrorism. The core issue, here, is not Kashmir, Madam. The core issue is Pakistan. The core issue is the subversive activities of Pakistan within the Union. That is the core issue; and unless Musharraf accepts that, there can be no bargain with Musharraf.

And the other issue is the issue between us, *i.e.* the way we have treated the people of Jammu and Kashmir, and we have to recognise it and accept it, that we have to balm their hurt, take care of them, educate them, economically provide them the necessary wherewithal so that they can stand up high, with dignity, as equal citizens in this country, to be fully integrated in this country. Madam, the issue is not Kashmir. Let me quote it in this way, "The issue is Pakistan." In fact, Madam, Pakistan has declared a war of a thousand cuts against India. That is the terminology that they use. "This war of a thousand cuts will continue and lead India to fragmentation!" Those are the words used by Pakistan! Let the Pakistanis know that we too know how to breed an impeccable force! And we will find a way to do that, if they continue to be subversive in our nation. It is better if all of us in this House unanimously understand the reality of Pakistan.

There is no point in falling prey to the persuasions of another power because we want to have the sanctions lifted. We rather live with the sanctions than be persuaded in this fashion.

In fact, Madam, I have almost done it and I am just going to sum up now. Sushmaji, when she was speaking yesterday, stated that he gave us a fixed deposit and we returned it. The fact is that we gave a blank cheque to his Government so that, after the Agra talks, they fill something in it to tell the world that this is what happened and this is how they have succeeded. But the blank cheque remained blank. Dina Nath Mishraji stated that it could not have been filled up; there was nothing to fill up. I don't know where the fixed deposit came from. She must be thinking of some other matter. There were several fixed deposits. She was surprised when the Leader of the Opposition and several Members of the Opposition were talking about the media management. The Leader of the Opposition explained, "We did not mean that you should manage the media. What we meant was that you should interact with the media. Just as Gen. Musharraf was doing in a breakfast meeting, we should also have taken steps to interact with the media". She expressed innocence about the concept of management of the media. But when I saw the newspapers this morning, I realised that she was a master at it; she was a master in media management. It is a master stroke that a speech full of sound and fury, signifying nothing, was managed beautifully in the media.

Madam, this is what I would like the Government to answer. The point is that we have reached at crossroads. We must decide what is it that we want to negotiate with Pakistan on Jammu and Kashmir. We have seen the spurt of killings in Doda. In fact, in recent days the killings have gone up much more than ever in the past. This is a direct result of the failure of the talks at Agra. In the meeting with the leaders of the Opposition parties, I was told, it was pointed out that if somehow the Agra talks failed, it was going to have an adverse impact. I was told that the Foreign Minister said, "No, we are on top of the situation". Well, Mr. Minister, you are certainly not on top of anything at the moment. Forget Jammu and Kashmir, you are not on top of anything. But, at the same time, you cannot change your neighbour as you have been saying, time and again. We have to negotiate with our neighbour. But before you negotiate, before you actually go to Lahore, please decide in your mind what you want to do. Let Gen. Musharraf decide in his mind what he wants to do. But you decide in your mind what is it that you can give and what is it that you

want to have. In the absence of that, the result is another summit, another failure, another host of killings in Jammu & Kashmir. Don't put the people of Jammu and Kashmir through this tragedy because history will never forgive you. Thank you very much.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I have to inform the House that the Home Minister was to come at 2 o'clock, but he is still replying in the Lok Sabha and is on his legs. We will continue with the discussion till he comes here with regard to the statement on the killings in Jammu and Kashmir. We are still having a lot of speakers and the time left is two hours and forty minutes. We should finish the discussion today so that the hon. Prime Minister can reply tomorrow after Question Hour. So, we will continue with the discussion. Shri Jnaneshwar Misra.

श्री जनेश्वर मिश्र (उत्तर प्रदेश): धैंक्यू मैडम। मैडम, मैं सरकार से लम्बी बात नहीं करूंगा, केवल यह जानना चाहूंगा कि मुशर्रफ साहब को क्यों बुलाया गया? प्रधान मंत्री जी ने अपने वक्तव्य में पहली लाइन लिख दी है कि मैंने पाकिस्तान के राष्ट्रपति परवेज मुशर्रफ को भारत आने का निमंत्रण दिया। सुषमा जी ने जो तर्क दिया प्रणब मुखर्जी की तरफ इशारा करके कि उन्होंने कहा था कि बातचीत का सिलसिला चलना चाहिए, पलटनी शासन से भी चलना चाहिए। उसका जिक्र किया था सुषमा जी ने। लेकिन मैं इस सरकार से और खास तौर से प्रधान मंत्री जी से जानना चाहूंगा कि आपने क्यों बुलाया? कैसे बुलाया? कोई इलहाम हुआ था क्या? किसी ने आपसे कहा था क्या? देश यह मांग कर रहा था क्या? यह मैं जानबूझकर पूछ रहा हूँ और सीधा सवाल पूछ रहा हूँ क्योंकि जैसे ही न्योता भेजा गया, परवेज मुशर्रफ से वहाँ के अखबार वालों ने पूछा कि क्यों बुलाया भारत के प्रधान मंत्री ने आपको बातचीत करने के लिए, तो मुशर्रफ ने कहा था शायद अमेरिका के इशारे पर बुलाया है। यह भारत के अखबारों में भी छपा और दुनिया के अखबारों में भी छपा। संदेश गया कि भारत का प्रधान मंत्री अमेरिका के इशारे पर मुशर्रफ को बुला रहा है। यह मुशर्रफ का बयान था। भारत सरकार ने सफाई दी कि हम किसी के इशारे पर नहीं बुला रहे हैं। मैं जानना चाहूंगा कि पाकिस्तान की जनता ने उस समय मुशर्रफ को क्या अपनी सरकार कबूल कर लिया था? क्या कोई भी आदमी पलटन के बल पर, ताकत के बल पर किसी देश का नेता बन जाए - कल को दाउद इब्नाहीम बन जाए पाकिस्तान का नेता, कल को बिन लादेन बन जाए पाकिस्तान का अगुआ, क्या भारत की सरकार जो चुनी हुई सरकार है, संविधान के मुताबिक चलने वाली सरकार है, उन सबको बातचीत करने के लिए न्योता देगी? क्या मुशर्रफ के हाथ में जो कारगिल के युद्ध के दौरान हमारे जवानों के खून के घब्बे लगे थे, वे सूख चुके थे? क्यों बुलाया गया, यह मैं जानबूझकर जानना चाहता हूँ। मैं बातचीत का विरोधी नहीं हूँ। दो लोगों के बीच में, दो देशों के बीच में जब मतभेद हों तो वे मतभेद बातचीत से दूर होने चाहिए। लेकिन एक बारगी कौन सी ऐसी चीज आ गयी, ऐसी घटना आ गयी? नेता विरोधी दल ने कहा था शायद तहलका से दिमाग को डाइवर्ट करने के लिए यह किया गया। देश में बहुत सी समस्याएँ हैं। उन समस्याओं का हल हम देश में बैठकर कर सकते हैं - आपस में एक दूसरे को समझा बुझाकर। तो क्या भारत सरकार को यह मालूम नहीं था कि मुशर्रफ का दिमाग क्या है? मैं पाकिस्तान के दिमाग की कार्यविधि की बात नहीं कर रहा हूँ। लेकिन मुशर्रफ के दिमाग की

