

The University of Allahabad Bill, 2004

THE MINISTER OF HUMAN RESOURCE DEVELOPMENT (SHRI ARJUN SINGH): Sir, I beg to move for leave to introduce a Bill to declare the University of Allahabad to be an institution of national importance and to provide for its incorporation and matters connected therewith or incidental thereto.

The question was put and the motion was adopted.

SHRI ARJUN SINGH: Sir, I introduce the Bill.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The House is adjourned till 2.30 p.m.

The House then adjourned for lunch at twenty six minutes past one of the clock.

The House reassembled after lunch at thirty minutes past two of the clock,

[MR. CHAIRMAN in the Chair.]

SHORT DURATION DISCUSSION

Foreign Policy of the country

श्री सभापति: आप बैठे-बैठे बोलिए।

श्री जनेश्वर मिश्र (उत्तर प्रदेश): सभापति महोदय, मैं सबसे पहले आपको धन्यवाद दूंगा। थोड़ी तकलीफ में हूँ और मैंने आपसे इजाजत मांगी थी कि शायद खड़े होकर बोल न सकूँ। ... (व्यवधान) ...

श्री सभापति: नहीं, आप बैठे-बैठे बोलिए। यह हाउस ऑफ एल्डर्स है। मैं समझता हूँ कि इसकी संख्या बढ़े, तो ज्यादा अच्छा है।

श्री जनेश्वर मिश्र: दूसरे नम्बर पर, मैं माननीय सदस्यों से माफी मांगूंगा क्योंकि ये हमारे साथी हैं और इनके सम्मान और शान के खिलाफ थोड़ी-सी गुस्ताखी कर रहा हूँ, जो मुझे बैठ कर बोलना पड़ रहा है। सभापति महोदय, आज का यह विषय बहुत ही निर्गुण किस्म का विषय है। निर्गुण मैं जान-बूझ कर कह रहा हूँ, क्योंकि आम आदमी, उसकी थाली की रोटी, उसके बच्चे की पढ़ाई, उसके खेत-खलिहान या रोजमर्रा की जिन्दगी से इसका कोई सम्बन्ध नहीं होता। लेकिन फिर भी विदेश नीति ठीक वैसी ही जरूरी है, जैसे किसी शरीर की आत्मा जरूरी होती है। विदेश नीति किसी

राष्ट्र की आत्मा है और इसलिए मैंने निर्गुण शब्द का इस्तेमाल कर लिया। पहले भी एक देश से दूसरे देश के सम्बन्ध होते थे। लेकिन उस सम्बन्ध के नियम ये थे कि या तो सीधे युद्ध हो जाता था, एक को मातहत कर लिया जाता था और दूसरा शराफत का रास्ता था कि एक अश्वमेध यज्ञ होता था, जिसमें घोड़ा छोड़ दिया जाता था, जितनी दूर जाता था, वह मान लिया जाता था कि वह उसकी हुकूमत है। बीच में भारत के पराभव के दिन थे। हम गुलामी के दौर से गुजरते रहे और गुलाम की कोई विदेश नीति नहीं होती। दूसरों से सम्बन्ध करने के लिए आजाद होते ही नहीं। हम उस दौर में थे। आजादी मिलने के बाद भारत की एक विदेश नीति बनी। पंडित नेहरू देश के प्रधान मंत्री थे, आजादी की लड़ाई में मरे-खपे थे। उनमें आजकल के भारतीय लोगों के मुकाबले देश की आत्मा को नजदीक से समझने की क्षमता ज्यादा थी। उनके चलते जो विदेश नीति चली थी, तब हम लोग लड़के थे। विरोधी पार्टी में थे। हम लोग पसंद नहीं करते थे। उसमें एक शब्द जो लोकप्रिय हुआ था, वह गुटनिरपेक्ष शब्द था, जो आज तक जिन्दा है। किसी विदेश नीति का, दुनिया के किसी भी देश की विदेश नीति का, कोई एक शब्द मंत्र की तरह से 50 साल तक जिन्दा नहीं रहता। सभापति महोदय, गुटनिरपेक्ष शब्द अभी तक जिन्दा है। गुट नहीं है। एक गुट लगभग समाप्त हो चुका है। अब तो अकेला एक महाप्रभु है। लेकिन हम अपने को गुटनिरपेक्ष कह रहे हैं। हमको याद है कि मोरारजी भाई की सरकार बनी थी। अटल जी विदेश मंत्री थे। सलाहकार समिति में हमने कहा कि जरा तिब्बत का सवाल गरम किया जाय तो कहा कि जनता पार्टी ने नेहरू की नीतियों पर चलने का फैसला किया है। यह उस समय के विदेश मंत्री हैं, नेहरू की नीतियों पर। आजकल नटवर सिंह जी और मनमोहन सिंह जी कभी कभी कह देते हैं कि हम लोग अटल जी की नीतियों पर चलने का काम कर रहे हैं। आत्मा की अपनी एक धारावाहिकता होती है। घटनाएं जो जितनी भी घटती रहें, अगर एक जगह भटकती गई तो भटकती रहेगी, वहीं पर भटकती रहेगी। मैंने मिसाल के तौर पर कह दिया कि हम लोगों ने गुट-निरपेक्ष नीति की बात उठाई थी, वह गुट अब नहीं है, एक महाप्रभु है। वह सबको अपनी अंगुली पर नचा रहा है और हम लोग नाच देखने को मजबूर हैं।

महोदय, अभी हमारे विदेश मंत्री गए थे, नहीं चाहते रहे होंगे मुशर्रफ साहब से मिलना, लेकिन मुलाकात हो गई क्योंकि सबै नचावे राम गुसाईं। एक राम गुसाईं हो गए हैं, दुनिया के नक्शे पर जो नचा दिया करते हैं। एक बार हमने भूतपूर्व प्रधानमंत्री जी को कहा था कि क्यों घुटने टेक कर बात करते हो, तो गर्म हो गए। यह सौ करोड़ की आबादी के देश का प्रधानमंत्री किसी के सामने घुटने टेके और हमको उल्टा सीधा भी बोले थे, लेकिन संदेश जाता है कि हम कहीं न कहीं कमजोर हुए जा रहे हैं। दुनिया की पंचायत में जो कमजोर बनकर बैठता है, वह अपने राष्ट्र को मजबूत नहीं बना सकता। वैसे आमतौर पर आदमी मन से कमजोर होता है, कोई बहुत बहादुर नहीं होता, कोई कोई बहुत बहादुर हुआ करते हैं। अभी मैं परसों-नरसों अमिताभ जी की एक फिल्म देख रहा था, जिसमें वह हीरो था, किसी ने उसको कहा कि तुम्हें बहुत चोट लग गई है, बड़ा दर्द हो रहा होगा तो उसने

