

to the Minister of Environment and Forests regarding the issue mentioned in Item No. 15 of the Special Mentions. ...*(Interruptions)*... The Hon. Minister had replied that ...*(Interruptions)*... The Hon. Minister had assured us that ...*(Interruptions)*... One minute please. ...*(Interruptions)*... I don't want to counter them. ...*(Interruptions)*... That is why I did not stand up then. Sir, we had given a memorandum to the Hon. Minister for Environment and Forests regarding the item mentioned at No. 15 of the Special Mentions. The Minister had given us an assurance...*(Interruptions)*... The Minister had given us an assurance that he had already constituted a Committee to enquire into the matter and to see that the interests of the fishermen are safeguarded. ...*(Interruptions)*... The Minister had given us an assurance that the concern of the fishermen would be addressed ...*(Interruptions)*... Thank you, Sir, for allowing me.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Now, it is seven minutes to one.

SHRI PRANAB MUKHERJEE: We can adjourn for lunch.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The House is adjourned till 2 O' clock.

The House then adjourned for lunch at fifty-three minutes past twelve of the clock, till two of the clock.

The House reassembled after lunch, at two minutes past two of the clock, the DEPUTY CHAIRMAN in the Chair.

SHORT DURATION DISCUSSION

International situation arising out of terrorists attack on WTC in USA leading to International intervention in Afghanistan, its impact on India and its ramifications and response of Government in regard thereto

DR. MANMOHAN SINGH (Assam): Madam, with your permission, I beg to raise a discussion on the international situation arising out of the terrorists attack on WTC in USA leading to international intervention in Afghanistan, its impact on India and its ramifications, and the response of Government in regard thereto. Madam, Lord Curzon once described Afghanistan as the cockpit of Asia. Big-power-rivalries in Afghanistan have always been a factor to reckon with because of its geo-strategic location. In recent times, the discovery of oil and gas in the Central Asian Republics, the fact that oil and gas pipelines may have to pass through Afghanistan, has further intensified the big-power-rivalries in and around Afghanistan. More recently, the tragic events of 11th September, 2001, in which nearly

5000 innocent lives were lost, and the role of the Taliban regime in Afghanistan in promoting, aiding and abetting international terrorism has once again focussed the world's attention on Afghanistan. Madam, international terrorism have been a subject of intense international concern even before the tragic events of September, 2001. And, in this context, I recall that the General Assembly of the United Nations, in its Resolution 49/60 of 9th December, 1994, adopted a declaration on measures to eliminate international terrorism. The Security Council, in its Resolution 1269 of 1999, adopted on 19th October, 1999, reaffirmed that suppression of acts of international terrorism, including those in which States are involved, was an essential contribution to the maintenance of international peace and security. The Security Council passed yet another Resolution on 19th December, 2000, in which it condemned the continuing use of areas of Afghanistan, under the control of Taliban, for sheltering and training of terrorists. It also noted that the Taliban provided safe haven to Osama Bin Laden, enabling him, and others associated with him, to operate a network of terrorist training camps from Taliban-controlled territory and to use Afghanistan as a base for sponsoring international terrorist operations. Furthermore, the Security Council adopted yet another Resolution on 30th July, 2001, in which it once again referred to the fact that the situation in Afghanistan constituted a threat to international peace and security in the region. Despite all these nefarious activities of the Taliban regime, the response of the international community, untill the tragic events of 11th September, was obviously far less than adequate. We, in our own country, have the experience of cross-border terrorism. We know that some of the terrorists who infiltrated into the Indian State of Jammu and Kashmir were trained in camps in Afghanistan. Our Government did bring all these things to the notice of the world community, but adequate attention was not paid to our concerns. And, then, came the tragic events of 11th September, and worldwide condemnation was the rule. Our hearts go out in sympathy to all those who suffered in that terrorist attack. As I said, over 5,000 people have lost their lives; their families deserve the sympathies of all right-thinking people, all over the world. Madam, the situation that has developed in Afghanistan since then is well known to all of us, and we have to fashion a response to the evolving situation in Afghanistan and in areas surrounding that country. Taking into account our essential national interest, first and foremost, it should be our endeavour to persuade the world community that what is happening in Afghanistan is only one act of the worldwide play which international terrorism has been indulging in. As I said, we ourselves

have been the victims of cross-border terrorism, but the world community has not taken adequate notice of our concerns. We recognise that in the present phase, which may be called Phase-I, the world community's attention has to be on Afghanistan, but we hope that that will not be the end of the matter; that the world community will take a truly global view of terrorism, wherever it exists, in whatever form it exists, and constitutes a threat to peace and security. Madam, it is, in this context, that we have to take note of what our Government have done, and what has been the response of the world community to our concerns. Soon after the tragic events of 11th September, our Government, as the entire people of India, conveyed their deepest sympathies and condolences to the people of the United States. Our Government also offered, according to newspaper reports, all possible help to build an effective coalition against international terrorism. Unfortunately, the response to this offer was somewhat far from enthusiastic. And, for reasons, which are well known to us because of the precise geographical location of Pakistan the US and its allies and other members of the coalition against terrorism thought it fit to placate Pakistan; and, as a result, the events of 11th September have led to a situation where Pakistan has once again emerged as a frontline State. Pakistan may have its compulsions, but it responded to the events of 11th September with speed, with determination, and, according to newspaper reports, Pakistan is now, once again, the beneficiary of large-scale flows of aid; its debt is being written off; apart from that, military supplies to Pakistan may also be resumed, not only from the United States, but from other developed countries as well. Of course, we do not grudge aid being given to Pakistan to re-build its economy, but if, once again, large-scale military assistance is given to Pakistan, the same thing can happen, as was the case when Pakistan, for the first time, emerged as a frontline State, at the time of the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan. At that time, we know that all those weapons which were given to Pakistan to fight the Soviets in Afghanistan were used against us in Jammu and Kashmir as well. So, we have to be alert. The Prime Minister has visited Russia recently. He has also visited the United States, and our Foreign Minister has been to be a number of other countries. We would all like to know from them how far the world community today shares our concern, that the fight against terrorism must not end with the control and with the dismantling of the *Al-Qaeda* network in Afghanistan, but that, terrorism, international terrorism ends here; particularly, what has been happening in the Indian State of Jammu and Kashmir should also be, equally, the concern of the world community. From

newspaper reports that we have been seen, it appears to us that the position of the world community on this problem of cross-border terrorism in Jammu and Kashmir is far from unambiguous. I know some pleasing, ambiguous, words have been used during the Prime Minister's visit, but the fact of the matter is that we have to reckon that while the world, including Pakistan, may have condemned the events of 1st October -- the massacre of 40 innocent lives in the attack on Jammu and Kashmir Legislative Assembly -- the major powers have refused to point to the source of that terrorist act that lies in Pakistan. The Attorney General of the United States may have recommended that Jaish-e-Muhammad and another organisation may be included in the list of terrorist organisations, but the two organisations have still not been declared formally by the State Department as terrorist organisations. The ambiguity persists and, whether we like it or not, during the recent visit of our Prime Minister as well as of Gen. Musharraf to the Western capitals, I think, there was a far greater media attention on what Gen. Musharraf said or did than what our Prime Minister said or did. In a way, it is somewhat odd that the Joint Communiqué issued by Gen. Musharraf and President Bush repeats Gen. Musharraf's call that India and Pakistan should once again, immediately, resume bilateral dialogue. That was, of course, the theme wherever the Prime Minister went. That was the theme in Russia; that was also the theme of the Prime Minister of the United Kingdom; but, for the first time, if I remember correctly, a Joint Communiqué issued by the President of the United States and the President of Pakistan makes a reference to the Jammu and Kashmir problem being resolved, taking into account the wishes of the people of Kashmir.

Madam, from all this, one thing is quite clear that we cannot be certain that after the present phase of dealing with the Taliban regime is over, the world community will necessarily turn its attention to areas which are of direct concern to us. We must, of course, persist in our effort, but we cannot be complacent. It is probably for this very reason that, at the conclusion of the Prime Minister's visit to the United States, hon. Jaswant Singh, the Minister for External Affairs, did state in a public statement that he would be happy if the US helped us in our war against terrorism, but our fight against terrorism will go on, even if the US did not help us. So, the first point I do wish to make is that, our concern should be to ensure that the world community is brought on board, that what is happening in Jammu and Kashmir is Pakistan-sponsored, aided and abetted naked international

terrorism. We must not lose any effort to carry conviction with the world community on this point.

Madam, the second thing that I wish to point out is: what is our interest with regard to the future set-up that may emerge, as a result of the demise of the Taliban regime in Afghanistan. We need a Government which will, of course, not allow the use of Afghanistan as a training ground for terrorists, and for their infiltration into India. We need a Government in Afghanistan, which is broad-based, which is neutral, which is non-aligned and which, as I said, will not allow, unlike the Taliban regime, the use of Afghan territory for perpetrating terrorist acts against India and other countries. In this matter some efforts are being made. I would like to know from the hon. Prime Minister and the External Affairs Minister the role that we are playing in ensuring that our concerns with regard to the post-Taliban phase are fully taken into account. Here again, I have to rely upon newspaper reports. We know that there is such a mechanism as 6 plus 2, and that this mechanism has been devised, with the blessings of Russia and the United States to work out arrangements for a post-Taliban phase and system of Government in Afghanistan. Newspapers have also reported that our Government's efforts to become a member of this mechanism have not succeeded and that this effort did not succeed even with President Putin. The United States also did not take kindly to the inclusion of India as a member of the 6 plus 2 mechanism. Of course, more recently, the United Nations has set up a group of 21. But I submit, Madam, to the Government that this 21 nations mechanism is not an adequate substitute for the 6 plus 2 mechanism. Therefore, it is very important that our Government should not give up our efforts to be actively involved in determining, together with other like-minded countries, the future of Afghanistan. We should be a part and parcel of the 6 plus 2 mechanism. Of course, if there is resistance, then, we should explore other avenues. We should talk to other members of the SAARC Group. We should involve the Non-Aligned Movement. We should be actively interacting with China. We should be actively interacting with Iran. I see, in this situation, that the Non-Aligned Movement can once again become a force for moral growth, for exercising its influence, in the interest of solid good governance being restored once again in Afghanistan. So, I do submit to the Government that they should seriously explore all possible avenues in relation to our concern, which is the concern of all, and which should be shared by the world community at large, of having a broad-based Government, a neutral Government, a non-aligned Afghanistan, an Afghanistan which will not be used in the future as a

base for training terrorists for infiltration into India and for indulging in terrorist acts against the rest of the world. I think this concern of ours should be the common concern of all the civilised countries. If the 6 plus 2 group does not take our concern on board, then, I think, we should explore all possible avenues to enlist the world's support for our point of view.

Madam, these are the two basic concerns of our country, and I do expect that when the hon. Prime Minister or the External Affairs Minister replies to the debate, he would enlighten us as to what exactly is being done to promote these concerns.

Madam, there are a few issues which arise out of what is happening in Afghanistan. There has been a concern about the growing use of nuclear, biological and chemical weapons by the terrorist groups. There have also been concerns expressed about the safety of the nuclear assets that are in the hands of Pakistan. There have been press reports that some soft members of Pakistan's Atomic Energy Commission have been, in the past, in touch with the Taliban regime. So, this is a great threat to humanity posed by the terrorist groups which has increased manifold. If these terrorist groups acquire access to nuclear weapons, fissionable nuclear material... and biological and chemical weapons. I would like to know from the hon. Prime Minister as to what action, concerted action, we are taking at the international level to deal with the situation and at the national level, what effective steps are being taken to protect our country's security against this type of threats.