2.00 P.M.

कार्यविधि की बात कर रहा हूँ। क्या यह पहले से मालूम नहीं था कि मुशर्रफ साहब किस तरह से सोचा करते हैं? प्रधान मंत्री जी विद्वान आदमी हैं। कूटनीति के, विदेश नीति के बहुत बड़े ज्ञाता हैं। तजुर्बा भी है। एक बारगी क्यों बुला लिया गया।

फिर अपने वक्तव्य के दूसरे वाक्य में लिखा है कि उनके आने के पहले हमने विरोधी दल के नेताओं को बुलाकर सलाह-मश्विरा किया था। मैं पढ़ रहा था। यह सलाह-मश्विरा बुलाने के पहले क्यों नहीं किया? बुलाने के बाद क्यों किया? विरोधी दल के नेताओं को फंसाने के लिए कि अब तो हमने बुला ही लिया है, बोलो क्या करें? अपने लोगों से इतनी चालाकी करेंगे? राजनीति करने वालों से राजनीति नहीं करनी चाहिए और चालाकी की राजनीति नहीं करनी चाहिए, मैं इतना कहना चाहता हूँ। बुलाने के पहले पूछ लिया होता। जितना देश किसी सरकार के प्रधान मंत्री का होता है, उतना ही देश के सब आदमियों का होता है और विरोधी पार्टियों के लोगो का भी उतना ही देश है। देश के मसले पर कोई कदम उठाने के पहले पूछ लेना चाहिए था कि हम यह कदम उठाने जा रहे हैं तुम लोग बताओ। अगर इन लोगों ने हाँ कह दिया होता तो इनका कमिटमेंट होता। ये लोग अपनी राय रखेंगे। तो पहले तो आपने कहा नहीं और जब आपने बुला लिया, तो उसने अमरीका की तरफ इशारा कर दिया। आप पर तोहमत लगा दिया। थोड़ी देर के लिए हम हक्का-बक्का हो गए कि यह क्या हो गया, हम बुला रहे हैं और वह कह रहे हैं कि अमरीका के कहने पर, उसके इशारे पर हमको बुलाया जा रहा है। हमने जरूर इंकार किया है, लेकिन हमारा अतीत क्या रहा है? कारगिल की लड़ाई हो रही थी। हमारी पलटन के जवान एक-एक इंच जमीन के लिए कुर्बान हो रहे थे। हम जमीन लगभग खाली कराने वाले थे कि तब तक अमरीका के राष्ट्रपति क्लिंटन साहब ने नवाज शरीफ साहब को बुला लिया। बुला करके उनसे कहा कि भारत की जमीन खाली करो और अपनी पलटन वापस ले जाओ। 6 दिन तक नवाज शरीफ साहब पाकिस्तान नहीं आ सके। उन्होंने कह दिया जी हज़ूर, वापस ले लेंगे। 6 दिन के बाद आए और पलट दिए गए। मुशर्रफ साहब देश के मालिक बन गए। मालिक बनने के बाद, उपसभापति महोदया, अभी वह राष्ट्रपति बने भी नहीं थे, केवल पलटनी हेड थे, सत्ता अपने हाथ में ले ली थी, तब तक हमारे प्रधान मंत्री ने मुबारकवाद हो, सदर-ए-पाकिस्तान कह करके मुबारकवाद देनी चाही। उसने कहा कि अभी तो मैंने ओथ भी नहीं ली है, आपको कैसे मालूम हो गया कि मैं सदर बन गया हूँ। इस गिरगिराहट की क्या जरूरत है? क्या हम स्वामिमानी राष्ट्र नहीं हैं? कोई राष्ट्रपति न बने और पहले से ही हम मुबारकवाद देने चलें तो यह कैसे हो सकता है? हमको अपनी हरकतों के बारे में, घर में बैठ करके, मैं विरोधी दल की हैसियत से आपसे बात नहीं कर रहा हूँ और न ही आपसे इसलिए कह रहा हूँ कि आप सत्ता पक्ष में हैं, हम भारत के लोग हैं। हमारे आचरण कैसे होने चाहिए, इसके लिए हमको सोचना पड़ेगा। मैं जान-बूझ करके इसलिए कह रहा हूँ कि मुझे शक हुआ जब उसने अमरीका के इशारे पर कहा, तो मैं हक्का-बक्का हो गया और सोचने लगा कि क्या ये दुनिया की ताकतें ही हमारे और पाकिस्तान के देशों को चलाया करेंगी। नवाज शरीफ को क्लिंटन ने डांट दिया। पलटन वापस हो गई। हमारी पलटन जान दे करके जमीन खाली कराने वाली थी, लेकिन उस पर कुर्बानी का सेहरा नहीं बंधा। रिटायरमेंट के बाद क्लिंटन ने कह दिया कि हमने तो नवाज शरीफ से कह दिया था इसलिए पलटन वापस हो गई और लड़ाई बंद हो गई। आप क्या समझते हैं कि इसका संदेश जाया नहीं करता। हमारी बहादुरी के बारे में संदेश जाता है, हमारे जवानों की शहादत के बारे में

