

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Yes; not reply; he would intervene in the debate. Now, we will take up the Short Duration Discussion...

श्री बालकवि बैरागी (मध्य प्रदेश): मैडम, मेरा एक निवेदन है।

उपसभापति: आपका निवेदन अभी नहीं। Once the Chair starts talking something else, सारे निवेदन खत्म हो जाते हैं।

SHRI EDUARDO FALEIRO (Goa) : Madam, as regards question of withdrawal of the Bill,...

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: It hasn't been withdrawn yet. When it comes to the stage of withdrawal, you can raise your objection then. It has not been brought at all.

Now, we take up further 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 the Government in regard thereto, raised by Dr. Manmohan Singh on 22nd November, 2001. On 23rd November, 2001, Shri P. G. Narayanan had concluded his speech. Now, I call Shri Arjun Singh to make his contribution.

SHORT DURATION DISCUSSION

International situation arising out of terrorists' attack on W.T.C. in U.S.A. leading to international intervention in Afghanistan its impact on India and its ramifications and the response of Government in regard thereto - (contd.)

SHRI ARJUN SINGH (Madhya Pradesh): Madam Deputy Chairman, I am grateful to you for the time given to me to make some observations on this issue. The hon. Leader of the Opposition, while initiating this debate, has made quite a comprehensive reference to the main issues involved. So I will not repeat them and take the time of this House. The dastardly incidents of 11th September in Washington and New York have to be condemned by all sane people in the world...

SHRI NILOTPAL BASU (West Bengal) : Madam, the External Affairs Minister is not there. It is not becoming of the Government that the External Affairs Minister is not present in the House when this discussion is taking place.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : The External Affairs Minister is coming

...(Interruptions)...yes; he has come. The Left should sometimes look at the right...

SHRI ARJUN SINGH: The right also should, sometimes, look at the left.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Yes, Shri Arjun Singh.

SHRI ARJUN SINGH: While we all condemn this dastardly act -- it is the manifestation of global terrorism at its worst -- we must also, certainly, know the anatomy of global terrorism, understand its complexity, its dimension so as to equip ourselves, as a civilised nation, to combat with that. In India, we have had a very early acquaintance with this phenomenon. Within six months of our becoming independent, the Father of the Nation, Gandhiji, was gunned down while he was in a prayer meeting. It was a bizarre thing seeing the apostle of peace and non-violence being gunned down in this manner in the presence of hundreds of people. When I said, 'anatomy', this has to be looked into. It is the twisted minds, the bigoted views of some people, which can whip themselves up into frenzy and commit crimes against humanity. And that is the crime that the world viewed at that time. It is also true, and our experience shows, that plural societies, multi-religious societies, multi-cultural societies are more easily amenable to this kind of crime because such societies normally have a democratic ambience, and in a democratic ambience, naturally, the freedoms that each one of us enjoy, give us an initial advantage. But it is all the more necessary, Madam, that the leaders of such societies, Governments of such countries must realise that global terrorism does not require merely a gun against a gun. That is necessary, no doubt. But it also requires the will, the capacity and the determination to see to it that the legacies that a nation has of a composite culture, a society where every one is considered equal, where liberal ethos of centuries are crystallised into ways of thinking and acting, are also preserved. I am quite sure that the Prime Minister, who was in the forefront of trying to forge the will against global terrorism will keep this in mind, specially in the case of India where even today, unfortunately, such diseased minds that are at work do not hesitate to pit religion against religion, community against community for their narrow political gains. I am quite sure that the weight of the Prime Minister's authority will be on the side of those elements that are determined and committed to combat these influences.. It will be something which we as a nation can contribute to the arsenal of those fighting against global terrorism. If we succumb, and if we allow ourselves to be swayed by

narrow political considerations, then, in fact, we will be helping the global terrorists to perpetrate those acts.

There were two other subsequent instances in India of terrorism. The first was on 31st October, 1984, when the Prime Minister of India, Shrimati Indira Gandhi, was assassinated. I only state this as a point of reference; I do not want to elaborate on it. And then, subsequently on 21st May, 1991, a young visionary, a dynamic leader of this country, Shri Rajiv Gandhi, was killed in a bomb blast at Sriperumbudur.

Therefore, I quite understand and I appreciate the concern of the Government to combat global terrorism. And we are all behind the Government in their effort to do it. But these efforts need to be taken, keeping in mind our broad commitment to democracy, civil liberties, human values and the overall necessity to preserve our composite culture and our composite society. It is in this light, Madam, that the Afghanistan situation, in my view, has to be viewed. We are all aware of what has taken place there; we are all aware of all aspects of the tragic trauma through which that unfortunate country has been going through for the last two decades, and we are all aware of the kind of violence which has rendered apart that unfortunate country. Our concern now, therefore, is that this conflict in Afghanistan must be brought to as speedy an end as possible, without any other consideration and we would like that the role that India has played to bring about a Government in Afghanistan which represents all the ethnic, cultural and political streams of that society, should be taken to its logical end; and I fully support the approach of the Government in this matter. Since this whole situation deals with the matter of global terrorism, I would request you, Madam, to permit me to make a reference to the particular incident, of the assassination of Shri Rajiv Gandhi. From every point of view, under every definition, all the ingredient elements of a global terrorist act are available in this incident. An organisation which has been identified and accepted as a terrorist organisation by the world community and our country also, was behind this. The highest court of this land had, in fact, convicted a few of them who were, actually, in the perpetration of this crime. So, the country has taken some steps. Now, I would like to tell the Prime Minister -- and I am sure he is fully aware of this -- that those people who from behind the thin veneer of social and political standing, plotted this crime, who were the conspirators in this crime have still to be brought to book. The Government of India is conducting an inquiry through the MDMA, which is working under the CBI, in this regard. My request to the Prime

Minister is that now that the focus of the world has been put on such crimes which are considered to be crimes against humanity, this crime, which is also a crime against humanity, should engage the attention of the Governments which are directly involved. This must be treated as a global act of terrorism. All the elements that go into the investigation of such a crime should be put into motion, if they have not been done already. I may inform the House that the organisation which is inquiring into this matter has already sent international letters rogatory to 23 countries of the world, which means, the threads of this conspiracy are international. It is necessary, therefore, that in order to appear sincere and in order to appear that we really understand the nuances of these acts, the Government goes into the inquiry with this in mind, and create an organisation which has the power -- is not restrained or can be brought under any influence -- to go to the root of this matter so that these people are unmasked and they are visited with the severest penalties that we can provide under the law of the land. It is only then that we can prove that our commitment to fight global terrorism has indeed been taken by us seriously.

श्री जनेश्वर मिश्र (उत्तर प्रदेश): शुक्रिया मैडम।

मैडम, हम लोग एक गंभीर विषय पर चर्चा कर रहे हैं। विषय है आतंकवाद का। इसमें एक पक्ष होता है जो अपनी हरकत के जरिए दूसरे को आतंकित करता है। दूसरा पक्ष होता है कि किसी की हरकत से डर जाया करता है। आम तौर से जो आमने सामने मुकाबला नहीं कर पाते हैं वे छिपकर हमला करते हैं और उसको आतंकवाद कहा जाता है। कहीं कहीं जो लोग मजबूत होते हैं — ताकत में, नम्बर में, पैसे में — वे लोग भी वही हरकत करते हैं जो आतंकवादी हरकत मानी जाती है। इसलिए जब कभी भी हम लोग यह बहस करने लगे तो क्या उसके साथ बिन लादेन डाला जाए? अभी तो बिन लादेन खत्म हो जाएगा। कभी भी कोई बुराई और कभी भी कोई अच्छाई मारने से खत्म नहीं हुआ करती है। बहुत पहले हम लोगों ने रावण को मारा था। क्या रावण खत्म हो गया? अब लड़कियों का अपहरण नहीं होता? बुराई मारने से खत्म नहीं हुआ करती है। हम गांधी के देश के लोग हैं, गौतम बुद्ध के देश के लोग हैं। हमको कभी कभी लगता है कि हम लोग मिस कर गए इस घटना को क्योंकि हमारी खुद की पीड़ा थी तो अपना ही घाव सहलाते रह गए और किसी बड़े को पीड़ा लग गयी तो अपना घाव लेकर उसके दरवाजे पर चला गया। अच्छाई भी मारने से नहीं खत्म हुआ करती है। आतंकवादियों से अब मैं कहना चाहता हूँ। अभी माननीय अर्जुन सिंह जी ने श्रीमती गांधी और श्री राजीव गांधी की हत्या का जिक्र किया और कहा कि ये आतंकवाद के शिकार हो गए पता नहीं वे गांधी की हत्या को क्यों खोल रहे हैं....(व्यवधान)...

कहीं-कहीं जो कमजोर होता है वह हमला करता है और कहीं-कहीं जो मजबूत होता है, वह भी हमला करता है। बहुसंख्यक का आतंकवाद अल्पसंख्यक के आतंकवाद के मुकाबले ज्यादा खतरनाक होगा। बहुसंख्यक माने जहां नम्बर नहीं हुआ करता, जन बल है लेकिन धनबल भी हुआ करता है। यह सच है कि तालिबान ने और बिन लादेन ने जो कुछ भी 11 सितम्बर को किया, सारी दुनिया ने उसकी निन्दा की। किसी ने उसको पसंद नहीं किया। 11 सितम्बर के

पहले जो वहां पर गौतम बुद्ध की मूर्ति तोड़ी गयी तो हम लोगों ने इस संसद में और पूरे देश ने उस घटना पर एक अजीब किस्म की उत्तेजना का वातावरण बना दिया था। गौतम बुद्ध की मूर्ति मानव मिजाज को संदेश दिया करती है। अमरीका का टॉवर आदमी की खुराक का इंतजाम करता है। मूर्ति भी पत्थर की होती है और टॉवर भी सीमेंट और लोहे का होता है। बिजनैस से, रोजगार से आदमी की रोटी का इंतजाम होता है, पेट भरता है और किसी महान व्यक्तित्व की मूर्ति से जो संदेश जाता है, उससे आदमी के दिमाग को खुराक मिला करती है। जब तोड़ा गया था, तब केवल भारत हल्ला मचा रहा था और दूसरे लोग बहुत हल्के-फुल्के ढंग से ले रहे थे। फिर भी वह घटना हुई तो सारी दुनिया ने उसको गंभीरता से लिया। मैं यह नहीं कहता कि वह घटना हल्की थी और दो घटनाओं का मुकाबला भी मैं कभी करना नहीं चाहता, लेकिन मैडम, जिस तरह की हरकत अमरीका ने अफगानिस्तान में की, हम भारत के प्रधान मंत्री जी से और विदेश मंत्री जी से जानना चाहेंगे कि क्या उस हरकत पर हम लोग मूकदर्शक बन कर बैठे रहते हैं? छोटे-छोटे बच्चे मारे गए। अगर तालिबान ने गौतम बुद्ध की मूर्ति को तोड़ा है, अगर तालिबान ने अमरीका में 11 सितम्बर को घटना की, तो उसकी हमने निंदा की, तो क्या मासूम लोगों की हत्या जो अफगानिस्तान में हुई है, उसकी हम निंदा नहीं करेंगे, उस पर हम चिंता जाहिर नहीं करेंगे? कहा गया मानवाधिकार आयोग? हमारे पुलिस के जवान, कश्मीर में या पंजाब में या कहीं भी जब थोड़ी हरकत पर चले जाते थे तो मानवाधिकार आयोग खड़खड़ा जाया करता था। क्या यह मानवाधिकार आयोग अमरीका का पिछलग्गू है? वह कुछ भी करेगा तो वह नहीं बोला करेगा, उसका नोटिस नहीं लेगा और दुनिया के पर्दे पर वह बात नहीं जाएगी। बेगुनाह लोगों की हत्या चाहे लादेन करें, चाहे जार्ज बुश करें, लादेन अगर धार्मिक आतंकवाद फैलाते हैं तो जार्ज बुश आर्थिक आतंकवाद फैला रहे हैं। जो कोई भी हथियार उन्होंने छोड़ा, जैसे दीवाली के मौके पर दिल्ली में सेल की दुकानें लगती हैं, उन साड़ी की कीमत, कोट की कीमत, स्वेटर की कीमत लिखी रहती है, उसी प्रकार काबुल में हथियारों की सेल लगाई जा रही है कि यह मिसाइल 70 हजार डालर की है। लगता था की काबुल में अमरीका की हथियारों की कार्ड नुमायश लगाई जा रही है, दौलत उनके पास ज्यादा है। लेकिन दौलत का मतलब यह नहीं हुआ करता है कि हमारी सरहद पर, हमारे पड़ोस में आ करके वह गलती करे। उसने गलती की है। जिसने गलती की है उसको सजा दो। यह नहीं के पूरे मुल्क को बर्बाद किया जाए। इसको पसंद नहीं किया जाएगा। यह सही है कि भारत सरकार इस समय जो वहाँ राजनीतिक व्यवस्था बनने जा रही है और पाकिस्तान की सरकार भी, मुशर्रफ़ मियाँ की सरकार भी उस राजनीतिक व्यवस्था से दोस्ताना रिश्ता बनाने के लिए बहुत कोशिश कर रही है। लेकिन वाजपेयी जी आप तो राम भक्त हैं। विभीषण जब गद्दी पर बैठा था तो वह लंकेश नहीं कहलाया था, वह राम भक्त ही कहलाया था। जो कोई भी अफगानिस्तान की गद्दी पर बैठेगा वह अमरीका भक्त कहलायेगा, वह आपका या मुशर्रफ़ का दोस्त नहीं बनेगा। यह साफ़ सी बात लग रही है, जो अमरीका कहेगा, वह वही करेगा। और एशिया में, अपने पड़ोस में दुनिया की सब से बड़ी ताकत को बेस बनाने की जगह दे दी जाए और हम मूक दर्शक की तरह रहें, जब रूस किसी जमाने में बना रहा था, तो अमरीका ने इन्हीं तालिबान का इस्तेमाल करके उस समय की सत्ता में परिवर्तन कराया और रूस की हरकत को बंद कराया और आज अमरीका खुद बना रहा है। अमरीका एक व्यापारी देश है। जॉर्ज बुश पहले तेल विभाग में काम कर चुके हैं। अगर उनका इतिहास पढ़ने कोशिश कीजिएगा तो जानिएगा कि अफगानिस्तान के उत्तर में जो कैस्पियन सागर हैं, वह तेल का खजाना नहीं है, सारे एशिया को और दुनिया को तेल के जरिए प्रभावित करने की ताकत दुनिया की महाशक्ति को मिल जाए, इस

पर हमारा वित्त मंत्रालय, हमारा पेट्रोलियम मंत्रालय जरा भी चिंतित नहीं होगा। ये बातें गंभीरता से सोचने की हैं कि हम कहाँ फँस रहे हैं? हमारी दृष्टि दूरदृष्टि है या हम केवल अपना घाव सहलाते रह जाएंगे कि हम को कश्मीर में इतना पीटा। यह सच है कि कश्मीर में जो कुछ भी हरकत हुई और जब कभी भी बेगुनाह मारे गए, सारे देश ने चाहे जिस किसी की सरकार रहे, एक स्वर में सरकार से कहा गया कि मुकाबला करो, लेकिन यह भी सच है कि कभी मुकाबला नहीं किया गया। मैडम, अभी पिछले दिनों वहाँ एसेम्बली पर आतंकवादियों ने हमला किया और इमारात टूट गयी, कुछ लोग मर गए। हम लोग समझते थे कि यह मौका है और धावा बोल दिया जाए, लेकिन हमारे प्रधान मंत्री ने जी ने अमरीका के राष्ट्रपति जी को चिट्ठी लिखी, हुजूर हमारे बर्दाश्त करने की सीमा पार हो चुकी है। यह चिट्ठी क्यों लिखी गयी? यह बुश कोई पुलिस हमारे दरोगा है यह कोई कलेक्टर है जिस के यहां हम शिकायत करने गए? यू.एन.ओ. को चिट्ठी लिखी होती तो वह समझ में आता, लेकिन यह कौन है जिसे हम ने चिट्ठी लिखी? क्या इस से हमारी तौहीन नहीं होती? हम स्वाभिमान की राष्ट्र नहीं हैं? हमारे ऊपर तकलीफ आए तो हम जिस किसी राष्ट्री को और दौलत में जो हम से बड़ा है, उस के सामने फरियाद करने लगे कि अब हम बर्दाश्त नहीं कर पा रहे हैं नहीं कर रहे हैं तो वह कौन होता है जिसे यह चिट्ठी लिखी जाए। सारे देश ने कहा कि इस कि कोई जरूरत नहीं थी।

मैडम, अटल जी हम से काबिल आदमी हैं। उन का तजुर्बा भी हम से ज्यादा है। हम उन की इज्जत भी करते हैं, लेकिन उन की उस चिट्ठी से मैं इतनी ही कहूंगा बहुत अदब के साथ और जितनी इज्जत करता हूँ वह सारी इज्जत उन के सामने पेश करते हुए कहूंगा कि उन की चिट्ठी से देश कि स्वायत्तता को, देश की स्वतंत्रता की भावना को और हमारे गौरव को झटका लगा है। आप हमें समझा देंगे कि यह कूटनीति है और कूटनीति में ऐसे खेल खेले जाते हैं, लेकिन देश की स्वायत्तता के साथ और रण-कौशल तो चल सकते हैं पर बहुत कूटनीति के रण-कौशल नहीं चलने चाहिए। हमने अपने को अपमानित महसूस किया। जब यह घटना हुई तो उस समय हम को अपने गांव की एक घटना याद आ गयी। मैडम, हमारे गांव के एक जमींदार साहब की कोठी में एक सांप निकला। उस सांप ने बहुत से लोगों को काट लिया। उन की कोठी बड़ी थी और सांप भी बड़ा था तो उस के काटना से कई लोग मर गए। गांवभर के लोग अपनी-अपनी लाठी लेकर निकल पड़े और कहने लगे कि हम मारेंगे सांप को जैसे अर्जुन सिंह जी कह रहे थे कि आतंकवाद को खत्म करो। यह अंतर्राष्ट्रीय समस्या है। इसी तरह गांव भर के लोग लाठी लेकर निकल पड़े और हमारा देश भी निकला। मैडम, वे गांव के लोग जब निकले तो कोई भी सांप को मार नहीं रहा था, केवल जमींदार साहब को दिखा रहे थे कि हम भी सांप मारने आए हैं। हमारे घर कश्मीर में भी छोटे छोटे सांप निकले और कई लोग मरे, लेकिन जमींदार साहब की निगाह उन पर कभी नहीं गयी। मगर जब उनके घर में सांप निकला तो हम लाठी लेकर चले गए। मैं भारत सरकार से पूछना चाहूंगा, हमारे गाँव की प्रजा जमींदार साहब को लाठी दिखाती है कि हम भी सांप मारने आए हैं। भारत आजाद होने के बाद इतने साल तक प्रजावाद का शिकार बन कर रह गया। क्या कभी हम स्वतंत्र राष्ट्र बनकर नहीं रह सकते? यह सवाल मैं जानबूझकर पूछ रह हूँ। बात-बात पर फरियाद करते फिर रहे हैं। क्या हम अपनी खुद नहीं लड़ सकते? दूसरो के सामने जाएंगे हाथ फैलाकर? यह नहीं चल सकता। मैडम, सब से खतरनाक बात यह कि अब अफगानिस्तान में जो भी सियासी परिवर्तन होगा, वह अमरीका बेस होगा। मैंने शुरू में कह दिया कि वह अमरीका भक्त होगा। अब अमरीका आप को पसंद करेगा या नहीं, यह अलग बात है। वह आप लड़ाना भी चाहता है क्योंकि कोई भी बड़ा आदमी अपनी प्रजा को

आपस में लड़ाया करता है, तभी उस का राज चलता है। वह दौलत का राजा है, लेकिन हम को अपनी नीति खुद बनानी चाहिए कि कब तक हम लड़ते रहेंगे। मैडम, खुद अफगानिस्तान किसी जमाने में हमारा दोस्त था। संगीत, कला, साहित्य और व्यापार के हमारे उसके साथ रिश्ते थे। धीरे-धीरे यह संबंध बिगड़े हैं। हमारे बहुत से पड़ोसी देश ऐसे हैं, जिन्होंने उसामा — बिन — लादेन इस हरकत को पसंद नहीं किया और अमरीका की भी इस हरकत को पसंद नहीं कर रहे, एशिया के देश खासतौर पर चिंतित हैं। क्या कभी उनके बीच में बैठकर बात करेंगे? यह नया बेस बन गया है।

उपसभापति महोदया, एक महाप्रभु, महाप्रभु में जानबूझकर कह रहा हूँ, पब्लिक में मैं महाराक्षस कहा करता हूँ, लेकिन यहां महाप्रभु ही कहूंगा, यह सभ्य भाषा है, हमारे पड़ोस में आकर बस गया, पता नहीं हमारे साथ क्या करे। उसका बेस बन गया है। इसको अगर हम गंभीरता से नहीं समझेंगे तो जिस आजादी को बहुत दिनों से बहुत मेहनत के साथ हमने हासिल किया था, आर्थिक आजादी तो जा रही है और उस पर हम लोग कभी कभी बहस भी कर रहे हैं, सरहद भी खतरे में पड़ जाएगी। इसलिए जरूरी है, और जब मैं महाप्रभु कह रहा हूँ तो जानबूझकर कह रहा हूँ, यह हम लोगों को प्रभावित करते रहे हैं। लाल बहादुर शास्त्री साहब के जमाने में हमारी पलटन थोड़ी सी लाहौर के ओर बढ़ गई थी तो उस समय जो दो महाप्रभु थे, एक महाप्रभु ने बुलाकर दोनों को डांटा कि खबरदार, अपने अपने घर चले जाओ, आपस में लड़ना ठीक नहीं होता। शास्त्री जी लौटकर नहीं आए, हम लोग गम मनाते रहे। कारगिल की लड़ाई हुई थी, हम लोगों ने बहुत ताल ठोका, हमारे जवानों ने ईमानदारी से बहुत कुर्बानियां दीं, भारत माता की हिफाजत के लिए लड़ाई चल रही थी तब तक महाप्रभु ने पाकिस्तान के मालिक को बुलाकर कहा—क्या हरकत करते हो, अपने घर में वापस वापस आ जाओ। उस ने बाज में गद्दी से हटने बाद कहा कि हम ने तो उस को मान किया था और तब वह अपनी पलटन लेकर गया था। क्या हम हिन्दुस्तान और पाकिस्तान के लोग दुनिया के महाप्रभुओं के इशारे पर अपनी सरहद का फैसला करेंगे, अपने बूते पर नहीं करेंगे? यह मैं उस जमाने की बात जब शास्त्री जी थे तब से और आज के जमाने की बात जब वाजपेयी जी हैं, तब तक, यह पूछना चाहता हूँ कि क्या हम अपनी मर्जी से सरहद का फैसला नहीं करेंगे? हमारा मुल्क, जो हमें अंग्रेजों से लड़ाई के माध्यम से जीत कर मिला है, क्या हम उसकी सरहद को बचा नहीं सकते? और, अगर हम नहीं बचा सकते तो हम को गद्दी पर बैठने और इस देश को चलाने का कोई हक नहीं रहता है।

महोदया, यह सच है कि जो हरकत हुई है, वह दहशतगर्दी कहलाती है। इस दहशत में सभी डरते हैं, छोटे छोटे बच्चे भी डर जाया करते हैं डरने से यह बुराई आती है कि मन में कोई भी नया विचार पैदा नहीं हो सकता, कोई भी नए किस्म का सृजनात्मक साहित्य नहीं लिखा जा सकता, नई कला नहीं आ सकती, नया हुनर सामने नहीं आ सकता। जो डरा रहेगा, उस में कोई नयापन नहीं आ सकता। इससे मानव सभ्यता का विकास ठहर जाया करता है। दहशतगर्दी, जिसके बारे में यह सदन गंभीरता से सोच रहा है, हम भी उतनी ही गंभीरता से सोचते हैं। इससे मानव मन का 50 साल के लिए, 100 साल के लिए नुकसान होगा, लेकिन जो दिल के मजबूत होते हैं उनको उस दहशत में भी सीना तानकर बाहर निकलना होता है। गांधी जी को मालूम था कि वह मार डाले जाएंगे। जो कोई जोखिम उठाया करता है, वह अपनी मौत के बारे में जानकारी रखता है। सारी दुनिया डर रही थी, अमरीका के बच्चे डर रहे थे, केवल बच्चे ही नहीं बल्कि जब अमरीका में 11 सितम्बर को यह घटना हुई थी तो हम लोगों ने खबर पढ़ी थी कि जार्ज बुश साहब व्हाइट हाउस के एक कोने में छुपकर रह रहे थे और जब जार्ज बुश

साहब और नार्दन एलाइन्स ने मिलकर चारों तरफ काबुल में हमला किया है तो जिसने यह हरकत की थी वह खुद किसी कन्दरा में छुप कर मुंह छिपाए बैठा है। दहशत कभी न कभी दहशतगर्दी फैलाने वालों पर भी आ जाया करती है। हमने दोनों को रोते और छिपते हुए देख लिया, लेकिन हम क्यों डरें?