कहा कि मर्द को दर्द नहीं होता। यह वाक्य उसका था और मैं सोचने लगा कि क्या यह सच है, सर? क्योंकि चीनी हमले के समय हमारे जो जवान मरे थे, तो हमारे यहां की माननीय सदस्या जो हैं, इन्होंने उस समय एक गीत गाया था—आंख में आंख में लो पानी, और उस समय हमारा जो सबसे बड़ा मर्द था, हम लोगों का मालिक, उसकी आंख में आंसू आ गए थे। हम सोचने लगे कि क्या अमिताभ सच बोल रहा है कि मर्द को दर्द नहीं होता। हम कहीं न कहीं पर मर्द नहीं हैं, यह मैं चुनौती देना चाहता हूँ क्योंकि हम लोग मार खाया करते हैं और जो मार खाया करते हैं, वे अपने राष्ट्र की मार को भी बर्दाश्त किया करते हैं। अमेरिका में कोई भी बच्चा मार नहीं खाता, बच्चे को पीटने पर सजा हुआ करती है। अगर मां-बाप भी मारें तो उन्हें भी सजा हुआ करती है। नतीजा है कि जब वहां का राष्ट्रपति बोल देगा कि नेस्तनाबूद कर देंगे, हम उसकी बात को पसंद करें या न करें, जब वह बोलता है तो नेस्तनाबूद कर देता है। उसने अफगानिस्तान को किया, उसने इराक को किया। हमारे यहां के सभी बच्चे मार खाया करते हैं, कभी बड़ी बहन ने मार दिया, कभी बड़े भाई ने मार दिया, कभी स्कूल के मास्टर ने मार दिया। जो एक बार मार खा लेता है, जैसे बकरी का कान पकड़कर चिकवा उठा लें और उसे मलाई भी खिलाई जाए तो गोस्त नहीं बढ़ता, उसी तरह जो एक बार मार खा लेगा उसमें कोई ताकत आ नहीं सकती, उसका कलेजा कमजोर हो जाता है। हम भारतीय कमजोर कलेजे के लोग हैं, जल्दी आंख में आंसू आ जाएगा, कड़ा होने की ताकत नहीं है और कभी गुस्से में आएं तो हम बोल देंगे।

माफ करिएगा आप लोग, अभी जो लोग इस समय सत्ता में बैठे हैं, इन लोगों की कोई विदेश नीति पक्की बनी नहीं है, लेकिन मैंने शुरू में कह दिया कि धारावाहिकता होती है, इसलिए इन पर तो कम बोलना पड़ेगा, पहले वाली विदेश नीति पर ज्यादा बोलना पड़ेगा, कभी कभी इशारा कर देंगे तो बुरा मत मानिएगा। कह देंगे आर-पार की लड़ाई, इस पार्लियामेंट पर हमला हुआ था, देश थरा गया था, हम सभी सहम गए थे, तब यह शब्द एक बार कान में आए थे। सत्ता में बैठे हुए लोग, हम राजनीति करने वाले लोग कभी देश के बीच में गर्जन-तर्जन कर लिया करें, लेकिन दूसरे देश हमारा प्रजा नहीं हैं, उनसे जब कभी बात करनी पड़ेगी, बराबरी के पैमाने पर करनी पड़ेगी। मुझे खुशी है कि नटवर सिंह जी राजनयिक महकमे में रहे हैं। जवाहर लाल नेहरू के साथ, उनके कार्यालय में 11 साल तक इन्होंने काम किया है, इनका तजुर्बा बहुत है। कूटनीति की भाषा गर्जना-तर्जना नहीं हुआ करती। नटवर सिंह जी के नेता ने भी जब चीनी हमला हुआ था तो कोलम्बो से कह दिया था कि हमने अपनी पलटन को कह दिया है कि विदेशियों को मार भगाओ, लेकिन जब वे यहां आए तो हमारी पलटन मार खा रही थी और तब उन्होंने कहा था कि चीन ने हमको धोखा दिया है। हम अपनी खेती-कारखाना सुधार रहे थे, वह अपनी पलटन सुधार रहा था। लोकतंत्र के लिए बहुत जरूरी होता है कि जो जितने जोर से बोलेगा, जनता उसके पीछे उतना ही आएगी। गर्जना-तर्जना करने वाला मुल्क की हिफाजत नहीं करता। पहले तो दृष्टियां ही बदल

जाती हैं। पिछली सरकार के एक मंत्री ने कहा था कि चीन हमारा दुश्मन नम्बर वन है। तब बाकी लोगों ने कहा कि यह तुमने क्यों कहा? तुम कौन होते हो यह कहने वाले, अपना बयान बदलो, क्योंकि बाकी लोगों की निगाह में पाकिस्तान दुश्मन नम्बर वन था। हमने कभी पाकिस्तान को अपना दुश्मन नहीं माना है और न हम मानेंगे क्योंकि 50 साल पहले हम लोग भाई-भाई थे। चीन से, फ्रांस से, अमेरिका से, इंग्लैंड से हमारी दुश्मनी हो सकती है क्योंकि वे हमारे भाई नहीं हैं, लेकिन पाकिस्तान, म्यांमार, बंगलादेश थोड़े ही दिन पहले भाई-भाई थे। भाई-भाई का झगड़ा दुश्मन से भी ज्यादा कड़वा हुआ करता है, उसमें ज्यादा खतरा हुआ करता है, लेकिन यह मानकर चलें कि हमारा झगड़ा भाई-भाई का है। यह भी हो सकता है कि कभी न कभी, यह जो बंटवारे की दीवार खड़ी है, यह भी टूट जाए। अगर बर्लिन की दीवार टूट सकती है तो यह क्यों नहीं टूट सकती? हुसैनीवाला के बगल में एक मामूली सी लकीर खिंची हुई है, अमृतसर में, वह क्यों नहीं मिटाई जा सकती?