Madam, with regard to the future set-up in Afghanistan, there has been a talk of bringing in the moderate elements of Taliban. Of course, our External Affairs Minister had thought that this was not a workable idea. He had pooh-poohed this concept. But newspapers have also reported that the hon. Prime Minister, in a Press statement in London, did state that the reformed or liberal elements of Taliban could become a part of the future set-up in Afghanistan. I would like the hon. Prime Minister and the hon. External Affairs Minister to enlighten the House as to what exactly the Prime Minister meant when he referred to "the reformed or liberal elements among Taliban being a part of any new set-up in Afghanistan".

Madam, I would further suggest this. Afghanistan, today, is passing through a very difficult phase. There are tribal animosities, tribal rivalries. The Northern Alliance has done well. It should be given all possible encouragement. But it is also essential that our Government should reach

out to the non-Taliban leaders in the southern part of Afghanistan and belonging to the Pushtun community. I compliment the Government for having taken the initiative to send a mission to Afghanistan for having established presence. But we need a far more pro-active policy in dealing with Afghanistan than we have pursued in the past. It is in this context that I submit to the Government that they should go out of their way in interacting with those Pushtun leaders who do not belong to the Taliban set-up and could, therefore, be important parts of a future set-up in Afghanistan.

Madam, in conclusion, I would like to say that the tragedy of Afghanistan is a tragedy which affects all of us. We are in South Asia and what happens in Afghanistan is a matter of deep concern to all countries of South Asia. The return of foreign armed forces in Afghanistan or anywhere in South Asia is a matter of deep concern to us in India. We should, therefore, work to ensure that this tragedy of Afghanistan can be brought to an end as soon as possible. Our heart goes out in sympathy to the innocent people, men, women and children, who have suffered as a result of the bombardment and hostilities that are now taking place in Afghanistan. We hope that this sorry and sad chapter in the history, the long and tortuous history, of Afghanistan, can be brought to an end very soon. And whatever can be done to provide humanitarian relief which would have a direct impact on the welfare of the people, the Government of India should take a lead in making the maximum possible contribution within, of course, our own resources to provide succour, relief and rehabilitation assistance to the people of Afghanistan.

Madam, one last point and that is with regard to the talks with Pakistan. I learnt from the newspapers that in his recent visit, wherever the Prime Minister went, whether he went to Russia or whether he went to the United States or whether he went to the United Kingdom, the common feeling of all the leaders in these countries was that India should resume discussions with Pakistan. The Prime Minister, of course, has been saying that there can be no discussion with Pakistan unless it stops cross-border terrorism. I respectfully submit to this Government that the Government have not pursued any consistent policy in this regard. The desire and the determination of the Government not to have talks with Pakistan was also mentioned last year, and then suddenly, we found that the ceasefire in Jammu and Kashmir was given up, and suddenly, an announcement was made to invite General Musharraf. At that time, one of the reasons that the

Prime Minister had mentioned to leaders of the Opposition for inviting General Musharraf was that there was international pressure that we should, at least, talk to Pakistan. My fear is that similar international pressure will once again build up, and that therefore, we should not be as ill-prepared for the resumption of these talks, as we were at the time of the Agra Summit. Therefore, we have to accept that sooner or later, the talks between India and Pakistan are inevitable, and therefore, when the occasion arises, we should be fully prepared for these talks. These are, Madam, some of the thoughts that I have on the tragic developments in Afghanistan, how they affect our national interests, and what our Government ought to be doing in order to protect those national interests. Thank you very much.

DR. L.M. SINGHVI (Rajasthan): Madam Deputy Chairman, I welcome the opportunity to reflect on the *suo motu* statement made by the Prime Minister, and the visit of the Prime Minister to four cities and three countries, particularly focussed on Afghanistan. I welcome also the reflections of my distinguished friend, the hon. Leader of the Opposition, who has voiced some of the concerns, which have been voiced in the Press generally. He has offered a broadly constructive approach in terms of our tradition of bipartisanship or multipartisanship on foreign policy issues, a great tradition of which we are proud. I am particularly happy that the hon. Minister for External Affairs told us that we are now in the process of establishing a mission in Kabul, and that is something, which is a parameter and index of the developments in the diplomatic field. We have this great tradition of the multipartisanship, and I think, it is that tradition which should be kept intact, it is that tradition which should be nurtured and strengthened, because, in International affairs, we draw our strength from the solidarity of the nation as a whole, in matters which concerns us all, and which decisions are arrived at in consultation with one and all. The visit of the Prime Minister to these four cities was, by common consent, a great success. It was a milestone in our foreign policy in recent years. It was an opportunity to renew old friendship and to reinforce our relationships with Russia, our traditional friend, and with U.S. and U.K., with whom we will have a common agenda in the global war and confrontation with terrorism. The Prime Minister's bilateral interactions in Russia, USA and UK and his Address to the United Nations General Assembly were focussed on terrorism, its global dimensions, the problem of Afghanistan and the future agenda of our country and the world as a whole, and the centre of that focus was India's national interest and its civilisational vision of the world. Moreover, the conjunction of events brought a measure of convergence

between the security concerns of India and the global anxieties, in the aftermath of the September 11 attacks. We have been committed to the peace process with Pakistan. I think our Prime Minister has gone more than many extra miles in making that peace process fructify. We have, if I may say so, pursued peace as if there is no situation of conflict, and, I hope, we must also pursue the fight against terrorism, as if there is no peace process, because it has to be understood that terrorism may not always listen to the language of friendship and amicable conversation. If I may say so, the world, as a whole, was face-to-face, on and after the 11th of September, and, for the first time, with the ugly hydra-headed reality of terrorism, which has been India's nightmare for almost two decades. Out of the tragic clouds of smoke and fire, emitted from the Twin Towers, came, I think, a silver lining for the world--and that silver lining was the perception of the United States and the perception of the world that terrorism was indivisible, that terrorism was a world-wide phenomenon, and not a mere local episode in one country, affecting one country. It seems to me that this may be the starting point of a new chapter in the history of humanity in tackling problems which give rise to values in establishing a new global world order in which several dialogues of civilisation would fructify and create a shared vision of the world, and I hope, Madam, that the United States' perception, which quickly became, because of the media especially, the perception of the world, there would now be an increasing momentum, both with regard to the problem which arose from Osama Bin Laden and with regard to terrorism which is a network and which is not to be found in one person or in one organisation, but in a network of organisations, in a network of individuals. Taliban is only, after all, a state of mind. It is, in fact, the twin problems of religious fanaticism on the one hand, and violence on the other, and, I think, if the world is to address this problem of terrorism, we would have to understand that, without a common agenda, without global togetherness, without a sense of purpose and a sense of mutuality and support, the battle against terrorism would remain only a battle in our time, for a day, for a week, for a month or for a few months, but not a battle for victory against terrorism. And it is that which is important. I think, that nightmare of terrorism, which we have faced for two decades, failed to dawn upon the world; it did not dawn upon the world in those years when we were facing it in a stoic manner. But it has now begun to dawn upon them. It is true that the Talibans were a creation of the illegitimate cohabitation between Pakistan and the United States which gave it funds and those funds flowed into the hands of Talibans. What was

meant to be *Talib-e ilm* became *Talib-e tashdud*. It became a movement of violence, and not a movement for knowledge of religious instruction. That is what happens when religious extremism and fanaticism, on the one hand, and violence and political objectives, on the other, are combined. That was Taliban-I which was born, bred and nurtured in Pakistan. Then, there was Taliban-II, which grew up in Afghanistan. That is why it is important for us to emphasise, as Dr. Manmohan Singh has rightly said, that it is not just in Afghanistan that the Taliban mentality has flourished. After all, it was exported from Quetta and Peshwar. It was nursed and nurtured, and given arms in these parts. That is why I share the concern which the Leader of the Opposition has voiced in respect of the huge amount of assistance given to Pakistan, not only a rescue package for their economic survival, but also with its propensity and potential of its use for purposes other than reconstruction of their economy. This is a great danger. In fact, we all know that money is a convertible commodity. You can convert that money into one thing or the other. It is a multi-purpose vehicle of doing something. Arms will be bought or arms may be bought. Monies may be diverted, and that is why our greatest concern is that Pakistan must be reined in. Yes, there was a period of time when they had to be placated. They were a frontline State. They rendered services, in terms of providing bases, and they have to be compensated for the services rendered. But the time has now come, in the aftermath of the fall of the Taliban regime in Afghanistan. I understand, that it is falling like a house of cards; one after the other. Kunduz has fallen. Kandahar, the last ditch battleground, remains. But the point is that, after the fall of the Taliban regime in Afghanistan, there is a greater responsibility for the US-led coalition to make sure that the monies that are given either as an incentive or as a recompense or as pin-money, if I may say so, are not used for nefarious ends, and that is where our diplomatic and national interest would lie.

I would like to make a point that the Talibans will not disappear just because of this operation in Afghanistan. The Talibans will go underground. They will be spread, and they will not just simply disappear. They will be there in many parts of Afghanistan and many parts of the world. My fear is that some of those who are coming into Pakistan would be positioned on our borders and near our borders. We have to take care that this does not become yet another nightmare or cross-border terrorism, another nursery for violence and terrorism. We have known all along that the Talibans were the offsprings of an affair of convenience when Pakistan

cohabitated with the United States in the fight against the Russian occupation.

But, I think, we also have to know that a new monster may be reared, a new monster may be born, and that monster is capable of being born if we consider and if we gauge public opinion in Pakistan today, if we gauge what has happened in Afghanistan, in terms of these Taliban, perhaps, not only hiding their equipments, but disappearing and then reincarnating themselves elsewhere. The problem then is that this pedigree, this traditional tendency of patricide, among these Taliban may turn to USA; may even turn to Pakistan. But we are endangered because this violence will be near our borders. Madam, for a long time, before Partition, Afghanistan had really shared a border with us. A long time before that, we shared a border, a very considerable border, with Iran because during the Mogul period, Afghanistan was very much under the control of he who ruled Agra or Delhi. Today, we have a situation where President Putin's remarks seem to be very apposite. I would like to quote the line that he said. He said, "The problem in Afghanistan was not the Taliban, it was Pakistan, the creator of Taliban". That is the statement which is candid and forthcoming which was made during the visit of our Prime Minister to Russia. President Putin blamed Pakistan for supporting those who fomented terrorism, and said, "We understood exactly how India felt about Kashmir and terrorism in Kashmir". He shared our point of view that moderate Taliban was merely a euphemism; or, as our Minister has, in a lecture, said an oxymoron, a contradiction in terms in simple words because a moderate Taliban is and will be hard to fight. The point, however, of this whole concept of moderate Taliban fielded by Pakistan is this. They wanted to make a last-ditch effort to breathe on the neck of Afghanistan by having a strong hand and control over the regime in Afghanistan. They wanted to prevent the Northern Alliance from taking Kabul. It is something which speaks more eloquently than any words can that Pakistan had made a demand and, for a moment, the USA seemed to concede their demand that the Northern Alliance will not be allowed to move into Kabul and take over Kabul. Even at that time I had felt that the USA, perhaps, had made too much of a concession by agreeing with Pakistan. I also felt that perhaps it was a statement only to appease Pakistan for a moment and that it was never meant genuinely. It is clear, Madam, that if the USA had insisted that the Northern Alliance cannot move into Kabul, it would have been a difficult situation for the Northern Alliance. Having facilitated their onward march, it was no longer possible for the USA to tell them that they cannot move