संदेश जाता है। जब इस तरह की बातें छपती हैं कि हम भी कमजोर हैं, हिन्दुस्तान और पाकिस्तान के लोगों ने अपनी सरहद के बाहर, सरहद मायने संयुक्त हिन्दुस्तान की सरहद के बाहर कभी हमला नहीं किया है। बंटवारे के बाद बहुत बढ़िया आचरण रहा है, आपके लाल बहादुर शास्त्री के जमाने में हिन्दुस्तान की पलटन पाकिस्तान की तरफ चली गई थी, थोड़ा लाहौर की तरफ घुसा गई थी, तब ताशकंद बुलाया गया और बुला करके कहा गया कि अपनी पलटन अपनी सरहद के भीतर वापस करो, जिसका जिक्र माननीय कपिल सिब्बल साहब कर रहे थे। शास्त्री जी ने कहा कि जी हजूर। यह दुनिया जो बनी है, यह हिन्दुस्तान में जैसे जाति व्यवस्था है उसी तरह बनी है। मैडम, अमरीका से लेकर इंग्लैंड से होते हुए रूस तक गोरो का देश है। हम हिन्दुस्तान और पाकिस्तान तथा अफ्रीका के लोग, जैसे गांव में कुर्मी, काछी, यादव, हरिजन आदि बसा करते हैं उसी तरह से हैं। हम आपसी टकराव में जब कभी अपनी पलटन का इस्तेमाल करेंगे, रुपये का लेनदेन होगा, सरहद पर लेनदेन होगा, जब गांव के ठाकुर साहब की नीयत खराब होती है तो कभी छड़ी ले कर आते हैं और डांट कर कहते हैं कि अपने घर में बैठो दूसरे के घर पर लाठी मत चलाओ। तो नवाज शरीफ को भी डांटा गया और शास्त्री जी को भी डांटा गया था। कितने दिनों तक हम दुनिया के नक्शे पर अपने को संप्रभु राष्ट्र कहते हुए एक रियाया और प्रजा की तरह रहेंगे। यह एक बहुत बड़ा सवाल खड़ा हो गया है। इसके बारे में हमको गंभीरता से सोचना पड़ेगा। अब की बार जरूर आगरा में चर्चा हुई। वह चर्चा तो हो नहीं रही थी। यह सही था कि मुशर्रफ साहब ज्यादा बोल रहे थे, अटल जी ज्यादा सुन रहे थे। इनकी मूक वार्ता ही इन की कूटनीति थी और उन का ज्यादा बोलना ही उन की कूटनीति थी। मैडम, इस वार्ता के लिए आगरा चुना क्यों गया? क्या उन के आगरा देखने के लिए? मैडम, जब कभी भी भारत की तरफ से कहा जाता था कि पाकिस्तान से आए आतंकवाद पर बहस करो तो मुशर्रफ कहते थे, मैं मुंह बंद कर लेता हूँ, कान बंद कर लेता हूँ, मुझे कुछ नहीं सुनना, कुछ नहीं कहना और जब कभी मुशर्रफ द्वारा कहा जाता था कि पहले कश्मीर पर चर्चा करो तो अटल जी कहते थे मैं मुंह बंद कर लेता हूँ और कान बंद कर लेता हूँ। दो गुंने और दो बहरे, दो मुहों पर आपस में बात कर रहे थे, इस के अलावा यह वार्ता और कुछ नहीं थी।

मैडम, हमको अच्छा लगा था जब पाकिस्तान में मुशर्रफ ने कह दिया कि मैं कश्मीर पर बात करूंगा तो यहां से भारत के प्रधान मंत्री ने कहा था कि हम पाक अधिकृत कश्मीर के बारे में भी बात करेंगे। मुझे अच्छा लगा था जब भारत के प्रधान मंत्री ने यहां पर वक्तव्य दिया और उस वक्तव्य में कहा कि, 'भारत पाकिस्तान के संबंधों की भावी संभावनाओं के बारे में राजनीतिक दलों के नेताओं, प्रतिष्ठित व्यक्तियों, मीडिया प्रतिनिधियों तथा बुद्धिजीवियों के साथ व्यक्तिगत और संयुक्त रूप से विचार-विमर्श किया था। उन्होंने लगभग सर्वसम्मति से हमारे इस विचार का समर्थन किया था कि इस यात्रा को पाकिस्तान के साथ स्थाई शांति और मैत्रीपूर्ण सहयोग के लिए अवसर तलाशने के संदर्भ में देखा जाना चाहिए। शिमला समझौता तथा लाहौर घोषणा पत्र के आधार पर हम चाहते थे कि निमंत्रण तथा तत्पश्चात् यात्रा के माध्यम से बातचीत के जरिए आपसी संबंधों को सुदृढ़ किया जाए।' विदेश मंत्री जी आप ने भी अपने बयान में शिमला समझौते की चर्चा की है। कल आप की सूचना, प्रसारण मंत्री जी ने कश्मीर का नाम नहीं लिया था। भारत के प्रधान मंत्री ने बार-बार कहा है कि मुद्दे में जम्मू-कश्मीर भी एक था। उन्होंने नाम नहीं लिया। अब बात छिड़ गयी कि जब दो बड़ों के बीच में बात होती हो तो सरकार के मंत्री थोड़ा सा नियंत्रण रखें। मैडम, एक और मंत्री थे जिन से पूछा गया कि अगर मुशर्रफ क्रिकेट के बारे में बात करे तो क्या करोगे? उस ने कहा कि मैं हॉकी के बारे में बात करूंगा। मैडम, मुझे हंसी आ रही थी कि क्या यह वार्ता