महोदया, हमने अखबार में पढ़ा कि हमारे प्रधानमंत्री जी के मकान की सुरक्षा व्यवस्था कड़ी कर दी गई है। उन्हें डरने की क्या जरूरत, लड़ाई तो काबुल में है। एक दिन हमने पढ़ा कि गृह मंत्री जी का पंडारा रोड वाला मकान सुरक्षा की दृष्टि से पर्याप्त नहीं है। यह दहशतगर्दी की निशानियां हैं कि एक घटना के बाद मकान असुरक्षित महसूस होने लगता है, अपना ही घर अपने को असुरक्षित होने लगता है। कभी-कभी हमको अपने ही घर में डर लगने लगता है। एक बार हम 12 साल बाद, 15 साल बाद अपने गांव गए थे तो हमको अपने ही मकान में डर लग रहा था। अंधेरा था, बिजली नहीं थी, चराग नहीं था तो डर लग रहा था। अपना ही घर कभी-कभी डरावना हो जाता है। अगर हम इस हिन्दुस्तान को एक डरावना घर बना देंगे तो यहां से तुलसी, यहां से सूर, यहां से कोई भी बड़ा विद्वान और कलाकार नहीं निकल सकता, कोई भी संदेश हम नई सभ्यता को नहीं दे सकते, गौतम और गांधी नहीं पैदा कर सकते।

इसलिए अपने देश को मजबूत देश बनाने के लिए और सारी दुनिया को नया संदेश देने के लिए, जो मानवता को एक करने का संदेश बन सके और जो लोग दहशतगर्दी किया करते हैं, चाहे मजहब के नाम पर, चाहे दौलत के नाम पर, उनकी हिम्मत तोड़ने के लिए भारत सरकार को यह संकल्प लेना चाहिए कि हम मजबूत से मजबूत कदम उठाएंगे और सारी इंसानियत को एक मिठास के बंधन में बांधेंगे। सारा विपक्ष ही नहीं, सारा देश ही नहीं, सारी मानवता, प्रधान मंत्री जी, आपके पीछे—पीछे चलने लगेगी।

मैडम, आपको बहुत-बहुत धन्यवाद।

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Now, we have five minutes to lunch. Our next speaker is Shri T.N. Chaturvedi. चतुर्वेदी जी, आप पांच मिनट बोलना चाहेंगे और फिर बाकी लंच के बाद बोलेंगे या आप लंच के बाद ही बोलेंगे, मैं जल्दी ऐडजार्न कर दूँ?

SHTI T.N. CHATURVEDI (Uttar Pradesh) : My colleague, Shri S.S. Ahluwalia, is not well. I have just been asked to speak. So, I will be speaking after lunch.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: So, you will be speaking after lunch?

SHTI T.N. CHATURVEDI: Yes, Madam.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Okay. Then, as I have announced, intervention of the Foreign Minister, the Leader of the House, will be at 4.30 p.m. Now, we adjourn for lunch, till 2 o'clock.

The House then adjourned for lunch
at fifty-eight 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 VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI RAMA SHANKER KAUSHIK) in the Chair}

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री रमा शंकर कौशिक): अब हम संयुक्त राज्य अमरीका में वर्ल्ड ट्रेड सेन्टर पर हुए आतंकवादी हमलों से उत्पन्न अंतर्राष्ट्रीय स्थिति तथा उसके परिणामस्वरूप अफगानिस्तान में अंतर्राष्ट्रीय अंतःक्षेप, भारत पर उसका प्रभाव तथा उसके परिणाम और उस संबंध में सरकार की प्रतिक्रिया के संबंध में डा. मनमोहन सिंह द्वारा 22 नवंबर, 2001 को आरंभ की गई चर्चा पर चर्चा करेंगे। चतुर्वेदी जी, आप बोलिए।

SHRI T.N. CHATURVEDI -: Sir, I am grateful to you for inviting me to participate in the discussion, which was initiated by the Leader of the Opposition, Dr. Manmohan Singh, in an extremely erudite and enlightening manner. He raised a number of issues; it is not for me to give any sort of a reply. I might, at some places, try to give my own personal reactions and responses to some of the points that have been made.

I listened to the presentation of Dr. Manmohan Singh, with the attention that it deserved. Fortunately, I was in a position to listen to most of the other hon. speakers on this very important subject. And, therefore, it is not for me to repeat many of the things that have already been said. But I think some of the points need underscoring and some need clarification. In the first place, I would like to mention that this forenoon, an hon. Member raised the point about the anatomy of terrorism; its genesis, its growth, its form, and the complexion it takes. But it is not for me, at this moment, to go into all those details because a lot of international literature has been produced on the subject, and tonnes of pages have been written, including an encyclopaedia on this particular subject. But I certainly believe that our country has been a victim of terrorism since long, as our great leaders like Mahatama Gandhi, former Prime Minister, late Smt. Indira Gandhi, under whom I had the privilege to serve, and Shri Rajiv Gandhi were all assassinated. And, all these things compel us to think as to what terrorism is and how it could be tackled. All the Governments, since independence, have been endeavouring their best to see that the culprits, who have escaped, are held to account - no doubt, some of them have been punished. As far as Shri Gandhi's case is concerned, I need not go into that. But one cannot take any umbrage at the feeling that has been expressed, as ours is a multi-cultural society and all of us, including this Government, are wedded to that particular concept. We not only believe in *Vasudev Kutumbkam*, but also believe that all routes and all religions lead to

God; to the Truth, whatever way or word we may adopt to recall that great Power. I would also like to mention that we cannot apportion blame to any section or any group. Rather, we are required to put our minds together, have a sense of self-introspection and to see that the ideas which lead to particular 'isms'; the ideas which lead to fragmentation, or divisiveness, are eliminated. I think, the entire political section of this country, and every informed citizen, owes a responsibility for this. Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, I listened with great interest to my friend, Shri Janeshwar Mishra. He has felicity of expression and lucidity of expression. He also evokes a lot of emotions in each of us, in a very laudable manner, when it comes to the question of human sufferings, whether in this country or elsewhere. I, certainly, share his sentiments.

I would like to make two points. The first point is, since independence, it has been the responsibility of the Government to protect and to defend the borders of our country. I think, there have never been two views on this. A reference was made to the phrase 'Mahaprabhu' and so on. I would not go into that because I have got limited time of thirty-eight minutes. I would only like to mention that as far as India is concerned, it has always followed an independent policy, which takes into account certain principles of morality, ethics and traditions of the freedom of movement. That was why many of the hon. Members mentioned it as a bipartisan or a multi-party stand-point, and there was no division. But all I want to say is this — it has also been made clear by the Prime Minister in this House, more than once - that India is not a 'banana republic' India will preserve security, and its economic sovereignty cannot be bartered away under any circumstances. He has said this in this House. And I think, both the Minister of External Affairs and the Prime Minister have repeatedly made it clear at different forums during their recent visits. They have made it clear that as far as India is concerned, it is fully equipped and is capable enough to meet the challenge of cross-border terrorism. But Sir, if the letter was sent to USA, it was not a petition; it was not a supplication; it was the expression of the agony and anger of this country to a country which has been designated or called as '*Mahaprabhu*'. But, so far as we are concerned, every country is a sovereign country; all have equal rights and liabilities and that is why, I do not believe that this world can any longer be divided between the '*Mahaprabhu*' and others.

Sir, the other point which I would like to make is in relation to a comment that was made by Shri Janeshwar Mishra, though he is fully entitled to do so. With the same respect which he has for the Prime

Minister and which I have for him, I would like to mention that whenever the question of rationalisation or a little bit of dilution in the security of many a big leaders in this country comes up there is a lot of song and dance and it is said that this Government wants to compromise with the security of these big leaders. He has also mentioned that we are living in an atmosphere of terrorism. So, Sir, when the atmosphere of terrorism is there, then, certainly, the decision to dilute or increase the security of WIPs lies with the persons who are responsible for maintaining the security of these people, and not so much with the persons who are to be protected, whether it is the Home Minister or the Prime Minister. I fully agree with him that any war is an anti-thesis of civilisation. During the First World War, when Bertrand Russell was asked as to why he was not participating in the war, which was to save the civilisation, Bertrand Russell, in his own inimitable way, said, "I represent that civilisation." So, I fully agree with him that all wars, civil wars, somehow or other, choke the stream of civilisation. That is why I was pleasantly surprised to read that the Prime Minister, while on his visit to Moscow, could find time to address the Soviet indologists and talk to them about the cultural, literary and other relations which this country has had with the erstwhile Soviet Russia and even earlier. It is a very long history with which all of us are familiar. I think that you have the ring of the interactions of civilisation in the various addresses that he gave this time at various places.

Sir, I want to make one or two other general points. We are very touchy when anybody tries to equate us with Pakistan. We are one of the original members of the United Nations, but Pakistan is a new member of the United Nations. Sir, I think, it is not right for us to be equated with Pakistan, and many a time in this House as well as that 'we are a much bigger nation', I say this not with any chauvinism, but with as much feeling of national pride as Shri Janeshwar Mishra, and which, I think, every citizen of this country shares and cherishes. Sir, as far as national pride and national self-respect is concerned, there is no question of any compromise. It has been said that 'India hustled through in giving promises and assurances that it will extend all facilities even before they were asked. Sir, this is really an index of the principled stand of this Government, not only of this Government, but also of the Government of India, that, so far as terrorism is concerned, whatever may be its genesis, whatever may be the places, India is opposed to it. So, that assurance has really flown out of that commitment; it has emerged out of that commitment and out of that principled stand, and India was not desperately seeking any special gain for it.

This was the indication. If I may say so, India was telling the entire world that if other countries are also affected by terrorism, India was ready to extend whatever help it can. It was unfortunate that there was a belated recognition of terrorism in other countries, including in the United States of America, though it had been experiencing it for the last 20 years. Even from my memory I can say that it had experienced it even in Marine barracks in Beirut. It had an experience of it in Tanzanian and Kenyan embassy explosions. It had an experience of it in its flight No. 103 while flying over Scotland.

Recently we had initiated in a mere and discussion about it for a International Convention against Terrorism. The principled stand that India took was an assurance of the Government of India that it would not be found wanting in extending all facilities to fight terrorism wherever it existed. We would not hesitate in condemning terrorism wherever it existed. There has to be a genuine international effort to fight terrorism of all kinds anywhere in the world. Unfortunately we find today that our neighbour, which is the creator of terrorism, is standing along with the United States of America, which is the victim of terrorism. That is why I say they had a belated wisdom. **देर आयद, दुरुस्त आयद।** Sir, I am not going into the history as to the way of terrorism the United States has allegedly committed or what happened during the Cold War in the Soviet Union or done by it. I am not speaking on that because it is now history and I do not have enough time to discuss about this. Moreover, it is not for me to defend either of the two. But, so far as India is concerned, our Government even at that time did condemn such incidents.. Pakistan is now in the vortex of a dilemma and is reaping the whirlwind of what it had sown earlier.

I would now like to draw your attention to one thing. In an enlightened tone, the Leader of the Opposition had raised several issues --misgivings, doubts and uncertainties -- which, we all, as citizens of this great country share. I thanked him earlier and I thank him now again for having said all this. I would now like to draw your attention to what the Prime Minister had said in his *suo motu* statement. This discussion hinges on what he had said after his visit to three countries. During the visit he focused on the issues of broader and long-term bilateral relationships with the countries he visited. These visits also provided him an opportunity for consultations on important international issues, including the campaign against terrorism and post-conflict challenges in Afghanistan. He said: We are worried about cross-border terrorism and terrorism in general. We are

worried about post-conflict challenges in Afghanistan, because we have relations with Afghanistan since our ancient past. Even in the Mahabharata we have a mention of Gandhari and so on. I have with me a paper which traces different historical links. Even when we read Pt. Nehru's autobiography, there is a mention about Afghan Princess, who came and met Pt. Nehru.

Not only of Tagore's Kabuliwala, but other things also. We have also been having a strategic interest in Afghanistan all along. I think, probably, on these concerns some more elaboration would be supplied or furnished by the External Affairs Minister. My humble submission is that the visit of the Prime Minister should be seen in the broader long term perspective because it concerns the long-term agenda of our bilateral relations with these countries. That is why he talks of Russia and fulfilled a bilateral decision of having an annual summit. Similarly, the visit to the United States; the Vision statement that was signed also talks of further strengthening of bilateral relations.

Sir, I just want to draw your attention to one aspect. It has been very much said, and there has been some kind of a hype in the press in a different way, that the visit of the Indian Prime Minister did not receive that much attention in the media, compared to others. In 1976, I was in the United States. I remember opening pages of the Washington Times. I also remember the visit of the then Indian Prime Minister and what kind of attention he was given in the media, except the press conference. Then, I was held up in Washington due to some unfortunate circumstances. I even contacted some members of that delegation. The same thing happened when another Indian Prime Minister visited the U.S. and addressed the Congress. We have all read about it. So far as the foreign media is concerned, we know how they treat us. That is why, in their psyche, again and again, it is to be dinned. India is a big country and its people; with the potential which they themselves very often, talk of us, cannot be taken for granted.

Sir, I do not want to compare a leader of a great democratic country with a dictator. There is no point even in saying what kind of a reception he got one; for lunch and another for dinner. Somehow I consider it as not relevant. President Musharraf might have derived some satisfaction, might have scored a point on public relations. But I wonder whether he really came back with any solid gains. I would just like to mention some of these. On the other hand, I think our Prime Minister's visit focused on

bilateral relations. We read the two things; the joint statement and the Moscow Declaration; and the reference to "double standards." I am glad the Declaration again emphasised the point on cross-border terrorism. I do not know whether you will permit me to read out the different portions of that joint statement by President Putin and the Indian Prime Minister, Shri Atal Behari Vajpayee. Of course, I do not want to go into those details. But I just want to say that the Moscow Declaration on international terrorism was signed by the Prime Minister of India, Shri Atal Behari Vajpayee and the President of the Russian Federation, Mr. Putin; and a number of other bilateral agreements were signed for strengthening cooperation in other fields. It is the cooperation in other fields which are of long-term interest to us. I am confident that this will strengthen the capability of this country to take on terrorism from whatever country or from whatever source it comes. The other day, our hon. friend, Mr. Roy Chowdhury said, "If we want to stand and be respected and counted in the world, then, it is question of developing our self-reliance in everything" -- self-reliance not in any narrow sense, not in a parochial sense, so that we can have enough economic strength. We must remember the necessary social cohesiveness flows from the prosperity of every section of the society and then no country in the world can take us for granted.

A very significant paragraph in that Moscow Declaration is about voices being raised often about self-determination and so on. This was earlier also said by a former Prime Minister or the last President of the Soviet Union when he came to the country. Here also, it has defined the limits of self-determination. Many people try to promote divisiveness in the country in the name of talking of unity and self-determination. Somehow or the other, they use this word. That has been completely buried in this statement. It is said, "In multi-ethnic democratic countries such as India and Russian Federation, violent actions have been perpetrated under the slogan of self-determination. In reality, the present acts of terrorism, in most cases, have international links." It is again a matter of great satisfaction that not only President Putin talked about the double standards. I am sure it will go home to the other countries in the world.

I would like to touch another aspect of the joint statement. An issue has been raised about Jammu and Kashmir by many members. I think many political commentators, very perceptive commentators, have also mentioned that so far as these visits of the P.M. are concerned, in the discussion of the United States, three words found little mention and they

are Pakistan, Musharraf and Jammu and Kashmir. And that shows that the focus, the intention of the Prime Minister, was not prompted by the exigencies of the moment. Something happened to them. But I think it is a long term perspective that motivated the visit.

There are four or five important issues to which I would like to refer. There was an agreement that both the sides acknowledged an active role for India, in consultation, on the political and economic future of Afghanistan. That is of important concern to us. In this regard, it was also mentioned that Richard Hass, pointsman for Washington, will, probably, be visiting. The second thing is, I think the agreement to expand cooperation on prevention of proliferation of sensitive technologies and weapons of mass destruction and applications including provision of additional training and programmes and equipment. Sir, this is also important because we have been also concerned about the CTBT and views have been expressed in this House many a time. I think this is another important matter in which there has been a good initiative.

Another point which was very relevant for us is, they agreed to discuss ways of stimulating bilateral high technological commerce, including dual use of technology. The subject of dual use of technology has been reopened. I have no doubt that this will be to our advantage and we are to take note of this so that we can prepare ourselves.

Another point is about expanding space cooperation in civilian and scientific fields. I have a feeling, and I share it with you, that this is a marked change from the days when the United States itself drew a line about discussing this dual use of technology.

Sir, I will just take two more minutes. Many other subjects of important nature were discussed. One notable outcome of the visit is to separate energy sector from the environment in the future discussions. This is expected, significant[^], to develop a regulatory framework for commercial projects, including our energy security. If I might say, the United States also agreed to resume three security-related projects, our atomic reactors which are ageing with which we have been concerned. Sir, I would also like to say two words about the United States. What was the game which they have followed so far as Pakistan is concerned? That is about the one billion dollar loan, part of which had already been announced by the United States spokesman Richard Bausher even earlier. This is one. But I fully share Dr. Manmohan Singh's concern and his view-point and I would also

like the Government to be conscious and to never let down its guards. We have to be alert that this money is not used for military equipment, etc. We should be alert in that.

The second aspect is, they never gave any assurance to Pakistan, that they will be arbitrators or mediators between the two countries. At no stage, anybody said anything about J & K. All of them, including Benazir Bhutto yesterday in Delhi, said that the two countries should resume their bilateral dialogue. And that falls within the purview of the Simla Pact. That is what we talk about. So, where is the pressure on India? The Prime Minister himself said, with reference to the message that he received from the Canadian Prime Minister on the American soil itself, "This is a matter for India to decide." I do not want to go into the question whether now India should go prepared, or if India went unprepared when the Agra Summit took place, because this is what was clarified at length by the External Affairs Minister and he can clarify much more if needed.

I may even mention that even in the Musharraf-Bush statement, there was caution probably, there was a prodding to him as to what kind of government he should have. "Both understood the importance of Pakistan to have a successful transition to democracy in the year 2000." I think there was some prodding. Probably, there was the same kind of prodding to the President of Pakistan when he called up the Prime Minister of India, trying to denounce the assault or attack in Kashmir, on our J & K Secretariat, killing a large number of people. That itself is an admittance that there are people who are coming from the other side and there are many other concerns. Particularly, one of them was that Taliban might find their way to Jammu and Kashmir. I think we have to be careful about it. Even if they are holed up in Pakistan, they may try to destabilise even that, regime. We want even a strong and stable Pakistan because that is in our interest. That has been our policy. They may lie low and, after some time, they may try to create some further problems so far as a part of our country, Jammu and Kashmir, is concerned. It is true that India developed further this idea of G 6 plus 2.

And this point was raised by Dr. Manmohan Singh also. I would like to mention that the United Nations has mooted the idea of grouping of 21 nations, which includes India, to facilitate the socio-economic reconstruction of Afghanistan and also its political reconstruction. We are really interested in this matter. In view of India's links and the humanitarian help and the other help which was mentioned and our links or our contacts

with the Northern Alliance, I hope that no groupings can ignore the India's stand and the India's view-point in the political arrangement that Afghanistan may have and it has rightly been stated by the Prime Minister that such a grouping should be broad based, it should be all inclusive of the ethnic groups and it is the people of the country, who ultimately, should decide this. So, I don't think that it is the *Maha Prabhu* from outside who will determine these things. There may be a period of transition, and it has happened in many countries. But ultimately, I have no doubt in saying that we have every consideration in our hearts for the people of Afghanistan. We really suffer when they "suffer, and that is why, one of the earliest steps was that Indira Gandhi Hospital should be revived, it should be revitalised and reinforced. Our representative has also gone for a meeting in Bonn, where this discussion has already started. I will end by saying that India has all along taken the principled stand in all respects, and the visit of the Prime Minister was not just directed to the question of Jammu and Kashmir or the cross-border terrorism only, but to the question of- global terrorism, and that was in conformity with the long term vision, the long-term interest, the bilateral dialogues by which this great country stands among the great countries like the Soviet Union and the United States. Thank you.

SHRI KAPIL SIBAL (Bihar): Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir. I consider it my privilege to participate in this Short Duration Discussion on the international situation arising out of the terrorist attack on the WTC, leading to international intervention in Afghanistan, its impact on India and its ramification, rather the response of the Government of India in regard thereto. Much has been said during the course of this debate. But I am afraid that we have not yet focused on the real issue in question. Where did India, as a country, stand prior to black Tuesday, September 11, 2001? Where does India as a country stand today- qua terrorism, qua the situation in Afghanistan and qua our national interest in this entire region? What happened on September 11, 2001, was an attack against humanity. There is no doubt about it, and I believe, that the international community, as part of a coalition, must respond to terrorism and deal with it, not only in the manner in which it is being done, but from a long-term standpoint. I sometimes wonder who really is a terrorist. Is it possible to identify a terrorist? The ultimate objective of a terrorist is ultimately to create terror in the minds of people, by assaulting a group of persons, a large section of the community, at a time when he chooses to assault.

There is, therefore, an element of surprise. It is very difficult to understand why a terrorist attacks you. The objects of the attack are innocent people not necessarily concerned with the source of the anger of the terrorist. To be able to fight such blind anger, such irrationality, perhaps, the fight through scud missile, cluster bombs, etc., may temporarily serve the purpose. We, as members of the international community, belonging to the comity of nations, must think ahead. What is Afghanistan? A wretched country, with a life expectancy, according to the United Nation's Report of April, 2001, of 43 years. Its rate of literacy is 23 per cent. Its per *capita* GDP is less than 700 dollars. The Afghans have no access to safe water, sanitation, health-care, education, etc. There is no infrastructure of any sort. You may bomb it; you may destroy it, in the hope that you will get Osama bin Laden. So, what? I am, sometimes, reminded of a terrorist who wants to get on to a plane, and he has weapons of offence on his person. He is scanned through the scanner. When he is scanned through the scanner, you are able to catch hold of his weapons. You are able to dispossess him of his weapons because you can identify the weapons. But you can never scan his anger. It does not come on the screen. How do you deal with that? That is the fundamental question the international community must ask itself. The Americans, the American Embassies, the American establishments, all over the world, have been attacked, time and again, ever since 1992. I don't want to go into the history. During the trial of some of the accused in the attacks on the American Embassy in Dar-es-Salaam and in Nairobi, one of the accused persons belonging to Al-Qaeda was caught. He defected and started telling the world as to how the Al-Qaeda was run. I want to share that with the Members of the House. His name is Jamal Ahmad Al Fadal. He says, "When the terrorists are explained how to attack ordinary people, they are taught that they should not fear killing non-combatants. That is drilled into their minds. Don't be afraid of killing the non-combatants. If the innocent victim is a good person, he will go to heaven. Don't worry, even if you have killed him. If the innocent victim is a bad person, in any case, he will go to hell". That is the psychology they are taught. This gentleman, Al Fadal, used to get 500 dollars a month. His origin is Swedish. There were others, who were Egyptians, who used to get three times more the money that he used to get. So, he was very upset about that fact. He said in his testimony-It is part of the record of the trial court-that he received from the Al-Qaeda 10,000 dollars for arranging a deal to purchase uranium. They, these terrorists, are further told that when you go to a country and when you are

going to do acts of terrorism, shave off your beards; you have to behave like those amongst whom you are living; you wear slacks, have a crew cut, take an apartment in the most modern sector of the town so that the neighbours do not pry on you, and behave like the ordinary people.