into Kabul. Their movement into Kabul was inexorable, unavoidable and unstoppable. And that this has happened despite Pakistan's very strong statements that it will not be allowed to happen, is a measure of the success that the coalition has achieved in so far as the attempts of Pakistan to capture power by proxy in Kabul are concerned. I think this is something which ought to be considered a landmark of success. During our Prime Minister's visit, this issue was discussed in considerable detail and depth. At that time, it was made clear that Russia shared with us the view that Taliban, moderate or otherwise, should have no hand in making the Government of Afghanistan. It is also clear that India should have a part to play in the future Government of Afghanistan. And those points having been considered by the very drift of events, one has to understand that Indian diplomacy has achieved a measure of success in what was our central objective. It was in the U.S.A. that our diplomacy was put to test. But it came out with flying colours. Madam, India is not a votary of a uni-polar world; but let us face the fact that the United States is much more than the first among equals in the international community. That is the reality we have to reckon with and, I think, it goes to the credit of the Government that they have taken that reality into account, in terms of making adjustments, in making policy perspectives of its own, in relation to the various issues that arise in relation to the United States. But I must say that while our relationship with the U.S. is a matter of great satisfaction and has a promise and potential which can be fulfilled, we must understand that our independence in foreign affairs remains intact and, this, the Government has striven to do. There is no bandwagon, which has yet been invented, on which India can be taken for a ride. We are very proud Indians and, I think, the long tradition of India's independence and autonomy have been preserved in a remarkable way. That is why though the Chief Executive of Pakistan returned with a handful of notes, with a very substantial assistance, estimated to be of the order of 1.3 billion dollars, our Prime Minister returned with our heads held high; our Prime Minister returned with our self-respect intact; our Prime Minister returned with a certain sense of India's own purpose, India's own agenda in international relations. That agenda is something with regard to terrorism. I think, the Prime Minister's statement has one proposition, and I wish to point it out that this is one of the outstanding, logical and diplomatic statements of clarity, of definiteness; he says, and I quote: "We have to reject our chain of unproductive arguments on the definition of international and State-sponsored terrorism or their root-causes. The universal revulsion against terrorism after the September 11

attacks should be exploited to single-mindedly destroy terrorism everywhere." I think, this is a very important statement, because there are cynics and there are intellectuals and, unfortunately, sometimes, they coalesce with each other, losing sight of the reality. My friend, Shri Eduardo Faleiro, knows that in diplomacy, academic considerations are important. But they cannot be controlling the reality; that has to be negotiated. In this case, it is important to remember that there are people who were trying to make an issue that you have to go into the causes of terrorism. Why? It was in order to eclipse the thrust in the war against terrorism. Therefore, this issue of causes became a whole statement of excuses, a kind of an apology for terrorists, and, I think, our country must understand that we cannot allow ourselves to fall in that intellectual trap of causes being converted into excuses, excuses being converted into justifications and justifications being converted into high moral ground. This is where, I think, we must establish an ideological base, and I think it is getting established, that terrorism is *per se* - Mr. Kapil Sibal will, I am sure, understand why I am saying *per se* - a crime against humanity. It is not that you have to say, "I have this justification for being involved in terrorism". Terrorism is, on its own, without anything more, a crime against humanity. And that is the great gain that is happening to us and to the world as a whole in terms of understanding terrorism.

The Prime Minister said that the terrorism might be difficult to define. In fact, it is not so difficult to define, although the international commission spent many years on trying to define it. Thanks to this visit of the Prime Minister, and the earlier efforts made by delegations of India in which members of different parties participated, we were able to contribute to the United Nations' jurisprudence very substantially with regard to the definition, with regard to the apprehension, the investigation, the prosecution and the punishment of the crime of terrorism. The only thing is, it did not make enough progress until the 11th of September. That speaks a lot for the way the minds of nations and individuals work. But that is no reason for us to say that since you did not do it then, we do not do it now. That is not the way. If they are coming to the position that we have held so long, we must welcome them and march along to establish an international legal framework for dealing with terrorism - a comprehensive treaty, which is binding on one and all; a system of extraditions which are granted without any exception. Many countries used to have this exception of 'freedom'; those who are fighting for the cause of freedom will not be extradited. When I had the occasion to negotiate our own extradition treaty, the first of

its kind, with the United Kingdom, and when they repeated the same condition, I said the treaty becomes meaningless for a country like mine unless you give up this condition. And it was given up. That extradition treaty with Britain today does not except the excuse of freedom as a cause for not extraditing a person who has committed violence. The strict liability with regard to the crime of extension is something which has to be enforced globally, and that is something which will come out as a result of all these deliberations.

I think, in the whole process, people are prone to compare, as our distinguished Leader of the Opposition was also prone to compare, the visits of General Musharraf and our Prime Minister. May I say this? Let us take it point by point. General Musharraf returned with a considerable amount of money, and the distinguished Leader of the Opposition was right in saying that we do not grudge them economic assistance, particularly in their present state of economy. But we must safeguard against the possibility of the use of those resources against us. Having said that, I must say that General Musharraf failed to obtain what was at the heart of his agenda. He failed to obtain F-16 planes. He wanted to obtain the combat planes known as F-16s. He failed to obtain them. They were not allowed to be given to him. President Bush did acquiesce in the entry of the Northern Alliance into Kabul, despite Pakistan's very strong and repeated opposition to it. They wanted, in effect, to internationalise Kashmir. This was their main agenda all along. Madam, what has happened is that terrorism itself has become internationalised. They have not succeeded in internationalising Kashmir. But terrorism has become internationalised. They have met with the same response that it is a matter between India and Pakistan to settle. Wherever they have gone, they have met with that same response. Therefore, they have gained not one centimetre of diplomatic ground in this respect.

I think it is also important that, in the ultimate analysis, we, in India, evolve a strategy to deal with terrorism and the threat of terrorism in our country with our own means. We cannot expect any other country to pull the chestnuts out of the fire for us; although, I think this new climate of opinion, this new movement against terrorism, this war against terrorism, will help us tremendously. For instance, organisation after organisation, which is functioning in Kashmir, have been outlawed or they have been blacklisted; their funds have been seized. This is needed to be done on a much larger

scale. Unless this is done, we cannot be assisted, in our own battle, in our own country.

SHRI PRANAB MUKHERJEE (West Bengal) : I think there is some background music. ...*(Interruptions)*...

DR. L.M. SINGHVI: I think, Mr. Kapil Sibal wanted to say something, but he did not get up. So, I would not yield to a Member who is...

SHRI NILOTPAL BASU (West Bengal) : I think what you are speaking is music to the ears of the Prime Minister. ...*(Interruptions)*...

DR. L.M. SINGHVI: I am happy to be accompanied by background music.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: It was somebody's cellular phone. I think the jammer which we have put in Parliament House is not working. So, we will find out.

SHRI SATISH PRADHAN (Maharashtra) : Madam, after every hour, my cellular phone gives an alarm. While switching off that alarm, that sound came. I am sorry for that.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Is it to wake us all? ...*(Interruptions)*...

DR. L.M. SINGHVI: Madam, may I say that many new developments have taken place, which are of far-reaching importance? There is a defence policy group in India which has been re-activated and will meet in December. We need to understand the new frontiers of diplomacy; we need to understand the new demands which diplomacy, multilateral and bilateral, make on us. I think, this is the great gain, that the Government of India has seized the opportunity the moment it has come to us. The discussions on bilateral economic relations have been very promising. There seems to have been many important gains, in terms of economic relationship with Russia, with United States, and I hope, with the United Kingdom. The Prime Minister, Mr. Tony Blair, was positive, and I think, they will continue to be positive, despite the constituency compulsions in that country, because international relations cannot be allowed to be controlled by some of these constituency compulsions.

What is important, Madam, is that the Prime Minister, in this short visit, found time to meet, apart from going to these four cities, including New York, and speaking at the United Nations -- in a way, he spoke for the nation as a whole; in a way, he articulated the concerns of the world as a

whole; in a way, he was able to formulate and conceptualise the entire strategy against terrorism in the world -- it is gratifying that he also visited and met the Indian diaspora. I think, this is an important resource which our diplomacy, our foreign policy, must fully utilise. The Indian diaspora, today, consists of more than 20 million people. Their annual income is equal to our GDP, as a whole nation, and they are the children of India who can be used to enhance our country's economic strength. May I say, in conclusion, Madam, that the visit itself was not hyphenated with Pakistan; and, in a sense, it was good? But since General Musharraf was visiting United States at the same time, people tended to compare, and they compared by what they saw on the television; they did not really take the balancesheet of gains and losses. I think, in that balancesheet, we have much to revel and thank our Prime Minister for.

I must also say that it has now become clear and I have always held that Pakistan needs to be exposed to the scrutiny of the world. I used to say to my friends from Pakistan who spoke against us, that if you don't stop telling lies about my country, then I have to tell the truth about yourself, and the truth will hurt you a great deal more.

I think, this is the time when we must expose the whole nefarious designs of terrorism in the world, how it eclipses the whole civilisation of humankind, how we are an endangered species, how constitutional governments and democracies would be at risk in the world, how the law and order would be at a risk in the world, how relationships between communities would suffer and be impaired, and how our own sense of unity in India and unity of humankind would be suffer a set-back. I think, Madam, this one visit, though a very short one, was with huge results. I do hope that the level of contacts with different countries would continue to be maintained, the dialogue would continue to be sustained; the Members of Parliament could be involved in that process, the diplomatic channels could be used more and more; because this is the time, in the aftermath of the Afghanistan events, when we are in a position to offer advice to Afghanistan, to the people of Afghanistan, to make their own fortune, in terms of constitutional integrity of their nation, in terms of federalism, in terms of how multi-ethnic communities have to live together through a constitutional framework. But, at the same time, we need to tell the world what pain and anguish terrorism has inflicted upon us for the last two decades, how it is as much a problem of the world as the Twin Towers

and the New York incidents were, and how international terrorism has to be dealt with internationally, and brooks no delay.

Thank you very much.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I think, when we are discussing terrorism, we should not forget the role of narco-terrorism, which played a very major role in Afghanistan, in the purchase of arms. We should focus on it because our country is a victim of narco-terrorism as well. A lot of narcotics have been passing through from the Pakistan borders into India.

SHRI NILOTPAL BASU (West Bengal): Thank you, Madam Deputy Chairman. At the outset, I would like to express our condemnation, in unequivocal terms, of what happened on 11th September. I would also like to say, totally and unequivocally, we are opposed to Taliban. We are opposed to all varieties of religious fundamentalism and sectarianism. I say this not because of the unsavoury references made in this House yesterday, but I say this with a degree of conviction. In the late 80's and the early 90's, the Left had forewarned the nation and the world on the danger of perpetrators, forces like Taliban, using the plank of Islamic fundamentalism to fight the so-called war of liberation that was being staged in Afghanistan. But, unfortunately, at that point of time, the mainstream political parties in this country, and the world at large, were euphoric about the triumph and victory of the forces of liberation and democracy in Afghanistan. Therefore, in terms of opposing Taliban, in terms of opposing fundamentalism, I speak with a conviction which is time tested and which has foreseen what is going to happen to this world once we nurture forces like them. I would say this, notwithstanding the fear of being branded a cynic or an intellectual, as Mr. Singhvi says, though I know I am treading a very dangerous ground because the ground is quite slippery inspite of the rough surface after Mr. Singhvi's speech, in the statement of the Prime Minister which we heard day before yesterday, on page 3, the Prime Minister states, "There can be no political, economic or ideological justification for terrorism." Now as a formulation this is unexceptionable. All of us agree. But the difficult is that there is a simplistic implicit conclusion sought to be drawn out of this, which has been elaborated by Mr. Singhvi. The converse is not true that while fighting terrorism you cannot overlook the ideological, economic and social roots of terrorism. So this is with a very, I think, conscious sleight of hand by whoever has drafted this statement. This formulation has been made to snuff out any proper, intensive and rigorous scrutiny of the concept of terrorism. It is very important for us to realise this because we are fighting

terrorism and not the terrorists. If we are fighting terrorists, there can be certain aspects which can be disregarded. When this is a fight against terrorism as being claimed by the self-proclaimed leaders or representatives of the global community, I think, we have to go into the ideological, economic and political roots of terrorism. I say this with a greater conviction after the 11th September events. Now I will just cite one small example. Now, Mr. Tony Blair, the Prime Minister of the United Kingdom, has been perhaps more vocal than President Bush in this campaign against terrorism or in this war against terrorism. When he was visiting the Middle East countries, the Al Jazeera Television which is now stated to have outdone the CNN or some of the Western channels was interviewing Mr. Blair. Anyone of us can look at that interview because it is put on the official website of the British Prime Minister, 10 Downing Street. The Al Jazeera interviewer is raising questions about the history of American intervention in the Middle East. He refers to what happened in Iraq, he refers to what happened in Lebanon, he refers to what happened in Palestine and then asks, "Mr. Prime Minister, don't you think that you have to address the alienation of the Arab people to the people of the developing countries of this world? You have to make this an integral part of your fight against terrorism." Mr. Blair retorts back and says, "Can all those things be a justification for what happened on 11th September?" The anchor who is interviewing Mr. Blair says, "Mr. Blair, no, we are not justifying it. But Mr. Blair, you cannot say that, who, by aiding and abetting the Zionist terrorists have created Israel and made thousands and thousands of Palestinians lost their homeland and become refugees..."