भारत के बारे में विदेश मंत्रालय को अपनी दृष्टि बदलनी पड़ेगी। भारत आज का बना हुआ देश नहीं है, भारत युगों का बना हुआ है। एक तो हम इस समय जिसमें रहते हैं, उसको भारत कहते हैं। दूसरा वह भारत है जिसको 15 अगस्त, 1947 से पहले हम लोगों ने पूजा था, जिसको हमारे पुरखों ने पूजा था और कहा था कि हम इसको आजाद करने के लिए लड़ने जा रहे हैं। पता नहीं उस लड़ाई में कितने शहीद हुए, कितने कुर्बान हुए, कितनी माताओं की कोख सूनी हुई और कितनी बहनों के सिंदूर मिट गए। वह हमारा राजनीतिक भारत था। आज का, भारत पाकिस्तान और बंगलादेश है और एक हमारा सांस्कृतिक भारत भी है। कई देश हैं जहां आज भी रामायण मानी जाती है, रामचरित मानस पढ़ा जाता है। कई देश हैं जहां की नदियां गंगा से भी ज्यादा पूजी जाती हैं। तीन तस्वीरें हमारे भारत की हैं - आज का वर्तमान भारत, एक राजनीतिक भारत और एक सांस्कृतिक भारत। जब कभी हम सार्क वगैरह के चक्कर में पड़ते हैं तो हम इन तीनों भारतों को क्यों नहीं देखा करते? कहीं न कहीं इनमें आपस में रिश्ते हैं, संबंध हैं। इन्हें जोड़ने का प्रयास नहीं होता, वहां कई मूल्य टकरा रहे हैं। जैसे म्यांमार कभी हमारा हिस्सा था, हम भाई-भाई थे। वहां तानाशाही के खिलाफ, लोकतंत्र की बहाली के लिए एक आंदोलन चल रहा है। नटवर सिंह जी, आपकी सरकार हिम्मत नहीं कर पा रही है कि उस आंदोलन के सवाल पर टिप्पणी कर सके। लोकतंत्र हमारा जीवन मूल्य है। नेपाल में लोकतंत्र के लिए लड़ाई चल रही है। माओवादियों को मैं पसंद नहीं करता, उनको हस्तकतों को पसंद नहीं करता, लेकिन वे एक राजशाही खत्म करने के लिए लड़ने जा रहे हैं। लोकतंत्र की बहाली के लिए जब कभी भी लड़ाई होगी और यदि भारत की आत्मा जिंदा है, विदेश नीति को एक निर्गुण शब्द कहते हुए यदि आत्मा निकाली जा रही हो, तो हमारा धर्म बनता है कि विदेश नीति पर आप एक श्वेत पेपर जारी करें, जिसमें अपने मूल्यों के बारे में हमको और पूरे देश को प्रतिबद्ध करने की कोशिश करें। एक रत्न मैं यह निवेदन करूंगा। सभापति महोदय, मैं दूसरा

निवेदन यह करूंगा कि आजकल आतंकवाद पर हल्ला ज्यादा चलता है और इसी वजह से, किसी जमाने में गुटनिरपेक्षवाद पर ग्रामोफोन की सुई आकर फंस जाती थी, चै-चै करती रहती थी। आजकल आतंकवाद पर ग्रामोफोन की सुई फंसी जा रही है और जब तक उठाकर हटाइए नहीं, कोई दूसरी धुन ही नहीं आती। केवल आतंकवाद की धुन आती है। हमको दिमाग खोल कर सोचना चाहिए, क्योंकि यह पंचायत है, यह पार्लियामेंट नहीं है। न ही यह सरकार और विपक्ष की तरफ से प्वाइंट कहने की जगह है। यह कचहरी नहीं है कि क्वालितबाज़ी की जाए, बल्कि एक-दूसरे को समझने और एक-दूसरे को समझाने की जगह है एवं जिसकी बात सुपीरियर लगे उसे मान लेना चाहिए। पंचायत का यही चरित्र है।

आतंकवाद दो तरह का होता है। एक आतंकवाद होता है, जो कमजोर का आतंकवाद होता है। कमजोर का आतंकवाद कभी किसी को मारने के लिए, किसी को निशाना बना कर नहीं चलता। बम फोड़ देगा, गोली छोड़ देगा, जान पर खेल कर कोई खिलवाड़ कर देगा और उससे दुर्घटनाएं हो जाएंगी। लोग दहशत में आ जाएंगे। मज़बूत की जो दहशतगर्दी होती है, वह दौलत के हिसाब से निशाना साध करके चलता है। मज़बूत क्षेत्रीय भी हो सकता है, राष्ट्रीय पैमाने पर भी हो सकता है, नम्बर के हिसाब से हो सकता है। ओसामा-बिन लादेन ने अगर अमरीका पर हमला किया था तो किसी को मारने के लिए नहीं किया था, लेकिन अमरीका वालों ने जब निशाना साधा तो ओसामा-बिन-लादेन को मारने के लिए साधा था। मज़बूत का आतंकवाद किसी व्यक्ति को निशाना बनाता है। कमजोर का आतंकवाद निशाना नहीं बनाया करता, बस अंधा-धुंध गोली चला दिया करता है, किसी को मारना लक्ष्य नहीं होता। कोई मर गया तो मर गया, नहीं मरा तो भाग गए या मर गए। कमजोर का आतंकवाद हमेशा कमजोर ही रहता है। मज़बूत का आतंकवाद जब आतंक फैलाता है, तब एक आदमी को मारने चलता है, वह मिले या न मिले, वह उसी को ढूंढ लिया करता है। जॉर्ज बुश का आतंकवाद मज़बूत का आतंकवाद था किन्तु ओसामा-बिन-लादेन का आतंकवाद कमजोर का आतंकवाद था। हालांकि ये दोनों ही घटनाएं निंदनीय थीं। मज़बूत का आतंकवाद सर्वनाश करेगा जबकि कमजोर का आतंकवाद एक बड़ी दुर्घटना कर देगा। इसमें यही फर्क हुआ करता है। आजकल आतंकवादियों ने कई तरह के दस्ते बनाए हैं, खुद अपनी ही जान पर खेल करके मारते हैं। लेकिन यह फर्क हमें दिमाग में रखना पड़ेगा। हिन्दुस्तान में भी पहले ऐसा हुआ है हिन्दुस्तान में हिन्दू लोगों की तादाद ज्यादा है। महात्मा गांधी ने केवल इतना ही तो कह दिया था कि पाकिस्तान को थोड़ा पैसा दे दिया करें, इस पर जिन लोगों की तादाद ज्यादा है, उनका गुस्सा गर्म हो गया और एक लड़का मुम्बई से चला, यहाँ दिल्ली में आकर गोली मार दी। मज़बूत का आतंकवाद जिसे मारना होता है, निशाना साधकर मारता है। कमजोर का आतंकवाद ऐसे ही ऊबड़-खाबड़ रूप से पीट दिया करता है, कोई मर जाए तो मर जाए। जब कभी आतंकवाद पर बहस कीजिए तो यह जरूर बहस कीजिएगा। जो मज़बूत के आतंकवाद के खिलाफ नहीं बोल