There is a reason why I am sharing this story with the hon. Members of this House. If an ordinary person is sitting next to you, how do you know that he is a terrorist? How do you identify him? How do you win a war against terrorism in this fashion? Sir, a lot of these people who ultimately went to camps in Pakistan were orphans from various parts of the world. Where the families could not afford to give them food and education, they were sent to these Madrassas, they were educated there and they grow up to become Mullahs. Because they had no links with their families, whatever their teachers told them to do, they would do. This was at the height in the 90s. I am not talking about the year 2000-01. I am talking about the 90s and even earlier. This is how these terrorists were trained. This is how the Taliban came into existence. The basis was hatred and the ire was against the Western world, India and of course, Israel. That is why the attack on the World Trade Centre symbolises an attack on prosperity, an attack on capitalism. This is not the first time that the World Trade Centre was attacked. Rarrad Yusuf in 1993 attacked the World Trade Centre by putting bombs in his truck and took it to the bottom of one of the basements of the World Trade Centre in the hope that if one tower fall, it would fall on the other tower and both the towers would collapse. Unfortunately, that did not happen. It is not as if America is new to this. It happened in 1993. Thereafter, even as late as in the year 1999-2000, there was an attempt to assassinate President Clinton. There was an attempt to assassinate the Pope. There was a plot to blow up the United Nations buildings, the tunnels. In fact, I would like to share with you the testimony which is a very important testimony of one of the earlier FBI agents who said before the Senate that the target of attack was going to be the United States in the years to come. These are facts. In fact, I would like to quote a US official in Washington who said in 1998, "We talk about the Bin Laden organisation. But it is really a Bin Laden alliance. It is unusual to find Palestinians, Yemenis, Sudanese, East Asians in the same alliance. He is the glue between the groups that have little in common with each. For instance, the Kashmiris and Egypt's Islamic Jihad." The point that I am making is that we are fighting a whole culture of terrorism. We are not just fighting the terrorists. The enemy is this culture of terrorism and the focus of the international community^{h*} is to be to deal with that culture, wherever it

may be. Now, having laid the foundation of what terrorism is and what we are fighting with, what is it that India has done, what is it that the United States has done and where are we today in Afghanistan? This is what we are dealing with in our debate today.

What is happening in Afghanistan? From September 11 onwards, what did we see? We see the focus. The focus was: How to get to Osama Bin Laden? Slowly, Mr. Rumsfeld, Mr. Colin Powell, Ms. Condoleeza Rice started admitting that it may be very difficult to find Osama bin Laden, but that they will try and destroy all the networks of Al-Qaeda in Afghanistan and other parts of the world; and the first step is Afghanistan. Today, nobody is talking about that. Today, we are talking about what kind of an interim arrangement we are going to make in Afghanistan. The United Nations have set up this meeting in Bonn; a Council is going to be set up there and a particular person is going to be named. Burhanuddin Rabbani thinks, it is going to be him. Some want Shah. We do not know who is going to be named. Then, the matter is going to be referred to the Lower Jirga, which is their tribal Council, in the meantime, in a period of two years, this particular temporary council is going to set up a Constitution. Then the matter is going to go back to the Lower Jirga; then the Constitution is going to be approved, and that is going to take another couple of years. So, what are we talking about? We are talking about a time-frame of two or three years within which the international community hopes to set up some kind of a structure in Afghanistan to be able to bring back that country from its levels of existence that it is in today. What is going to happen in the interim period? There will be some kind of a provincial arrangement in which the super powers will have their own interests. The reason why I say this is, I don't find India anywhere there. If you look at the Six plus Two initiative, India is absent; Pakistan is there. If you look at the Cyprus initiative, India is absent. If you look at the Rome initiative, India is absent. If you look at the Peshawar initiative, India is absent. India lauds itself that, now, in the Group of 21, we will be present. What is the role that we have to play there? Who is asking us what role we have to play there? The reason why we are absent lies in the peculiar situation in which Afghanistan is in because -- I give you a small example -- there are as many Tajiks in Afghanistan as there are in Tajikistan; so, naturally, Tajikistan has an interest in it. There is the Uzbek minority in Afghanistan; there are the Hazaras; of course, there are the Pashtuns; and there are other communities. And, amongst these communities, amongst the Shias and Sunnis, there are also groups. The whole country is a tribal

country, and these groups had destroyed each other from 1992-96, when, ultimately, the Taliban took control of Afghanistan. And, each of these groups has a vital interest in that area. The reason is simple. It is because, in the Caspian Sea -- the Leader of the Opposition rightly said so -- there is a game going on, and the game that is going on is reflected in a recent publication by two Frenchmen in a book called "Bin Laden, the Forbidden Truth" written by Jean-Charles Brisard and Guillaume Dasquie. Now, in this, they talk about one Mr. John Unil, Deputy Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation. This gentleman had, in fact, investigated the bombings of the World Trade Centre in 1993, a U.S. base in Saudi Arabia in 1996, the U.S. Embassies in Nairobi and Dar-es-Salaam in 1998, and the USS-Cole last year. He made a very interesting revelation, and it was, that just before September 11, in early 2001, the Bush Administration began a series of negotiations with the Taliban, Washington and Islamabad were also venues for some of the meetings. The authors claim that before the September 11 attacks, Christina Rocca, in-charge of Asian Affairs in the U.S. State Department, met the Taliban Ambassador to Pakistan, Mullah Abdul Salam Zaeef, in Islamabad on August 2, 2001.

"And the United States was interested in the oil and gas reserves of Central Asia, which, for the present, are controlled by Russia. And the Bush Government was wanting to change all that, and the rationale of energy security changed into a military one" In fact, the U.S. representative -- it is alleged in the book -- told the Taliban, "Either you accept our offer of a carpet of gold or we bury you under a carpet of bombs." It happened much before September, n. What does that mean? The meaning, Sir, is simple; and the meaning lies in some facts which I want to place before you. We have the Caspian Basin; and in the Caspian Basin, there are five riparian States, namely, Russia, Kazakhstan, Turkmenistan, Iran and Azerbaijan. Kazakhstan has a potential of 65.56 billion barrels of oil; Turkmenistan has a potential of 46 billion barrels; Azerbaijan has a potential of 10.3 billion barrels. In fact, the total region has a potential of over 200 billion barrels of oil. Now, there is the question of access, because you have to transport oil. The country through which the oil will go will charge transit fee and the country which will build the oil pipeline or the companies which will build the oil pipeline will earn profits. So, every country is wooing the other country that the pipeline should pass through that country. Now, either you have the exit through the Bosphorus -- and there, Turkey is saying that it is an environmental hazard -- or, you have the exit through the Black Sea where Russia is interested: so Russia and Iran are quite close on this;

or, the Arabian Sea where India is interested, and that is why Unicoi came in, and now, of course, Unicoi has withdrawn, and that is what we were negotiating so that we could get a pipeline over land; remember, there was a talk of having a pipeline under the sea; now pipeline over land. We were almost ready to accept that, but there were some problems. So, there are large interests at stake, and in these States, *i.e.*, Kazakhstan, Turkmenistan, Iran and Azerbaijan, there are ethnic minorities which have a stake in Afghanistan. Each of these border States, each of these Central Asian States, will have their own interests to follow in Afghanistan. What are we doing about it? In fact, last time, we had a debate on Agra. The hon. Foreign Minister was in this House; and I said that our foreign policy is only Pakistan-centric and Kashmir-centric. Every time something happens in Kashmir, we tell the international community, "see Pakistan is the sponsor of terrorism". Please, look beyond Pakistan, where our national self-interest lies. If we look at the expected rise in the internal consumption of oil in the years to come, say, in the middle of the 21st century, the kind of volumes of consumption of oil is unthinkable. Where are we going to get that from? We should start thinking in terms of our foreign policy, looking to the year 2050. Are we doing that? Are we setting up alliances? We are not even called upon to play a role in Bonn, even though our representative will go there. That is one part of it. The other part of it is terrorism. What has happened about terrorism in India? We had the hon. Ministers go to the public in this country and say, "now the war against terrorism is being fought in Afghanistan, we will have security on our borders". Where is that security?

In fact, at the end of September or the beginning of October, 42 persons were massacred outside the Assembly in Jammu and Kashmir. That was the message the terrorists were sending. Wherever President Musharraf has gone after September 11, he has said that the issue of terrorism in Afghanistan is entirely different. 'The issue in Kashmir has nothing to do with terrorism because that is a fight for freedom.'

Has the perception changed? No. Has Pakistan changed its policies in terms of what was happening in Afghanistan? No. Has the attacks on Afghanistan, against the Taliban, in routing out the Taliban had any impact on terrorism in Kashmir? No. Just this morning, I was looking at the Hindustan Times. It is talking about yesterday. It says, "A suicide squad of the Lashkar-e-Taiba, on Sunday, attacked a security camp at Jawahar Tunnel on the Jammu-Srinagar highway. Three security personnel and a

civilian were killed in the attack, while five, including three security men, were injured. The attack comes exactly a week after Lashkar militants Killed 17 people, including 13 soldiers at Ramban."

So, the so-called fight against terrorism in Afghanistan is having no impact on the terrorism in Kashmir. What is the policy? What are you doing, apart from telling the U.S.? What is your policy? If it is POTO, it is fine, because POTO is in operation since October 15th. Through your POTO, could you catch these militants who came across and killed our innocent security men? Could you catch them? So, please tell us.

Through you, Sir, I beg on the hon. Prime Minister, to enunciate what his policy towards Afghanistan is. What does the Government of India wants to do? Every time a dastardly attack takes place from across the border, naturally, reactions are emotive. One day, the Prime Minister rightly said, "We have crossed the limits of patience and we are not going to talk to Musharraf any more, till the cross-border terrorism stops." Of course, we have unilaterally ordered a ceasefire, despite what had been stated earlier. But, again, now this was said. When he was asked before his trip to New York, "Will you be talking to Musharraf in New York?" He said, "Why should I talk to him in New York? I can talk to him in New Delhi." When he comes back, he is asked a question, "What about Kathmandu?" He says, "Yes, in Kathmandu, I can talk." So, please tell us whether you want to talk or you don't want to talk; when do you want to talk or you don't want to talk; how are you going to talk, what is it that you want to talk about. What is your agenda? Please let us know. Please let the country know. So, you don't have a Kashmir policy. If this kind of cross-border terrorism continues, how are you going to deal with it? Do you have any contingency plans? That is one part.

The other part, if I may mention, is, as far as the U.S. is concerned, the U.S. and other oil companies in the U.S. have already a vested interest in more than 50% of all the oil reserves in that part of the world. The only access America can get, for oil, for the purpose of commercial utilisation, is through Pakistan. So, in America's long-term interests, America will never give up its association with Pakistan, despite the fact that the Americans have evidence, which the Government of India has given them. In fact, in the year 2001, there was an investigation in New Delhi, in respect of a possible attack against the Embassy in New Delhi, along with the American Embassy in Myanmar. In fact, in a report, that is being filed, Osama-bin-Laden has been accused in this case, along with five others. The Americans know.

All this is now clear. In Kunduz, what' is happening? President Musharraf is pleading with the Americans, "Allow my people in Pakistan, who have gone there, to come back. Give them some kind of a safe passage." So, Americans know that the ISI is directly involved. Some of the youth in Pakistan, misguided maybe, are directly involved.

In fact, when President Musharraf changed three top officers, including the then ISI Chief, Mehmood, they did so with the knowledge that they are pro-Taliban. In fact, the Chief of the ISI went across to deal with Omar for the purposes of asking him to hand over Osama Bin Laden, but went there and told him, "No, no, we are with you." The Americans came to know about it. So, the Americans are totally aware of the fact that Pakistan is the breeding ground of terrorism in the world. Yet America has not once said so. Even with regard to attacks in Kashmir whenever we are pleading with the Americans, "Please now say", Collin Powell only comes and says, "Yes, that was a terrorist attack." But he never says that it was sponsored by Pakistan. That is the reality of the United States. We respect them because any sovereign nation would look to its interests. We respect them. I do not think we can have any quarrel with them. But the question is how we are looking after our interests and what we are doing in the matter. That really, Sir, is the issue that we are debating today. Where is our policy on Afghanistan and what are we going to do? If America is not going to give up Pakistan because its large economic interests lie there and, of course, they themselves have said, to dismantle Al-Qaeda is a Herculean job. It is not going to happen in a day. This fight against terrorism is going to go on and on. If America is not going to recognise the reality of the day, that it is Pakistan which sponsors terrorism, where is India and where is our policy? I request, through you, Sir, and I ask the Prime Minister to lay bare and to share with the people of this country what his policy is with regard to Afghanistan and what India is going to do, in respect of Kashmir as well. Thank you very much.

SHRI FALL S. JMARIMAN (Nominated): Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, I welcome the Prime Minister's *suo motu* statement especially the part which relates to his visit to Russia. People to people cooperation that is stressed between peoples of Russia and of India, I believe, is a most important step, a step in the right direction in our external relations. The traditional friends and compatriots of the people of India have always been the people of the erstwhile Soviet Union and now of Russia. Over the years, many of my American friends frequently ask me why we in India have always been

suspicious about American foreign policy. My answer has been and remains that ever since President Nixon threatened to send his largest aircraft carrier, The Enterprise into the Indian Ocean during the Bangladesh War to bombard India, it was only because of the intervention of the Soviet Union that he backed off and the threat was not carried out. This single act has entered into the psyche of the Indian people. I believe, it is this one single act that has kept the peoples of the United States and India apart and brought the peoples of Russia and India closer together. We need, of course, to establish a dialogue for closer relationship between the people of India and the people of the United States as well. I welcome what the Prime Minister has described as a new vigour in Indo-US relations. But this vigour should not be gauged or assessed as it is being assessed in the media on the basis only of the financial aid being given to Pakistan. Friendship between nations as with individuals gets debased when it is based on financial expectations. Speaking dispassionately and having no party affiliation, I look upon the visit of the Prime Minister to Russia, the United States, the United Nations and the United Kingdom as one that must needs be supported. The more the contact between the world leaders of whom the Prime Minister is one, the better for peace and tranquillity in the world. Having said this, a special word about Afghanistan. The bombing in Afghanistan was a sequel to the events of the 11th September. It was a wake-up call for the United States, and not a wake-up call for India, however. We have been trying to alert the United States to the dangers of global terrorism for many years before. It was only when terror was brought home to the USA that it reacted. And the United States Government did wake up genuinely. There was a report in some sections of the press — otherwise, missed around the world — of what the United States Government did the day after September 11. On September 12, a day after the destruction of the World Trade Towers, it, quietly and without much fanfare, paid up most of its arrears of contribution to the United Nations, indicating its resolve as the world's oldest democracy to fight global terrorism through the United Nations. But, regrettably, the bombing of Afghanistan was not under the U.N. auspices, but as a response of the U.S. alone, in what was called 'self-defence.' Though warranted under the U.N. Charter, such attacks, I believe, are defensible only when they respect the twin principles of necessity and proportionality. This is not only the civilized way; it is the only way known to international law. What has happened has happened. But, neither necessity nor proportionality justifies any more the continuance of the US or Britain bombing Afghanistan and further jeopardising the lives

of the innocent civilians in that unfortunate country. World opinion is veering round to this view. In the issue of the London Times of 21st November, 2001, a frequent contributor, Simon Jenkins, writes, and I quote, "Had the Afghanistan situation been handled not by war but by bribery, cajoling and financial strangulation, nobody can tell if Bin Laden would now be dead and the Taliban on the run. Those whose opinion I trust..." -- Simon Jenkins says -- "...believe so. Bombing was, therefore, avoidable." But September 11 was a wake up call for the United States, not merely to combat global terrorism, but for another reason as well. The destruction of the Twin Towers in New York was not just some gigantic terrorist operation of a group of maniacs. It was a planned attack, full of symbolism, as my friend, Mr. Kapil Sibal, has said, on the economic and military might of the world's super power. It was terrorism with a purpose -- a vicious attack on the United States for being too self-righteous, too prosperous, and much too uncaring. We have to impress upon the First World to now address itself to the mass of humanity - those living not only in geographical concentrations of enormous wealth, but the millions of others living in large areas of abject poverty. This lesson of September 11 has not so far seeped into the psyche of the West.

Shortly after the attack of September 11, someone in Delhi said, "Hatred is a super-bomb which even America cannot handle." Although the United States has launched its counter attack on terrorism, it has not, so far, addressed its causes the policies that have engendered so much hatred amongst large sections of people around the world.' I believe, the role of the Government in the international fora is clear. It must be to help devise structures and strategies to strengthen the free world, to work not only for a world free from fear, but for a world free from ignorance and free from want, because ignorance and want spell doom and they are fertile breeding grounds for terrorists. We must impress upon the leaders of the world that happy contended, people do not indulge in wanton destruction. It is the discontented, unhappy, people who become terrorists. But preaching is not enough. We must show, by our example, by our policies in Kashmir, for instance that we do want a happy and contented State. This means, building bridges, gaining the confidence of the people in the State. This can be done best only through a dialogue. Cross-border terrorism must be addressed in the same breath as greater autonomy for the people of Jammu and Kashmir, as my dear colleague, who sits behind me, Mirza Abdul Rasheed, has always been pleading. In the meanwhile, if we are genuine in our concern for combating global terrorism, the Government of

India must ratify and actively encourage the ratification of certain Conventions. The first one of such Conventions is the Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court, 1998. Only forty-three Nation-States have so far ratified it. It requires ratification by sixty States to come into operation. The second one is the New York International Convention for the Suppression of Terrorist Bombings, of December, 1997, which hardly a handful of States have so far ratified. And, what of the future? The American policy in Afghanistan is consistent. Find Osama and kill him, by any means. Keep it simple. That is their motto.

So far, they have not succeeded, but, they, probably, will. And when they do, then what? The Americans and the British want to get out of Afghanistan as fast as possible. To save their conscience, they will send humanitarian aid, and, incidentally, this will help the starving refugees. But the long-term policy appears to be that Afghanistan must heal its own wounds, and find its own path to salvation. If it spawns another Bin Laden, the West will go back and bomb it again. With a policy like this, we, in India, I believe, have to be particularly watchful. It is good that we have opened our Embassy in Kabul. It must function as a source of succour and help to the Afghan people, different from all our embassies abroad. We must give what Afghanistan needs, whatever the Government chooses, as a good neighbour should. On this, we must not bother what Pakistan does. Afghanistan must no more be neglected. I have no doubt that long before the events of September 11, the destruction and defacement of the Bamiyan statues was not only an act of vandalism, but it was also done out of frustration. A symbol of being treated as a pariah in the world, a victim of United Nation's sanctions. No one took notice, except to condemn this. It still kept them out of the civilized world politics. So, they behave in a totally uncivilized manner, for the world to take notice. The Prime Minister has spoken about strengthening the traditional links of solidarity with the Government and the people of Afghanistan. It is good, but it is not enough. The Government must draw up a detailed plan as to how this is going to be achieved, and then implement it. That, I believe, is the only way to revive and establish, once again, friendly and cordial relations between the people of India and the people of Afghanistan. And, that is the main hope of peace in this region. Thank you.

श्रीमती सरोज दुबे (बिहार): धन्यवाद, उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय। आज हम सब खतरनाक आतंकवाद के विषय में विचार कर रहे हैं। इस आतंकवाद ने पूरे विश्व को दो हिस्सों में बांट दिया है। एक हिस्सा तालिबान का समर्थक हो गया और दूसरा तालिबान के खिलाफ हो गया।

हिन्दुस्तान में आतंकवाद ने समय-समय पर अपना कहर बरपाया है लेकिन इसको वैश्वीकरण की सहमती नहीं मिल पाई। विश्व के चौधरी अमरीका के पैंटागन और विश्व व्यापार केन्द्र पर 11 सितम्बर को हुए आतंकवादी हमले ने न केवल अमरीका बल्कि सारी दुनिया के दिल को दहला दिया और इससे विश्व के सभी देश स्तब्ध रह गए। राष्ट्रपति बुश जब अपनी सामान्य स्थिति में आए तो उनका डायलॉग था कि "ओसामा बिन लादेन जिंदा या मुर्दा चाहिए, अफगानिस्तान आतंकवादियों का स्वर्ग है, हमें पूरी दुनिया से आतंकवाद को समाप्त करना है।" मीडिया के माध्यम से यह पूरे विश्व में गूंज उठा। अमेरिकी राष्ट्रपति का यह ऐलान सुनकर भारतीय नेतृत्व की तो बाछें खिल गईं। उसने सोचा कि अमरीका के आतंकवाद की लड़ाई के साथ हम भी अपना युद्ध जीत लेंगे। शायद यही कारण है कि दुर्भाग्यवश इस घटना के तुरंत बाद ही "अमरीका के पहल किए बिना ही, अपनी विदेश नीति को ताक पर रखकर, सरकार ने जिस उतावलेपन से अपने आपको अमरीकी पक्षधर घोषित करने का जो क्रम चलाया, इससे इसकी स्थिति, 'मान न मान, मैं तेरा मेहमान, वाली हो गई। युद्ध के लिए हर प्रकार का सहयोग देने जैसी हड़बड़ाहट में जो अपनी बेजान सी भूमिका अदा की, इससे इसकी स्थिति पिछलग्गू जैसी हो गई। अमेरिका को सर्वशक्ति मानकर, उसकी हां में हां मिलाने वाली मातहत जैसी हो गई। गत 1 अक्टूबर को जम्मू कश्मीर की विधान सभा पर किए गए आतंकवाद के खतरनाक हमले ने यह स्पष्ट कर दिया कि पिछलग्गुओं की स्थिति मार खाने के लिए ही होती है और यही कारण है कि जम्मू-कश्मीर की विधान सभा पर जब हमला हुआ तो वहां के मुख्य मंत्री केन्द्र सरकार की असमर्थता और असहाय स्थिति के लिए फूट-फूटकर रोने के लिए विवश हुए। उन्हें यह कहना पड़ा कि रोज रोज मरने से अच्छा है कि हम एक दिन लड़कर मर जाएं। लेकिन उसके बावजूद केंद्र सरकार के कान पर जूं तक नहीं रेंगी। उसने एक पत्र राष्ट्रपति बुश को लिखकर अपने कर्तव्य कि इतिश्री कर दी और उन्होंने बहुत कोशिश करके 'सिमी' पर प्रतिबंध लगा दिया। लेकिन जब 'सिमी' के कार्यकर्ताओं की धर-पकड़ शुरू हुई तो चला कि सौ लोगों से ज्यादा गिरफ्तार नहीं हो पाए।