Our Foreign Minister had stated that there can be no justification for the strikes of 11th September. Therefore, we have a moral right to say this. And, significantly, Madam Deputy Chairman, I would like to draw the attention of Mr. Singhvi to the development that took place after Mr. Tony Blair went to England. He publicly announced that Palestinian State is something on which the Western world would have to take a re-look. Therefore, the problem of taking this holier-than-thou attitude is that, you end up in exercising self-delusion. What has been the experience of fighting terrorism in this country? Forget about the Congress regime. Even here, I can quote umpteen number of statements by the Government, when we talk of fighting the terrorists in the North-East, when we talk of fighting the terrorists in Kashmir, when we talk of fighting the terrorists in Punjab, or elsewhere in the country. There is a complex and multiple dimension in the fight against terrorism.

DR. L.M. SINGHVI: Will you please yield for a minute?

SHRI NILOTPAL BASU: Yes, I will yield.

DR. L.M. SINGHVI: When you address the cause of alienation, you are doing the right thing. But when you make causes into excuses, and excuses into justification, you are doing the wrong thing. The Prime Minister's statement says, "It is not a justification." It does not say that we should not look into the cause of alienation or address the causes of alienation.

SHRI NILOTPAL BASU: I think my English is very poor, compared to Mr. Singhvi's. ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI KAPIL SIBAL (Bihar) : He is Dr. Singhvi, not Mr. Singhvi.

SHRI NILOTPAL BASU: Okay, okay. Really, I am not an intellectual. I am also very poor in assigning titles to people. So, I will immediately concede that my English is really poor. But I also did not say that. I agree with the Prime Minister, in so far as the statement is concerned. But what I am reading in this is that, if you make a statement without a subsequent qualification, that to fight terrorism you need to address those categories, you are making a mistake. Therefore, the Prime Minister's statement falls in the category of अश्वत्थामा गजः हतहा

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: For those persons like me who do not know Sanskrit, you explain what you said in Sanskrit.

SHRI NILOTPAL BASU: I don't think Mahabharata is the exclusive prerogative of the BJP Benches. ...*(Interruptions)*... We consider Ramayana and Mahabharata as the two great epics of this country. But we don't misuse epics as historical evidence for whipping up passion in the country, bashing and killing people. ...*(Interruptions)*... No, I am saying that the unstated part should have been stated. Without that, a discussion of the nature that we are having here is incomplete, and will lead us into a very, very dangerous trap. Now, having said that, we should go into the genesis. Why we say this? Because the incident of 11th September is really a very, very serious warning signal to all of us. You tell me. Mr. Jaswant Singh was also the Minister of Defence for quite sometime. I know he will have difficulty in sharing many of the classified intelligence inputs that he may have been given. But the way the whole thing happened... What kind of planning went into the strikes of 11th September? What was the security and intelligence network in the United States?

This is quite a serious thing. Now, how do you go about anticipating and fighting these kinds of things? Because, even if you go by the narrow, military and strategic requirements of fighting terrorism, you cannot stop terrorism; you have to constantly pre-empt the terrorists. These plans were going on for two years. What was happening? I read a speech by Fidel Castro. I think a lot of people may have antipathy towards Fidel Castro. But he speaks...*(Interruptions)*... no; no, I am not looking at you. My point is Fidel Castro was speaking to the Cuban people on 12th September, 2001. He was explaining the approach of the Cuban Government and the Cuban people towards the events of 11th September. He said, 'Our heart bleeds for those innocent people who have been killed in the WTC attack. Why is this happening?' He went on record further, saying, 'We have sent a detailed list of 800 terrorists groups functioning on the American soil, and 400 of them are armed.' If you go into the history of what happened to the school of America located in Panama, functioning from 1946, and teaching military and strategic things to the people, you will find that it turned out to be a nursery for terrorists. In 1984, when the Panama Government kicked out the school of America, it got re-established in one of the American States. And who are the graduates from that school? All those hated tinpot dictators and people who have staged coups in different countries of Africa and Latin America are its graduates. Now, unless you are ideologically committed to fight terrorism, can you really play a role?

We were hearing very frequently about the global concept of democracies during this entire episode. I think the global concept has become a little bit bitter. And it is not producing the kind of symphony, which our Government was, perhaps, wanting to hear. Because you cannot, for whatever geographical or strategic reasons, have Pakistan participate in that global concern. It is not possible. If we look at the history of Americans, in terms of their foreign policy, I think, Dr. Singhvi's speech was a classic example in self-delusion. I don't say that you have to go hammer and tongs against the Americans. But, at least, be realistic and be practical in facing the situation. Yes; America is a super-power. We cannot wish off that reality. But, at the same time, if we are opposed to unipolarism, while we are dealing with a super-power, we will try to create conditions and processes which makes this world a multi-polar world rather than a uni-polar world. Now, where is that effort? What has been the approach of the Government? Now, you say that there is no need to go into all these ideological, political, historical and cultural nitty-gritty to fight terrorism. How

can you say this? It was said immediately after 11th September. Is it not a fact? Definitely, our Ministers and our Government will bear me out that various explicit enquiries have been made by the American Administration.

About the possibility of going to Iraq; about the possibility of going to Yemen. These are documented in the contemporary literature and newspapers coming out in America itself. And during the Gulf war, various questions were raised by the American media on this issue. How can we overlook this? In one of the BBC interviews, while replying to a question that, as a result of your policy, 5 lakh Iraqi children died, as they were not getting medicines; they were not getting the things required for living, the then Secretary of State Madeline Al Bright said, "This is a collateral damage which is the price for democracy in Iraq." Do you think such statements will not create terrorists? Because of the havoc that has developed in Afghanistan, today, the children are dying. Of course, we are opposed to terrorism. We want terrorism and the Taliban to go. But, I would like to ask through you Madam, Dr. Singhvi, the Prime Minister and the Foreign Minister. We have seen photographs in newspapers, of innocent children, old, infirm, who had nothing to do with Taliban, who had been marginalised, who had been persecuted by the Taliban during the last six years. Is it a war against terrorism? Therefore, I think, India, as a nation, has to take a broader view. I feel quite tragic that in a country where the first Prime Minister was Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru -- and perhaps, we, the Left, had the biggest of fights with him-- I had to recall Nehru because we are bringing our foreign policy down to the level of competing with Pakistan -- we are trying to see how far close we can get to the Americans. If this is the sum and substance of our foreign policy, I am very sorry. Shri Jaswant Singh will tell me -- he knows foreign policy better-- hon. Pranab Mukherjee was also Minister of External Affairs -- I am not good at history; I was born much later and, also, I did not get the opportunity-- during the Press Conference held by Robert Blackwill, he went public with the things even before the Indian Parliament came to know about them. Because, after that, I went carefully through the statement of the Prime Minister-- the wide range of subjects where the US and India will have strategic interests. I am a Member of the Defence Standing Committee. When we ask for information of this nature, we are told, this is a classified information; we cannot share it with the Standing Committee. But, the American Ambassador goes overboard with such information; he goes public with all these things even before the Indian Parliament comes to know of them. Is this the way we secure our national interests? Frankly speaking, I have my

doubts. You can call me a cynic; you can say that I am indulging in intellectual masturbation...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI PRANAB MUKHERJEE: Today, what is happening in the House, Madam. We are hearing colorful languages...*(Interruptions)*....

SHRI BALBIR K. PUNJ (Uttar Pradesh) : Madam, this word is unparliamentary. It should be removed...*(Interruptions)*...

श्री राजीव शुक्ल (उत्तर प्रदेश) : ये शब्द निकलवा दीजिए, मैडम। ...*(व्यवधान)*...

SHRI KAPIL SIBAL: It should be cohabitation.

SHRI NILOTPAL BASU: I am sorry if I have hurt the sensibilities and sensitivities of some of the hon. Members. I completely withdraw this word. It could be 'intellectual futility.'

So, Madam, the point is, we have to see to these linkages. Now, Dr. Manmohan Singh was just hinting that he has doubts about what the Americans would do *vis-a-vis* the Pakistanis. But it is very clear as to what they are going to do. It has gone on record in so many interviews. Mr. Colin Powell visited India only to balance the things. India has come on the margin! And why not? The Americans have maintained relationship with Pakistan for so many years; I mean, this is not a new relationship. I do not know why our foreign policy mandarins are suddenly full of surprise and behaving in a wide-eyed disbelief? From the days of the Baghdad, CENTO and SEATO Pacts, it is pretty much clear. For one thing, you cannot find fault with the Americans. They are very candid. They say, "We do not have any permanent friends or enemies; we have only permanent interests. So, at a given point of time, whosoever is serving to advance our interest, we will go with him." I think, we have really acted like a bunch of naive school girls.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Why girls, why not boys?

SHRI NILOTPAL BASU: Also boys, Madam; if that addresses your gender concern, I have no problem.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: It does. ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI NILOTPAL BASU: But whether it is a boy or a girl, it remains a naive creature. That is what is important.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Nilotpai Basu, I object to all those abuses which are gender-biased. ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI NILOTPAL BASU: No; no, Madam, I am not saying that. What I am saying is that I am a person who is totally gender-neutral in my thinking ...*(Interruptions)*... in terms of my formulations. ...*(Interruptions)*...

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I thought only the Chair is gender-neutral!

SHRI NILOTPAL BASU: Madam, when this happened on 11th September, I quote what our Prime Minister had said. He said, "We stand ready to cooperate with you in the investigations into this crime and to strengthen our partnership in leading international efforts to ensure that terrorism never succeeds again." It is fine. But what happened, Mr. Prime Minister, when the first part was totally ignored, and the Americans went straightway into the second phase of the action? Why I am saying this is because this is very important. I agree with Dr. Singhvi that terrorism, by its very nature, is opposed to democracy, is opposed to civilised laws. Therefore, terrorists can afford to act in complete disregard of law, but can the human civilisation, democracies, afford to do so? Tell me this. Why I am saying this is because, there are umpteen numbers of legal examples by which it can be proved that Americans had actually acted in Afghanistan in utter violation of the existing international law. We do not know about it. We have not got the firsthand information from Americans. Maybe, the Government is having that information. We will be happy to have that information shared. But our source of information is the British Website which has shared 70 paragraphs of what it thinks is conclusive evidence to link *Osama-Bin-Laden* to the 11th September's strikes. How do they preface the presentation of that evidence? They candidly admit that this is not admissible in a court of law.