सकता, वह कमजोर के आतंकवाद का मुकाबला नहीं कर सकता। छः महीने तक हमारी पलटन पाकिस्तान की सरहद पर पड़ी रह गई। ज़रा सोचिए, वहां के नागरिकों की परेशानी, जरा सोचिए, वहां के पलटन के जवानों की परेशानी और बिना किसी वजह से आपने इसे चुपचाप वापस ले लिया। जब किसी प्वाइंट पर पूरी दुनिया फंस रही हो तब अमरीका आपकी मदद नहीं करने वाला है। वह आपका दोस्त नहीं है। किसी भी विकसित देश को अमरीका बरदाश्त नहीं करेगा। विकासशील देश को बरदाश्त नहीं करेगा क्योंकि सभी विकासशील लोग अगर विकसित हो गए तो उसको बाजार कहां से मिलेगा, वह तो दुकानदार है। वह उसको कभी बरदाश्त नहीं करेगा। इसलिए मैं माननीय नटवर सिंह जी से प्रार्थना करूंगा कि अभी आपकी सरकार नई कही जाएगी, दुर्भाग्य से सरहद पर हरकत कम हुई है और दुश्मन की तरफ से या सौभाग्य से कहिए कम हुई है। पिछले दिनों जब हुआ करती थी तो वाजपेयी जी सत्ता में थे। वाजपेयी जी का नाम सुनकर, जोशी जी का नाम सुनकर या इन लोगों सब का नाम सुन करके हिन्दुस्तान का अल्पसंख्यक कांपने लगता है। ये लोग बुरे लोग नहीं हैं, मैं जानता हूं। इनमें से कई हमारे मित्र हैं। हम लोग जेल में साथ-साथ रहे हैं, बड़ी मीठी बातें हुआ करती थी, वहां एक दिन भी झगड़ा नहीं हुआ। लेकिन पता नहीं इन लोगों का नाम सुन करके क्यों कांपने लगता है, दहशत आ जाती है। जब यहां का अल्पसंख्यक कांपने लगता है तो जो लोग पाकिस्तान में हुकूमत करते हैं, वे कहते हैं कि -खबरदार, किसी को छेड़ना नहीं, वरना हम हिफाजत के लिए चले आएंगे। अपने इन मित्रों से कहूंगा कि अपने को ऐसा बनाओ कि किसी को देखकर कोई कांपे नहीं। अपने देश में जो अल्पसंख्यक हैं, उनको गले लगाना पड़ेगा, पाकिस्तान को दोस्त बनाने के लिए। मैं जानता हूं कि कांग्रेसी लोगों का नाम सुन करके हिन्दुस्तान का अल्पसंख्यक कांपता नहीं है और इन लोगों के मुकाबले तो कम कांपता है, क्योंकि कांग्रेस पार्टी के जमाने में ही अयोध्या का ताला खुला था, मंदिर का या किस का? उस समय यही लोग सत्ता में थे। तो इनसे थोड़ा कम कांपते हैं, ये लोग चालबाजी कर देते हैं। ये लोग सीधे मारो-मारो, क्या बोलते हैं - जय श्रीराम। वह जय श्रीराम इतना खतरनाक लगता है, वैसे राम का नाम बुरा नहीं है, हनुमान का नाम बुरा नहीं है। अपने मन को ताकत देने के लिए किसी ताकतवर का नाम लिया जाए अपने को ताकतवर बनाने की एक चाल है, और बहुत अच्छी बात है। लेकिन जय श्रीराम का दुरुपयोग कि हमसे जो कमजोर है वह नाम सुन करके कांपने लगे या अल्लाहो अकबर का दुरुपयोग या जो हमारे खिलाफ खड़ा है वह यह नाम सुनकर कांपने लगे, ईश्वर का नाम इसके लिए नहीं होना। ईश्वर का नाम, अल्लाह का नाम, राम का नाम का दुरुपयोग हम लोग अपनी सियासत के लिए कर रहे हैं और एक पड़ोसी ऐसा आ गया है कि जब दुरुपयोग करेंगे तो वह कहेगा कि - खबरदार, यह बहुत अच्छी बात नहीं हो रही है और आ करके खड़ा हो जाएगा या कहीं से आदमियों को भेज देगा, बात आगे बढ़ नहीं पा रही है। मेरा ख्याल है माननीय विदेश मंत्री जी, यह मुशर्रफ आपसे ज्यादा चालाक आदमी है। वैसे भी हिन्दुस्तान में पैदा हुए मुसलमान हिन्दुस्तान के हिन्दुओं से ज्यादा चालाक होते हैं बुद्धि के मामले में। हमने देखा है, क्योंकि अल्पसंख्यक होता है इसलिए अपने