राष्ट्रपति बुश को पत्र लिखना, जैसा कि आदरणीय जनेश्वर जी ने कहा कि क्या वह कोई दरोगा था या हमारा मालिक था जिसे हमने रिपोर्ट कर दी। हमारे देश की यह नीति रही है, हमारी सार्वभौमिकता है कि हम अपने आंतरिक मामलों में किसी को दखल नहीं देने देंगे। लेकिन आपने राष्ट्रपति बुश को पत्र लिखकर क्या जाहिर किया कि आओ हमारे मामले में दखल दो, हमें हमारा पड़ोसी देश तंग कर रहा है। हमारी एक परंपरागत विदेशी नीति है जिसमें हम काफी सफल रहे हैं। उपसभाध्यक्ष जी, जिस समय, जब हम नये-नये आजाद हुए थे तब पंडित नेहरू की आवाज पूरी दुनिया में गूंजा करती थी। समस्या होने पर पूरा विश्व देखा करता था कि हिंदुस्तान की तरफ से कौन-सी आवाज आती है? कौन-सा समर्थन आता है? यह वही देश है जब बंगलादेश का पाकिस्तान से युद्ध हुआ तब इंदिरा गांधी जी ने सैवेंथ फ्लीट को डांटकर भगा देने, वापस जाने के लिए विवश कर दिया था। यह वही देश है जिसने हमेशा विश्व शांति और पंचशील का संदेश दिया। आज यही देश अमरीका को पत्र लिख रहा है कि हमारे साथ आतंकवादियों ने इस तरह से हरकत कर दी। आप क्या साबित करना चाहते हैं? हमारे कश्मीर के मुख्य मंत्री बहुत दिनों से मांग कर रहे थे कि कई आतंकवादी संगठनों पर प्रतिबंध लगा दिया जाए लेकिन इस सरकार ने नहीं सुनी और जब अमरीका ने लश्कर-ए-तोएबा और अन्य संगठनों को नामित कर प्रतिबंध की घोषणा कर दी तब बहुत खुश हुए कि हमारी बात मान ली गयी। अब हमारी यह स्थिति है कि हम सीमा के अंदर तो आतंकवादी नेताओं का स्वागत-सत्कार करते हैं, बातचीत करते हैं, उनका सम्मान करते हैं लेकिन सीमा के पार जाने की हमारी स्थिति नहीं है तो हम कैसे

आतंकवाद से निबटेंगे? कैसे आतंकवाद को मार भगाएंगे? कैसे अपने देश में शांति स्थापित करेंगे? हम ऊहापोह की स्थिति में रहते हैं। एक तरफ तो हम नैतिकता का बखान करते हैं कि रमजान में हमला नहीं करेंगे। तमाम सेना के जवानों को शहीद होने के लिए विवश करते हैं और दूसरी तरफ विश्व युद्ध के लिए अमरीका के पीछे-पीछे भागने लगते हैं। समझ में नहीं आता कि सरकार की यह कौन-सी नीति है, कौन-सी चाल है? अफगानिस्तान के खिलाफ जो युद्ध हुआ वह चीन और पाकिस्तान के लिए वरदान साबित हुआ। विश्व के बनते बिगड़ते घटनाक्रम में अपने राष्ट्रीय स्वार्थ को सिद्ध करना इन दोनों से बेहतर कोई और नहीं जान सकता। जब भी हमारे यहां कोई घटना या अनहोनी होती है तब हमारे यहां यात्राओं का दौर शुरू हो जाता है। हमारे विदेश मंत्री जी जिनका मैं बहुत सम्मान करती हूँ, भागे-भागे अमरीका, ब्रिटेन, जर्मनी सभी जगह चले गये। चीन खामोश रहा, सब खामोश रहे। चीन ने केवल इतना कहा कि निर्दोषों पर बमबारी नहीं होनी चाहिए। जब हमे कहीं भी समर्थन या कोई सम्मान नहीं मिला तब फिर थक-हारकर भारत के गृह मंत्री और रक्षा मंत्री को यह कहना पड़ा कि कश्मीर में जारी आतंकवाद का मुकाबला करने में हम खुद सक्षम हैं। हम अच्छी तरह से जानते हैं अमरीका सर्वत्र लोकतंत्र की दुहाई देता है पर स्वार्थवश पाकिस्तान के तानाशाह की जय-जयकार कर रहा है, प्रशंसा के पुल बांध रहा है। अमरीका अच्छी तरह से जानता है कि कश्मीर का आतंकवाद पाकिस्तान के संरक्षण और आर्थिक सहयोग से चल रहा है। मुशर्रफ ने अमरीका में कश्मीर की रट लगाकर भारत के खिलाफ बहुत विष वमन किया। बुश ने न केवल मुशर्रफ की सराहना की बल्कि घुमा-फिराकर यह भी जताने का प्रयत्न किया कि देर-सवेर कश्मीर में भी दखलंदाजी की जा सकती है। यह बहुत ही खतरनाक संकेत है और आने वाले दिनों में सतर्क रहने की खतरे की घंटी है। तालिबान के लाखों सैनिक समर्थक कहां गए? या तो वे अफगानिस्तान के बीहड़ों में चले गए जो वहां अपना युद्ध जारी रखेंगे या फिर पाकिस्तान में चले गए। देर सवेर पाकिस्तान की शह पर ये तालिबानी भारत में, जम्मू और कश्मीर में घुसकर जरूर आतंक मचायेंगे। पाकिस्तान की मदद से अमेरीका अफगनिस्तान में तालिबान को परास्त करने में सफलता प्राप्त कर रहा है लेकिन अब अमेरिका कश्मीर के मामलों में घुमाफिराकर जरूर हस्तक्षेप करेगा। इस सिलसिले में राष्ट्रपति बुश का संयुक्त बयान कम खतरनाक नहीं है। उनके संयुक्त बयान में है कि "कश्मीर की समस्या का समाधान कश्मीर की जनता की भावनाओं को ध्यान में रखकर करना चाहिए।" क्या यह वास्तविकता को नकारना नहीं है? क्या किसी राष्ट्र को यह हक है कि वह हमारे अदरुनी मामले में दखलंदाजी करे? क्या अमेरीका द्वारा पश्चिमी देशों में इस तरह की मुहिम का समर्थन किया जा सकता है? कभी नहीं। इसके बाद भी हम अमेरिका के सामने अपना सब कुछ समर्पण करने के लिए तैयार हैं। न्याय का कोई भी सिद्धांत अमेरिका के लिए अलग और एशियाई देशों के लिए अलग, यह कभी नहीं हो सकता। इस संदर्भ में मैं भारत के पत्रकारों को साधुवाद देना चाहूंगी। वे पत्रकार साधुवाद के पात्र हैं जिन्होंने राष्ट्रपति बुश को पत्रकार सम्मेलन में पूछा और बेहिचक पूछा कि "यह कहा का न्याय है कि अमेरिका आधी दुनिया को लांघकर आतंकवाद को कुचलने के लिए अफगानिस्तान में अंधाधुंध बम बरसाए। लेकिन हमारे देश ने अपने एक प्रमुख राज्य कश्मीर में सीमा पार से आए दिन हो रहे आतंकवाद को नजरन्दाज कर दिया है।" बुश इस प्रश्न को टाल गए क्योंकि उनके पास इसका कोई जवाब नहीं था और वे डिनर की बात करने लगे। मैं माननीय मंत्री जी को बताना चाहूंगी कि इस देश ने हमेशा बहादुरी, साहस की पूजा की है। अभी जब क्रिकेट मामले में विवाद उठा और हमारे खिलाड़ियों को अनुशासन-हीनता के बहाने निकाल दिया गया तो हमारे देश के अंदर एक बड़ी मायूसी छाई। लेकिन जब इस मामले में क्रिकेट कंट्रोल बोर्ड

ने कठोर कदम उठाया तो पूरे देश ने जय-जयकार की। आज भी अगर हम अपना सर उठाकर चलें और कोई ऐसा रास्ता निकालें, जिस तरह से निर्गुट देशों को लेकर श्रीमती इंदिरा गांधी ने रूस और अमेरिका के बीच में एक नई ताकत पैदा की थी और इस देश को पूरे विश्व में एक नई शक्ति के रूप में खड़ा कर दिया था, उसी तरह की स्पिरिट की आज इस देश को जरूरत है। आप जितने दौरे करें, चाहे जितने लोगों के यहां जाएं, हमारे विदेश मंत्री का एक पैर हमेशा हवाई जहाज में रहता है लेकिन जब भी कोई समस्या पैदा होती है तो वे असहाय खड़े रहते हैं, चाहे यह कश्मीर का मामला हो, चाहे जहाज अपहरण का मामला हो और चाहे वह आतंकवादी को अपने जहाज में ले जाने का मामला हो — इस घटना को यह देश कभी नहीं भूल सकता है — हम देखते हैं कि सरकार हर मामले में असहाय खड़ी रहती है। हमारे माननीय प्रधानमंत्री जी लंदन गए। ब्रिटेन के प्रधानमंत्री टोनी ब्लेयर, जिन्होंने राष्ट्रमंडलीय देशों के सम्मेलन में पाकिस्तान के खिलाफ खुलकर कहा था और उन्होंने पाकिस्तान में लोकतंत्र के अवसान को लेकर इतनी ज्यादा चिंता जताई थी जितनी की एक पाकिस्तानी नागरिक को ही हो सकती थी और उन्होंने राष्ट्रमंडल से पाकिस्तान को निकाल दिया था और कहा कि जब तक पाकिस्तान में लोकतंत्र की बहाली नहीं होगी तब तक हम उनसे कोई सरोकार नहीं रखेंगे। वहीं टोनी ब्लेयर अब मुशर्रफ की तारीफ करते हुए नहीं अघाते हैं। उनका आतंकवाद को समाप्त करने का जो अभियान है उन्होंने उनको उसका सेनानी समझ रखा है। सामरिक और रणनीति के हिसाब से पाकिस्तान के मुकाबले भारत ज्यादा कारगर था। मगर उन्होंने पाकिस्तान को, जो आतंकवाद का पोषक और संरक्षक है, उसको आतंकवाद का विरोध करने वाले देशों का हीरो बना दिया जब कि भारत की मांग यह थी कि आतंकवाद के विरोध लड़ाई में इस आतंकवाद के संरक्षक को कोई स्थान न दिया जाए। लेकिन अमेरिका और यूरोपीय देशों ने इस मांग को ठुकराकर इसके लिए पाकिस्तान को चुना। यह हमारी उपेक्षा नहीं है तो क्या है? गिरगिट की तरह रंग बदलते हुए इन पश्चिमी देशों को आपको पहचानना होगा। समय ने सिद्ध कर दिया है कि हमारा सच्चा साथी सोवियत संघ है। वह हर कसौटी पर खरा उतरा है। आज जब हम अमेरिका के सामने हाथ पसारकर खड़े हो गए हैं तो इससे रूस के तेवर भी बदले हुए नजर आते हैं। कहा भी गया है कि दुविधा में दोनों गए, माया मिले न राम। हम अमेरिका को अपना बना नहीं पाए और रूस जो हर अग्नि परीक्षा में, हर कसौटी पर खरा उतरा है उससे हम कहीं दूर होते चले गए हैं। यह सच है कि दोनों देश आतंकवाद को मानवता के विरुद्ध एक अपराध मानते हुए सहमत हुए और यह कहा कि “आतंकवाद को उचित ठहराने के लिए उसके टुकड़े नहीं किये जा सकते”। दोनों देश सहमत हुए कि आतंकवाद से जुड़े देशों के खिलाफ निर्णायक कार्यवाही होनी चाहिए परन्तु मास्को घोषणा पत्र में कश्मीर का कोई जिक्र नहीं। संवाददाता सम्मेलन में राष्ट्रपति पुतिन कश्मीर की खास चर्चा को बता गये। प्रधानमंत्री जी की इस यात्रा के दौरान उन्होंने रूस की नीति घोषित कर दी थी कि “भारत और पाक आपसी बातचीत से अपना यह मुद्दा सुलझा लें”। सोवियत संघ इस बात का कट्टर समर्थक था कि कश्मीर हमारा अभिन्न अंग है लेकिन अमेरिका पश्चिमी देशों तथा चीन के साथ नये समीकरणों के संदर्भ में रूस उतना कट्टर नहीं रह गया। पाकिस्तान ने रूस से विमान, टैंक और अन्य शस्त्र प्रणालियां खरीदने की बात चलाई। यह सब कुछ और ही संकेत देते हैं। हमें यह सोचना पड़ेगा कि हम कहां खड़े हैं। इस छोटे से दौर में प्रधानमंत्री जी का दौरा या विदेश मंत्री जी का दौरा कोलिन पावेल और रमसफील्ड और बुश का हृदय परिवर्तन नहीं कर सकता है। अतः हमारे लिए सब से बड़ी महत्वपूर्ण बात है कि हम इस विश्व के संकट को राष्ट्रपति की अपनी नज़र से देखें, दूसरे के चश्मे से नहीं देखें। आज जो यह समस्या है, विश्व संकट पैदा

हुआ है, इस पर हमें सावधानी से कदम उठाना होगा। कई प्रकार के सवाल हमारे सामने खड़े हैं। भारत अमरीकी संबंधों की क्या दिशा होगी? पाकिस्तान अमरीका के नजदीकी संबंध क्या रहेंगे? भारत और पाक के नये संबंध क्या होंगे? इन सब का दक्षिण एशिया की सुरक्षा और स्थिरता पर क्या असर पड़ेगा? इस समूचे परिदृश्य में भारतीय हितों की कितनी रक्षा हो सकती है? इन सारे सवालों को ध्यान में रख कर हमको कदम उठाना पड़ेगा। अफगानिस्तान हमारा पड़ोसी देश है, हमारा मित्र देश था, किसी वजह से दूरी हो गई थी और इसमें जो नयी सरकार बनने वाली है, उस पर हमें अपनी भूमिका अदा करनी पड़ेगी क्योंकि यही हमारे रूस, चीन मित्र देश होंगे, इसलिए भारत को तय कर लेना चाहिए। अब तक हम आर्थिक मामलों में तो अमरीका की चरण वन्दना कर ही रहे हैं और अब राजनैतिक और राष्ट्र की संप्रभुता के मामले में हम अमरीका के सामने सिर को नहीं झुकाएँ, दबें नहीं, यह हमको पूरे तौर पर ध्यान रखना होगा। अमरीका इस विश्व का बड़ा पूंजीपति देश है जो हमारे जैसे देशों का खून चूसना चाहता है केवल भारत को बाजार के रूप में देख कर उन्होंने थोड़ी सी शह भारत को दे दी तो भारत को गलतफहमी हो गई। इसलिए मैं सरकार से अनुरोध करना चाहती हूँ कि इस संकट की घड़ी में बहुत ही बहादुरी के साथ, जनभावनाओं को देखते हुए, अपने वीरतापूर्ण इतिहास को देखते हुए, अपने गौरवशाली इतिहास को देखते हुए, जो हमारे देश का नेतृत्व कर गये, उन सबको ध्यान में रखते हुए कोई ऐसा कदम उठाएँ जिससे हमारा सम्मान पूरे विश्व में बढ़े। आपके पास यह समय है कि आप दूसरे देशों को विश्व शान्ति का पाठ पढ़ा सकें और जो विकासशील राष्ट्र हैं उनको लेकर उनका नेतृत्व करके इस विश्व को नयी दिशा दें। अफगानिस्तान जिसको नये सिरे से पनपना है, उसमें आपने जो पांच करोड़ की सहायता दी है, अच्छी बात है। उसमें किस ढंग से अपनी भूमिका अदा करेंगे, इन सारी बातों को देखते हुए आपको कदम उठाना है और इस आतंकवाद को जड़ से समाप्त करने के लिए और खास तौर से अपने देश से निकालने के लिए, अपने आपको सक्षम बनाना पड़ेगा, राजनैतिक इच्छा शक्ति लानी पड़ेगी। केवल पोटो लगा देने से या सिमी पर प्रतिबन्ध लगा देने से आतंकवाद खत्म होने वाला नहीं है। अमरीका ने इस बात को स्पष्ट कर दिया है...**(समय की घंटी)**... अगर सीमा पार से आतंकवाद पैदा होता है तो हम उसके आतंकवादी शिविरों को आक्रमण के जरिए नष्ट कर सकते हैं। यह एक इतिहास बन गया है। अपने देश की सीमा, अपने देश के ऊपर किसी प्रकार का हमला अपने देश की संप्रभुता को किसी भी प्रकार की चुनौती को हम बर्दाश्त नहीं करेंगे। यह देश बड़ी कुर्बानी के बाद आजाद हुआ है। यह देश किसी के सामने झुकने वाला नहीं है। आप बहादुरी के साथ कदम उठाइये, पूरा देश, पूरा विपक्ष, पूरे देश की जनता आपके साथ है और इस हिन्दुस्तान का सर ऊंचा उठाने के लिए हर कोई कुर्बानी देने के लिए तैयार है। धन्यवाद।

† मौलाना ओवैदुल्ला खान आजमी (झारखंड): शुक्रिया सदरे मोहतरम।

सदर साहब —

"एक-दो जख्म नहीं, सारा बदन है छलनी

दर्द बेचारा परेशां है, कहां से उठे"।

अमेरिका में वर्ल्ड ट्रेड सेंटर पर हुए दहशतगर्दना हमले से पैदाशुदा बैनलअकवामी

† Transliteration of the speech in Persian Script is available in the Hindi version of the debate.

सूरतेहाल और उसके नतीजे में अफगानिस्तान में बैनलअकवामी मुदाखलत, हिंदुस्तान पर उसका असर और इस बारे में हमारी गवर्नमेंट का रद्दे अमल, यह है वह सब्जेक्ट उनवान और बहस के लिए तयशुदा हिस्सा जिस पर पार्लियामेंट में बहस हो रही है।

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री रमा शंकर कौशिक): दो दिन से हो रही है।

मौलाना अबैदुल्ला खान आजमी: मुसलसल दो दिन से हो रही है, अपर हाउस में हो रही है। सर, अफगानिस्तान से हमारा सदियों, सदियों का रिश्ता है। तहजीब का रिश्ता है, मआशीयात का रिश्ता है, तिजारत और सियासत का रिश्ता है, अखूव्वत और मुहब्बत का रिश्ता है, सदभाव और भाईचारे का रिश्ता है। इन रिश्तों के बनने और बिगड़ने के अपने-अपने वक्त में हमने अंजाम भी देखे हैं। इसे दुनिया की तारीख, एशिया की तारीख और हिंदुस्तान की तारीख पढ़कर समझा जा सकता है। जब तारीख के दर्पण में हम देखते हैं तो यहां और वहां कभी-कभी खुदगर्जियां भी हमें देखने को मिली हैं जो खूरेजी में तब्दील हो गयीं और तारीख में ऐसा भी एक दौर आ गया जिसमें न इधर से कोई खुदगर्जी और न उधर से कोई खुदगर्जी और दोनों तरफ के रिश्ते काश्मीर के सेब और कंधार के अनार के आदान-प्रदान पर उस्तवार होते हुए दिखलाई दिए। मगर यह वक्त तारीख की गहराइयों में जाने का नहीं है। यह सारी बहस 11 सितम्बर, 2001 को वर्ल्ड ट्रेड सेंटर पर होने वाले दहशतगर्दना हमले के नतीजे में हो रही है। दहशतगर्दी, टेरोरिज्म आतंकवाद है। मुजरिमों के मुख्तलिफ नाम हैं और मुजरिमाना हरकतों की मुख्तलिफ तस्वीरें हैं। मगर इस सच्चाई से दुनिया का कोई भी पढ़ा-लिखा इन्सान इन्कार नहीं कर सकता कि दुनिया का जो सबसे ज्यादा मूजी मर्ज है वह आतंकवाद है। दुनियाए इन्सानियत पर फैलनेवाला मनहूस साया आतंकवाद है। इस आतंकवाद के नतीजे में शहर वीरान होते हैं, मां और बहिनों की मांग का सिंदूर खुरच जाता है, बच्चे यतीम हो जाते हैं, घर के घर, खानदान के खानदान और नस्ल की नस्ल उजड़ जाती है। आतंकवाद जिस देश में और दुनिया के जिस खिते में अपने हाथ-पैर फैलाता है, इन्सानियत की शकल बिगाड़कर रख देता है। आदमियत और मानवता के सबसे बड़े दुश्मन का नाम आतंकवाद है। आतंकवाद इन्सानियत दुश्मनी का प्रतीक है। आतंकवाद जिस देश में भी हो, जहां कहीं भी हो, वह इन्सानियत के लिए जहर है। आतंकवाद की मनहूस छत्रछाया में पलने और बढ़ने वाले आतंकवादियों ने दुनिया में जब-जब अपनी बुरी हरकतों का इजहार किया है तो दुनिया को खून के आंसू गम, अलम, रंज और मुसीबतें देखने को मिली हैं। आज भी आतंकवाद पर जब बहस हो रही है तो हमें संजीदगी से इसे समझने की जरूरत है कि आतंकवादी हमले, जिसके नतीजे में पूरी दुनिया इस वक्त छिन्न-भिन्न हो करके रह गई है और आतंकवादियों को पकड़ने की कोशिश दिन-रात जारी है। ये हमले सिर्फ भारत पर ही अपना अच्छा या बुरा असर नहीं डालेंगे, बल्कि पूरी दुनिया पर इनके बुरे असरात मुरतब होंगे। इस आतंकवाद से कैसे छुटकारा हासिल करें? मर्ज पर सब का इत्तफाक है, मगर मर्ज के लिए दवा कौन-सी मुंतखिब हो, किस पैथी के जरिए इस मर्ज का खात्मा हो, इस पर बहस दुनिया में जरूर हो रही है। जो लोग अपनी जान पर खेलकर आतंकवादी घटनाएं दुनिया में बरपा करते हैं, उनकी इस सोच की गहराई में भी हमें डूब कर सोचना होगा कि आखिर इस तरह की चीजें उत्पन्न क्यों होती हैं, आखिर लोग मरने-मारने के लिए तैयार क्यों हो जाते हैं, आखिर लोग अपने हाथों में आतंकवादी बम क्यों ले लेते हैं, आखिर लोग दुनिया के रौशन मुस्तकबिल को भयंकर अंधेरे में डालने के लिए क्यों तैयार हो जाते हैं? अगर किसी से बदला लेना है, तो बदले की हद तक बदला तो समझ में आता है, मगर बदले के नतीजे में पूरी दुनिया को सजा देना, यह बदले

की कौन-सी परिभाषा है, यह बात समझ से बाहर है। 11 सितम्बर को जो कुछ अमरीका में दहशतगर्दी बरपा की गई, उसकी यकीनन पूरी दुनिया के लोगों ने भर्त्सना की है और दहशतगर्दी की भर्त्सना और भरपूर मुजम्मत होनी भी चाहिए, इसलिए कि हम एक बेकसूर इंसान की हत्या को, सारे मानव संसार की हत्या मानते हैं, एक बेकसूर इंसान के कत्ल को सारे इंसानी समाज का कत्ल मानते हैं और किसी इंसान की जान बचाने को सारे मानव संसार को जीवन देना मानते हैं। 11 सितम्बर को जो हमला हुआ उस हमले के बाद रद्दे-अमल क्या हुआ? होना यह चाहिए था कि अकवामें मुत्तहिदा से मामलात को तय करके कोई कदम उठाया जाता, जिसके नतीजे में संजीदा इंसानियत की पुष्टपनाही भी अफगानिस्तान में बम बरसाने वालों को हासिल होती। मगर सर, ऐसा नहीं किया गया। हम फिर बार-बार आतंकवाद की भर्त्सना करते हैं। आतंकवादियों को पकड़ने में जो हमारा सहयोग हो, हम अपना हर सहयोग देने के लिए तन, मन, धन से तैयार हैं, मगर आप मुझे यह बताएं कि जिस तरह आतंकवाद की भर्त्सना हो रही है, क्या आप उसी तरह अफगानिस्तान की सर जमीन पर हजारों बेकसूर लोगों को मौत के घाट जिस बेदरदी और दहशतगर्दी के जरिए उतार दिया गया, क्या उसी तरह उसकी भी भर्त्सना हो रही है? हम हर जुल्म के खिलाफ बोलें, अगर हम पर जुल्म हुआ और हम भी दुनिया पर जुल्म करने लगें, तो अपने पर होने वाले जुल्म के खिलाफ तो हमें सहानुभूति चाहिए, मगर दुनिया पर जो हम जुल्म कर रहे हैं, हमारे जुल्म के खिलाफ अगर कोई बोले तो संदेह के बादल नहीं छाने चाहिए। अमरिका जिस ओसामा बिन लादेन को पकड़ने का आज प्रयास कर रहा है, अमरिका जिस तालिबान को उखाड़ फेंकने का आज प्रयास कर रहा है, अमरीका जिस आतंकवाद के खिलाफ लड़ने की आज बात कर रहा है, अमरीका जरा आईने में अपनी तस्वीर देख लेता तो बेहतर होता। गुजरता है हर शख्स चेहरा छुपाए, कोई राह में आईना रख गया है। दर्पण झूठ नहीं बोलता है। हम अमरिका के सामने भी दर्पण रखना चाहते हैं। जब तालिबान पैदा हुआ तो किसने पैदा किया था? जब यह चलना नहीं जानता था तो इसे खून-ए-जिगर पिलाकर किसने चलने और दौड़ने के लिए जमीन हमवार किया था? जब यह अपने पैरों पर खड़ा नहीं हो रहा था, तब पैरों पर खड़ा होने के लिए इसको टॉनिक कौन पिला रहा था? इसको वरजिश कौन करवा रहा था और इसको रशिया के खिलाफ किसने इस्तेमाल किया था? रशिया के खिलाफ जब इसी ग्रुप को अमरिका लड़ा रहा था और रशिया को अमरीका तोड़ रहा था तब ये सब-के-सब अमरिका की नजर में स्वतंत्रता सेनानी थे और जब अमेरिका का सारा किया धरा कारोबार...(व्यावधान)... अभी कल ही प्रधान मंत्री जी ने कहा है कि टोका-टाकी नहीं होनी चाहिए और उसका आज ही उल्लंघन हो गया।