Ten days before the American representative at the United Nations, Richard Nikeponte, claimed that they had the UN sanction, the Chief National Security Advisor of the US, Ms. Condoleeza Rice said: "We do not care for UN sanction or mandate. What we want to do, we can do it unilaterally." This is a very dangerous situation we are placed in. Can the country of Nehru afford to take a position that we are taking into account the super-power status of the United States and we care little if the global democracies and even the United Nations are marginalised? Can we take this position? We could have tried to talk with all the nations, for activating the United Nations. There was no statement from the Government on this score. Now there is every possibility of re-inventing ourselves in the new situation. I completely agree with Dr. Manmohan Singh that because of the

historical circumstance, when the Cold War has ended, the Non-Aligned Movement faces a completely new context. Moreover, the whole question of terrorism being spelt out by the Americans is also because of this situation. Everybody knows of the Project Tax, where the President of America authorised the CIA agents to go into countries and kill their leaders. How is it that all progressive Arab regimes, which had nationalist leaders, were assassinated by the CIA apparatus? And you completely ignore the entire historical genesis to fight terrorism today. Is it possible? Therefore, the question of re-inventing the Non-Aligned Movement to rally the developing countries is all the more relevant.

Today, the difficulty is that the Americans do not have the Soviet spectre to justify what they are doing. Therefore, what is the solution? They are trying to project as if they are over-reacting on terrorism. While saying this, please note that I am not holding any brief for terrorism. Whenever, wherever and however they function, we have to fight it. But, at the same time, the spectacle of the entire Cold War period is sought to be re-enacted in justifying what they are doing. The Non-aligned Movement may not be there. India will have no role to play in re-inventing the Non-Aligned Movement, in this context. We are feeling uncomfortable because America is not castigating Pakistan for its role in Jammu and Kashmir in the manner they should have done. American complicity is only to this extent. Can the Indian Parliament discuss it in that manner? Or, do we have a larger global role to play? I say this because we saw it in Doha very recently. The Indian Government found that though it tried to put up a fight, it could not do so in the manner it should have done, because all the developing countries could not be rallied, because the task of unifying and rallying together the developing countries against this kind of super-power hegemony cannot be fought in one sector alone. Unless you are consistent over the whole range of issues, you cannot earn the confidence of the developing countries. It is very significant. Pakistan, of all the countries, was demanding from the Americans that India and Israel should be kept out of the global war on terrorism.

So, this is the status we have earned through whatever policy measures we have undertaken. I think this is a very serious situation. Then, what has happened, after that letter from the Prime Minister? The Cabinet Committee on Security met on 13th September and decided to offer all cooperation and facilities for any U.S. military operation, in pursuit of the culprits of the carnage in the U.S. How was the Government confident that

the carnage was perpetrated by Bin Laden or Al-Qaeda or Taliban? I am not saying that they did not do it. But how were you convinced that they have done it? You have to tell us. What was the evidence before you, on the basis of which you went in for this great pronouncement?

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Basu, how long you are going to speak, because your time is over?

SHRI NILOTPAL BASU: Madam, it is a very important subject which you have considered. I think I will ...*(Interruptions)*... I am representing a completely new view of the events. So, considering that, whatever directions you give me, I will abide by that.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I am only a time-keeper.

SHRI NILOTPAL BASU: I am also very loyal Member, always acting in deference to the wishes of the Chair. But I think the nature of the issue demands that I be allotted more time

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Can I give it from the time of the Congress Party or the BJP?

SHRI NILOTPAL BASU: That is your prerogative. Even to comment on that is a reflection on the Chair.

श्री सुरेश पचीरी (मध्य प्रदेश) : जब सत्ता पक्ष की काफी चीजों का जिक्र कर रहे हैं तो उन्हीं का समय लिया जाए।

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: It will be better if you try to conclude as soon as possible.

SHRI NILOTPAL BASU: Of course, an effort will be there.

Now, the Foreign Minister has stated at a press conference, "There have been contacts at all political, executive and operational levels about this." In that press conference he was specifically asked, "What does that mean?" He said, "India would provide logistic help and staging ground for U.S. military operations." As if not to leave anything to chances, he also added, "The Prime Minister's letter is explicit, without ambiguity and the offer is unconditional." I think the establishment was generally euphoric on the 12th and 13th September, that the good old days have returned that after bashing of Taliban by America, they would straightway come to Peshawar and other places and would take care of Pakistan. This has not happened because our entire strategic policy set up is packed with people

who, I am sorry to say that, cannot see any critical aspect of the Government's policy like Dr. Singhvi. They were complete in their appreciation for what the Government was doing. They were not trying to see what could be the practical consideration which will inform American intervention in Afghanistan. Sycophants may sound very well at some point of time. But if you take up the policy structure with sycophants alone, then, you are in for trouble. One of the classic examples of this is; Mr. K. Subrahmanyam who is the Chairman of the Security Advisory Board, wrote in a newspaper, I quote : "The World Trade Centre towers was chosen since its destruction would hit three nationalities which the Jihads hate, Americans, Israelis and Indians and cause large casualties among them."

Unfortunately, our administration was also a victim of Samuel Huntington's theory. What did Samuel Huntington, revered professor of political science at the Harvard University, say, "Roughly, there are 8 civilisations.

And, in the post cold-war period, the major events in the development of history will take place through the clashes of those civilisations which is now known as the clash of ignorance. People are saying that. He said that the main war would be between the western civilisation and the Islamic civilisation. Now, that suits everybody. Fine. I read the Organizer editorial speaking in the same language, exactly same language. Mr. Prime Minister has written in his statement that this is not against any religion. What do we hear from the Chief Minister of Uttar Pradesh, Shri Rajnath Singh? "If POTO fails here, tomorrow, we will bring it in Uttar Pradesh." ...*(Interruptions)*... We are not discussing POTO here. This is a reference. I am not digressing. Sorry. I am not yielding.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: At least, you will have to yield to the Chair.

SHRI NILOTPAL BASU: Madam, I have almost come to the quite penultimate stages of my submissions.

My point is that you cannot ignore the fact that from the literature which is coming out from the BJP, from the RSS, from some of the organisations, it seems that an attempt is being made to polarise the Indian society as much as Huntington proposed, as much as Bin Laden complimented the Huntington theory, saying that 'this is an attack on Islam'. Therefore, we have to steer clear of these ideological distortions. And we have to go--whether you like it or not, Dr. Singhvi,--into the

historical genesis of terrorism. We have to go into the architecture of the contemporary global, political, economic and ideological relations.

DR. L.M. SINGHVI: You must move on, not just remain in the historical genesis.

SHRI NILOTPAL BASU: Yes, we are trying to move, we are trying to change this unipolar world. The Government must also do that. As you stated, the Government is committed to oppose unipolarism. Of course, you have punctuated your observation with the other observation that America is the first among equals. ...*(Interruptions)*... More than the first. I really thank you for correcting me. I stand corrected.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Please conclude now.

SHRI NILOTPAL BASU: I am concluding, Madam.

Therefore, I think this debate, discussion, will have any meaning if there is real introspection into Indian Foreign Policy. That is the only thing.

Secondly, our contacts, all those points, Dr. Manmohan Singh, made with others, on how we can have a broad-based democratic Afghanistan, all that we should try. But, first of all, we should mend our own home and start some serious introspection because I think, never before, the Indian Foreign Policy thinking, the Indian Strategic Policy thinking, was as disgraced as during the last 70 days, post-September 11 strikes. Thank you.

उपसभापति : कृपया समय का ध्यान रखिए, 18 मिनट हैं।

SHRI K.M. SAIFULLAH (Andhra Pradesh): I am always within the time, Madam.

Madam Deputy Chairman, now, this discussion is being done with regard to terrorism and Afghanistan. Before we discuss terrorism and Afghanistan, we must answer ourselves whether we are powerful enough to eradicate terrorism within India. On that, I can say a few words. In my view, there is no iota of doubt that Bin Laden is a terrorist, born fundamentalist. There is no iota of doubt about it as far as my personal view is concerned.

We are supporting the U.S.A. because it is a powerful country. Every country is extending help to them. Every country is saying that they stand by the United States of America in this hour of crisis. They are going

to help America. Is it not a fact that Bin Laden was the creation of the United States of America? His hands were strengthened by the U.S.A., he was financed by the U.S.A., some arms were given to him by the U.S.A. just for their selfish ends, in order to bifurcate the Soviet Union and create Uzbekistan, Tazhakistan and so on out of the U.S.S.R. They are responsible for all these things. Ultimately, Bin Laden came to Afghanistan. He took shelter in Afghanistan, and he promoted terrorism among the Taliban, and ultimately, Pakistan used the Taliban people to spread terrorism in Kashmir. This is a vicious circle of terrorism which was abetted by the U.S.A., and further reinforced by Bin Laden. The menace of terrorism has spread to India, especially, Jammu and Kashmir. When the vicious circle of terrorism is going on, we are talking about eradicating terrorism from our country. The United States of America must feel sorry for what has happened there on 11th September, 2001 in which a lot of innocent people have died, to whichever caste or religion they belonged. Innocent people have died in Afghanistan, innocent people are dying in Jammu and Kashmir. For all these terrorist acts, America is responsible. It should be regarded as the first terrorist. The second terrorist is Bin Laden. The third terrorist is the Taliban people. They have fomented the trouble. So far as Pakistan is concerned, it has always been inimical to India. They are making use of the Taliban people against India. When all these things are going on, what is the use of supporting one side, criticizing the other side and talking about the world politics? Let us put our house in order first. We are not so powerful. When we talk about terrorism in the Parliament, what do the Indian people think about us? My personal view is that the Parliament and the Indians are talking about the terrorism prevailing in the world when they are unable to eradicate terrorism from their country. For instance, Shri Rajiv Gandhi was assassinated by a terrorist from Sri Lanka. Did you have guts to wage war against Sri Lanka? Have you been able to catch the culprit till today? We are talking so boldly about eradication of terrorism from our country. When Rajiv Gandhi went to Sri Lanka, he was hit by a rifle butt by one soldier. Was any action taken by the Sri Lankan Government against him? What has happened to that case? I do not know. We are not able to catch a small gangster called Veerappan in our country and we are talking of wiping out terrorism from our land. So, this is our fate. We are talking about the world terrorism and the people are laughing at us. Whatever it may be, my suggestion is that ...*(Interruptions)*...

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Even your colleagues are laughing.

SHRI K.M. SAIFULLAH: I am making them laugh. The hon. Prime Minister, Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayeeji, is here. We do not know as to how long you will remain, Sir. We wish you a long life. But during your time, you must come forward and settle the problem of communal tension. If this problem of communal tension is settled, everything will be all right in India. This problem has been the root cause of creating terrorism within India. If you are able to solve this problem, then automatically, the mujahideen and other fundamentalist groups will go away from India. If you are able to bring Hindus, Muslims and Christians together in India, a lot of problems will automatically be over. We are fighting amongst ourselves for the sake of votes, by creating a division among various castes and religions. If we join hands together, we will become so strong that nobody can stay on in India against our wishes. They will leave the country on their own. We are giving them chance here to participate in all these things. Some Imam from Delhi--I do not know him personally-- has been saying that this is a holy war. Who is he to say this? I have not seen him, I am also sorry to refer to what the VHP people have said. They said: "We are not going to care about the Supreme Court orders. We are going to construct the temple." Some one has been saying and it has come in the newspapers also that the Hindus and the Christians are one, and they will wage a war against the Muslims.

SHRI JIBON ROY (West Bengal): They are complementing each other.