बच्चों का खेल है! आप मिनिस्टर हैं, लेकिन जो मन में आता है बयान दे देते हैं। यह देश की ऐसी तस्वीर है जिस के बारे में झंझट आजादी मिलने के बाद से आज तक फंसी हुई है। इस के कारण लोग तबाह हो रहे हैं। मैडम, यह सच है कि जब वाजपेयी जी ने मुशर्रफ साहब को न्योता दिया था और उन्होंने कबूल कर लिया था तो हिंदुस्तान की गरीब जनता और पाकिस्तान की गरीब जनता, दोनों देशों के बुद्धिजीवी और साहित्यकारों के दिल खिल गए थे कि अब हमारे बुरे दिन लौट जाएंगे, लेकिन मुझे दुख के साथ कहना पड़ता है कि बात करनी ही नहीं थी। जिस शिमला समझौते की बात की जा रही है, मैडम मैं एक वाक्य पढ़ना चाहता हूँ जो कि वाजपेयी जी के भाषण से है। आप मुझे इसे पढ़ने की इजाजत दीजिए। 'चार लड़ाइयाँ हुई हैं। हर युद्ध में हम जीते हैं, हर शांति में हम हारे हैं, हर मैदान में हम जीते हैं, मेज पर हम हारे हैं, हम रणनीति में जीते हैं, हम कूटनीति में हारे हैं। हम समझते थे 1971 के बाद शिमला में नया इतिहास लिखा जाएगा, लेकिन जो लिखा गया वह लज्जाजनक इतिहास है। वह जवानों के बलिदानों पर पानी फेरने वाला इतिहास है। यह शिमला समझौता भारत के राष्ट्रीय हितों के साथ विश्वासघात करने वाला समझौता है।' मैडम, यह मैं नहीं बोल रहा हूँ यह अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी साहब बोल रहे हैं जो किसी जमाने में विपक्ष के नेता थे और इस विषय पर चर्चा हुई थी। जिस शिमला समझौते को आप बुनियाद मानकर चल रहे हैं क्या वे बातें अब असत्य हो गयी हैं। इस का मतलब है कि पहले से आप के मन में शिमला समझौता कुछ भी नहीं था, वह विश्वासघात का समझौता था। अगर उसी भाषा में मैं कह दूँ कि कारगिल के जवानों की शहादत के साथ विश्वासघात करने वाली आगरा की शिखर वार्ता थी तो आप बुरा मान जाएंगे। उस समय आप अपनी तरफ से कठोर भाषा बोल जाते हैं। उस समय इंदिरा जी के जमाने में आप नहीं जानते होंगे कि किसी जमाने में आकर आप को भी उसी कुर्सी पर बैठना पड़ेगा। मैं विपक्ष में बैठे हुए लोगों से कहूँगा कि आप जब विपक्ष में बैठें तो थोड़ा संयम से बैठें क्योंकि कौन जाने कि कब आपको वहाँ जाना पड़े और तब आपकी बोली हुई बातों को वोट किया जाए। आपसे भी कहूँगा कि कभी उधर जाना तो थोड़ा संयम के साथ बैठना, आपकी बोली हुई बातों को वोट किया जाएगा।

श्री सुरेश पच्चीरी (मध्य प्रदेश) : मिश्र जी, आप हम दोनों को तो सीख दे रहे हैं, लगता है कि आपने तो उम्मीद ही छोड़ दी है कि आप सत्ता में आएंगे।

श्री जनेश्वर मिश्र : हमारे लिए कुर्सी का कभी कोई महत्व नहीं रहा।

उपसभापति : मिश्र जी, आपकी पार्टी का समय खत्म हो गया है।

श्री जनेश्वर मिश्र : कितना समय है हमारी पार्टी का?

उपसभापति : 15 मिनट हैं, आप ज्यादा मैम्बर लाएंगे तो बढ़ा देंगे।

श्री जनेश्वर मिश्र : 'प्रधान मंत्री श्रीमती इंदिरा गांधी और राष्ट्रपति जिस मिट्टी के बने हैं, जिस वर्ग के प्रतिनिधि हैं, उसमें शायद वे यह नहीं चाहते कि हमेशा के लिए झगड़े खत्म हो जाएं।' यह भी कहा गया है। ये वाक्य हैं अटल जी के, उन्हीं की भाषा में मैं समझाना चाहता हूँ। मैं इसको दोहराना चाहता हूँ कि अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी और परवेज़ मुशर्रफ जिस मिट्टी के बने हैं, जिस सोच के लोग हैं, ये भी नहीं चाहेंगे कि दोनों के झगड़े खत्म हों। सही कहा सिब्बल साहब ने कि असल समस्या तो पाकिस्तान है, जब से बन गया तब से आज तक और आप कश्मीर कभी दे भी दें तो क्या कभी झगड़ा खत्म हो जाएगा। यह तो आपकी पलटन के एक रिटायर्ड