श्री संघ प्रिय गौतम (उत्तरांचल): मैं तो एप्रिसिएट कर रहा हूँ कि आप हिंदी के इतने अच्छे शब्द बोल रहे हैं।

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री रमा शंकर कौशिक): आप इसे टोका-टाकी क्यों कह रहे हैं? वह तो आपकी प्रशंसा कर रहे हैं।

मौलाना अबैदुल्ला खान आजमी: मैं यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि अमरिका जब रशिया को तोड़ रहा था तो यही तालिबान और यही अलकायदा को वह स्वतंत्रता सेनानी होने का सर्टिफिकेट दे रहा था। जब अपने मुँह पर थप्पड़ पड़ा तो अब अमरीका इनको आतंकवादी कह रहा है। मैं कहता हूँ कि आतंकवाद, आतंकवाद है, फिर चाहे वह हमारी भलाई के लिए काम करता है तो भी उसे आतंकवाद कहना चाहिए या हमारी बुराई के लिए काम करता है तो भी उसे आतंकवाद कहना चाहिए। मगर अमरीका की दोहरी नीति हर जगह दुनिया की नजर के सामने

है। हमने जो कुछ महसूस किया, वह यह कि अमरीका आज भी ईसाफ से काम नहीं ले रहा है। आतंकवाद को जड़ से उखाड़ फेंकने के लिए अमरीका किसके सहयोग से उसे जड़ से उखाड़ फेंकने की बात कर रहा है? हमारे लोगों ने अगर अमरीका को सहयोग दिया था तो इस बात पर तो चर्चा हो सकती है कि हमें झुककर सहयोग नहीं देना चाहिए था, पिछलग्गू बनकर सहयोग नहीं देना चाहिए था, दोस्त और बराबरी की सतह पर सहयोग देना चाहिए था, पिछलग्गू बनकर सहयोग नहीं देना चाहिए था, दोस्त और बराबरी की सतह पर सहयोग देना चाहिए था, इस पर चर्चा हो सकती है। अगर हमने आतंकवाद के खिलाफ सहयोग की पेशकश की तो मैं इस पेशकश को बुरी नजर से नहीं देखता, मैं इस पेशकश की बुराई नहीं करता। यह पेशकश जरूर होनी चाहिए थी, मगर अमरीका ने हमारी पेशकश को ठुकरा दिया। अमरीका आतंकवाद के खिलाफ लड़ने के लिए हमारी पेशकश पर कान धरने को तैयार नहीं हुआ। अमरीका ने अगर आतंकवाद के खिलाफ लड़ने में किसी की ताकत पर भरोसा किया, किसी को साथ लेकर खड़ा होने की बात की तो अमरीका ने पाकिस्तान को अपने साथ लिया, अमरीका ने पाकिस्तान को साथ लेकर आतंकवाद को खत्म करने की बात की। यहीं से अमरीका की नीयत पर हमें शुबाह होता है। सर, एक डाकू, दूसरे डाकू का हाथ पकड़कर अगर दुनिया में एलान करे कि दुनिया वालों होशियार, सावधान खबरदार हम सारी दुनिया से डकैती का खात्मा करने के लिए निकले हैं तो दुनिया के इंसान इस बात पर भरोसा नहीं कर सकते। पाकिस्तान के सहयोग से अमरीका आतंकवाद का खात्मा करने के लिए निकला है। अमरीका को क्या कश्मीर नहीं दिखलाई देता, कश्मीर में हिंदु-मुस्लिम हत्याएं नहीं दिखलाई देतीं, कश्मीर में पाकिस्तान का दस साला टैरेरिजा नहीं दिखलाई देता, कश्मीर की तबाही और बरबादी अमरीका को नहीं दिखलाई देती? जब अमरीका के अपने ऊपर पड़ती है तो आतंकवाद उसकी समझ में आता है और बदला और इंतकाम उसकी समझ में आता है और दुनिया के ममालिक जब इसी आतंकवाद से कराहते हैं तो अमरीका आतंकवाद की व्याख्या बयान करता है। इस दोहरी पॉलिसी के नतीजे में आज पूरी दुनिया को अमरीका ने गुलामी के शिकंजे में कस रखा है। सर, सच्ची बात तो यह है कि आतंकवाद के खिलाफ लड़ने का जिन लोगों के अंदर साहस है वह भी अपने दिल को मसोसकर रह जाते हैं कि अमरीका के सहयोग से आतंकवाद के खिलाफ लड़ाई लड़ी जाएगी। सर, अमरीका आतंकवाद के खिलाफ लड़ाई नहीं लड़ी जाएगी। सर, अमरीका आतंकवाद के खिलाफ लड़ाई नहीं लड़ रहा है, अमरीका अपने मफाद की लड़ाई लड़ रहा है। जहां उसका फायदा होता है वहां वह लड़ाई लड़ता है, जहां उसका फायदा नहीं होता है वहां चौकीदार नहीं बल्कि ठेकेदारी करने खड़ा हो जाता है। वह हमसे कहता है कि पाकिस्तान से बात करो कश्मीर के मसले पर, लेकिन उसने क्यों नहीं बात की अकवामे मुत्तहदा से अफगानिस्तान के मसले पर? उसने क्यों नहीं बात की पूरी दुनिया से अफगानिस्तान के मसले पर? उसने अकवामे मुत्तहदा से बात किए बगैर अफगानिस्तान पर बमबारी की, हजारों मासूम इंसानों की जान ली और उनको लुकमा ए अजल बना दिया। अगर हमारे हिंदुस्तान पर कश्मीर में मुसलसल पाकिस्तान की तरफ से आतंकवादी बम बरसाए जा रहे हैं और हम अगर डायरेक्ट पाकिस्तान पर अटैक कर दें तो अमरीका फिर अकवामे मुत्तहदा की दुहाई देगा, अमरीका फिर वर्ल्ड के इंसानों को आवाज देगा, अमरीका फिर हिंदुस्तान को कुसूरवार और गुनहगार ठहराएगा, अमरीका फिर हिंदुस्तान पर हमला करने का आरोप लगाएगा। मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि यह कैसी दोहरी नीति है? अकवामे मुत्तहदा से पूछे बगैर अफगानिस्तान पर बमबारी करें तो यह जायज और दुरुस्त है और हिंदुस्तान में हजारों हजार लोग पाकिस्तान की दहशतगर्दना हरकतों से मौत के घाट उतारे जाएं और जब हिंदुस्तान पाकिस्तान से टेढ़ी आंख कर के बात करे तो अमरीका वहां से कहता है होशियार रहो। टेढ़ी आंख करके बात करने की जरूरत नहीं, टेन्स होने की जरूरत नहीं, सरहदों पर फौज इकट्ठा करने की

जरूरत नहीं, अभी हम मुसीबत में हैं, अभी हम अफगानिस्तान में अपने सर्वोच्चतम होने की लड़ाई लड़ रहे हैं, अभी हमारी मूँछ कट गई है, हमारे गाल पर थप्पड़ पड़ गया है, अभी दुश्मनों का इलाज कर रहे हैं, इसलिए तुम लोग आपस में लड़ने की कोशिश मत करो। इसका मतलब यह हुआ कि अमरीका जब कहेगा कि हिन्दुस्तान पाकिस्तान दोस्ती करे तो हम दोस्ती करेंगे और अमरीका जब कहेगा कि हिन्दुस्तान पाकिस्तान दुश्मनी करे तो हम दुश्मनी करेंगे। अमरीका जब कहेगा कि अपनी-अपनी फौजें अपनी सीमा पर ले आओ तो हम फौजें लाकर ट्रेनिंग देंगे और अमरीका जब कहेगा कि वापस चले जाओ तो हम वापस चले जाएंगे। सर, हमारे उत्तर प्रदेश के पूर्वी इलाके की एक कहावत है — “बरैया मारे, रोवे न दे”। ताकतवर मारता है और रोने भी नहीं देता। कतील शिफाई ने बहुत अच्छी बात कही थी —

तू के न वाकीफे आदाबे गुलामी है अभी।
रक्स जंजीर पहन कर भी किया जाता है।

सर, गुलाम कौमों का हाल यह है कि वह आदाबे गुलामी सीखें और आदाबे गुलामी यह है कि मालिक अगर पैरों में जंजीर पहनाकर नचवाता है तो भी नाचना पड़ेगा। मैं तो यह देख रहा हूँ कि अमरीका सबका मालिक बन गया है और सब अमरीका के गुलाम और ताबेदार बनकर उसकी गुलामी की जंजीरें अपने पैरों में पहने हुए नाच रहे हैं। यह नाच नाचने से आतंकवाद खत्म नहीं होगा। सच्ची बात तो यह है कि आतंकवाद को अमरीका ने पनपाया है, आतंकवाद का पालनहार अमरीका है, आतंकवाद जन्मा है अमरीका की गोद में, दुनिया के मुल्कों में अमरीका अपने को एस्टेब्लिश करने के लिए आतंकवादियों को तरह-तरह से जन्म देता रहा है और नतीजे में ताकत की बुनियाद पर वह सारी दुनिया से खिराज वसूल रहा है। यह तरीकेकार दुनिया से आतंकवाद को उखाड़ेगा नहीं बल्कि नित नए आतंकवाद को जन्म देता रहेगा। मैं आपसे बताना चाहता हूँ कि रोजाना फिलिस्तीन के ऊपर बम बरसाए जा रहे हैं और अमरीका चूँ तक करने के लिए तैयार नहीं, रोजाना हमारे हिन्दुस्तान में कश्मीर में पाकिस्तान की तरफ से खून का दरिया रवां किया जा रहा है और अमरीका चूँ तक करने के लिए तैयार नहीं। वह अमरीका दहशतगर्दी के खिलाफ क्या लड़ेगा, जिस अमरीका में दहशतगर्द पनाह लेते हैं, वह युरोप क्या लड़ेगा दहशतगर्दी के खिलाफ, जिस युरोप में दुनिया के हर मुल्क के बागी लीडर जाकर पनाह लेते हैं। दुनिया के सारे आतंकवादियों के खाते इन्हीं मुल्कों में रहते हैं। यह लोग बैनुल अकवामी तौर पर दहशतगर्दी की मंडी अपने यहां पैदा किए हुए हैं क्योंकि इन्हें अपने हथियार बेचना हैं, इन्हें अपने औजार बेचना हैं, इन्हें गरीब मुल्कों को लड़ाना है। यह खुद दहशतगर्दी के जन्मदाता हैं।

सर, दुनिया में इंसानियत की खिदमत करने और इंसानियत को बचाने की क्षमता अगर है तो दुनिया अपनी गरीबी में भी अपनी खुदारी को न कुर्बान करे, अपने जमीर को न कुर्बान करे और अमरीका को साफ-साफ यह कह दे कि तुम्हें अपनी पालिसियों पर गौर करना पड़ेगा, तुम्हें अपने लिए किसी चीज को पुण्य कहने और दूसरे के लिए किसी चीज को पाप कहने की रवायत को बदलना पड़ेगा। अमरीका वह अजब चीज है, सर, कहता है कि हमारा दुश्मन हमको दे दीजिए, हमारा मुजरिम हमको दे दीजिए। जरूर दे दीजिए और जिसका जो मुजरिम है वह उसको दे दीजिए। मुजरिमों को पनाह देना बड़ी गलत बात है। अगर यह उसूल तय किया है तो जब अलामे-इस्लाम का दिल दुखा रहा था सलमान रुश्दी और अलामे-इस्लाम सलमान रुश्दी को मांग रहा था तब यही लोग उसको छिपाए हुए थे। हमारा मुजरिम छिपाएं तो यह उनके लिए पुण्य है और हम अपना मुजरिम मांगें तो यह उनके लिए पाप है। यह दोहरी नीति नहीं चलने वाली है।

सर, हमारा देश हमेशा इंसाफ के लिए लड़ाई लड़ा है। मैं आपको सही बताता हूँ कि न अमरीका की हिम्मत है हिन्दुस्तान का कुछ बिगाड़ देने की, न वर्ल्ड की हिम्मत है हिन्दुस्तान का कुछ बिगाड़ देने की, न आतंकवाद की हिम्मत है हिन्दुस्तान का कुछ बिगाड़ देने की, बस हिन्दुस्तानियों में आपस में सच्चा प्यार होना चाहिए, आपस में सच्चा भाईचारा होना चाहिए। हम हिन्दुस्तानियों को सोचना चाहिए कि आतंकवाद का दूसरा नाम नफरत है। हम अगर जात बिरादरी की नफरत पैदा करेंगे तो आगे चलकर यही आतंकवाद का स्वरूप ले लेता है। हम धर्म के नाम पर अगर नफरत पैदा करेंगे तो यही आगे चलकर देश को कमजोर करता है। इसलिए हिन्दुस्तान को अगर हमें अपने पैरों पर खड़ा करना है तो भारत को मजबूती के साथ दुनिया के नक्शे पर खड़ा करके रोशन करना है तो हमें हिन्दू का 'ह' और मुस्लमान का 'म' निकालकर भाईचारा बने। आज बदकिस्मती से हमारे मुल्क में भी नफरत की जहरीली हवाएं चल रही हैं। जिस जमाने में तालिबान को नफरत के लिए अमरीका व पाकिस्तान ने पैदा किया था, उसी जमाने से हमारे मुल्क के अंदर ही धर्म के नाम पर, मंदिर और मस्जिद के नाम पर नफरत का एक बिगुल बज गया था। जरूरत है इस नफरत के बिगुल को तोड़ देने की और मोहब्बत की बंसी बजाने की। जिस तरह श्रीकृष्ण ने मोहब्बत की बांसुरी बजाकर नफरत का खातमा किया था, जिस तरह श्री रामचन्द्र जी ने सामाजिक इंसाफ का बिगुल बजाकर नाइंसाफियों का खातमा किया था, जिस तरह मौइनुद्दीन चिश्ती ने इतिहास का बिगुल बजाकर आपस में समता का पैगाम दिया था, जिस तरह इस देश के सूफियों-संतों ने आपसी मोहब्बत और भाईचारे का पैगाम देकर हिन्दुस्तान को एक निर्णायक मुल्क बना दिया था, आज उसकी जरूरत है। हमारे पास किसी चीज की कमी नहीं है। हमारे पास दुनिया की हर दौलत, हर ताकत मौजूद है। हमारे पास दुनिया जहान के सारे धर्म मौजूद हैं, सारे कर्म मौजूद हैं, सारी तहजीब मौजूद है, सारी संस्कृति मौजूद है, इनकी सारी अच्छाइयों को अपनी जिन्दगी में हमको डालना चाहिए, दाखिल करना चाहिए, और यही एक चीज है जिसकी हिन्दुस्तान को जरूरत है।

हमारी आज की बहस का मेन मुद्दा है कि हिन्दुस्तान पर इसके क्या असर पड़ेंगे, मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि कुछ असर नहीं पड़ेगा। हिन्दुस्तान पर अगर असर पड़ेगा तो आपस की फूट से पड़ेगा, हिन्दुस्तान पर अगर असर पड़ेगा तो आपस की नफरत से पड़ेगा, हिन्दुस्तान पर अगर असर पड़ेगा तो जात-बिरादरी की सियासत से पड़ेगा, हिन्दुस्तान पर अगर कोई बुरा असर पड़ेगा तो धर्म की सियासत और राजनीति से पड़ेगा, हिन्दुस्तान के ऊपर अगर कोई बुरा असर पड़ेगा तो मंदिर और मस्जिद के नाम के षडयंत्र से पड़ेगा। इसलिए बेहतर यह है कि हिन्दुस्तान पर खारजी या दाखिली का कोई असर न पड़ने पाए। देश के सारे लोगों को अखुव्वत के धागों में पिरोकर के सारी दुनिया को यह पैगाम दिया जाए:-

एक शजर ऐसा मुहब्बत का लगाया जाए
जिसका हमसाए के आंगन में भी साया जाए।

धन्यवाद, शुक्रिया।

SHRI KARTAR SINGH DUGGAL (Nominated): Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, it is cruel to say so, after the September 11 tragic happenings in the USA, but I would hate myself if I don't remind America that the Talibans are

4.00 P.M.

the creation of their principal ally and they have played a no mean role in introducing and equipping the Talibans with a variety of sophisticated weapons themselves during their fight with the erstwhile Soviet occupation. In fact, it is believed that whatever arms sent for fighting in Afghanistan in those days leaked in transit and went into the hands of the so-called freedom fighters elsewhere, whether in Kashmir or in Chechnya.

And, maybe, the USA would have been saved the horrendous happening of September 11, if they had listened to India, which is fighting against the Afghan terrorists for the last one decade and more. Every time we complained, our pleas fell on deaf ears. Even when President Bill Clinton was in New Delhi, the massacre that took place in Chattisinghpura, a Sikh village in Kashmir, did not open the American eyes. They have realised it now at a very heavy cost. And the irony of the circumstances is that they are now fighting the Talibans with an ally who created and fostered them all these days. Even today, it is said, one wing of Pakistan is fighting against the Talibans, and the other wing is supporting them with men and material.

With the fall of Kabul, the Talibans can be considered as having been defeated. But they cannot be written off. The real Afghan-like fighting is going to start now. And it forebodes to be wily and wicked, fought in caves and caverns.

Fearless, ferocious, barbarous, bigoted, the Talibans, a name given to them only recently, are an ancient people. They have the blood of Taimur, and Nadir Shah, Ghoris and Abdalis, running in their veins. They were witness to, and not infrequent participants of, the hordes of marauders forging their way into India and returning with camel-loads of loot. Geographically destined to be a land-locked country, with utterly hostile environs, no hardship is too hard for them and no suffering is too inhuman for them. Jealously guarding their own freedom, they have little respect for others' rights. Condemned to a medieval way of life, their needs are frugal, excepting their Allah whose company they seek five times a day.

No wonder that the British who started annexing the subcontinent bit by bit beginning from West Bengal halted their operation at the North West Frontier Province.

Not only this; when, in 1845, Dost Mohammad, the King of

Afghanistan assumed a menacing posture, the British sought help from Punjab to subdue him. Accordingly, Maharaja Ranjit Singh's son, Sher Singh ordered General Aitaville to move from Peshawar to the relief of the British. The Sikh troops recaptured Ali Masjid beyond Khyber and relieved Jalalabad. In Indian history, it was Maharaja Ranjit Singh who for the first and, perhaps, the last time turned the tide of ages and taming the wild Afghans, hoisted his flag on the Kabul Fort. The exploits of his legendary General Hari Singh Nalwa were fresh in the memory of the Tribals of the region until yesterday, who would frighten their malingering children by telling them, "Haria Rawda", there comes Hari Singh Nalwa.

Known in the West Punjab as Rashes, these Tribals whether Afridis, Yusufzais, Khattaks or others of Swat and Bannu and beyond have always styled themselves as Mujahids and Ghazis. According to M.A. Macauliffe, the noted historian of Sikhs, the main reason why Aurangzeb started his campaign of Islamization from Kashmir was that Kashmir had Tribals of Kabul and Kandahar next door. If the Hindus of Kashmir misbehaved, a jihad could be raised and the non-believers subdued with sword. The Tribals were illiterate, religious fanatics frightfully ferocious and wild.

No wonder that Mr. Jinnah also thought of the Afghan Tribals in 1947 in his misadventure to annex Jammu and Kashmir. The atrocities they perpetrated are still fresh in the memory of the people of Poonch and Baramulla.

There is no denying the fact that the British did not only halt their operations at NWFP, they learnt to live with the Tribals. Their writ ran up to the Durrand Line, mainly Peshawar and not quite so after sunset even in the Peshawar Cantonment I have experienced it personally during my tenure at the All India Radio, Peshawar in the early 40s. The Britishers had an exclusive department to keep the Pakhtoon Tribals and beyond humoured. They had agents who distributed largesse and arms to them regularly. They also had a broadcasting outfit, probably the oldest one in the subcontinent, which helped them keep in touch with the Tribals.

Not only this, coming from a village in the vicinity of Rawalpindi Cantonment, we had the frightful experience of these Tribals raiding the villages in Pothohar with the beat of drum, looting and disappearing in thin air. The British soldiers in barracks at a stone throw would look the other way. In my memory, our village was raided three times, our own house

being the target once. What the Government did after the robbery was that my father was issued a licence for a gun and the case was closed.

The Americans, indeed, have an impossible enemy on their hands. I hope, now they would appreciate our fight in Kashmir which they dismissed as a struggle with freedom-fighters and our endeavour to put down terrorism which they condemned as violation of human rights.

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री रमा शंकर कौशिक): एक निवेदन मैं सभी माननीय सदस्यों से कर दूँ कि अभी 9 सदस्य और बोलने वाले हैं और उन्हें साढ़े चार बजे तक बोलना है, फिर साढ़े चार बजे माननीय सदन के नेता चर्चा में हिस्सा लेंगे और हमें आज ही इस चर्चा को खत्म करना है। इसलिए मैं आपसे निवेदन करूँगा कि आप थोड़ा-थोड़ा समय लीजिए। चूंकि बहुत सी बातें कही जा चुकी हैं, इसलिए जो प्वाइंट्स रह गए हैं, उन्हीं प्वाइंट्स को आप यहां रखिए।

श्री दयानंद सहाय (झारखंड): माननीय उपसभाध्यक्ष जी, आपने मुझे बोलने का समय दिया इसके लिए आपका बहुत-बहुत धन्यवाद। मैं हाउस का चार-पांच मिनट से ज्यादा समय नहीं लूँगा। इस सवाल पर बहस हो रही है कि 11 सितम्बर को वर्ल्ड ट्रेड सेंटर पर बम गिराया गया या उसे हवाई जहाज से लड़ा दिया गया। उससे उत्पन्न स्थिति पर हम लोग चर्चा कर रहे हैं। उसके बाद से अमरीका तालिबान को मिटा देने की कोशिश कर रहा है। मैं तो अपने प्रधान मंत्री जी को बहुत-बहुत धन्यवाद देना चाहता हूँ कि बिना कुछ खर्च के हम लोगों ने, इस देश ने न एक रुपया खर्च किया, न इस देश की कोई आर्मी भेजी, फिर भी, हम लोगों की, हमारे देश की गिनती इसमें आ गई है कि हम लोग अमरीका का साथ टैरिज्म को खत्म करने के लिए दे रहे हैं। हमने बिना किसी खर्च के इज्जत पाई है। आज दुनिया का हर बड़ा देश चाहे रूस हो, चीन हो, इंग्लैंड हो, जर्मनी हो या आस्ट्रेलिया हो, या पाकिस्तान हो, सभी देश कह रहे हैं कि वे तालिबान वालों को, बिन लादेन को पकड़ने के लिए अमरीका का साथ देंगे। इसके लिए सरकार को धन्यवाद दिया जाए, इसकी सराहना की जाए। मैंने यहां पर कई नेताओं के भाषणों को सुना और कई लोग अमरीका को गाली दे रहे हैं, ऐसा मौका देख रहे हैं कि हम अमरीकन फारेन पालिसी को अपने इस हाउस से कंडेम करें। मैं तो इस घटना को 1944-45 की घटना से मिलाता हूँ। 1944-45 में जब जापान के ऊपर एटम बम गिराया गया था, उससे ज्यादा जघन्य, नीचा, गंदा काम अभी हुआ है क्योंकि उस समय युद्ध हो रहा था, लड़ाई छिड़ी हुई थी, विश्व युद्ध था। विश्व युद्ध में कितने लोग मरे यह सवाल नहीं है। उस समय जब बम गिरा तो सारे विश्व के लोगों ने अमरीका को कंडेम किया था। लेकिन आज कोई युद्ध नहीं है। चुपके से अमरीका का जहाज अमरीका के ही एयरपोर्ट से उड़ा करके बिन लादेन के सपोर्टर लोगों ने वर्ल्ड ट्रेड सेंटर पर गिरा दिया जिसमें निरीह लोग मारे गये। इसको तो हम लोगों को कंडेम करना चाहिए था। लेकिन, मैं दो महीने से सुन रहा हूँ, यहां के अखबारों में भी आर्टिकल पढ़ा, खासकर के वामपंथी साथी इतने खुश होते हैं कि अरे बिन लादेन ने अमरीका को बता दिया न। एक अखबार में एक आर्टिकल देखा उसमें कहा गया कि कहां गई अमरीका की ताकत। जो पृथ्वी की एक-एक सुई की फोटो ले लेता था अब वह बिन लादेन का फोटो भी नहीं ले पा रहा है। हिन्दी के अखबार में एक अच्छे साहब ने ऐसा लिखा। अमरीका को नीचा दिखाने के लिए हमारे मित्र श्री जनेश्वर मिश्र जी बहुत अच्छा बोले। लेकिन कुल-मिलाकर के ऐसा लग रहा था कि वे अमरीकन पालिसी को कंडेम कर रहे हैं। उससे क्या फायदा होगा? उसको किसलिए कंडेम करना चाहते हैं?...(व्यावधान)...