बचाव के तौर-तरीके हम लोगों से वह ज्यादा जानता है, और जब जो अपने बचाव के तौर-तरीके जानता है तो वह चालाक कहलाता है। वह अपने दाहिने-बाएं सोचता रहता है, कभी बातचीत करता रहे तब तक कोई कड़ी बात बोल देगा तो आप लोग भड़क जाते हैं। अगर धीरज है तो यह मान कर कि यह छोटा भाई है, 50 साल पहले एक ही घर में हम लोग पैदा हुए और पले। बीच में किसी की चालबाजी या अपने लोगों की गलती से हम अलग हो गए जो अब हम दोस्त बनाए जा सकते हैं। अगर हिम्मत थोड़ी ज्यादा हो तो मैं कहूंगा कि लड़ाई हो रही है, म्यांमार में लड़ाई हो रही है, नेपाल में भी हो रही है। हमारी सरहद पर मूल्यों के लिए लड़ाई हो रही है। हमारी विदेश नीति भी सृजनात्मक हो और देखने में दमदार लगे ताकि कमजोर राष्ट्र के कमजोर लोग भी उसकी तरफ आकर्षित हो जाएं। अश्वमेध यज्ञ से विदेश नीति का समर्थन नहीं जुटाया जा सकता, युद्ध से देश का झंडा दुनिया भर में नहीं फहराया जा सकता। गौतम बुद्ध के जमाने में दवाइयों के मार्फत बौद्ध धर्म का प्रचार किया गया। जड़ी-बूटी लेकर के लोग तिब्बत और चीन होते हुए जापान चले गए। आज वही जड़ी-बूटी वहां की प्रमुख दवाई बन गई है। हमारे साधु-संत लेकर गए थे अपनी बात फैलाने के लिए, क्योंकि वैसे तो वहां वे हमारी बात सुनेंगे नहीं और अगर कोई बीमार हो और उसको दवा दे दो तो वह आपकी तरफ आकर्षित हो जाएगा। वे नेचुरल दवायें, जो हमारी जड़ी-बूटी की हैं, जापान से लेकर चीन तक चारों तरफ फैली हैं। अब दवायें भी इतनी आ गई हैं कि आपकी दवाओं का माध्यम भी काम नहीं करेगा। केवल विचार बोलने से, हो सकता है कि सरकारों में दोस्ती चलती रहे, लेकिन सरकारों की दोस्ती विदेश नीति नहीं कहलाती है। विदेश नीति में जब तक दो देशों की, तीन देशों की जनता की दोस्ती और मेलभाव नहीं होता, तब तक वह विदेश नीति सफल नहीं हो सकती है। सरकारी तो औपचारिक दोस्ती होती है। डिनर पर बैठे, टेस्ट लड़ाया, खाना खाया, पन्ना पढ़ दिया कि हम अपनी जनता की खुशहाली के लिए कामना करते हैं और उसने भी कुछ पढ़ दिया। हम चाहेंगे कि इस बनावटीपन से दूर रहना चाहिए। चूंकि विदेश नीति एक निर्गुण नीति होती है, निर्गुण नीति होती है और किसी राष्ट्र की आत्मा होती है, इसलिए उस आत्मा को जगाये रखने के लिए, देश की जनता के बीच में संबंध बनाये रखने का प्रयास किया जाना चाहिए। पाकिस्तान की जनता नहीं चाहती है कि लड़ाई हो, हिन्दुस्तान की जनता भी नहीं चाहती है कि लड़ाई हो, लेकिन हिन्दुस्तान और पाकिस्तान की कुर्सियों पर बैठे हुए लोग चाहते हैं कि लड़ाई हो। क्योंकि हिन्दुस्तान के लोग भी, जो कुर्सी पर बैठते हैं, अपने देश की जनता की रोटी का इंतजाम नहीं कर सकते, अपने नौजवान बेटे की नौकरी का इंतजाम नहीं कर सकते, बूढ़े बाप की दवाई का इंतजाम नहीं कर सकते। अगर सरहद पर पलटन नाचती रहेगी, तो उन्हें यह दिखाने में मजा आता है कि अभी क्या करें, देखो न लड़ाई है। यही वहां मुशर्रफ करता है। कहीं न कहीं इससे छुट्टी लेनी पड़ेगी और जनता के बीच में मधुर संबंध बन सकें, भारत सरकार इसके लिए प्रयास करे। वह नौटंकी वाला मधुर संबंध नहीं, लाहौर यात्रा, बस यात्रा या खिलाड़ियों का आदान-प्रदान, बल्कि गरीब लोगों के रिश्ते कायम हो सकें। कई जगह हैं, जहां पर पासपोर्ट नहीं है, नेपाल के साथ हमारा

3.00 P.M.

पासपोर्ट नहीं है। हम अपना चल ही तो रहे हैं और दुनिया की पंचायत में हम बढ़िया जगह पा सकें। मुझे खुशी है कि चीन के प्रधान मंत्री ने एक जगह पर बयान दिया था कि भारत को सेक्योरिटी काउन्सिल में जगह मिलनी चाहिए। मैंने इसको पढ़ा था। आपको भी अच्छा लगा होगा बाद में बयान थोड़ा बदला-बदला होगा। बहुत से लोग चाहते हैं कि आप सेक्योरिटी काउन्सिल में जायें, लेकिन सेक्योरिटी काउन्सिल में जाकर करेंगे क्या वीटो? भारत को यह प्रयास करना पड़ेगा...., यानी बाकी देश प्रजा बनकर रहेंगे और थोड़े से लोग वीटो सम्पन्न देश बनकर रहें। अगर भारत को एक बढ़िया दुनिया बसानी है, यह सच है कि यह भारत माता है, लेकिन सारी दुनिया की धरती, धरती-माता भी है। भारत-माता सुरक्षा परिषद में जाकर खूबसूरत हो जाये और धरती-माता के अधिकांश हिस्से प्रजा बने रह जायें और थोड़े-से वीटो सम्पन्न देश ही सारी दुनिया की तकदीर का फैसला करते रहें। हमको याद है, जब हम लड़ते थे, जब यह गुटनिरपेक्ष नीति पंडित जवाहर लाल नेहरू जी की चला करती थी, तो यह नीति हम इसलिए चलाते थे कि कहीं हमको काश्मीर पर रूस का वीटो लेना था और चूंकि अन्न कम पैदा होता था, तो अपने लोगों के लिए अमेरिका से रोटी लेनी होती थी। रोटी और वीटो के लिए विदेश नीति खत्म करते रहे। इस तरह से विदेश नीति नहीं चल सकती है। हम चाहेंगे कि धरती-माता भी खूबसूरत हो सके, इसके लिए बराबरी के दर्जे पर पंचायत में सभी राष्ट्र बैठें और पंचायत का चरित्र यह न बने कि इधर के लोग जब खड़े होते हैं, तो इधर के लोग दूसरी बात करते हैं, सभापति महोदय, कभी कचहरीनुमा बहस होने लगती है। हम पंचायत में बैठे हैं, हम सुप्रीम कोर्ट में बहस नहीं कर रहे हैं कि अपनी बात साबित करेंगे। पंचायत में, हमें जितनी अक्ल है, हम आपको समझायेंगे। आपको जितनी अक्ल है, हमको समझाओं तर्क-वितर्क के बाद जो बात फाइनल हो, जो नम्बर की ताकत बने, बहस की ताकत पर, वह पंचायत की आवाज़ कहलाती है और पंचायत की आत्मा की आवाज़ कहलाती है और वह राष्ट्र की आवाज़ कहलायेगी। अंत में, यह अपील करते हुए कि 6 महीने, 9 महीने या और समय ले लीजिए, साल भर ले लीजिए, विदेश नीति के कई संदर्भ बदले हैं, उन बदले हुए सभी संदर्भों में कोई व्हाइट पेपर आपकी तरफ से आना चाहिए। विदेश नीति के बारे में आपकी थोड़ा ज्यादा सावधान इसलिए रहना पड़ेगा क्योंकि आपकी पार्टी की जो नेता हैं, इन विपक्ष के लोगों ने, मीडिया के लोगों ने और कई लोगों ने उन पर विदेशीपन का आरोप लगाया था जो बड़ा गंदा आरोप था। जब देश की जनता ने उनको समर्थन दे दिया तो वे देश की नेता हो गयी हैं, लेकिन यह आरोप लगा था। आपको बहुत सावधान होना पड़ेगा। विदेश नीति तय करते समय हम लोगों से भी ज्यादा राष्ट्रीय और देसीपन आपको दिखाना पड़ेगा। कहीं भी अगर आपकी कलम कमजोर पड़ गयी तो मैं यह चेतावनी देना चाहता हूँ कि राष्ट्र की जनता है तो कम पढ़ी-लिखी, लेकिन बहुत जबर्दस्त किस्म की जज है। अब तो चुपचाप जजमेंट दे दिया करती है, पहले तो हल्ला बोलकर हम लोग देते थे, इंदिरा हटायो,