अफसर ने कहा था कि झगड़ा नहीं खत्म होगा। झगड़ा दांव-पेच से खत्म नहीं हो सकता, झगड़ा व्यवहार से खत्म हुआ करता है। जब मुशर्रफ साहब आ रहे थे, हम तब से प्रधान मंत्री जी के वक्तव्य से यही देखते थे कि हम किसी सीमा तक अपनी कूटनीति की तैयारी कर रहे हैं, लेकिन पाकिस्तान के साथ हमारी कूटनीति नहीं चलती। फ्रांस के साथ चल सकती है, इंग्लैंड के साथ चल सकती है, अमरीका के साथ चल सकती है, रूस के साथ चल सकती है, लेकिन पाकिस्तान के साथ नहीं चलती। 52-53 साल पहले हम और पाकिस्तान एक थे, दो भाई की तरह से, 50 साल में हम अलग हो गए हैं। अलग होने की तल्लियां हैं। भाई-भाई में कूटनीति नहीं चला करती है। भाई-भाई को अगर मिलाना होता है तो दिल चौड़ा करना होता है, कूटनीति नहीं करनी होती है, लेकिन कूटनीतिक प्रयास विदेश विभाग की तरफ से हुआ। दोनों तरफ से हुआ - प्रधान मंत्री जी चुप रहकर कूटनीति कर रहे थे और मुशर्रफ बोलकर कूटनीति कर रहे थे क्योंकि उसने बोलकर अपने देश की जनता को और दुनिया को यह बताना चाहा था कि भारत ने हमको राष्ट्रपति कुबूल कर लिया है, हम कुछ लेकर नहीं जाएंगे, कुछ देकर नहीं जाएंगे, खाली हाथ जाएंगे तो भी ताल ठोकते हुए जाएंगे और भारत के प्रधान मंत्री को चुप रहकर दिखाना था कि हम बातचीत के लिए अग्रसर हैं, वही नहीं कर रहा है। उसका नतीजा भारत को भगुतना पड़ रहा है। सबसे अच्छा है कि भारत की जनता पाकिस्तान की जनता के साथ सम्पर्क करे, पाकिस्तान की जनता भारत की जनता के साथ सम्पर्क करे। यह सच है कि हम दो राष्ट्र वाले सिद्धान्त को नहीं मानते, लेकिन क्या यह सच नहीं है कि हमारे देश में जो अल्पसंख्यक समुदाय के लोग रह गए, उनके ऊपर एक खास किस्म की सोच के लोगों के ज़रिए लगातार हमले होते रहते हैं। हमारे यहां जो कमजोर वर्ग के लोग हैं, खास तौर से मुसलमान, उनको अगर हम गले लगाकर रहेंगे तो पाकिस्तान के मुसलमानों को संदेश जाएगा, वहां की जनता को संदेश जाएगा कि अब हमें वहां सताया नहीं जाता, यह सरहद मिटा दी जाए और अगर बर्लिन की सरहद मिटाई जा सकती है तो भारत-पाकिस्तान की सरहद क्यों नहीं मिटाई जा सकती। बंगल के सदन में एक नेता ने कह दिया कि मुशर्रफ साहब उस हवेली में जाकर क्यों रहेंगे, रेसकोर्स पर आकर रहेंगे। भाई लोगों ने हल्ला मचा दिया। लेकिन मैं सच कहता हूं, शर्त दे दी जाए कि सरहद अगर मिट जाती है, हमारे जैसे आदमी की यह निजी राय है, तो आने वाले 10 साल के लिए भी रेसकोर्स के 7 नम्बर पर कोई अल्पसंख्यक समुदाय का आदमी ही बैठे, हम यह गारंटी देने को तैयार हैं हिन्दू बहुसंख्यक समाज के लोग, लेकिन भारत, पाकिस्तान और बंगलादेश की तरह नहीं। बड़ा सपना देखना पड़ेगा, इसके लिए सीना चौड़ा करना पड़ेगा। अपने यहां जो कमजोर हैं, उनके साथ बढ़िया व्यवहार दिखाना होगा, तब जाकर पाकिस्तान के लोगों का और वहां की सरकार का दिल जीता जा सकता है। धन्यवाद।

श्रीमती सविता शारदा (गुजरात) : मैडम, मिश्र जी ने बहुत कुछ कह दिया कि दिल चौड़ा करना पड़ेगा, आपस में एक दूसरे के साथ मिलकर रहें। तो मुझे यह सुझाव चाहिए कि पाकिस्तान के लोग और हिंदुस्तान के लोग आपस में कैसे मिलें, कोई तो मुखिया चाहिए मिलाने वाला। मैं छोटी सी बात कहना चाहती हूं कि जब भूकंप आया था तो बहुत सारे लोग यह कहते थे कि यह करो, वह करो, ऐसे करो तो यह होगा। मेरे साथ एक भाई बैठे थे, उन्होंने कहा कि जीभ बहुत छोटी होती है, बहुत चलती है, हाथ बड़े होते हैं, इसलिए उठने में देरी लगती है। मैं यह कहना चाहती हूं कि जीभ से तो हम बहुत कुछ कहते हैं लेकिन प्रैक्टिकल काम हमें क्या करना है, यह देखना चाहिए। हम सुझाव तो बहुत देते हैं कि यह कर : चाहिए, वह करना चाहिए ... (व्यवधान) ...