SHRI K.M. SAIFULLAH: What is this, Madam? All these things are going on when we are in power! If we keep quiet, all these youths who are unemployed, who have no food to eat, who have no work to do, will be misled. We are abetting them to terrorism. Their condition has to be improved. Madam, I know that everybody whosoever is in power, has got some difficulties in strengthening the relationship with these fundamental organisations. But the Government must come forward. They reform them or adjust with them. This fighting will not remain for ever. For instance, I tell you that when the Supreme Court Order is in force, somebody trespassed into the Ayodhya site and a case was registered under 186. What is 186, Madam? Under 186, it is a non-cognisable offence. What is a non-cognisable offence? For a non-cognisable offence, the police have no power to arrest. Simply, a policeman can write it in the case diary and ask the Magistrate whether he has to register it and whether he has to book it or not. So, we should not show leniency to whichever case they belong. You book those people, you book those boys; book everybody, but get

peace to India. Section 144 is there. What is section 144? What is section 30 of the Police Act? Five or more than five people join together unlawfully to enter into a restricted area. You keep 386. The perfect sections are 353, obstruction in the discharge of official duty. You keep 148. You keep 149. You keep all cognisable offences under those sections. Or, you settle down. I pray to the Prime Minister of India to take bold steps and solve the Ayodhya issue. People are vexed with this, and everybody is fighting on these versions--the Al-Qaeda, Jamat-e-Islami--I do not know their names; they are all appearing in the newspapers. Let us sit together and discuss it. You take the credit and solve it somewhere else. I do not know how you are going to solve it. It is a very difficult task for you, but try to do it. You will be credited throughout your life-time if you solve it. Even after death, people will remember you, "You are the man who did it!"

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Why do you make such a wish?

SHRI K.M. SAIFULLAH: No, no; there is such a bad atmosphere. Madam, after this Afghanistan War, after this bloody war, with which we are not concerned, being Muslims, if we go somewhere and mention Muslim names, we are being suspected! For remaining in India. I can say, to avoid terrorism. Just believe Indian Muslims and other people. They will be namak halal, but they will never be namak haram; they will be for the country. On behalf of the Muslims, I can assure you they will never betray India. Of course, there may be some persons; we will rectify them. Let us promote our country. That is my personal aim. Also, people are commenting in the newspapers, "No, no, the issue is not the Terrorist Act. It is only vandalism!" I know how terrorists come into existence. First rioting, next casteism, next communal riots, next fanaticism, and, finally, go to terrorism. You cut short in the earlier stage. Do not give other names to protect them. So, my only request to the Government is, first get ourselves strong to fight terrorism. And, then, be alert against Pakistan because Pakistan gave help to America; naturally, the USA will also be helpful to Pakistan. After this war, Pakistan may wage a war against India with their support. We must be alert on this. See the United States of America. Madam, when the then President, Mr. Clinton, came here and addressed the Joint Parliamentary Session, twelve or thirteen people were massacred in Jammu and Kashmir. When it was brought to the notice of the then President, Mr. Clinton, he said, "It is your internal matter. आपस में बात करिए आप, मेहरबानी करके। What is this? When you are attacked, it has become a world affair! When our people died in Jammu and Kashmir, he

said, "You talk between yourselves". So, this is very bad. But I appreciate the Prime Minister of India who has visited the foreign countries in order to bind our relationship with them so that they may not forget about Pakistan. We have to safeguard the interests of Jammu and Kashmir. We have to better our relationship with the United States and the United Kingdom. The Prime Minister of India has taken pains to visit those countries. He has made good efforts. I hope that he would do the same in respect of other things also. Then only our country will prosper. Thank you.

SHRI EDUARDO FALEIRO (Goa): Madam Chairperson, may I, at the outset, join the previous speakers to mourn the death of thousands of innocent people on September 11? I am sure, every Member of this House and every citizen of the country would condemn this barbaric and terrorist attack of September 11 in New York and Washington where thousands of innocent people died. It could be me; it could be you; it could be our children; it could be our relatives because there are so many of them in New York. It could be anyone. Therefore, we must really mourn their death in that tragic incident.

Having said that, I would like to place before this House and submit very strongly that in the actions that have now been taking place against Afghanistan thousands of innocent people died. Afghanistan, as you know, is one of the most miserable countries in the world. If anybody travels around the world, he may find that Afghanistan is one of those countries which are so impoverished and in dire circumstances. But there is hardly any other country which is in a worse situation and, therefore, as a retaliation, thousands of innocent people are dying in Afghanistan. I would like to submit before this House that the attack that is now being carried out by the United States and its coalition forces against Afghanistan, which started in October, is not just an act of revenge. Great powers and matured countries do not act on the feelings of revenge. Big and matured countries go to war as the last resort to meet the national objectives. If Osama bin Laden is the man who has to be brought to book, if the Israelis could get the Nazis, the perpetrators of atrocities, by going into other countries, if so many people could be assassinated by the powers that we are talking about in recent times, there is no question that Osama bin Laden should be brought to book without killing thousands of innocent people in Afghanistan, as it is happening at this point of time. It is war against the Taliban. The Taliban was created by the United States and Pakistan to destroy the Soviet Union. Now, we find a fundamentalist country. This is

one of the most barbaric countries. It is, perhaps, the most barbaric regime of all the barbaric regimes that Afghanistan has witnessed. No tears are shed over the demise of the Taliban, whatever one may think about it. Some may think that he has really gone down in the history of Afghanistan and there is no way that it could be resurrected. Therefore, I want to place before this House that this war is to reshape the new world order. The new world order that arose after the Iraq war did not produce the required or desired results. There are problems on the economic front. As far as the WTO is concerned, there is a lot of resentment among many countries, among many great powers. The WTO is not producing the results which it is expected to. Therefore, the reshaping of the new world order will bring about many other things--the presence of super powers in this region, as has been stated by the policy-makers of the United States. It is going to be, and I quote, "a long and sustained campaign". It means that it is going to be a long and sustained presence of the great powers in this region.

[THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI T. N. CHATURVEDI) In the Chair]

Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, you will recall that Rudyard Kipling -- this is not a new thing in Afghanistan -- had spoken almost 100 years ago about the great game of Afghanistan. Now Afghanistan has really been the country chosen by the great powers who operate in this region, by the imperial powers of the time to use a modern expression to give strategic depth to the ambitions of the great powers in Asia. Therefore, the British were the first to protect the East India Company. The Czar of Russia went there and did not succeed. Napoleon himself tried to go there because Afghanistan was really the key to Central Asia and in fact the entry point to India which at that point of time was perceived as a country of immense riches and a country that would give access to the warm waters of the Indian Ocean. Today things have changed. Today basically the economic interests are at stake. Therefore, it is the politics of oil that dictates the great powers to once again be in control of Afghanistan. This is not a civilizational conflict. This is not a clash of civilisations. This is not a struggle against Islam. Sir, I was in Bosnia during the civil war in Yugoslavia. I can say that, but for the USA, but for the NATO, the Bosnians or the Muslims of Yugoslavia would really have disappeared by now and the ethnic cleansing would have succeeded. I must admit that due to the USA and due to the action of NATO, at that point of time Bosnia was really saved from complete ethnic cleansing. This is not, therefore, a civilizational conflict. This is not a war against Islamic

terrorism. We are talking about terrorism. But this is not and this cannot be a war against Islamic terrorism. McWeigh who destroyed the towers in Oklahoma a couple of years ago and killed in the process hundreds of innocent school children was surely not an Islamic terrorist. The people in our own neighbourhood who terrorise the Tamil people in the Island of the South of our country, are surely not Islamic terrorists. The LTTE is not an Islamic terrorist organisation. The people who destroyed the 18th Century Mosque in India and recently a mosque in Jaipur were certainly not Islamic terrorists. We are against a global war against terrorism of all sorts. But this is no global war against terrorism. This cannot be expected to be a global war against terrorism. The USA is one country which, like every country, whether big or small, has to take care of its own national interests and terrorism will be a meaningful enemy for the USA only to that extent where it can turn and attack the United States' national interests. Therefore, we have this position in which the great powers under the leadership of the United States -- this is the reality -- are going now to take charge of Afghanistan and have their presence felt in this region for many years to come. It would have been a comedy, if it were not so tragic, the manner in which, in this situation, both the Government of India and the Government of Pakistan ran, crouched, jumped and offered their services and offered their presence as servants of the masters. Why did the Government of India had to rush and say, "Please do whatever you want with us, use our services?" When we were spurned by the United States and the United States moved towards getting the services of Pakistan, we started sulking. That did not appear to be a very mature strategy of the Foreign Minister and the Prime Minister. That really does not seem to be what is expected of a country of India's tradition. We had to launch a struggle for freedom. This country's independence was based not on a nominal independence but on real independence and that real independence is now at stake. It is, therefore, very important that the Government of India takes a little more independent position than what it has been taking. Both the Government of India and the Government of Pakistan have been running along, jumping to become servants or clients if I may use a better expression of the master, the USA. This is not becoming of them. India and Pakistan have been trying to shout over the rooftops that they are the allies of the United States. Both India and Pakistan must understand that they can never be the allies of the United States. At the most, they can hope to be the satellites of the United States, and this is really not the position that we should aim at. In this situation, in which the

great powers are once again playing the great game, when we are moving forward to the past -- this is not back to the future, but this is forward to the past -- it is a replay of the colonial and imperial expansion of the 19th century. This is what is happening.

At this point of time, it is important that, for maintaining the best of relations with the United States, which we should, we must also assert our independence and do a few things to begin with; and I would suggest the following. At the global level, we must strengthen the United Nations. We must ensure that the United Nations is democratised. We seem to have left behind the campaign for permanent membership of the Security Council in doldrums. We must renew our campaign for permanent membership of the Security Council because it is expected that India, being the second most populous country in the world, we must necessarily be a permanent member of the Security Council, just like China is. If anybody like Osama Bin Laden comes, he cannot be tried by the same country that is the complainant; that is the prosecutor; that is the court, and that is the hangman. This is not the rule of law which these countries are talking about. This is not the rule of law by which the United States swears, by which India swears. It is necessary to have an international criminal court and it is also necessary to strengthen the International Court of Justice to deal with all such situations. We must, however, as has been said here, look at our own problems. And, while looking at our own problems, the top priority is to normalise relations with Pakistan; whether you call it the core issue or you do not call it the core issue, undoubtedly, Kashmir is a major issue. On Kashmir, Pakistan must understand -- and it should have understood by now -- that it can't have a different approach to Afghanistan and a different approach to Kashmir or India. It cannot disown Taliban as a terrorist outfit and, at the same time, prompt other terrorist organisations inside India. This is a contradiction; it is a dual policy which Pakistan cannot afford to follow. Pakistan and General Musharraf have said, "We are disowning Taliban because for us it is not a question of 'Taliban or no Taliban'. For us, it is a question of national interest of Pakistan." Pakistan must understand that having supported, for so many years, now for more than a decade, the so-called jihadis or the militants or the terrorists, they have not gained anything. They have lost money. They are almost ruined economically and they were almost on the verge, before the September 11 attacks, of being declared a rogue State. Pakistan knows that it cannot be counting on the definite, total and eternal friendship of the United States. They know it by now. After the honeymoon, the divorce is going to take

place. And the fear is also there. It has been mentioned here that Pakistan did not gain as much as it made out to be. Pakistan could not get a Government in Afghanistan of their liking. The Northern Alliance is there; many other things have happened to Pakistan even now in spite of its relations with the United States; these are not to their liking. Pakistan must realise this and it must stop supporting these terrorists. Therefore, the countries of Asia and, for that matter, even the countries of Africa, must all agree 'let the borders be'. Whether they are the borders between India and Pakistan, or they are with any country, big or small, let the borders be. We cannot be redrafting the borders; we cannot be redrawing the borders every now and then. Allow all the people within the country, within the borders, to live with equality, with dignity and let all share in prosperity. Let us, therefore, solve the problem in this manner.