गरीबी हटाओ करके, अब बिना हल्ला के ही हिन्दुस्तान की जनता जजमेंट देने लगती है। इसलिए मैं आपसे प्रार्थना करूंगा कि उसी जनता के बीच में कभी न कभी तो जाना ही पड़ता है। हम आपके समर्थक हैं, हम आपके विरोधी नहीं हैं। सत्ता में आने के बाद, आपकी कलम से कोई ऐसा आरोप न आ जाए, कि फिर लोगों को यह कहने का मौका मिले कि हम लोग कहते थे कि विदेशियों से सावधान रहो। हम आपसे कहना चाहते हैं कि यह भूल मत कीजिएगा। बिल्कुल राष्ट्रीयता से ओत-प्रोत, भारत की एक विदेश नीति का व्हाइट पेपर जारी करें और उसमें यह साफ करें कि पाकिस्तान हमारा दुश्मन नहीं है। आज से पचास साल पहले हमारे घर का भाई था, आज अलग हो गया। कुछ लाइनें साफ करके मुलायम रुख से चलिए। वैसे आप जिस तरह का प्रयास कर रहे हैं, कई अखबारों में मैंने उसकी तारीफ पढ़ी है। क्योंकि आप तर्जुबेकार हैं इसलिए आपसे गलतियां कम होंगी। जवाहर लाल जी के जमाने का तर्जुबा बहुत बढ़िया है। उस समय आप अधिकारी थे। हम चाहेंगे कि इस व्हाइट पेपर के साथ आप आइए। तब यह सदन खुलकर बहस करे। अभी तो आपकी विदेश नीति पर यह सदन बहुत अनजान हालत में आप पर तीर छोड़ेगा और आप लोगों में से कुछ लोग अपने पास्ट पर इन लोगों की तरफ, भाजपा की तरफ तीर छोड़ देंगे, वह एक बिना नतीजे की बहस होगी, परिणामविहीन होगी। हम चाहेंगे कि कोई नतीजे वाली बहस हम लोग करें। सभापति जी, आपका बहुत-बहुत धन्यवाद।

SHRI YASHWANT SINHA (Jharkhand): Thank you Mr. Chairman, Sir. Whenever I see the hon. External Affairs Minister, I feel somewhat constrained in my style, because, he has been my senior in service; he has been, as has been said just now, one of the most experienced diplomats of this country, and he is heading the Foreign Policy Establishment of this country today. But before I come to the other qualities of the hon. External Affairs Minister, I would like to say that, perhaps, this discussion on Foreign Policy of the country would have been more worthwhile, would have been more fruitful if we have had the statement from the Prime Minister that we had demanded the week before the last. You had agreed, Sir, that the Foreign Policy will be discussed in this House, and I had raised this issue then. During the inter session period, there have been so many Summit-level meetings, apart from the meetings that the hon. External Affairs Minister has had at his level. And, therefore, the Prime Minister owed it to this House to come here, take us into confidence and tell us what had transpired in those Summit level meetings. I understand, Sir, that, perhaps, a statement from the Prime Minister will be coming later, and we have just a few days left in this Session. Today, in taking up the discussion on Foreign Policy, we are actually pacing the cart

before the horse. But be that, as it may, Sir, I would like to tell the Government, through you, that when that statement comes, we would like to seek clarifications on that statement, and that this discussion in the House today should not preclude seeking such clarifications because if that were the scheme of things of the Government, it will be clearly unacceptable to us.

Coming back to the Foreign Policy of the country, Sir, I was talking about the hon. External Affairs Minister. I am very happy that the official spokesperson of the Ministry of External Affairs has clarified that when the Minister came back from South Korea, he did not rush to the Prime Minister to offer an explanation. There was a misleading report, perhaps. I do not know who originated it in the newspapers, and I am glad that such an explanation, such a clarification has come because no Foreign Minister can really do justice to his job if he is called upon to explain his statements or his conduct while he is abroad. To that extent, he will stand diminished. And, therefore, that clarification was essential, and that clarification has come.

But, Sir, I will like to refer to some other statements which the hon. Minister has made, from time to time, as I go along in this debate. But I would first like to take up the most topical issue of the day. The most topical issue of the day is India's permanent membership in the U.N. Security Council. We were all witness to the statement which the hon. Minister made, Sir, in this House, when a suggestion had been made that India could, perhaps, look at the option of accepting a membership sans veto, and the Minister clarified, asserted, that there was no question of India accepting a membership, permanent membership, of the Security Council without a veto, and that we were not going to be second-class members, permanent members, of the U.N. Security Council. And we all supported that. We all supported that statement that India must stand firm and seek equal membership with all the rest, and that we should not dilute our stand at this point of time. We are all aware; this Blue-ribbon Group was appointed by the U.N. Secretary-General. It has given its Report. There are some recommendations in that Report. That Report will be discussed. Various members of the U.N. will make their stand clear, and India will have to continue to work very hard, as, indeed, we have done in the past, to ensure that we get a permanent place in the Security council, and get it with honour and dignity. And, Sir, therefore, I was completely taken a back when I found newspaper report. I must confess that I have

not been paying much attention to the Foreign Policy in the last few days, but I came across newspaper reports, not in one newspaper but in many newspapers-saying that India may accept Security Council seat without a veto. And this statement is ascribed to a senior level in Government. Background briefings go on, Sir. It will be better, if they do not go on like this, when the Parliament is in session. But anonymous background briefings by senior levels in the Government contradicting directly what the hon. External Affairs Minister had said in this House have come not only as a surprise, but also as a shock to all those who watch the goings on in the foreign office. Therefore, I would like to make two points here. The first point is that the Government must explain, in the course of its reply to this discussion, what the official policy of India with regard to permanent membership of the Security Council is. Is this the official policy? Is the official policy what the hon. External Affairs Minister has said? Is there any confusion and contradiction within the Government? Has the Government not made up its mind? Was the statement of the External Affairs Minister, in this House, just an off-the-cuff remark? These are all very serious issues. Let me tell you, Sir, that the whole world watches when statements like this are made. I would dare say that our case stands considerably weakened, considerably diluted, by a statement of this kind. Therefore, the Government must come clean on this. I would like the hon. Minister to assert, as he did the other day in this House, that India would stand by what he said and that there would be no weakening of the case of India for a permanent membership of the Security Council.

THE MINISTER OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS (SHRI K. NATWAR SINGH): Where are you quoting from?