श्री जनेश्वर मिश्र : मैडम, इन्होंने पूछ लिया है तो मैं एक मिनट में अपनी बात कहना चाहता हूँ ...(व्यवधान)... एक मिनट, क्योंकि उन्होंने भूकंप का जिक्र किया है ...(व्यवधान)... मैं यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि जब भूकंप आया था तो राहत के लिए मुशर्रफ साहब ने भी बहुत सामान जहाज से भिजवाया था। उस समय अगर अटल जी, मुशर्रफ के यहां जाकर मुबारकबाद देते और धन्यवाद देते कि हम पहले के भाई-भाई हैं, तुमने बहुत अच्छा किया जो मुसीबत के वक्त हमारी मदद की, हम भी जरूरत पड़ने पर तुम्हारी मदद करेंगे। अगर यह किया होता तो बहुत बड़ी बात हो जाती और आगरा समिट की जरूरत नहीं पड़ती।

SHRI RAVI SHANKAR PRASAD (Bihar): Madam Deputy Chairperson,...

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: If the Home Minister aggress, then we will allow Shri Ravi Shankar Prasad because he has already started. After that we will take up the statement by the hon. Home Minister ...*(Interruptions)*... It will take ten or fifteen minutes...

SHRI RAVI SHANKAR PRASAD: Madam, I am grateful to you for giving me this opportunity. Madam, since yesterday I am hearing speaker after speaker particularly from the Opposition on this discussion. I heard Dr. Manmohan Singhji, I heard Kapil Sibalji and I heard Shri Janeshwar Mishraji. We have also been in Opposition from time to time. But we have never sought to make any comment which may be used by those across the border. What I heard yesterday and today, let me say, it may be music to the ruling establishment in Pakistan. Mr. Kapil Sibal talked about Kerala musing of the Prime Minister, quoting only one part of it, without emphasising when he stated that there must be a conducive atmosphere. Was it not in the same language which Musharraf is talking out, the centrality of Kashmir what Mr. Kapil Sibal talked about? जनेश्वर मिश्र जी अभी कह रहे थे कि सरहद एक हो जानी चाहिए और आपने यह भी कहा कि बातचीत क्यों की? बात समझ में नहीं आई। आप कहते हैं कि सरहद एक कर दो, आपके नेता कहते हैं कि मुशर्रफ साहब नेहरावाली हवेली में न रहें, 7 रेसकोर्स रोड में रहें, अगर प्रधानमंत्री जी ने बातचीत की पहल की तो आपको उस पर भी ऐतराज है। Much has been talked about as to what was the gain from the Agra Summit, Let me ask you certain questions. Was it not for the first time that India did not lose even an inch on the Summit table? When Musharraf talked about Kashmir being the core issue, was it not for the first time that the Prime Minister very strongly, but in a dignified manner, said, "Yes, if you talk about Kashmir being the core issue, we will have to go into the core of that core, i.e., your illegal occupation of Azad Kashmir what Mr. Kapil Sibal talked about? Was it not for the first time that the Indian Prime Minister said, "How is it that when Pakistan could subjugate the wish of the Azad Kashmir people they could talk about the wish of the Kashmiri

people what he talked about? When Mr. Musharraf came to bid farewell taking cue from what Mr. Bhutto did to Smt. Indira Gandhi, he cajoled, he requested, he persisted for an agreement. But what Atalji said was this, "Sorry, you have spoiled the entire atmosphere." All this we can talk about; if diplomacy means talking about the country's interests, with self-pride, it was the moment.

Dr. Manmohan Singh talked about Pokhran and lack of consistency and coherence in our foreign policy. What happened in Pokhran-II? India was isolated with sanctions. We never made any compromise. We never begged before any world power to lift the sanctions imposed on us. We never submitted ourselves to the various treaties which were sought to be imposed on us. And, even today, India has not compromised. But, Mr. Sibal, you have talked about the American pressure. One of the first terms of the sanctions is that there shall be no military engagement. And, recently, Jaswant Singhji had gone to America, as the Defence Minister. He was invited to Pentagon also. Here was a military-to-military contact at the highest level, with the sanctions in place, which we never begged to withdraw. I think, your entire argument, that this whole initiative has been taken under pressure, is absolutely misplaced. It is a part of our conviction that we must live in peace with our neighbours. Madam, Advaniji met Mr. Musharraf, and told him, "हमारे दाउद इब्राहीम को वापिस दे दीजिए, छोटा शकील को वापिस कर दीजिए।" The reply was, "Mr. Home Minister, you are becoming tactical. Dawood Ibrahim is not here." I have got an interview of Chota Shakeel in *India Today* of 6th August, which I would like to quote. In that interview, he said, "हम तो कहीं बाहर गए ही नहीं थे।" And that is his saying. What has been the gain from the Agra Summit? For the first time, the real, cruel, diplomatic face of Pakistan is there before the world. Mr. Musharraf said, "I am a commando." Madam, commando has got the spirit of daredevilry and courage; but two qualities more -- delusion and deception. Mr. Sibal talked about cross-border terrorism. He asked cross-border terrorism is a concept very well understood, then why did you go in for talks? Initially, we had said that we would not go. But, in two years' time, because of the consistent efforts of the Government of India, the world has recognised our concerns over this cross-border terrorism and, Madam, let me quote from the Report of Patterns of Global Terrorism, published by the U.S. State Department, and released on 30th April, 2001. I just quote only two lines from this Report. It says, "Pakistan military Government, headed by General Pervez Musharraf, continued previous Pakistani Government support of Kashmir insurgency and Kashmir militant groups continue to operate in India." There is also a Report of the Canadian Security and

Intelligence Services, dated June 20, 2001; and, again, I quote from this Report. It says, "Pakistan's long-standing support to extremists is a major factor in its endurance. The effect of on-going support by Pakistani Intelligence apparatus to the Jammu and Kashmir conflict, with its growing linkage with Taliban, has spilled into East Asian expatriate communities around the world." Firstly, during the last two years, we have been able to show to the world that Pakistan, today, exports terrorism. And what is the face of Pakistan which has come before the world, at Agra? Secondly, earlier, Jihad was on the fringe of Pakistan polity. Today, Jihad has become the core of Pakistani army which rules there. Pakistan exports terrorism as a tool of diplomacy. These are the two issues, Mr. Sibal. We agree on many things.