Before I proceed further, I must say this that our Prime Minister was the first to congratulate General Musharraf. Even before he was appointed as the Chief Executive of Pakistan, even to Musharraf's surprise, he rushed to congratulate him. This time, in New York, our Prime Minister went into a purdah -- not actual purdah, but he went into a diplomatic purdah. The U.N. Security Council hosted a lunch in New York, and the Prime Minister, out of fear that he might be seated next to General Musharraf, avoided the lunch. If I had not the respect that I have for such a seasoned and senior, and not just senior but a statesman like the Prime Minister, I would have said that this is immature, this is not diplomatic. In short, I must say, please resume the dialogue, not in the manner you have done before, not just taking a trip to Lahore, not just having a meeting in Agra without any preparation, but you must have the benchmarks. Pakistan must understand, and I am sure they, by now, understand after the fall and the disappearance of the Taliban, that all the support to the Jihadis has not given any result. Kashmir is still a part of India. Pakistan must understand that the resolve of the people of India and the resolve of the people of Kashmir is that Kashmir will never go out of India. The people of Kashmir are our brothers and they will remain with us and our family will never be divided. Therefore, Pakistan should keep its hands off Kashmir. While saying that, the Government of India has very great responsibilities. The Government of India must get back the trust in a broader form. I would say, get back the trust of the people of Kashmir. Mr. Saifullah, who has just spoken, made a very important and valid point. He mentioned about the growing sense of distrust against the entire community, and must more so, against the people of Kashmir. Why are the people of Kashmir Valley not

taken into the Armed Forces, whereas people from the other parts of Kashmir are taken? Why are they not taken into the Police and the security forces, while people from the other parts of Kashmir are taken? How can the people of Kashmir then trust us? We must restore their trust. We must see to it that, not merely by the terrorists, but even by the security forces, abuses do not take place. We must ensure that the genuine grievances of the people of Kashmir are met. We must give employment. We must give pensions and support to the widows of those innocent people who have died. We must restore the trust of the people of Kashmir. You cannot solve this problem otherwise. People of my generation have seen the colonial wars, and we know that colonial problems cannot be solved just by the use of force. You must have a second arm, which is the political arm, which is the arm of bringing the people together, of giving them schools, of giving them food, of giving them employment, hospitals and so on. This is the way in which you are going to get back the trust of the people, not just by having these terrorist acts, more and more militant forces and then more and more abuses. That is not the way. This doubled-edged approach is of great essence and anybody who has dealt with this situation will tell you so.

Now, the subject of this debate is the people of Afghanistan. We must ensure that Afghanistan remains united and that it remains a democratic polity. A division of Afghanistan, after the religious strife, the ethnic strife and the nationality strife, will create instability in that country and instability will affect the whole region. A united, democratic Afghanistan, a progressive Afghanistan is what we must work for. Let Afghanistan not be managed just by one country. Let Afghanistan be managed by the United Nations as a whole during the transition period, just like it was done in Cambodia, which we now call Kampuchea, after the fall of the Khmer Rouge. What was done was that Kampuchea was placed under the United Nations trusteeship council. When it was placed under the UN trusteeship council, for five years the United Nations addressed itself to the reconstruction of Kampuchea. So, it must now address itself to the economic reconstruction of Afghanistan. As far as maintaining law, peace and order in that country is concerned, I would strongly say that neither the big powers' troops should be there, nor the troops of the neighbouring countries -- troops of none of the neighbouring countries. The troops there should be of small European countries or small Asian countries and, therefore, at the end of five years, let there be elections in Afghanistan on a multi-party basis, so that a democratic government emerges there that brings progress and prosperity to that country. With these words, once

again I say that India must learn the lessons of history; India must appreciate that we are moving forward and this should not happen. The historian, Arnold Toynbee had written that those who do not learn the lessons of history are condemned to see it repeated.

We must learn lessons from history and must see to it that colonialism or imperialism, in whatever form, is never allowed again in this region. Thank you, Sir.

SHRI J. CHITHARANJAN (Kerala): Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, it is good that the Prime Minister has visited the three major countries, with the intention of strengthening the bilateral relations between India and these countries, and also to expand our relations in various sectors like economy, technical cooperation, etc. In the present-day context, while conducting negotiations, one of the issues which might have been dealt with is the question of how to build an international front to eliminate terrorism, not only in India but the world over.

Sir, the terrorist attack of 11th September on the World Trade Centre was a heinous attack, and it was really a heinous crime. Sir, we have been facing terrorism for the last two decades in various parts of our country, and we have lost about 16,000 citizens, due to these terrorist attacks. Even though we have been facing the problem of terrorism for a long time, neither America, nor Britain, expressed sympathy to us. They did not even condemn those attacks. But, on September 11, America was attacked, although it was very alert to the terrorist attacks. Of course, we can understand America's taking interest in booking the persons or terrorists who have committed the heinous attack and also to get them punished, as per the international law. Naturally, for getting them punished, as per the international law, they should have sought the help of the U.N.O. and also the international community to carry out this task. But what America has done is, they have sidelined the U.N.O; they have unilaterally declared a war against Afghanistan, and that war is still continuing. At that time, India, being a country which had been the champion of international peace all along for the last five decades, should have expressed its strong view that this shall not be done. We should have protested against that. We should have demanded that the U.N.O. should be utilised for doing this work. Even though America declared the war, their objective was not clear to anyone, not even to their own close allies like Britain. We can understand that from the statements made by these people at various times. At the beginning of the war, the President of the United States, Mr. George W. Bush, said that

it was only an attack to get Bin Laden 'either alive or dead.' Then, he said that they will carry on this attack to finish off Bin Laden, his terrorist outfit, and also the Taliban Government which had given shelter to Bin Laden. After some time, he declared that even though the first phase of the attack would be against Afghanistan, they would attack other countries also. They have really named certain countries, and then also, our Government didn't comment. Then, the U.S. President said, "We would also be attacking against certain specific targets." But they have not confined to that alone. It is a well-known fact that they have been attacking civilian centres, leading to the killing of innocent people. Not only that; they have destroyed hospitals and even godowns belonging to the Red Cross. All those things were destroyed. Then also our Government didn't say anything.

When these things were going on, our Government was keeping silent, closing its eyes to all these things; our Government's pride was not hurt. Our country, which was looked upon by the entire developing countries and the peace-loving people all over the world, as a country which is a champion of international peace, its position against war, closed its eyes to all these things. It is really a matter of shame that our country has been led to such a position. The war is still continuing.

Another point is, of course, facing international terrorism. We are trying to build relationship with America and other world powers. If we can build up friendship with them, of course, it would be a good thing. It is quite welcome. But, at the same time, you should not forget your past also. Take for example, the Kashmir problem. What was the approach of the U.S. towards the Kashmir problem for the last more than five decades? I don't go into the details of it because everyone knows it. It is the U.S. which has armed Pakistan. That is known to us. So far, they have not condemned, even now, the terrorist activities and cross-border terrorism that has been carried on by Pakistan against India. Even now they have not.

The Prime Minister, in his last paragraph, has said, "Developing countries have recently faced some hard realities of the impact of globalisation on domestic poverty levels and income gaps." On the results of Doha, again, the words are underlined, "the urgent need for a global dialogue on development." What is the experience we had in Doha? We had certain objectives and those objectives were defeated. Finally, what happened? The domination of the U.S. and its allies in the European Union, in the WTO, are still continuing; and, to that extent, our interests have suffered. Sir, in that case, what was their interest? Their interest was to

establish their dominance in the world economy. They want to capture the whole market, including the Indian market. For that, they were exerting pressure; they were resorting to undemocratic procedures. Then, the notorious Green Room process and all other things were taken. I am saying this because, in all these things, America is not taking a favourable attitude or a sympathetic attitude towards India or even towards other developing countries.

That is the position. Therefore, in facing terrorism also we should not mainly depend on America. Of course, our Prime Minister and the Home Minister have come forward and made a statement that we will have to face this terrorism ourselves and we shall not depend on anybody. Of course, that is good. While saying that I do not mean that we should not try to have cooperation from other countries to fight terrorism here as well as in other countries. Mr. Nilotpal Basu has already explained in detail that America as a State has promoted various terrorist organisations in the whole world, including Taliban and Bin Laden. That is the position. Even recently Mr. Clinton, the former President of the United States of America made a statement that the CIA was given direction to kill certain leaders, Presidents or Prime Ministers of certain other States. Unfortunately, that could not be carried out. That was what Mr. Clinton himself had said. In fact, they were doing this practice all along. It is such a country that we are trying to win over. In our attempt to bring about a better relationship with America in order to win over their friendship, I am afraid, we are drifting away from our basic policies. In fact, our foreign policy, our declared foreign policy has been given a go bye. Now we are talking about the developing countries. What was the attitude of the Government towards the Non-Aligned countries or the Non-Aligned Movement? Our Ministers have made statements often whether the NAM has got any relevance at all; it had relevance at the time of the Cold War; now the Cold War is over and it has no relevance. Is it true? By experience we know that even in the World Trade Organisation and in its Ministerial Conference or in the General Assembly if we have to fight the manoeuvres and the threats of America and the industrialised countries of the European Union, we have to build up a united front of the developing countries whether they are least developed countries or less developed countries. But the attitude of the Government towards the NAM has done a great harm to us. It is because of this, we failed to build a united front in the WTO. It is because of that we failed to mobilise these nations for a world economic order where all these countries will be equal. Through this relationship not only people but everybody will get justice.

Every country can develop freely. Such a situation will have to be fought for. Therefore, what I have to say is that it is high time that the Government reconsidered its foreign policy. It is steadily drifting towards an appendage of America and supporting America. At the same time, we should try to revive the Non-Aligned Movement and thereby strengthen our economy and our sovereignty. Thank you.

SHRI SHANKAR ROY CHOWDHARY: Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, on the 11th of September this year, the United States discovered that there was something called terrorism in the world. Before that, before the attack on the World Trade Centre, terrorism was something which was perhaps in foreign countries. When we used to go as supplicants to the United States, they used to give us good advice, but no assistance. Now that the United States itself have been touched, it has become a war on terrorism. We have offered our support to the United States. It is good. We must support the United States in the war of terrorism, but only to the extent that it benefits us in our own war against terrorism. The United States incident of the strikes on the World Trade Centre has to be seen in its global context. But, I think, it is more important for India to see the WTO bombings in the regional context because the core concern of the war on terrorism, as far as India is concerned, as far as India's national interest is concerned, is strictly regional, and the players in this regional concern remain India, Pakistan, the various groupings in Afghanistan, and, ultimately, the question of Kashmir. So, while we should be concerned about the global impact of terrorism, realism demands that we must concern ourselves more with the fallout of the World Trade Centre bombing, the war against terrorism in Afghanistan, and how it impinges upon India's interest. And, in this, we have to bear in mind a few basic facts. Pakistan and Afghanistan are one strategic entity. This is in accordance with what Pakistan calls the 'Aslam Beg Doctrine'. General Mirza Aslam Beg was one of the Chiefs of Pakistani Army. He propounded a doctrine that to gain strategic depth against India, there must be a confederation of Pakistan, Afghanistan and Iran. The Iran component fell through on the *Shia-Sunni* confrontation. But it is a strategic imperative for Pakistan to ensure that Afghanistan always has a Government which is aligned, totally integrated with Pakistan. So, the first thing we must understand is that Pakistan will always be dissatisfied if there is any Government in Afghanistan which is not totally sympathetic and aligned with Pakistan. That is why in the post-Soviet vacuum, Pakistan created Taliban to ensure that there was a Government in Afghanistan that

would be under the total influence of Pakistan and the ISI. We must also know that Taliban were becoming a regular army. They were being advised by Pakistani regular officers. There were many Pakistani advisors in the Taliban Army. And, if this had been a confrontation of one-to-one, between the Northern Alliance and Taliban, without American intervention, the Northern Alliance had no chance at all of defeating Taliban. And the fact that the Taliban is being attacked must also be linked, as far as we are concerned, with the hijacking of Kathmandu-Kandahar Indian Airline's flight 814 on the Christmas Day of 1999.