SHRI YASHWANT SINHA: I am quoting from various newspapers. But I have a copy of **THE HINDU** in my hand and you can see its screaming headline. I will not be travelling abroad.

SHRI V. NARAYANASAMY (Pondicherry): You are relying on anonymous statements that are coming in the newspapers. Can we rely on them? The hon. former External Affairs Minister knows the entire procedure.

SHRI YASHWANT SINHA: Sir, this is a by-line. The name of the journalist, who has written this story, is printed here and because I had been the Minister of External Affairs, I would like to tell the hon. Member,

Shri Narayanasamy, that I am aware of the ways of the foreign office and I am aware of the ways of the other elements within the establishments of the Government. I can tell you, if you were to ask me in private where this came from. I am surprised that the External Affairs Minister asked me where I was quoting from because I had hoped that, after his return from Seoul, this would have attracted his attention immediately and that he would have taken some corrective steps already to undo the damage which has been done by this kind of behind-the-scene briefings by, as I said, the elements within this Government.

Similarly, I would like to go back a few days, a fortnight, when the Russian President, Mr. Putin, was here. We watched almost in helplessness what transpired when he met the media along with the Prime Minister and said that he wanted India to take the membership of the Security Council without the veto. I don't know whether I can refer to this House. But I am again referring to newspapers reports. Had it not been for your intervention, perhaps, this would have just been allowed to pass. I would like the hon. Minister to clarify when he replies to the debate here what the Government did when Mr. Putin made his statement, and there was that misinterpretation during translation or interpretation, and what the Minister of External Affairs or the PMO did to ensure that these were not left to chance and that Mr. Puntin corrected his statement according to his intention. Sir, I am not aware of what exactly the Foreign Office did. I am not aware what exactly the PMO did. What I am aware of is, again as I say, through newspaper reports that it is only when you went to Mr. Putin and this matter was brought to his notice, he then issued a clarificatory statement. I am surprised at the style of functioning as far as the foreign policy of this Government is concerned. That was not all what Mr. Putin said. I know another great expert of foreign policy, a former Foreign Service office who said, "Clarification was a tongue in cheek." But I leave it at that. I would like to believe what the Russian President said later through his clarification that Russia stands solidly with India as far as the claim of India to a permanent membership of the Security Council with veto is concerned because we have had, through various regimes, perfect relationship with Russia. If there is one country about which we can say with a degree of confidence that there has been perfect relationship, it has been Russia. Therefore, one feels concerned that at the Summit level, there should have been a *faux pas* of this kind. It was avoidable and it

should have been avoided. But even more disconcerting from our country's point of view is another statement which again came out on the front pages of many newspapers, including this one that I am quoting. This is about Russian fuel for Tarapur. This is about the supply of two additional reactors for the atomic energy plant which is being set up in Koodankulam which is one of the shining examples of Indo-Russian cooperation in the atomic energy field. I was surprised when the Director of the Russian Federal Atomic Energy Agency, Shri Rumyretsev made a statement to the correspondent of this newspaper saying, "We will not supply fuel to Tarapur because we are bound by the Nuclear Supplier Group's conditions." In the same context, he said, "We are not going to supply to India two additional reactors for Koodankulam." Whether they supply the fuel or not, whether they supply the reactors or not, is a matter which, I am sure, the Government would like to discuss with the Russian authorities and they might have already discussed when Mr. Putin was here. But what is shocking is the fact that the Russian official should go out of his way to make this kind of a statement on the Indian soil during the visit of the Russian President. This is a jarring note which has been sounded in Indo-Russian relationship. Even if they did not have the intention of supplying either fuel or reactors, they could have quietly told the Government that they were not able to do it because of NSG membership, NSG regulations. But why have they gone public? What is happening to the perfect relationship and understanding, bilateral relationship that we have had with Russia in all areas? Shri Janeshwar Mishra was referring to Russian veto in the Security Council, whenever we felt, we had a problem. What is happening to that understanding? It is a matter of some concern. The Government of India, the Atomic Energy Commission of India, was compelled to respond to this statement the next day which was also published in the newspapers and it was mentioned that our scientists are trying to develop alternative fuel. But I would like to know from the hon. Minister what exactly is the position with regard to Russian supply of fuel to Tarapur. What exactly is the position about the supply of these two reactors for Koodankulam Atomic Energy Plant? And, I would like to ask him generally as to what is happening to India-Russia relationship. Did you notice anything in Mr. Putin's behaviour of statements in conversations that you had one-to-one with him and at the delegation level, which would show a shift in the regime? I ask this because, Sir, again, as far as the Security Council is concerned, one is aware of the statement which the

Secretary-General of the United Nations has made suggesting that India and other countries, should accept their membership without veto, and that there is going to be a P-5 position on that. Now, Russia will be a party of this P-5 decision. P-5 cannot take a decision without Russia being a party to that understanding. Therefore, what is it that we are doing? We have seen the statement of the U.S. Secretary of State. We have seen other statements. We know that the spoilers' club is active in New York. We know that there are countries which do not want India to have this membership. Therefore, we would like to know what exactly is the Government's thinking, what exactly is the Government's strategy, in ensuring that this does not happen.

Sir, similarly, on the question of India's relationship with the United States, we were accused often times of following a policy which was dictated from Washington. And, in its CMP, this Government made it bold that they would follow an independent foreign policy — as if we were following a dependent foreign policy! And, this independent foreign policy was reflected in the letter of congratulation that our hon. Prime Minister sent to President Bush on his reelection. And, I am specially drawing the attention of our friends here in the centre, who belong to the Left. What has the Prime Minister of India said? He says and I quote: "Mr. President, during your first term in office, our bilateral relations underwent a qualitative transformation due, in no small measure, to your personal commitment and efforts." He then say, "I look forward to working with you as we rededicate ourselves to further strengthen the progress that we have made in the last few years." Is this progress good or bad? If only it was good, would you have proceeded to strengthen it further? If the relationship was bad, or, if this qualitative transformation in our relationship with the United States should not have taken place, then, what is it that we are rededicating ourselves to? And, I am very sorry to say this that even our respected Foreign Minister was a votary of this school of thinking. And, suddenly, we find that this Government comes into office after having condemned us, after having criticised us, after having held us to ransom, and then, they follow the same policies. Where are we? Now, they not only follow the same policy, they also go various steps forward.

Sir, through you, I would like to ask the hon. Minister a few questions. We were in consultation with the Government, the Administration of the

United States, about what is generally known as the Next Step in Strategic Partnership (NSSP), and there were issues there, which we were considering. One of the issues was the end-use verification of dual-use items which India received from the U.S.. Americans use an expression 'firewall'; there must be firewalls so that something, which is of dual use, does not get used militarily in our country. And, therefore, they were looking for these firewalls to ensure that such a diversion will not take place.