SHRI KAPIL SIBAL: If you are saying that, why did you call him?
...(Interruptions)...

SHRI RAVI SHANKAR PRASAD: You also said that there has to be a continuous dialogue ...(Interruptions)... And this became the occasion. There was unanimity also. What I am simply trying to say is that Pakistan exports terrorism, Pakistan supports terrorism, and Pakistan supports, openly, Jihad. Agra was the conclusive demonstration of that, and that I see ...(Interruptions)...

SHRI KAPIL SIBAL: Are you saying that it has come to project itself as a terrorist State? ...(Interruptions)...

SHRI RAVI SHANKAR PRASAD: Let us not go into that...(Interruptions)... Please, yes...(Interruptions)... That is diplomacy. If you understand it correctly, it is a part of diplomacy to safeguard its national interest. Today, Sir... Madam, Vice-Chairperson, I wish to cite ...(Interruptions)...

AN HON. MEMBER: Deputy Chairperson, not Vice-Chairperson.

SHRI RAVI SHANKAR PRASAD: Deputy Chairperson. I stand corrected. If Mr. Kapil Sibal can call you 'Sir' so many times, one mistake may be allowed to me.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: He is a lawyer and you are a lawyer. You can.... (Interruptions)...

SHRI KAPIL SIBAL: One second, if you hear me. *...(Interruptions)...* One second, if you yield. *...(Interruptions)...*

SHRI RAVI SHANKAR PRASAD: Allow me to conclude. *...(Interruptions)...* We will settle it in the court. *...(Interruptions)...* We will settle it in the court, Kapilji.

SHRI KAPIL SIBAL: You believe in...

SHRI RAVI SHANKAR PRASAD: Please allow me to speak. I am not yielding.

SHRI KAPIL SIBAL: Doesn't matter.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I thought you were giving an explanation of why you called me 'Sir'.

SHRI RAVI SHANKAR PRASAD: Madam, General Musharraf said, "It is a freedom struggle, we are not supporting it, and it is indigenous. I am giving certain evidence in this House. I saw what was the address of Harkat-ul-Mujahideen, on its website. It is: Head Office, House No.B-154, Khyban Sir Sayyad, Near CDA Bus Stop, Rawalpindi, Pakistan. Current Account No. 2758, Muslim Commercial Bank, Alfara Branch, Islamabad, Pakistan. Mr. Musharraf, are you listening? The Head Office of Harkat-ul-Mujahideen is in Islamabad. Madam, let me quote. 'Herald' is the monthly magazine of the 'Dawn' group of newspapers. In its March issue, in an article, Dr. Khalid Mahmud, Secretary-General of Jamaitul-islame of Sind had made a very telling comment. Let me quote that. He said, "Why is the Pakistani Army not fighting for Kashmir? Why are they getting our youth killed there? They are using our youngmen for their own goals." Let us be clear about one thing. These Jehadi groups cannot function and survive without official patronage. Is there a single militant training centre in Pakistan which can operate without the consent of the Pakistani Army? Madam, we have heard a lot about Kadam Sethi, a well known journalist of Pakistan. He had written in 'Friday Times' on the 18th of May, 2001, "The Musharraf model seeks to covertly ally with the Jehadi groups, while keeping the mainstream political parties out of power loop. This is to enhance and sustain his covert external agenda, while internally maintaining an overtly fundamentalist stand". Madam, this brings me to the very rationale of Pakistan. Fifty years have passed by and, at least, on this assessment, Mr. Kapil Sibal and myself have a lot of unanimity. It is yet to grow out of anti-India hatred. The two-nation theory has failed. Pakistan

has this idea that only it has got the right to talk about the Muslims of India. And I salute the tolerance of India. I salute the secular traditions of India. Today, the Muslims have shown that they are safe in this country. Pakistan was defeated a number of times and Pakistan learnt that, as a country it cannot defeat India. Therefore, it must try to bleed India; it must go for a proxy war. And if Pakistan has not succeeded in the past, Pakistan is not going to succeed in the future also. But one thing is there. We would have to be firm on our guards and we would have to clearly demonstrate that Pakistan would never succeed in this proxy war, and the entire country is one. When I see discordant voices there, I have a little problem. I have great regard for Shri Janeshwar Mishraji, for his vision and his understanding. But when he says that people must meet, I would only say that his idea is utopian, without any relation to the existing reality. And the existing reality of Pakistan, today, Madam, is that Pakistan is ruled by a psyche, by a mindset, which has yet to come to terms with India. That mindset has to go. We wish Pakistan very well. Pakistan has seen democracy, followed by coup. Elected leaders went to jails. That is their problem. But this mindset has always survived. I learnt from the reporting of Pakistan that the Director-General of ISI had gone to a conference of Lashkar-e-Toiba. A resolution was passed there that, "Like Mohd. Ghaznavi, we have to show India, its true place, and let us try for that." Such types of resolutions, supported by official patronage, would never be healthy for a conducive atmosphere. Yet, Jaswant Singhji had made a very important quotation in a memorial lecture at Patna, Madam. ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI NILOTPAL BASU (West Bengal) : Madam, can I make a procedural point?

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Yes.

SHRI NILOTPAL BASU: As per the time allotted to the parties, it was decided in the morning that we would try to shorten this debate so that the Prime Minister can reply to the debate tomorrow morning at 12 o'clock.