हम लोग अपने देश के प्रधान मंत्री जी को धन्यवाद देते हैं कि उन्होंने देश की इज्जत रखी है और यह भी बताया है कि हम एंटी टैरिस्ट लोगों को मिटाने में शामिल हैं। हम लोग टैरिस्टों के खिलाफ 11 सितम्बर को लेकर कानून बनाने जा रहे हैं। लेकिन इसके लिए हमें अध्यादेश जारी नहीं करना चाहिए था। हमारे यहां पर तो हमारी पुलिस एंटी टैरिस्ट को काबू करने के लिए कैपेबिल है। हमारे यहां एक और नियम है जो उत्तर प्रदेश से शुरू हुआ था एनकाउन्टर। पुलिस एनकाउन्टर से बड़ी और कोई चीज़ नहीं होती है, कानून बनाने की क्या जरूरत है? 1975 में जो इमरजेंसी के लिए कानून बना, उससे बड़ा कानून यहां अध्यादेश से बन गया। हमारे अटल जी, हमारे आडवाणी साहब, ये लोग सफरर हैं कि पुलिस कैसे टैरिज्म के नाम पर तंग कर सकती है। हमारे जय प्रकाश नारायण जी, चन्द्र शेखर जी, इन सब लोगों को देशद्रोही कहकर जेल भेज दिया गया। हम लोग टैरिज्म का नाम लेकर, 11 सितम्बर का नाम लेकर अपने देश में जो अध्यादेश ला रहे हैं, एंटी टैरिस्ट कहकर, हमें लगता है कि वह उचित नहीं है। महोदय, मैं इतना ही कहकर बैठना चाहता हूं कि मैं सरकार को धन्यवाद देता हूं कि हम लोगों की इज्जत उन्होंने बढ़ा दी है। धन्यवाद।

SHRI N. K. PREMACHANDRAN (Kerala): Thank you, Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, for giving me this opportunity to participate in this debate on the international situation arising out of the terrorists attack on WTC in USA leading to international intervention in Afghanistan and its impact on India.

Sir, at the outset, I would like to strongly condemn the inhuman and the brutal attack on the World Trade Centre and the Pentagon by the international terrorist forces. There is no denying the fact that it is a crime against humanity; it is a crime against the mankind. The whole world has condemned this act of terrorism. Immediately after the 11th of September, the world community has risen to fight against terrorism. That is also a good thing as far as our country is concerned. It has been very clearly stated in this debate; Narimanji told us that it was a waking call for the Americans. Terrorism has been adversely affecting the interests and the security of the Third World countries. But when this terrorist attack took place at the World Trade Centre in America and the Pentagon complex, they have come out to fight against the terrorist forces. The September 11 attack has, at least, opened the eyes of the developed countries and they have now come forward to fight against terrorism.

Sir, as far as our country is concerned, for the last one decade, in the Kashmir Valley alone, according to the data available, 56,000 innocent people have been killed. The terrorists have been very active in the Kashmir Valley and various parts of our country. It is being sponsored by a neighbouring country. It is being abetted by a neighbouring country. The important point to be mentioned in this debate is that a global war has been declared by the United States, without any consultation with the UN

Security Council or the other international fora. They have declared a war against global terrorism. Why? It is because of September 11. So, my point is this. When 56,000 innocent people in the valley of Kashmir and various parts of India were brutally murdered by bomb blasts, by explosions and by other means of terrorist acts, the international community did not come forward to support our campaign against terrorism. The global campaign against terrorism comes now, only because the American citizens have been injured or because the prestige of the American empire has been destroyed by these terrorist forces. That is the reason why this global war has been waged now against these forces. Sir, subsequent to this intervention in Afghanistan, immediately after the September 11 incident, President Bush declared that these attacks had been committed by Osama Bin Laden and the Al-Qaeda movement. This has been said specifically, without going into elaborate discussions. So, the first requirement is that the terrorists have to be removed from the globe and, for this, the first object in Afghanistan will be to destroy the headquarters of the Al-Qaeda movement. What has happened subsequent to this war? Subsequent to the war, it is being stated that support is being given by Pakistan and by India. As far as the present international situation is concerned, we are very much concerned about this region, and in this region, especially about the relations between India and Pakistan. So, what is the role of India and Pakistan in this international political situation? Pakistan has supported the war and without taking into consideration the huge cries and protests, Pakistan's Pervez Musharraf has come to the forefront of this war; He is supporting America. We have made a *suo motu* statement; we are also supporting America. Sir, during the last two months, I have read in the media and watched on the television, President Musharraf specifically stating as to what was happening in Kashmir Valley was not terrorism but that it was a freedom movement. They are supporting America. And what is India's stand? For the last fifty years, we have been taking the same position, that Kashmir is an integral part of India and that there is no question of intervention by any other foreign country and that it will be settled on the basis of the Shimla Agreement. And we are also supporting this war waged by the United States. If we draw a comparison, who has benefited more after this war? The point that we are considering is this. They are getting financial packages. That is okay. But they are also getting military assistance. For the last so many years, they have been having a good relationship with the USA. I do appreciate that India is able to build up some relationship with the US, which is a positive thing. There is no doubt about it. But after the

[26 November, 2001]

RAJYA SABHA

September 11 episode, this attack on the Jammu and Kashmir State Secretariat and the Legislative Assembly complex is a direct attack on the democracy of India. 38 persons have died. Even Mr. Colin Powt; who had come to India and even the British Prime Minister who had come to India, were also not willing to express or they were not willing to specifically state that these terrorists had done it and that it was being supported by our neighbouring country. The present position is that though the Attorney General has recommended it, still this particular organisation has not yet been listed by the State Department. That is the position. How would it be beneficial to our country? That is the main question to be discussed. Now, after the war in Afghanistan, political reconstruction is going on. There also the position of India is not in a good shape.

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री रमा शंकर कौशिक): आक कृपया समाप्त करें।

SHRI N. K. PREMACHANDRAN: I am concluding, Sir. So, here also the position of India is not in a good form. The point that I would like to make is this. I do appreciate the move made by the hon. Prime Minister in having a discussion and a declaration, the Moscow declaration. It is a very good thing and it brought a little bit of relief to us. But America's interest in this region is to have an alliance with Pakistan, a good rapport with Pakistan; arms, financial help and every aid is being given to Pakistan. This will be adversely affecting the interests of our country. So, in addressing terrorism, in rooting out these terrorists from Kashmir, my suggestion is that we should take advantage of this opportunity because there is an emotion against terrorism all over the world. The whole world opinion is against terrorism now. So, we should take advantage of this and India should expose the terrorist forces in Kashmir Valley which are being aided, abetted and even sponsored by our neighbouring country, Pakistan. We must take immediate steps to turn the world opinion in our favour. I will make only one more point. I would also like to put it on record that all this is also the consequence of the neo-liberalised global economic policy because the present economic policy does not have any human face. It does not have human values. Everything is based on profit.

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री रमा शंकर कौशिक): आप कृपया आसन ग्रहण करें।

SHRI N. K. PREMACHANDRAN: This is a very important point, Sir, that I would like to make. I will conclude, Sir. It is regarding one policy resolution of the Department of Atomic Energy. The use of monazite, limonite and thorium also is going to be privatised. If I have connection with

any terrorist forces, it will be very easy for me to pass on plutonium and these other strategic elements. I would like to submit that this policy should be reviewed and that these terrorist forces should be dealt with seriously. The support of the international community has to be taken so that India can move forward. With these words, I conclude.

श्री राजीव रंजन सिंह ललन (बिहार): उपसभाध्यक्ष जी, 11 सितम्बर को अमरीका के वर्ल्ड ट्रेड सेंटर और पेंटागन पर हुए आतंकवादी हमले की निन्दा जिन शब्दों में और जितनी की जाए वह कम है। यह कारगरतापूर्ण घटना थी और पूरी मानवता के ऊपर एक कलंक था। जब हम 11 सितम्बर की घटना पर चर्चा कर रहे हैं तो हमें इस घटना की पृष्ठभूमि में भी जाना होगा और आतंकवाद तथा अंतर्राष्ट्रीय आतंकवाद की चर्चा संपूर्णता में करनी होगी। यदि उस घटना को हम सिर्फ 11 सितम्बर की घटना तक सीमित रखते हैं तो यह चर्चा आतंकवाद और अंतर्राष्ट्रीय आतंकवाद पर अधूरी रहेगी। इसलिए हमें उस पर संपूर्णता में चर्चा करनी होगी। हमारा देश बारह साल से जम्मू और कश्मीर में आतंकवाद को झेल रहा है। हमने और हमारी सरकार ने बराबर यह प्रयास किया है कि हम विश्व समुदाय का ध्यान यहां के आतंकवादियों और सीमा पार के आतंकवादियों की ओर आकृष्ट करें। लेकिन किसी ने उस पर ध्यान नहीं दिया। हमारे देश के नार्थ-ईस्ट में या देश के अन्य कई राज्यों में विदेशी स्पोन्सर्ड टेररिज्म चल रहा है। हम उस ओर बराबर विश्व का ध्यान आकृष्ट करते रहे लेकिन किसी ने उस पर ध्यान नहीं दिया। लेकिन इस 11 सितम्बर की घटना से यह फायदा जरूर हुआ कि पूरे विश्व समुदाय का ध्यान आतंकवाद की ओर गया और पूरे विश्व में अंतर्राष्ट्रीय आतंकवाद के खिलाफ एक माहौल बना। एक विश्व जनमत तैयार करने में हमारी सरकार और हमारे देश ने जो भूमिका अदा की है वह सराहनीय है और इसके लिए हम माननीय प्रधानमंत्री जी का आभार व्यक्त करते हैं कि इन्होंने अपनी नीतियों से पूरे विश्व का ध्यान इस अंतर्राष्ट्रीय आतंकवाद की ओर खींचा और उसमें सहयोग दिया।

आज अफगानिस्तान और तालिबान के आतंकवाद की चर्चा हो रही है। जब हम अफगानिस्तान और तालिबान की घटनाओं की ओर ध्यान दे रहे हैं तो हमें जानना होगा कि ओसामा-बिन लादेन कहां की उपज है? किसने पैदा किया? कहां प्रशिक्षित हुआ? इन तालिबानियों के पास हथियार कहां से आए? इन सारी चीजों को देखना पड़ेगा। आज अमरीका सारे विश्व को अपनी ओर तथा 11 सितम्बर की घटना की ओर आकर्षित करना चाह रहा है। लेकिन हमारे यहां एक कहावत है कि-"बोआ पेड़ बबूल का तो आम कहां से होए"। आपने जिसे प्रशिक्षित किया, ट्रेड किया, हथियार देकर आतंकवादी बनाया आज वह आप के ही सिर पर गिर रहा है। अगर हम पाकिस्तान की ओर देखें तो पाते हैं कि 11 सितम्बर की घटना के बाद पाकिस्तान में जो आंतरिक विरोध का माहौल बना हुआ है प्रदर्शन हो रहे हैं, विरोध हो रहे हैं और उसके बाद पाकिस्तानी शासक के जो भारत विरोधी बयान आ रहे हैं और उससे माहौल डाइवर्ट करने का प्रयास किया जा रहा है। संभव है कि वे अपने उन विरोधियों को संबोधित करने के लिए इस तरह के बयान दे रहे हैं। ऐसा होना स्वाभाविक है क्योंकि जिस तरह से वहां के प्रत्येक नागरिक को आतंकवाद की सुई लगाई गई है उससे उनके खून में, उनके रग-रग में समा गया है। आतंकवाद एक कैंसर है और उस कैंसर की बीमारी अगर वहां के नागरिकों में है तो उसका परिणाम वे आज भुगत रहे हैं। आज वहां विरोध हो रहे हैं और यह सारी स्थिति पैदा हो रही है। उपसभाध्यक्ष जी, मैं 11 सितम्बर की घटना के बाद 24.9.2001 की ट्रिब्यून रिपोर्ट की ओर आपका ध्यान आकृष्ट करना चाहूंगा। रिपोर्ट

[26 November, 2001]

RAJYA SABHA

के मुताबिक अमरीका के हमले में 6,818 लोग मारे गए। उन 6,818 लोगों में से 3000 के करीब यानी 50 प्रतिशत से अधिक विदेशी नागरिक थे सिर्फ 3000 अमरीकी नागरिक थे।

[उपसभापति महोदया पीठासीन हुई]

उस घटना के बाद जिस तरह अमरीका ने तालिबान को समाप्त करने का संकल्प किया। हमारे देश में पिछले 12 वर्षों से जो आतंकवाद चल रहा है उसमें करीब करीब 26-27 हजार निर्दोष लोग मारे गए हैं। अगर अमरीका में 11 सितम्बर की घटना के बाद आतंकवाद पूरे विश्व के लिए चुनौती बन सकता है तो हमारे जम्मू और कश्मीर में 26 हजार लोगों के मरने के बाद वह आतंकवाद क्यों चुनौती नहीं हो सकता? इसलिए महोदया, सरकार से मैं अपील करता हूँ, प्रधानमंत्री जी से गुजारिश करता हूँ कि जम्मू और कश्मीर विधान सभा पर हुए आतंकवादी हमले के बाद जिस तरह से आपने कठोर स्टैंड लिया, आज आवश्यकता इस बात की है कि आज भी आप उसी तरह से स्टैंड लें, कठोर स्टैंड लें और आतंकवाद जो जम्मू कश्मीर में चल रहा है, उस आतंकवाद को समाप्त करने के लिए अपनी दृढ़ इच्छा-शक्ति और दृढ़ संकल्प का संदेश पूरे विश्व को दें कि भारत स्वयं देश के अंदर आतंकवाद को समाप्त करने में सक्षम हैं। महोदया, दो-तीन दिनों पहले हमने अखबारों में देखा कि प्रधानमंत्री जी, सार्क देशों के सम्मेलन के दौरान पाकिस्तान के राष्ट्रपति परवेज मुशर्रफ से मिलने वाले हैं। मैं नहीं जानता कि इसमें कितनी सच्चाई है लेकिन मैं विनम्रतापूर्वक प्रधानमंत्री जी से आग्रह करूंगा कि आप फिर से परवेज मुशर्रफ से वार्ता करने से पहले पूरी स्थिति की समीक्षा कर लें और इसके लिए पूरी योजना तैयार कर लें क्योंकि आगरा शिखर सम्मेलन के बाद जिस तरह से विश्व समुदाय के सामने पाकिस्तान ने कश्मीर इश्यू को खड़ा किया फिर उस तरह की परिस्थिति आगे भी पैदा न हो, यह मैं प्रधानमंत्री जी से आग्रह करूंगा।

महोदया, मैं प्रधानमंत्री जी से यह भी आग्रह करना चाहूंगा कि अफगानिस्तान में अमेरिकी हमले के बाद जो अंतरराष्ट्रीय लड़ाई हुई उससे तालेबानी खदेड़े जा चुके हैं और वहां पर नादर्न एलायंस का कब्जा हो चुका है। आपने अभी रूस, अमरीका और ब्रिटेन के साथ मिलकर वहां की भावी सरकार की रूपरेखा पर विचार किया है। प्रधानमंत्री जी, आज आवश्यकता है इस बात कि है कि आप इसमें पहल करें, पूरे विश्व समुदाय के सामने पहल करें और जनमत का विचार करके वहां पर नादर्न एलायंस के नेतृत्व में सरकार गठित करने के लिए जो भी संभव हो, प्रयास करें। इन्हीं शब्दों के बाद मैं अपनी बात समाप्त करता हूँ।

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : You are given five minutes.

" SHRI PETER ALPHONSE: (Tamil Nadu) : Madam, I have been waiting for two days.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I know; we all wait for years to get something. Even the Prime Minister gets only five minutes in the United Nations General Assembly. I am giving you five minutes!

SHRI S. PETER ALPHONSE: Madam, for two days, the whole House had the opportunity to hear the most enlightened Members of the House. We have heard enough of terrorism, its psychology, its reasons and the way in which terrorism has taken shape, not only in our country, but

also over the whole globe.

Madam, regarding the discussion in the House-the international situation arising out of the terrorist attack on the World Trade Centre, its impact on India, its ramifications and response of the Government--I am not going to advise the USA as to how it should fight its war. I am going to the core concern to be followed in India, the problems we are already facing, and the peculiar situation in which the country is placed. It is a problem in which our country is neither owned nor claimed by the international community.

Madam, the day before yesterday, my son-in-law came from the U.S. He told me that in that country, nobody talks as much as we talk about the global war. He came from Cleveland. In this country, everybody talks about the war; every paper, worth its name, has a full page about the war against terrorism; every Minister in the Central Cabinet and every Chief Minister and every leader worth his name, talks about terrorism advising the U.S. as to how it should tackle terrorism and how it should go about dealing with terrorism. But nobody talks about India. ...*(Interruptions)*... Vocal terrorism! I think, this country should follow the Chinese approach to this problem. What China did immediately after 11th September was that they felt that America needed a lot of their National Flags. So, they manufactured them in millions and sold them to America and made some money. They never talked about terrorism. They never advised America how to do what. What about our country? I am not going to repeat what my other friends have said here in this House. I am just going to mention only two aspects which India should learn from. I am very fortunate this evening that I have the Prime Minister as well the Minister of External Affairs here. I would like to mention to them that we are now talking so much about market economy, economic policy, WTO and all that. America is the leading country which makes the entire globe, the entire developing nations to follow the market economy. This is for the first time they were made to understand what it means to be a developing country or a poor country .like India. They were against giving aid from the Government's budgetary fund to Industry. But this is for the first time that the American Government has provided 25 billion dollars to its air travel industry because they say it is an extraordinary situation. So, when an extraordinary situation comes to America, they would relax the rules of the market economy. But here in our country we are daily facing an extraordinary situation. So, America should understand and here our country should take a lesson that we should go by the necessities of our country. Then again the Intellectual Property Rights.

I would like to mention here about a medicine Cipro for Anthrax. They were telling in all world forums that no country should manufacture it because they should have the formula. But now this is for the first time that America is prepared to buy Cipro from any country even when there is a violation of these Property Rights and all that. When in Canada, they were willing to buy Cipro from other than the Bayer Company, they did not make any noise. America did not enforce the Patent Rights Act and trade regulations and rules for Europe. This 11th September has made the entire world to understand that market economy or protection of Intellectual Property Rights are only for the developing countries and not for the developed countries like America. This is one lesson which we have learnt. Another lesson for our Government, I think, is that wherever there is terrorism, wherever there is insurgence, there is one minority, whether it is religious or political or ideological or racial or geographical or linguistic minority. So, whenever a minority is violated it rebounds in terrorism. So, Afghanistan is the standing example we have to learn that if religion is given top prominence in politics and governance, that country will be a political disaster and a diplomatic fiasco. That is the lesson which India should learn from Afghanistan and from the occurrences of September 11. I would request the hon. Prime Minister, who is a seasoned leader and whom I have been admiring since my student days that there is an opportunity knocking at his door as the opportunity knocked at the door of Madam Gandhi when she was the Prime Minister that India should provide leadership to the developing countries. You have to ask the United States because this is the time that America should know that India is the only "Not anti-American" country in the whole area. The entire South Asia is anti-American. India is the only country which is not anti-American. So, our voice should be heard by the United States. We should tell them that they should approve the International Court of Justice. That is also one of the countries which has not accepted the International Court of Justice. It is our duty, it is India's duty to request America to accept the International Court of Justice at least after the occurrences of 11th September. There should be international protection for minorities. For that also India should provide a sort of leadership. Thank you.

THE MINISTER OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS (SHRI JASWANT SINGH): Thank you, Madam Deputy Chairman. The hon. Prime Minister, as has already been agreed, will be replying to the discussion tomorrow -- of course, subject to the approval of the Chair, at 120' clock.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I think so; soon after the Question Hour.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: I am grateful to all the hon. Members who have participated in this important discussion. I, personally, and the Government, have benefited by the views expressed. I would, very briefly, cover the views expressed; and, during my reply, endeavour to answer as many of the points as have been raised by hon. Members. Naturally, as is inevitable in such a discussion, a number of hon. Members have covered the same ground and expressed the views that are not similar. I must, however, point out that the starting point of this discussion was a *suo motu* statement made by the hon. Prime Minister and the statement covered, of course, the events of the September 11 attack on the WTC. But, principally, during his visit to Moscow, to Washington, to the United Nations and, thereafter, during his visit to the U.K., the hon. Prime Minister had then considered the matter and decided that, as both the Houses would be meeting, it would be better if he shared his views with the Members on the current situation in Afghanistan too, as that had also been discussed during this visit and, indeed, in the U.N. As is inevitable, perhaps, understandable, the discussion that we have had for two days has focussed itself almost entirely on Afghanistan, on terrorism, on the September 11 attacks, and has missed accenting the aspects of the Moscow visit, the U.S. visit or the very important, delayed, U.N. General Assembly that met and, in fact, discussed this very subject. The U.N. General Assembly, in its shortened and delayed Session, discussed only Afghanistan and terrorism; most of the speeches. But there was a marked departure from that, in our hon. Prime Minister's speech, because while, of course, he accented on, the developments in Afghanistan, at the same time, he put across India's viewpoint. He emphasised that the U.N. is, essentially, a developmental organisation. Therefore, it is vital not to forget the aspect of development. His speech comprised of these two principal elements. I thought it is necessary to bring some of the focus back on to that aspect. That is the origin, the beginning, of this discussion.

The hon. Leader of the Opposition, Dr. Manmohan Singhji, spoke about terrorism, its global concern, also the U.N. Resolution on the centrality of Afghanistan. He, understandably and quite rightly, enquired about India-Afghanistan and the future -- a query that a number of other hon. Members made -- role of what is Six plus Two, whether we have been in touch with any other countries -- China, Iran, etc., - spoke of his concern, gave voice to his concern about the weapons of mass destruction and the Taliban and concerns arising from that, and spoke of the future of Afghanistan, whether the Taliban would have a role to play, the humanitarian aspects of the

Afghan situation. A number of Members enquired about the future of talks with Pakistan. A number of other Members -- Dr. Singhvi, Shri Nilotpal Basu, Shri Saifullah, Shri Eduardo Faleiro -- gave voice to similar sentiments. Our distinguished, gallant, colleague, General Shankar Roy Chowdhury, emphasised that it was a regional issue and not a global issue, a view that the Government does not share; and enquired whether we would be in touch with other leadership of Afghanistan. I will be, as I go through my intervention, explaining that Arjun Singhji was gracious enough to commend the action what the Government is taking. He spoke of the anatomy of global terrorism, expressed his concern about terrorism, society and democracy, and said -- it was not the exact phrase he used -- it must never be permitted to descend into a clash of civilization.