In effect, in doing all these - the bombing of Kandahar, the bombing of Kabul, the bombing of Kunduz, the battle for Mazar-i-Sharif - in a manner of speaking, perhaps, the United States is doing something, which we did not have the capability to do, when our aircraft was hijacked to Kandahar and some Indians were killed. In the WTC bombing, as, perhaps, all of us are aware, 241 Indians were killed. That is a figure given by the Consulate in New York. So, the equation from the Afghan war must be seen in the context of the triangle of India, Pakistan and Kashmir. As far as the fallout of this war is concerned, India has taken a number of steps. India has sent out a team to Kabul to re-establish our Embassy there. This is a very bold step. It is a good step, and I compliment the Government on this. The only comment I have to make is whether we are in contact with Mr. Burhanuddin Rabbani, who, as you know, is from an ethnic minority in Afghanistan. In Afghanistan, the majority of the ethnic groups are the Pashtuns; varying between 40 and 60 per cent. Then, there are the Tajiks, the Uzbeks and the Hazaras. Rabbani is a Tajik. The other contestant for the leadership of post-Taliban Afghanistan is King Zaheer Shah. So, I don't know whether we are maintaining contact with King Zaheer Shah or not. If we are not, I would suggest to the Government that apart from maintaining contact with Mr. Burhanuddin Rabbani, who will not be accepted by the Pashtuns, we should keep our channels of communication open with King Zaheer Shah. We have offered our services to the United States. As I said, we should co-operate with the United States, but only to the extent that it is helpful to us. From whatever I have seen in the media; what I have read in the print media, and what I have seen in the visual media, I understand, we seemed to be far too eager to offer our services. I think we should not have done that. It has made us look more than ridiculous. There are many leaders coming up in the various factions in Afghanistan. The Government, I am sure, is aware of them. There is, of course, Burhanuddin Rabbani, there is Farheen Khan, Mohammad Dostum, Ismail Khan etc. I am

sure, we have contacts with those people. But I would like to know what is the Government's assessment of a gentleman called Gulbuddin Hekmatyar. Is he coming back into the play? Are we in contact with him? Because, I think, Pakistan will try and see, somehow or the other, to introduce Gulbuddin Hekmatyar as the Pashtun representative. I don't know whether they are keeping contact with him or not. I don't know what the Government's assessment on that is? We are having defence cooperation with USA. This is not a new issue. This started off, I think, way back in 1992-93 with the so-called kick-lighter proposal. And this is merely a development of that. In 1995, Dr. William Perry, the then Secretary of Defence, had come; the same agreed minutes were signed and things started looking up. Then they stopped. Now, they are being revived. At that time also, we had no answer to this question: what is the ultimate aim of defence cooperation with the USA?

By itself, defence cooperation is an excellent thing. The USA has excellent training facilities. We have no defence equipment from the USA, atleast, so far, but if we can get something from them, nothing wrong. But what is the ultimate aim of this defence cooperation? That answer was not there earlier; I do hope we have an answer now. If that is so, if we are entering into a strategic partnership with the USA,-- we have entered into strategic partnership with Russia also-- between the two of them which do we think is more important, on which we are going to lay more stress? The Government must have an answer for that. While we are dealing with the various Afghan factions, we have to keep an eye on another source of trouble in this area; and that is Saudi Arabia, because the entire terrorism which flows out of Afghanistan is financed by Saudi Arabia as well as by the drug money through the Golden Crescent. So, while we are negotiating in the post-Taliban phase in Afghanistan, I do hope we are keeping our eyes open as to what is happening in Saudi Arabia. I happened to see a television programme....

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI T.N. CHATURVEDI): Mr. Chowdhury, please conclude.

SHRI SHANKAR ROY CHOWDHURY: Yes, Sir. Just give me two minutes. I happened to see a television programme of Secretary of State, General Colin Powell, interacting with the US Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, in which he made it very clear that the fight against terrorism was with the real terrorists, and, in that, he mentioned Al Qaeda; he mentioned the FARC, Colombia and, he mentioned the real IRA. As far as the other

terrorist organisations were concerned, he very clearly said "we have to decide because one man's terrorist is another man's freedom fighter." The groups like Lashkar-e-Taiba, Jaish-e-Mohammed are an offshoot of Al-Qaeda, but have not directly attacked, as far as we know, America itself. And, I do strongly suspect that after dealing with Afghanistan, America's attention will be diverted away from the sub-continent to other areas. There is already talk of Iraq, Syria, etc. So, we must be very clear on this. America is nobody's friend. We have no friends. America is nobody's friend. It will utilise us as long as it suits them. After that, we will be dropped. So, while we should be friends with America; while we cooperate with America, we should understand that in this game, there are no permanent friends, and we should not expect too much from America. Is this a clash of civilisations? America says "it is not so" we are saying "it is not so." That is fine in theory, but, in actual, at the ground level, it is turning into a clash of civilisations. And we, as a multi-racial, multi-cultural and multi-religious society, must be aware of this. India is a soft target. Again, in the media, in newspapers, you yourself must have seen a photograph of a rally in Peshawar, wherein the people were carrying a banner displaying that the biggest terrorists are the USA, Israel and India. Of these three, let me assure you, Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, India is considered to be the softest target. So, in the post-Taliban fall out, we must be prepared to deal more strictly with internal terrorism in India. It is a subject which arouses much passion on many issues, but the fact of the matter is, we must be prepared to deal with an upsurge of terrorism in India, as many speakers have pointed out that it stands to reason that Taliban will move out of Afghanistan. They will probably seek shelter in the tribal areas of Pakistan and at their own time and place, they will move eastwards into Kashmir and elsewhere. We had an opportunity, which we missed, an opportunity of opening a second front against Pakistan in Afghanistan. And, this is an issue which we have been pressing for many years. If we had utilised the opportunity to help the Northern Alliance in sufficient quantity earlier, Pakistan would not have troubled us in Kashmir, and we would have troubled Pakistan, which is heavily committed in Afghanistan on their Western Front. But, for many reasons, successive Governments in India, including, I am afraid, the present one, have not taken the required steps. So, ultimately, the question before us is : What is the biggest lesson, the biggest policy that India has to follow post-Taliban? There is no alternative to self-reliance. We must stand strongly on our own feet. We must not seek disadvantageous alliance with any country, whether it is USA, Russia

or any other country, until we can build up ourselves to stand on our own feet, to fight our own battles. The Government must ensure that, without over-relying on any country, whether it is the USA or anybody else.

SHRI P.G. NARAYANAN (Tamil Nadu): Thank you, Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, for giving me this opportunity. Sir, our hon. Prime Minister visited America, the United Kingdom and Russia. The Moscow declaration and the joint statement that our Prime Minister and Mr. Putin initialled after the talks underlined the post-September 11 geo-political reality only, but failed to address the issue of bilateralism.

Sir, the Government's failure to convince the Russian President, Mr. Putin, resulted in Russia endorsing the view of General Pervez Musharraf for resuming the dialogue.

The Pakistan's request to implement U.N. Resolutions on Kashmir, and the request to give F-16s, and not to fight during *Ramzan* have not been honoured by America. Of course, these are the negatives for Pakistan.

Sir, Pakistan created and used Taliban and terrorism as an instrument against India. Pakistan is now maintaining its right to continue its own brand of terrorism in Pakistan-occupied-Kashmir.

Sir, nobody anywhere, including in Moscow, believes that Pakistan has no case on Jammu & Kashmir or that India's troubles there are entirely Pakistan created, or that we can resolve them without talking to Pakistan. Nobody can make us do what we do not want, but to defy the looming pressures demand India to chalk out a brand new strategy.

Sir, we must stop delaying the overdue effort to tackle the situation within Kashmir. A carefully thought-out campaign is needed to persuade the international community to accept that Jammu & Kashmir is an integral and indivisible part of India. Above all, we must start on a sustained, purposeful and efficient domestic reinvigoration, especially, for our economic capabilities.

Who are the Taliban and who created them? To throw the Soviet Union from out of Afghanistan in 1979, the Taliban were created, armed and financed by the Americans and the Pakistanis. After achieving the purpose of liberating Afghanistan from the Soviet Union, America washed off its hands. America is keen in exploiting the rich crude oil resources in the Central Asian Republics. They want a friendly Government in

Afghanistan to transport crude oil from these Republics to the coast. The Taliban were created only for this purpose. After creating the monster called Taliban, America lost its interest in the area for the last 20 years. Taliban has its own agenda of spreading Islamic fundamentalism in the Central Asian Republics and Chechnya. Their area of operation extended up to Kashmir. Taliban was providing arms training to the Kashmir insurgents and also provided necessary forces to fight the so-called liberation struggle in Kashmir. I would like to emphasise that American and Pakistani role in creating Taliban cannot be minimised. The same Taliban exploded bombs in Moscow two years ago in collaboration with Chechen rebels. Several people were killed in Moscow, but the same Americans urged Russia to be restrained in tackling the Taliban. Russia waged an all-out war against the Chechen rebels, who were trained by the Taliban. But America criticised Russia, calling it adventurism. When it hurt America on September 11, 2001, they want the entire international community to support their war against terrorism. Nobody supports terrorism. But, when people are killed in Moscow, America does not shed tears. Even now, America has not acted against Pakistan for sponsoring cross-border terrorism in the Kashmir Valley. They two major extremist groups, Lashkar-e-Taiba and Jaish-e-Mohammed, which are financed by Pakistan are yet to be banned by America. Pakistan is showered with aid by the American Administration. This is not the way to fight international terrorism. Americans are not bothered when civilians are killed in Kashmir or in Moscow. They are worried only about their kith and kin, who lost their lives in the terrorist attack of September 11. This attitude of selective targeting of terrorists needs to be deplored.

Another danger India faces is the massive movement of Taliban insurgents from Afghanistan to Pakistan in the last ten days. They have gone to Pakistan after the American forces bombarded Taliban targets in Afghanistan. The Taliban insurgents, who are now in Pakistan, will definitely move into the Kashmir Valley. The Government of India, our Armed Forces, the Home Ministry and our intelligence agencies should be fully geared up to meet this possible infiltration.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI T.N. CHATURVEDI): Thank you. Further discussion on the Short Duration Discussion will continue on Monday, the 26th November.

Now, the hon. Minister of State for Railways will lay his Statement on the Table of the House. Clarifications, I am sure, the House would like

to seek later on. Now, the hon. Railway Minister will lay a copy of the Statement regarding collision of 214 Dn. Mokama-Howrah passenger train with relief light engine on Mokama-Kiul section of Eastern Railway's Danapur Division.

STATEMENT BY MINISTER

**Collision of 214 Dn. Mokama-Howrah passenger train with relief light engine
on Mokama - Kiul section of Eastern Railway's Danapur Division**

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF PARLIAMENTARY AFFAIRS AND MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF RAILWAYS (SHRI O. RAJAGOPAL): Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, on behalf of my senior colleague, Shri Nitish Kumar, I beg to lay on the Table of the House a copy of the statement regarding collision of 214 Dn Mokama - Howrah passenger train with relief light engine on Mokama-Kiul section of Eastern Railway's Danapur Division on 20th November, 2001.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI T. N. CHATURVEDI) : The House stands adjourned till 11.00 a.m. on Friday, the 23rd November, 2001.

The House then adjourned at one minute past five of the clock till eleven of the clock on Friday, the 23rd November, 2001.