SHRI RAVI SHANKAR PRASAD: I am concluding ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI NILOTPAL BASU: I think, in the House, the Government has the biggest responsibility to stick to that agreement ...*(Interruptions)*...

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I will tell you. He is about to finish his speech. Then, he is speaking within the time allotted to the BJP. When he finishes, then the hon. Home Minister will ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI NILOTPAL BASU: If the Chair is satisfied, then we are also satisfied...*(Interruptions)*...

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Please, don't make everything political. It was a comment on the Chair...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI B.P. APTE (Maharashtra) : Madam, ...*(Interruptions)*

उपसभापति : प्लीज़ आप बैठिए। इतना सेंसिटिव मत होइए। यह तो टाइम के बंटवारे का किस्सा है।

श्री राजनाथ सिंह "सूर्य" (उत्तर प्रदेश) : मैडम, ये सिर्फ उन्हें डिस्टर्ब करने के लिए बोल रहे हैं और कुछ नहीं है। ...*(व्यवधान)*...

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Just one minute. May I have your attention please? Mr. Basu, you said, 'if the Chair is satisfied, we are also satisfied'. It is not a question of my satisfaction; it is a question of Members' satisfaction, because I have no role to play in the satisfaction part. Mr. Kapil Sibal took more time; I think, your party took enough time. So, if he has his party's time, he is within his limit. That is the point. It is not a question of my satisfaction...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI RAVI SHANKAR PRASAD: Madam, should I continue? ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI NILOTPAL BASU: Madam, the only thing is that we had decided to sit late and that we would seek extra time; but, everybody will have to stick to that time. I mean, I cannot take responsibility for Shri Kapil Sibal, but, at least, surely, the hon. Minister of Parliamentary Affairs, ...*(Interruptions)*... who was also present during that discussion, should take responsibility ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI B.P. SINGHAL (Uttar Pradesh) : There is no room for further arguments ...*(Interruptions)*...

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Singhal, you don't have to be angry. You took one more minute beyond your time. So, I don't want to quote. And, now, you have taken two-three more minutes. So, let us not sit like a 'balance'. Let him finish.

SHRI RAVI SHANKAR PRASAD: Madam, I was saying that in spite of knowing everything about Pakistan, we cannot change our geography. It is the geography which has made Pakistan our next-door neighbour, howsoever we are in disagreement with the 'two-nation' theory. In fact, it

has failed today. How the Mohajirs have been treated; how the people of Sindh have been treated; what is the fate of Baluchistan; what treatment was given to the people of East Bengal, i.e. Bangladesh. The entire history of Pakistan is there for us to see. What is happening to the Ahmedias in Pakistan? They talk of democratic rights. Madam, I am coming to the last point. Much was talked about the media part; media management and media interaction. I have only one comment to make about the great breakfast meeting. I have with me the article of Mr. Prem Shankar Jha, in the 'Outlook' dated 30th July, where he says "Let me start by saying, without qualification, that what Musharraf did was grossly unethical. The meeting was, like such meetings all over the world, off the record. What's more, we were there not because we asked to meet him but as he wanted to meet us. So, it was incumbent upon him to tell us that the meeting was not only on record but was to be televised. Neither before nor during the meeting were we told of the change." Mr. Sibal, do you want that our Prime Minister should also behave in the same fashion?

SHRI KAPIL SIBAL : No, ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI RAVI SHANKAR PRASAD: Let me put this question. You talked about the media part ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI KAPIL SIBAL : If he puts a question to me ...*(Interruptions)*... I am supposed to answer that ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI RAVI SHANKAR PRASAD: All right, all right ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI KAPIL SIBAL : Either you withdraw your question, or allow me to answer it ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI RAVI SHANKAR PRASAD: Come on. Come on ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI KAPIL SIBAL: Are you withdrawing it ...*(Interruptions)*... either withdraw it or allow me to answer it. ...*(Interruptions)*...

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : He is not in the Chair. So, he can neither allow you nor withdraw it ...*(Interruptions)*... Neither Shri Nilotpal Basu is there in the Chair ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI KAPIL SIBAL : Madam, I would like to respond to his question ...*(Interruptions)*...

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Let him finish now.

SHRI RAVI SHANKAR PRASAD : Madam, I am not yielding ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI KAPIL SIBAL : Why are you worried? I will say something in your favour ...*(Interruptions)*...

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : I think, there are far too many lawyers in this House. We should have more politicians in this House ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI RAVI SHANKAR PRASAD : I was saying that there were certain norms of diplomatic discourse and conduct. And, if Mr. Musharraf ...*(Interruptions)*...

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Please conclude.

SHRI RAVI SHANKAR PRASAD : ...met the Press to violate it, we should not be asked to follow it.

Madam, lastly, I would only say, the discussions must go on. It is a bold step. But, at least, in the future, as far as the media part is concerned, Pakistan should be told to decide as to what shall be the parameters of media interaction. 'You did not do that in Shimla, you did not do that in Lahore also -- though television was there. You flouted that in Agra, hence decide it before hand.' I am deeply grateful for giving me the time. Thank you, Madam.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Now, we have the statement by the hon. Home Minister regarding the recent incidents of killings in Jammu & Kashmir.

STATEMENT AND DISCUSSION ON RECENT INCIDENTS OF KILLINGS IN JAMMU AND KASHMIR

THE MINISTER OF HOME AFFAIRS (SHRI L.K. ADVANI): Madam, Deputy Chairman, the Members are well aware that terrorist groups in Jammu & Kashmir have continuously showed total disregard for the yearning for peace and normalcy on the part of the people of Jammu & Kashmir, and did not respond positively to the Government's unilateral Ramazan peace initiative.

Following the withdrawal of Non Initiation of Combat operations, the security forces have stepped up operations against the terrorists. Significant