जनेश्वर जी ने अपनी बात विशेष परिचित शैली में रखी। उनकी भाषा और भाव उनके अपने थे, पर लगता है कहीं प्रेरणा थी...(व्यावधान)... उन्होंने जो विचार और बातें रखीं, मैं उनकी बातों का अवश्य उत्तर दूंगा...(व्यावधान)...

श्री जनेश्वर मिश्र: मैडम, एक मिनट, जब यहां पर हम लोग किसान मुद्दे पर गंभीरता से बहस कर रहे हों तो मंत्री जी बोलने वालों की नीयत पर शक नहीं होना चाहिए। प्रेरणा और नीयत पर अगर मंत्री जी शक करेंगे तो किसी नतीजे पर हम लोग पहुंच पायेंगे। इतना ही मुझे आपसे निवेदन करना है।

श्री जसवंत सिंह: जी, मुझे तनिक भी संदेह नहीं, जनेश्वर जी, मुझे संदेह कहां, मैं तो आपका बहुत आदर करता हूं। मैंने संदेह व्यक्त नहीं किया हूँ, मैंने मात्र एक विचार व्यक्त किया है। आपको संपूर्ण अधिकार है कि आप उस विचार से सहमत न हों, पर आप यह मत सोचिए कि किसी प्रकार से आपके जो विचार हैं मैं उन पर कोई संदेह व्यक्त कर रहा हूँ। पर अभी अवश्य आपने जो बात कही, सांप-सांपों की, छोटे सांप, बड़े सांप, जिस शैली में कही, जनेश्वर जी गांव का रहने वाला मैं भी हूँ, मैं कोशिश करूंगा कि उसी बात का उत्तर दूँ। चतुर्वेदी जी ने अपने विचार व्यक्त किए। उसी तरह hon. Shri Kapil Sibal spoke about the role of the enemy of the culture, that is, terrorism. I quite agree. He also enquired about the Six plus Two, and also about the forthcoming Bonn Meeting. It starts tomorrow.

सरोज दुबे जी ने शिकायत की कि विदेश मंत्री जी भा-भागे विदेश चले जाते हैं, बहुत ज्यादा विदेश जाते हैं। मैं सरोज जी का भी आदर करता हूँ अब विदेश मंत्री का काम तो विदेशियों से मिलना ही है। इसलिए विदेशियों से मिलने के लिए विदेश जाना पड़ता है। पर सरोज जी को मैं बता दूँ कि मैं भागा भागा विदेश नहीं जाता हूँ, मैं तो हवाई जहाज पकड़ कर विदेश जाता हूँ।...(व्यावधान)...

कर्तार सिंह दुग्गल जी ने अपने अनुभवों के आधार पर बहुत अच्छी बातें कहीं हैं मैं उनका बहुत आभारी हूँ। Before I come to the substantial aspects of the points made by some hon. Members, I do wish to address, at least, one aspect, which, I find, has featured in the intervention by some hon. Member. I am a

bit disappointed, and I would like to express my disagreement about India acting in a fashion as if it is pressurised, as if it is acting under persuasions other than of national interest, and as if India has acted in haste. I will, of course, address this point. I am astonished, Madam, that it is said about a Government that has clearly, emphatically, demonstrated to the global community the country's ability to stand-up, to act in the national interest, and to continue to adhere to national interest post-May 1998, and demonstrate repeatedly, year after year, not simply in bilateral terms in our engagements with countries, with the United States, principally; and persuade United States through interaction, which is the function of foreign policy. The function of the Ministry of External Affairs is to engage with nations. The function of the Ministry of External Affairs -- entrusted with this responsibility by the Prime Minister - is not isolationism. My function is as best as God gives me the ability - to subserve India's national interest and, where necessary, to stand up for India's national interest, even if alone in the global community. And we had to stand up for ourselves, post-May 1998, year after year, month after month, against all kinds of pressure; and we stood up. I wish some hon. Member had commended or commented on that reality also. I do not say that with arrogance. But I do say it as part of the continuing reality of this very great nation. We are a nation of one billion humanity. Nobody can pressurize one billion human beings; nobody can isolate a billion human beings. There is no way that the United States of America, or, the EU, or any other country can do it. It is they, through engagements, who have been persuaded, over months of repeated engagements in the last three years, and now see India for what it is - and to engage with India on equal terms. माननीय जनेश्वर जी से निवेदन करूंगा कि आप हमारी बात को नामंजूर कर दीजिए, मत मानिए, आप ने अपने भ्रमण के आरंभ में हिंसा के सामने अहिंसा कि बात कहीं। निश्चित रूप से कौन चाहता है कि निर्दोष बच्चों और महिलाओं की हत्या हों? मैंने बयान दिया, माननीय प्रधान मंत्री जी ने जब वह अमरीका में थे बयान दिया, तब वाशिंगटन पोस्ट में उन्होंने बयान दिया कि मुझे लगता है कि जिस तैयारी से यूनाइटेड स्टेट्स ऑफ अमरीका को आतंकवाद की इस लड़ाई में उतरना चाहिए था, उस तैयारी से वह नहीं उतरा। यह बयान उन की यात्रा के दौरान छपा है। अब हम पर आप चाहें दूसरा लांचन लगाएं, लेकिन यह लांचन मत लगाइए। यह लांचन हम पर न लगाएं कि यह सरकार किसी की पिछलग्गू सरकार हो गयी। मैं बहुत आदर से जनेश्वर जी आप से निवेदन करता हूं कि और जो चाहे आप टिप्पणी कर दें, हम को इतनी बड़ी गाली मत दीजिए। और जो आप चाहें टिप्पणी कर लीजिए। आपने कहा कि कोई एक बड़ा सांप जमींदार के घर निकल आया तो पूरा गांव भाग उठा। भाई, अब सांप का क्या करेंगे? सांप को मारने में जुड़ेंगे या नहीं जुड़ेंगे? गांव की शैली में अगर कहना है तो बचपन में हमको बताया गया कि सांप को मारना है तो उसकी पूंछ से मत खेलो, उसके सिर को कुचलो और सिर को कुचलने के बाद भी क्योंकि उस मरे हुए सांप की आंखों में

याददाश्त रह जाती है, वह सांप याददाश्त पनपाता है, इसलिए सांप को जलाओ। मैं क्या करूँ, आप बताइए। जिन सांपों से उलझना है...(व्यावधान)...

श्री जनेश्वर मिश्र: मैडम, हमारे विदेश मंत्री जी हमको छेड़ देते हैं। हमने यह नहीं कहा कि सांप को न मारा जाए। हमने यह कहा कि जितने लोग डंडा लेकर निकले थे, वे सांप को मार नहीं रहे थे बल्कि राजा को दिखा रहे थे कि राजा साहब, हम भी सांप को मारने के लिए आए हैं। यह प्रजावाद की प्रवृत्ति स्वतंत्र राष्ट्र में नहीं रहना चाहिए।

श्री जसवंत सिंह: खैर, कभी आप और हम बैठकर इस चर्चा कर लेंगे। यह प्रवृत्ति हमारी कभी नहीं रही। इस सरकार में हमारे प्रधानमंत्री जी नेतृत्व में यह प्रवृत्ति नहीं आएगी। इससे आप विश्वस्त रहिए। हमारी टिप्पणी आप जरूर कीजिए, गलतियाँ निकालिए। अगर गलती होगी तो हम सहज उसको स्वीकार करेंगे और प्रार्थना करेंगे कि ईश्वर हमें सदबुद्धि दे हम उस गलती को सुधार कर सही रास्ते पर चलें।

Madam, many observations were made relating to terrorism. And, I must share the fundamental things. The first thing I wish to share which I stated there is this. Soon after September 11, I said "I wish to share with the rest of the international community." It is not as if India's war -- not battle-- India's war against terrorism started only on Tuesday, the 11 September, from New York or Pennsylvania or Washington. India has been fighting its war against terrorism for almost two decades. It is not India that has joined the battle against terrorism, it is the United States of America that recognised the centrality of terrorism; and joined India's battle on September, 11. This is the mentality, Madam.

SHRI DIPANKER MUKHERJEE: It is their battle, not our battle.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: It is up to you. It is the reflection of mentality. Have self-confidence. We have said so in the United States of America. We did not join; they have joined because, repeatedly, for years when I have had to engage with them, I pointed this out to them. We live in this reality. You are shutting your eyes to this reality. I have said in my speech, in New York, during my recent visit, that "now, you are talking with me about Taliban. You go through your records and see what I have been telling you about Taliban." The two progenitors have left their progeny. Those who gave birth to the Taliban have now abandoned it. And, who gave birth to the Taliban? It is the United States of America and Pakistan. So, are we, therefore, to continue to live in the past? India's approach to international relations, to foreign policy - I would like to tell my gallant colleague - is not just simply regional; it is global, and India's approach to terrorism is also global. What is terrorism? Terrorism redefines power. Terrorism also dramatically redefines conflict, through a rejection of all

restraint on means; there is no Geneva Convention for the terrorists; there is no Red Cross; there is also no Red Crescent, and there are no restraints about targeting the innocents.

In fact, terrorism spreads terror by attacking and targeting, principally, the innocent. We, in India, Madam, have known war, peace and truce. India, like no other country in the world, has lived with clandestine war, with proxy war, with State-sponsored terrorism, with cross-border terrorism, and what other terminology you wish to device. And all this, we have communicated clearly, unambiguously, month after month, to the international community. Because we did so, the international, global, world, opinion about terrorism, international terrorism has never been more than during the last three years. India brought this issue on to the international agenda, and it is because of that, that there was an awakened consciousness. Of course, all these awakened consciousness are subject to national interest. Because, terrorism has re-defined wars; there is no concept of truce in terrorism. In a very real sense, terrorism has re-defined political geography. You are saying, "How is this our war? Why are we getting into all this?" It is because, it is terrorism that has re-defined geography, and it recognises and accepts no boundaries. It is an ideology in itself. Because it colonises, through conquests, the mind and it has thus drawn, -- please understand that is the challenge -- re-drawn, the contours of geo-politics. It is not simply, Madam, that peace becomes the primary casualty of terrorism; it is democracy which is the next casualty, and it is individual liberty and free thought which immediately follow thereafter. And, why? Because, principally, terrorism converts the precise strengths of democracy into major weaknesses of the target it chooses. Free thought, free movement, means of communication, technology -- these are all strengths of a free Press. These are all strengths. These are the strengths that are converted into weaknesses and employed by terrorism. I must address myself to the questions raised by hon. Shri Arjun Singh. Madam, I want to say that the Government is very clear in its mind. It is not any clash of civilisations. We do not accept it as such. It is because -- I said so in a public speech that I gave at Sapru House, not too long back -- terrorism has no faith. Terrorism itself has become a faith, and that is why, I wish to share with the hon. Members that the Government is very clear in its mind. We believe, and I do personally subscribe to the belief, that Islam has brought great comfort and peace of mind to countless millions of men and women. We have the second largest Islamic population of the world. It has given dignity and*meaninp ^ a drab, impoverished, life otherwise. It has

5.00 P.M.

taught people of different races to live in brotherhood and people of different creeds to live side by side, in reasonable tolerance. It is, in fact, a great civilisation in which others, besides Muslims, lead a creative and useful life and which, in a sense, is an achievement that has enriched the whole world. That is why terrorism, I view, is actually anti-religion. In any event, I hold, Madam, that Islam is against terrorism; terrorism is anti-Islamic, it is practised in the name of Islam; and terrorism distorts the very face of Islam.

उपसभापति: जनेश्वर मिश्र जी ने एक बहुत अच्छा उदाहरण दिया था। उन्होंने "बिन लादेन" "लादेन" कहा। "बिन लादेन" का मतलब होता Son of Deen, Son of Religion, उन्होंने कहा "लादेन", जिसका मतलब है जिसका धर्म नहीं हो, so what was done La Deen, जो दीन पर नहीं चलता हो। You are rightly saying that.

श्री जसवंत सिंह: मैं इसी भावना की अभिव्यक्ति कर रहा हूँ।

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Exactly.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: If we say Islam, it is the voice of God or the voice of Allah. It speaks of being compassionate. Then, how can they fight against terrorism? It is the voice of the whole civilised world against the evil. We are speaking of forces which are anti-democratic, anti-individual, anti-religion. It is a matter that is of direct consequence to India, as we have been fighting against it.

SHRI ARJUN SINGH: Madam, with your kind permission, if Mr. Jaswant Singh Will yield, I think, you have totally misconstrued what I have spoken here. I have not used either the terminology of civilizational conflict, or the real ingredients of that. On the contrary, I was saying -- I am sure you must have noted - that we accept the hon. Prime Minister's stand in favour of those forces which are trying to prevent division. We are against those forces which speak in the language of division and which want to impose themselves on other communities and other religions and thus increase the conflict that is taking place. That is part of the legacy that we have, and that is getting strengthened. I have never mentioned about Islam or anything like that.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: I am not much satisfied. What the hon. Member says is really what he said. But, I am, of course, pained to say and the hon. Prime Minister will also say on this point. I thought in my own fashion, to respond to the point that the hon. Member had made whether this Government views this whole conflict as a clash of civilisations as

voiced by Humington or are we viewing it as any other kind of conflict. The Prime Minister has repeatedly made it clear on a number of occasions that we do not view it as a clash of civilisations. I have given voice to my views. In the same spirit, the Prime Minister will say so; when he intervenes he will also say so.

One thing I would like to make it clear, that it is of great significance that, for the first time, during the last 50 years, the Prime Minister of India, in one visit, went directly from Moscow to Washington. Moreover, it was an official visit. It was a State visit. There have been occasions, of course, when former Prime Ministers, while travelling, back from Washington, have transited through Moscow. But those were not visits having the same significance. When I say so, I appeal to the hon Members not to treat this as if I am trying to score a debating point. But what I wish to point out is that this visit was of a special significance to the world community as, today, the world has begun attaching importance to India. It is in recognition of the important role of India that when the Prime Minister was transiting back through the United Kingdom, the British Prime Minister emphasised that he too wished to consult. I wish to point this out to assert that it is necessary to see the whole approach to the management of international relations, not just post-September 11, right from the beginning, the Government was engaged in consultations with, perhaps, all the important countries, in the shortest possible time. This was not so in any earlier similar period.' I have been in touch, not only with the countries cited by the hon. Member, Shrimati Saroj Dubey, but also with my distinguished counterpart in China and Iran, which were amongst the first countries with whom I was in touch.

I have been in constant touch with the Foreign Minister of Saudi Arabia, with the Secretary-General of the Arab League, with the Foreign Minister of Turkey, with the Foreign Minister of Egypt, with the Foreign Minister of Tunisia, with the Foreign Minister of Morocco, with all the major countries, the Arab League - indeed, personally, the Prime Minister also - with the President of the Palestine, Mr. Yasser Arafat. So far as the international consultation is concerned, there has been nothing lacking. India's views have been sought by the European Union. Never have there been so many Joint Working Groups or Joint Groups on Terrorism with India as now. Never have there been so many statements of solidarity and joint effort against terrorism as now. Madam, I wish to address myself to some of the other issues that the hon. Members have raised here.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: It is long for you because your throat is bad.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: Thank you very much.

One of the points that was repeated by a number of Members was, "Why did India react so early? Why was India among the first to react?" I must frankly say that I am astonished at this question, as we are the victims of terrorism directly, as few other countries in the world have been almost for 20 years now terrorism in all its manifestations. When others begin to recognise its centrality, we stand up and say we are with the rest of the international community in its fight against terrorism and also with the U.S.A.. Then, for some hon. Members to say, "Why did you say this? Why did you not wait?" is not correct. How could India in its own fight against terrorism, not be amongst the front-ranking of the international community and wait for any other country to take a lead in this regard?

An observation has been made that there were no consultations with the non-aligned countries. Personally I have had repeated consultations, extensive consultations, with them, including with the former Chairman of the Non-Aligned Movement. Recently, I joined them in New York. We had a full day meeting under the Chairmanship of South Africa, which is the current Chairman of the NAM. We also discussed other aspects. At the meeting of the SAARC also, we discussed it. So, there is no question of lack of consultation; and for India to be at the bottom of the front-ranking nations which stand up in the international community against terrorism, to me, is an astonishing observation.

A question was also raised, "Why should India support this effort at all?" Now, the global aspects of terrorism have been recognised, how can anybody else - leave alone India -- address this question, except in its totality? That is why we said, we will stand shoulder to shoulder with the international community.

We were advised, "Don't trust the U.S.A., today, they will be with you, tomorrow they will abandon you." This is a country not to be persuaded by its national interests. I appeal to the hon. Members to base the foreign policy neither on nostalgia nor on prejudice. We are dealing with the reality of today. We must deal with the reality on the fundamentals. When nations act on the persuasion of their national interests, India would determine all the issues on the basis of national interests. We will work with the U.S.A. or with the international community or with the People's Republic of China or with Russia or with the European Union will make clear in our

mind that it is our national interest that guides us and determines the policy. Just as we are determining our policy on the basis of that national interest, of course, all those that we engage with, shall also equally determine their policy. So, where is the question of trusting or not trusting? The question here is of assessing a situation; after assessing it, influencing the situation; influencing not through staying away, but influencing through engagement; and having engaged, influencing through persuasion. And, if, at any stage, there is any recognition that any country is acting in a fashion that is not to India's national interests, of course, there will be no difficulty in not having anything to do with it any further. But, to be guided, at the starting point, by nostalgia or prejudice, both based on the past or the experiences of the past, I appeal to hon. Members, is not really a good foundation for the establishment of an approach or a policy for today.

I have spoken, Madam, quite clearly about the non-aligned.

Then, Madam, an observation was made that the interests of the United States of America are currently limited, firstly, to Osama-bin-Laden and then, to Al-Qaeda and a question was added, how we would benefit by it. I will just appeal to hon. Members. Here is a situation that we have been pointing out to the international community that the centre, the focus, of global terrorism had shifted westwards and it got focussed on Pakistan and Afghanistan. We have been saying this, in the Ministry of External Affairs, for the last three years. This had been got focussed on Pakistan and Afghanistan. We have arrived at a situation in which one joint factory of terrorism, a factory that is producing terrorists that are acting against India's national interests, against India on our territory, a factory that is producing terrorists seven days a week, 24 hours a day, 365 days a year, that factory called Afghanistan, is brought to a stand-still and the wherewithals of producing those terrorists are dismantled. Are we, therefore, to welcome that development, to support that development, or to say, "No, no, because the dismantling was done by X, Y or Z, therefore, what have you to do with it, how are you benefited?*" We are benefited directly. Directly, we are benefited. As I have said clearly, our war against terrorism did not start on Tuesday, September 11; and it does not end when they will call it an end. In Jammu and Kashmir, we have stood up against terrorists and terrorist attacks; and we will continue to stand up whether the rest of the international community is there or not there. That is our national responsibility. But, if the members of the international community volunteer and take steps which, in fact, hurt the terrorist activity in Jammu and

Kashmir, and thereafter also, if hon. Members find fault with the policy, it is saddening, indeed, it is astonishing. One has to go not just by "the United States did not do this or that or the other"; one has to go through the list of those Al-Qaeda groups; one has to only go through the list and recognise the inevitability, in addition to the list, of the closure of bank accounts, financial steps being taken against foundations, trusts. We made it very clear because we had known from experience, the fight against terrorism is not simply a fight that involves the military; it is a fight that is psychological; it is a fight that is diplomatic; it is a political fight; it is also an economic fight. When all these issues are addressed and the international community joins hands with you and addresses the central question of Al-Qaeda of which Osama Bin Laden is one component, and many like Al-Qaeda, Jaish-e-Mohammad, Laskar-e-Taiba, Hizbul Mujahideen and so many others are listed as part of the Al-Qaeda beneficiaries in some way, they will all be affected and neutralized. How is it not directly of India's national interest, cannot be clearly understood? In fact, some hon. Members have raised a point of criticism against the Government. I appeal to them to address this very issue in this light. A number of hon. Members have said that India was left nowhere, because, the distinguished Chief Executive, His Excellency the President of Pakistan, General Pervez Musharraf Saheb, received a great deal of exposure on the media. Madam Deputy Chairman, I wish to say nothing about the media. But I do wish to say something otherwise. I think it was some American, who is no longer alive. He said some years back that in our present times, we will have a situation in which almost everybody would be famous for about three minutes. Those who commented on the prominence that the media was conferring upon His Excellency General Musharraf Saheb, the President of Pakistan in earlier months, must now be commenting on the fact that the media is far more attentive to our friend, Mr. Abdullah, who is currently the Foreign Minister of the Government in Afghanistan. Now, therefore, if the media is focussing on Mr. Abdullah, who is so close to India, does it mean that Afghanistan has now upstaged Pakistan? This kind of observation that the media attention is the determinant of the success or failure of a policy, is really to my mind, an observation which is not the criteria that ought to determine such serious issues of policy. A number of hon. Members spoke of the energy aspect, of the strategic importance of Afghanistan in the energy sector. We have always known that. A number of hon. Members, of course, got some wrong figures. 45 per cent of the world's energy reserves are in the Gulf and the West Asia. 20 per cent are in the Caspian region. Of the 20 per cent global

reserves, we are talking about 65 per cent of the world's energy reserves between the Caspian region and the Gulf. The Gulf, as it is, is today entirely dominated by the U.S. presence,"not simply their bases, but 20 per cent of their investments in the Caspian region, and barely 5 per cent has no exit route, which can be benefited through the southern route. We are in direct touch. Some hon. Members suggested that we have no policy; our only policy is Pakistan. Others suggested that we have no policy for Pakistan either. Then, it is all right. So far as the question of energy is concerned, in fact, it is this Prime Minister, who directed that energy security will be one of the important foreign policy goals, which we have been pursuing, and, in fact, I have personally spoken about the agreement. We have signed more energy agreements internationally than any other country has signed, than any other previous Governments have signed. I have personally spoken of the future of the Daulatabad field from Turkmenistan, which is the only substantial field, which can find an exit. It is Daulatabad field only, and the Daulatabad field by itself has no exit to the West. It is a field which is not dependent on Afghanistan. We have known from the very beginning of what role UNOCAL has played in this, and in future also, UNOCAL will play a role.

We cannot put a stop to it. But that our policy will be subservient to either UNOCAL or to some others; please be disabused of this; not now, not in future, not ever. We have a recognition of the centrality of energy, and that is how we are addressing the House. Madam, I think I have addressed all the points.

I will share what we have done, because hon. Members want to know what is India's approach to Afghanistan. I am a little bit disappointed to be enquired about India's approach, this Government's policy, towards Afghanistan. When it was the Taliban regime in Kabul, we did not recognise the Taliban. We recognised President Burhanuddin Rabbani's Government. Burhanuddin Rabbani's Government was the Government that had recognition in the United Nations. That was India's policy. We continued to support the Northern Alliance. We continued to support, in material terms. We continued to support, in human terms. It is this Government that has established, for the first time, a hospital at Farkko, just across the border in Tajikistan, and, today, that hospital is the only hospital which has certainly served for the last two-and-a-half years all the soldiers and the civil population of the Northern Alliance from Punchsher to all these names that you are currently hearing here. From Talukan, Kunduz, Falzabad, Mazar-e-

Sharif, casualties came. I have the great pleasure and honour, under the Prime Minister's direction, as the Defence Minister of this country, to host the late head of the Northern Alliance, the great warrior, the great soldier. For three days we kept him in the hospital. He went back and in an action, which is directly attributable to the ISI-Taliban complicity, he was killed. He died in this hospital at Farkko. You had asked what our policy was; and our policy was to support. What else did the Government do? Even before Kabul fell, the Prime Minister took a decision and said, "You must make an announcement that a million tonnes of wheat will be offered to Afghanistan". We got in touch with Pakistan and we said, "We have a million tonnes of wheat. We would like to move some of the wheat through Pakistan to Afghanistan. We will hire railway wagons from Pakistan Railways; we will hire trucks in Peshwar at our cost and we will transport this wheat". Pakistan expressed some logistic difficulties. They said, "We have some difficulties. You choose an alternative route". I may share with you that the largest donor to the World Food Programme is the United States of America. In no year, has the United States donated more than 600 thousand tonnes of wheat. This year, India is donating a million tonnes of wheat for the Afghan refugees. We made a public commitment. The Prime Minister directed, "You should make a commitment of restarting the Indira Gandhi Hospital in Kabul, which is essentially for women and children". I made a public commitment and a team of doctors is already there. I am happy to share this information with the hon. Members. A team of doctors from India is already in the Indira Gandhi Hospital in Kabul and the hospital is functioning. The Prime Minister said, "You announce a credit line of a million dollars". We announced it. As soon as there is a broad-based Government which is ready to receive this credit, this hundred million dollars--I am sorry, it is not one million dollars; it is one hundred million dollars; I beg your pardon--credit line is open. That credit line is open, as soon as there is a Government and a functioning system in Afghanistan to receive them.

So far as the Jaipur Foot - I say Jaipur not because of any parochial reason; I am from Rajasthan - is concerned, this system which was devised by a doctor is, in fact, one system which is highly commendable. Afghanistan has been ravaged by mine blasts in 23 years of warfare. Children, women and men have lost both their feet. The Prime Minister said that you would re-establish it. The Jaipur Foot team can do up to 1,000 artificial limbs per month which is many multiples of any other system in the world. We do it at a fraction of the cost. We do* something

which is particularly relevant and useable in the mountainous terrain because of the lightness and flexibility of the foot so devised. I am happy to announce that in the next flight, we will send a team of the Jaipur Foot doctors to Kabul and to Mazar-e-Sharief and it will be functional. It was under the Prime Minister's direction that we sent a team within days of the fall of Mazar-e-Sharief. Our Ambassador, our defence attaches and doctors were in Mazar-e-Sharief. They were in touch with all the leadership whose names we are hearing currently from Ustad Atta to Rashid Dostum and everybody else. We sent a team to Herat. We also sent a team to Kabul. It was a matter of pleasant surprise to me which I shared with the Prime Minister. We left the Mission in 1996. In the Mission, the Mission cars are still red labelled. We are now making efforts to revive those labels. Of course, the Mission has not been cleaned for all these years. We are cleaning the Mission. I am happy to know that some of the papers that were left on the tables and on the machines in those years, are still on those tables. I am very unhappy to inform the hon. Members that the Ambassador's residence, unfortunately, did not receive the same treatment. The Ambassador's residence seems to have become some kind of a Headquarters of the Taliban. It was full of ammunition and full of other aspects which the Taliban appeared to have left in haste as they exited from Kabul. I am happy to inform the House that our people are there. They are functional. I am also happy to inform the hon. Members that among the items that this team carried to Kabul were 25 to 30 videocassettes of Indian films. If there was anything that was on instant and urgent demand, it was these films. I am also happy to inform the hon. Members that we will be sending many more audiocassettes of our Hindi songs, as soon as I have the clearance of the Prime Minister. By the time the next flight goes, we will have received the input from Kabul of additional medicines and whatever additional material is required and the flight will take all this. It is our intention to start a daily flight between Kabul and Amritsar as soon as normalcy returns in Afghanistan. We will be doing this in Mazar-e-Sharief also. So far as the current situation in Afghanistan is concerned, the hon. Members are fully briefed by a number of television stations that are operating out of Kabul. Since I had no knowledge and no assurance about the security in Kabul when we sent our first flight, I would like to assure the hon. Members that in the next flight that we send after the Prime Minister approves it, we will be sending other journalists and television teams so that the widest possible public in India is able to see how India is a central factor in the consciousness of Afghanistan.

Some hon. Members said, "It is because we have nothing to do with the Six plus Two; India is nowhere." It is not possible that India is nowhere in relation to the future of Afghanistan. It is just simply not possible. Please shed that inhibition of yours. The Six' plus Two came into existence in 1997. This Government had nothing to do with the Six plus Two; we did take a decision that we will have nothing to do with Six plus Two because the countries that were part of the Six plus Two were* a part of the problem. How can problems become solutions? And, I don't want to name the countries. The hon. Members asked, "What is the point? You are only a part of the G-21 countries." Yes, we are part of the G-21. We are part of another 21 nations of the world. 'For development of Afghanistan, we are not called upon' is another observation. India has, actually, been called upon; we are going there in the observer status. We cannot be participating in the discussions that the Afghans want to have amongst themselves, under the aegis of the United Nations, under Rabbani's control. We don't want to be among that. The Afghans would decide' what the future of Afghanistan is to be. India is amongst the countries that have been asked to send two representatives. That is why our representatives have gone there. How can there be a solution to Afghanistan without India? Yes; we are not immediate neighbours, but we are in the neighbourhood of Afghanistan. And, please, I do appeal to the hon. Members; certainly, find fault with the Government; but in the process of finding fault, don't find fault with the totality of India's* relevance and centrality to the issue.

Madam, I will keep the hon. Members briefed as often as required. It is a evolving situation. As regards what to do with Pakistan, etc., I would, much rather desire, the Prime Minister, when he replies to this debate tomorrow address this question. But, so far as Afghanistan is concerned, so far as the visit of the Prime Minister is concerned, I have, to the best of my ability, addressed all the questions raised. I don't have anything more to add. Thank you.

प्रधानमंत्री (श्री अटल बिहारी वायपेयी): महोदया, इतने अच्छे और विस्तृत भाषण के बाद मुझे कहने के लिए कुछ नहीं है। फिर भी आप अगर चाहेंगी तो मैं बोल दूंगा। लेकिन मैं नहीं समझता कि सदन इस समय एक दूसरे भाषण की आवश्यकता अनुभव करता है। अभी अफगानिस्तान की चर्चा आगे चलेगी और थोड़े दिन बाद फिर हम उस पर विवाद उठा सकते हैं।

LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION (DR. MANMOHAN SINGH):
Madam, the hon. Minister of External Affairs has dealt with many issues. But, I think, he has not touched upon some of the issues that were

highlighted here. Certainly, in my speech, I was not swayed by either nostalgia or ignorance and I had, specifically, in the context of the Prime Minister's visit to the three countries, raised this question: Is it a fact that our perception of what is happening in Jammu and Kashmir is being shared by the members of the Global Alliance, in particular, Russia, the United States and the United Kingdom, which the Prime Minister visited? The hon. External Affairs Minister did not answer that question. Also, the hon. Minister talked about three years of talking to various countries. We know, for example, that the hon. External Affairs Minister has been talking to Mr. Talbott and the other American interlocutors. But, I think, it would benefit the country enormously if some details of those negotiations, which remain secret, are published so that the country knows, for example, what has been discussed and what has been agreed to between our External Affairs Ministry and the Government of the United States in those 13 or 14 rounds of discussions that did take place during the last three years.

SHRI A'RJUN SINGH: Madam, we have all listened with rapt attention to the speech of the hon. Foreign Minister and he has covered a lot of ground. Apart from what the Leader of the Opposition has just said, there are some points which have also been addressed to the hon. Prime Minister. I[^] would request him that, in spite of his inhibitions, he must speak tomorrow and address the House.

उपसभापति: अब प्रधान मंत्री जी के लिए सवालात तो बहुत आ गए हैं जवाब देने के लिए। कल आप चाहे भले 10-15 मिनट ही बोलें।

श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी: नहीं, नहीं, मैं लम्बा बोलूंगा।

उपसभापति: आप पर कोई पाबंदी नहीं है। आप जितना चाहे बोलें।

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: Madam, the honourable, the Leader of the Opposition is right; he did raise this issue. It is not that I wanted to deliberately avoid any of the issues that any hon. Member raised, leave alone what the hon. Leader of the Opposition raised. And he said it particularly; I didn't miss it. You did, Sir. You did raise the issue. On the question of Jammu and Kashmir, what is the current approach of Russia, of UK and of USA? The United States of America and the UK had expressed the view prior to the visit of the Prime Minister. In fact, during the visit of the Prime Minister to Washington, Jammu and Kashmir, the word 'Jammu and Kashmir', the State of Jammu and Kashmir, what was happening in Jammu and Kashmir, did not feature in the talks with President Bush at all, because the Prime Minister had not gone to Washington to either discuss

Jammu and Kashmir or to discuss our relationship with Pakistan, our western neighbour. It was purely a bilateral visit, on the invitation of the United States of America. And the question of discussing it and that visit becoming a kind of a visit where the United States of America either plays some kind of a role in regard to Jammu and Kashmir or in regard to Pakistan was simply something that we had ruled out completely, clearly and unambiguously, in advance. So, the question just simply did not arise either in America or in other forums. Now, the approach to Jammu and Kashmir that the United States of America, as also Prime Minister Blair, took, was, I think, clarified by the Prime Minister when Mr. Tony Blair came here. They were of the view that at the current moment, the international community's attention being focused on addressing the situation in Afghanistan and the situation in Afghanistan being crucially balanced at that time, it would overload the existing international agenda if any other issue came on the surface. We said, "All right. Fine; because our war against terrorism in Jammu and Kashmir, again, is not dependent on what you do, what you say and it did not start from there".

On the second aspect of what you said, about my discussions with my counterparts in the United States of America, not just simply with my friend, who is no longer in office, Mr. Talbot, but also with the Secretary of State, Colin Powell, the Secretary of Defence, Donald Rumsfeld, or the National Security Advisor, Condoleezza Rice, I am sure the hon. Leader of the Opposition recognizes that much as I would like to benefit by publishing everything that I have -- I will, no doubt, make a great deal of money by publishing it - unfortunately, I cannot share, because I am bound by the rules and conventions of a number of such discussions that are held as confidential and private, and I am bound by the confidentiality of the discussions; so, I cannot share them. But about the essentials of these discussions, there have been a number of discussions in both Houses of Parliament over the last three years. I can assure the hon. Member that there is nothing substantial or important that I have ever kept from the Parliament or from the country in this regard. The details, I am afraid, I cannot share.

SHRI ARJUN SINGH: Madam, I don't want to disturb, but I am quite sure the hon. Prime Minister appreciates our anxiety that we want to hear him because, still, there are some aspects which have not been addressed. I don't want to address them now.

श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी : यहां मैंने मान लिया है मैं कल बोलूंगा, आपको संतोष होगा।

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Before I adjourn the House, I have to announce that as Friday is a holiday; on Thursday, the 29th November, the House will discuss the Private Members' Resolution on Education Policy, of Prof. (Shrimati) Bharati Ray. Mr. Virumbi has not made his speech, but I think we should adjourn the House because we are already...

SHRI S. VIDUTHALAI VIRUMBI (Tamil Nadu): Madam, I will speak tomorrow.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You can speak tomorrow for some time. Mirza Abdul Rashid, I did call your name, but you were not in the House.

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF PARLIAMENTARY AFFAIRS AND THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF RAILWAYS (SHRI O. RAJAGOPAL) : Madam, let them finish today itself. ...*(Interruptions)*...

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: How much time will you take now? ...*(Interruptions)*... If the House so agrees, we can finish it.

SHRI PRANAB MUKHERJEE (West Bengal) : I think, speeches should be finished today. We have a heavy agenda for tomorrow. The Prime Minister can reply straightaway, after the Question Hour.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Virumbi, after hearing such an elaborate reply, if you still have a few questions left in your mind -- you may not take all the 14 minutes allotted to your party -- which we may give you some other time -- you can just put them.

SHRI S. VIDUTHALAI VIRUMBI: Madam, I will finish within ten minutes.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Ten minutes is still on a higher side.

SHRI S. VIDUTHALAI VIRUMBI: Okay, I will take five minutes.

श्री संघ प्रिय गौतम: मैडम, ये भाषण कल अच्छे लगेंगे।

उपसभापति: अभी हो जाने दीजिए, तभी कल 12.00 बजे प्रधानमंत्री जी जवाब दे सकेंगे। बीच में डिसरप्शन नहीं होगा।

SHRI S. VIDUTHALAI VIRUMBI : Madam, the hon. Minister of External Affairs, in his intervention, has enlightened us further in this regard. Madam, all of us, cutting across party lines, appreciate what the External Affairs Minister told that we have not joined America, but America has joined India in its fight against terrorism. I think, we have to write it in golden

letters. But I have one reservation. If America had come forward to condemn the Afghan regime when the Buddha statue was demolished, it would have been much appreciated.

Madam, from 1950, we have experienced and lived through many wars like the Korean War, the Vietnam War, the Gulf War. Madam, since you have asked me to conclude my speech, as early as possible, I would leave some points and deal with some important issues only. Madam, we have to feel much not only as Indians but also as Asian. Madam, throughout the world, there are 12 million refugees. Out of that, 19 per cent are in Europe; 30 per cent in Africa; and 44.7 per cent of total refugees of the world live in Asia. It clearly shows that the Asians are much disturbed by the wars. Madam, it has not started now; for more than 23 years, the Afghans have been suffering. I can say that the people who had an eye on the oil reserves of the Central Asian Republics of the erstwhile U.S.S.R, wanted to disintegrate the U.S.S.R. At that time, this process was started. Still it is not complete, even though some of the Central Asian countries have actually been carved out of the former USSR, because of the actions by some European countries.

Madam, for the first time, the trouble started with Mujahideen Vs. the USSR, until 1989. Then, Mujahideen Vs. the Nazibullah Government till April, 1992. Between 1992 and 1994, there was a civil war among the various groups in Afghanistan. In 1994, the Talibans captured the capital, Kabul. That was in 1994. The Mujahideens formed a coalition. Then, Al Qaeda took birth. Who are the father and mother of Al Qaeda? Everybody knows it. Madam, the war against terrorism was started and was supported by the Conference of Indo-European Union. The 21 leaders of Latin American countries now support it. Day before yesterday, they supported it. It is supported by the United Nations Resolution No. 1368 and 1373. Resolution No. 1368 condemns the attack by terrorists. Resolution No. 1373 calls for international peace and security. Concerned by terrorism, this stand is taken. All these things have happened.

Now, Madam, the concern before us is the widespread network of Al Qaeda. It has spread across 26 countries. It is not going to be stopped only by getting rid of the Talibans in Afghanistan. The Afghans, by birth and nature, are peace-loving people like Indians. They had their own Royal Jirga. The Royal Jirga was demolished first by the Talibans. The Royal Jirga is nothing but a tribal assembly. They were headed by the chieftains of the tribals. They were demolished by the Talibans. I want to conclude my speech as early as possible.

The military regime of Pakistan, under President Musharraf, has got further strengthened by exploiting the Afghan issue. Madam, the Pakistan's present regime is being supported by the OIC, comprising 57 member countries. ^ think, those 57 member countries are with Pakistan, as far as the definition of terrorism is concerned. According to them, terrorism is different and the legitimate fight for self-determination is different. If my memory is correct, they have passed a resolution too to that effect. In that respect, Pakistan has got the support of not only the OIC, but also that of the United States. Therefore, the hands of Musharraf are strengthened further. Therefore, the democratic process, that is talked of now, may get further delayed in Pakistan. This is what I fear. When there is no democratic process, or when it is being delayed, how are we going to solve the problem of Kashmir? This is going to affect us. The Americans can't get rid of the Taliban completely, because they have 250 tanks and 250 fighters and powerful planes with them, compared to the Northern Alliance's hardly 60-70 tanks and 15,000-20,000 men. Now, the Taliban's hold has come down because of the attack of the Americans. The Tomohawk missiles have been utilised for attacking the Taliban hideouts. One Tomohawk missile costs 10 million US\$. They are being utilised over there. In spite of that, the Taliban are fighting.

After this war is over, until and unless a proper democratic system is established in Afghanistan, the Pakistan regime would have increased cooperation with Afghanistan and fight against us. Therefore, our concentration should be on a different matter, that is, how democratic process can be established in Pakistan. The Kashmir issue is going to depend on that. Yesterday the former Prime Minister of Pakistan met our Prime Minister and held talks with him. We do not know whether these talks were directed towards democratic process in Pakistan or not. We hope the hon. Prime Minister will indicate the interaction that he had with the former Prime Minister of Pakistan. Madam, as far as our Party, the DMK is concerned, we are second to none in condemning terrorism in any form. Madam, what our hon. Prime Minister stated after his visit, we consider it as a reply to the resolution of the OIC. I quote from the Press statement of our Prime Minister. It says, "All the leaders agree that terrorism should be tackled on a global and in a comprehensive manner, that no political, economic or ideological justification for terrorism is acceptable." This is the observation made by the hon. Prime Minister. As far as this statement is concerned, we stand hundred per cent by the Prime Minister. We will strengthen his hands. We will see to it that democratic

process in Pakistan and Afghanistan is furthered thereby terrorism is minimised. I feel that we cannot contain terrorism by military and weapons alone. The medium of buying weapons is not the American dollars only. Terrorists are using narcotics as a medium of Exchange for buying arms and ammunition. Until and unless we are able to control the movement of narcotics and our intelligence is further improved, we cannot stop terrorism. Narcotics movement takes place from Pakistan to European countries via Gujarat, the Southern States and Sri Lanka. Therefore, we have to keep an eye on that. That is number one. Our intelligence system has to be improved further. We have also to improve our communication system as well as the information technology. We should curb the narcotic movements. If all these things are done, I feel, terrorism can be stopped once for all. With these words, I conclude, Madam. Thank you.

उपसभापति: रशीद साहब, मैंने आपका नाम तो बुलाया था आप हाऊस-में नहीं थे। चलिए, दो एक बाद कह दीजिए क्योंकि आप कश्मीर से हैं।

† मिर्जा अब्दुल रशीद(जम्मू और कश्मीर): मैडम, एक सवाल कर लेता हूँ।

उपसभापति: हां, सवाल कर लीजिए, कल जवाब भी आ जाएगा।

† मिर्जा अब्दुल रशीद: मैडम, मुझे तकरीर करने का मौका नहीं मिल रहा, सवाल करता हूँ। आनरेबल प्रधानमंत्री, जिनका रूस अमरीका, ब्रतानिया का दौरा बड़ा कामयाब रहा उनसे मैं केवल एक ही सवाल करूंगा। मैडम, पिछले 15 साल से भारत यह समझता रहा है सारी दुनिया को और खासकर अमरीका को कि टेरेरिज्म क्या होता है, अब जब अमरीका को चोट लगी तो उसे अहसास हुआ कि टेरेरिज्म क्या है। टेरेरिज्म का सबसे बड़ा सबूत है, जो जम्मू-कश्मीर की असेम्बली पर सुसाइडल हमला हुआ और जिसमें तीन मिलिटेंट मारे गए, उनमें वजाहात पेशावर का था दूसरा रशीद पजाब पाकिस्तान का था और तीसरा करांची का था। यह तीनों जेश-मोहम्मद के मिलिटेंट थे, जो सुसाइडल अटैक में मारे गए। अब किस किस्म का सबूत और मांगेंगे वह भारत से?

मैडम, अब अफगानिस्तान में तालिबान की गवर्नमेंट तो कलेप्स हो गई है, उसके बाद जम्मू-कश्मीर में जो टेरेरिज्म है, जिसका सबूत उन्होंने दे दिया है असेम्बली को डिमोलिश करके, उस बारे में उनके क्या विचार हैं? उस दिन असेम्बली में काफी लोग, एमएलएज और आधा दर्जन मंत्री बैठे हुए थे, लेकिन यह जो मिलिटेंट थे बाहरी थे, जो उस बिल्डिंग के हिस्से में चले गए, जहां हमारे यह लोग नहीं थे, और इसलिए बच गए। अगर लोकल होते, बिल्डिंग से वाकिफ होते तो फिर तो सब कुछ तबाह हो गया होता। इसलिए मैं यह सवाल करना चाहूंगा कि अब टेरेरिज्म से सबूत की अमरीका को और कोई जरूरत नहीं है, तो तालिबान के खत्म होने के बाद अब जम्मू-कश्मीर में इंटरनेशनल लैवल पर वे हमारी क्या मदद करेंगे और क्या पाकिस्तान को टेरेरिस्ट कंट्री डिक्लेअर करेंगे?

श्री जसवंत सिंह: मैडम, माननीय सदस्य को मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि आपके सवाल के

† Transliteration of the speech in Persian Script is available in the Hindi version of the debate.

दो पहलू हैं। एक पहलू तो है कि जम्मू-कश्मीर असेम्बली पर जो हमला हुआ उसमें जो तीनों आतंकवादी वहां आए थे, वे तीनों पाकिस्तान के थे, यह हमें मालूम है और आपने पूछा कि इन सबूतों से क्या अमरीका वाकिफ है, तो मैं माननीय सदस्य को बता दूँ कि 11 सितम्बर के बाद इंटेलिजेंस शेअरिंग का आव-जाव बढ़ गया है। हमने अमरीका को आतंकवाद के बारे में बहुत कुछ इंटेलिजेंस दिया है, बहुत सारे कदम जो अमरीका ने उठाए वे उसी इंटेलिजेंस से जुड़े हुए थे और यह सिलसिला आगे भी चलता रहेगा।

दूसरा पहलू है कि क्या अमरीका पाकिस्तान को आतंकवादी देश घोषित करेगा, इस बारे में मेरा एक निवेदन होगा आपसे कि हमारी जो लड़ाई है वह उस पर आधारित नहीं है, सिर्फ उसी पर मुनहसिर नहीं है और मैं यह नहीं चाहता कि हम किसी किस्म से अमरीका को कहें कि आप यह करो, फलां करो, ढ़िमका करो। शीशा उनको स्वयं दिखा गया है, दहशतगर्दी को वे समझ गए हैं। तो उनको शीशा दिख गया, वे दहशतगर्दी को समझ गए कहां से इसकी उपज है, कहां क्या हो रहा है, वे यह बात भी समझ गए। अब देखिए आगे क्या होता है।

उपसभापति: क्यो चेयर कोभी एक सवाल करने की इजाज़त है?

श्री जसवंत सिंह: मैडम, आप हुक्म करिए।

उपसभापति: इतना कुछ आप कर रहे हैं-हवाई जहाज भेज रहे हैं, डाक्टर भेज रहे हैं, जयपुर फुट भेज रहे हैं, यह अच्छा काम कर रहे हैं, मगर जो बामियान का मुद्दा है, जो शायद इस पूरे हाऊस में मैंने ही देखा था कि उसे किस तरह से तबाह और बर्बाद किया गया है ...(व्यावधान)

श्री संघ प्रिय गौतम: मैंने भी देखा था।

उपसभापति: आपने भी देखा था, थैंक्यू। तो क्या हम उसको रिबिल्ट करने की कोशिश करेंगे क्योंकि किसी कंट्री में उसका एक मॉडल बनाया जा रहा है, लोग उसे रिबिल्ट कर रहे हैं। तो मैं जानना चाहती हूँ कि क्या भारत इसमें कुछ पहल करेगा? वह हमारी एक विरासत थी जो तालिबान ने बर्बाद की थी, जिसके जिसके लिए मेरी आंख में आंसू भी आ गए थे, जब मैं यहां से बोल रही थी। तो क्या हम कोशिश करेंगे?

श्री संघ प्रिय गौतम: वैरी गुड क्वेश्चन मैडम।

श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी: महोदया, आपके हृदय में जो भावना है, वह हम लोगों के हृदय में भी है। अब भावना को किस तरह से ठोस रूप दिया जाए, उस पर विचार करेंगे और आपसे सलाह लेंगे कि क्या किया जाए।

उपसभापति: जपान और चाइना में शायद लोग उसको बना रहे हैं।

श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी: वह भी अभी तस्वीर साफ नहीं है।

उपसभापति: प्रधान मंत्री जी, आपका बहुत-बहुत शुक्रिया जो आपने अपनी भावनाएं प्रकट कीं और कल आपका जवाब होगा। The House is adjourned till eleven of the clock tomorrow.

The House then adjourned at fifty-eight minutes past
five of the clock, till eleven of the clock on Tuesday,
the 27th November, 2001.