Now, Sir, I understand and I will stand corrected, if I am wrong; but will certainly like the Minister to clarify it that as far as 'End-use Verification' is concerned, it is not merely with respect to supplies from the US that we have agreed to such 'End-use Verification', but it appears that we have also agreed to 'End-Use-Verification' of items that we receive from third countries, which may have US origin. US-origin items will be coming to our country directly from the US, which are all licensed; so, US knows what exactly is coming. But in regard to anything else coming through third countries also, India will be compelled to give or permit End-use Verification. Is that so? If that is so, then, it is a matter of serious concern, because, as I said, it is not merely 'strengthening' the bilateral relationship, it is 'surrendering' before the US.

Similarly, Sir, when the US Defence Secretary was here--and our hon. External Affairs Minister also had a meeting with him--as far as, I believe, he was good enough, kind enough, liberal enough, to offer us various arms for supply from US to India. Is that so? Did the Defence Secretary of the US offer sophisticated equipment to India? And, was it in order to compensate us for the arms supply that they are making to Pakistan?

Sir, another question is whether the arms supply to Pakistan by the US includes F-16s or not. Our information is that it already includes the F-16s, and it is only a question of time when it is publicly announced. But what has worried us the most in the last few months is the fact that elements within our establishment have conveyed to the US that India will not mind even if F-16s were supplied to Pakistan. And I would like the hon. Minister for External Affairs to contradict me on this. Let him say that such an impression was not conveyed to the US. The question of US arms supply, Sir, has been therefore quite some time. The Government of India had been resisting it. Now, we have the Defence Minister's statement that this will not merely have an impact on our bilateral relationship with the US, but that it will also jeopardise the peace process with Pakistan.

He said it somewhere in Bhubaneswar recently. What is the authoritative view of the Government of India on this -- arms supply, including F-16s, from the US to Pakistan -- and in what terms has it been conveyed to US, not at high level but also at the highest level? In what manner has the concern of India been made known to the US? And I am saying this with a great worry in my heart that once this arms supply from the US to Pakistan begins, it will open up the floodgates of such supplies to Pakistan from all other arms-supplying countries in the world. And we will absolutely have no face to stand up and tell, "Don't do it". And this, we know from the statements made by no less a person than President Musharraf himself, that Pakistan is seeking military parity with India. And, therefore, are we becoming a party to that, willy-nilly, by following a soft policy? Sir, India-Pakistan. The hon. External Affairs Minister made some statements immediately after he assumed office. Again, according to newspaper reports, he had to telephone the Pakistan Foreign Minister, Khurshid Kasuri, twice, to explain he did not mean this, he did not mean that. But, be that as it may, the point is, we feel that our relationship with Pakistan is not merely drifting, it has entered a dangerous territory, once again.

Sir, the January 6th statement was very brief; it was very pointed, very focused. It left absolutely nothing to chance. And, yes, we did agree that we will start a dialogue with Pakistan under the composite dialogue framework after an assurance came from Pakistan that they will eschew hostility, violence and terrorism. And, this is inscribed, written in stone in the January 6th joint statement. There is absolutely no mention there of any care issue. There is no mention there of any third party mediation. There is no mention there of any third party, within Pakistan or India, sitting on the negotiating table. It says clearly, "to the satisfaction of both sides."

Over a period of time, Sir, by making statements, which I would not regard as very responsible, we have diluted the achievements of the January 6th statement. We had protested, well, after the meeting of the Prime Minister with President Musharraf in New York. A press statement had been issued and we had said, that was not enough. Was the BJP alone in saying this that the whole issue of cross-border terrorism, which had been brought to the centre stage of international concern, stood diluted by the 24th September statement, issued after the meeting of the Prime Minister with the President?

I have, here, the report of the Dawn, a Pakistani newspaper, Sir, what does it say? I quote: "The statement, although an important diplomatic document in itself, was more noticeable for what it omitted than what it said. The most notable omission was that of the Indian claim that Pakistan was encouraging cross-border terrorism in Kashmir." This is the statement of the Dawn newspaper in Pakistan.

We will have all these questions to ask, as the Leader of the Opposition is saying, when the Prime Minister comes out with a statement. But the point I am making, Sir, is, was in this House that I had asked the Defence Minister is the question whether he sees any let up in the activity of Pakistan as far as infiltration and cross-border terrorism is concerned. What was the reply? He saw no let up. So, what has happened in these seven months, after January 6th? One, Pakistan is now insisting that Jammu and Kashmir is the core issue. Pakistan is insisting on Hurriyat. Hurriyat is also insisting, that they must be a necessary third party at the negotiating table. Sir, we were also talking to Hurriyat. We had also said that they can talk to Pakistan. But their talking to Pakistan was conditional on their talking to us. And, we have today a situation where the Government permits them to talk to Pakistan when they are saying that they are not prepared to talk to them. And we have this most ridiculous situation of the Hurriyat delegation coming here and meeting the Pakistan Foreign Secretary when he visits Delhi, meeting the Pakistan Foreign Minister when he visits Delhi, meeting the Pakistan Prime Minister when he visits Delhi, and they say, जिस को हिन्दी में कहते हैं, "डंके की चोट पर", "We will not talk to you." What kind of policy is this? By all means, permit them to go wherever they want to, but not as citizens of an independent country. Why are we not insisting on passports? Janeshwer Mishraji was saying that we are a weak country. Are we so weak that we can't even ask our citizens to travel on passports on this Srinagar-Muzaffarabad bus service? Pakistan is insisting that they will not permit Indian Passports. Jammu and Kashmir citizens travelling to any other country including Pakistan through any other route will travel on Indian passport. But when they cross the Line of Control they will not travel on Indian Passport. How does it legitimise anything? When they signed the Indus Waters Treaty in 1966, did it legitimise the partition of Jammu and Kashmir? Isn't Pakistan a party and aren't they threatening you that they are going to raise this issue with the World Bank on Baghlihar and I do not know what we are doing with it.

Where is the change in Pakistani attitude? They are publicly opposed to our joining the Security Council. They are threatening to take Baglihar to the World Bank according to the terms of the treaty. They are not satisfied with all the information that have made available to them. General Musharraf goes to U.K.. In London he goes to Tony Blair and says, 'you mediate between India and Pakistan'. Everywhere he has gone back and he has been allowed to go back, on January 6. This is my charge Sir, against this Government, that in conducting the negotiations with Pakistan, unfortunately, in trying to earn whatever points they want to earn, they have lost track of national interest. I agree entirely with what Janeshwarji said, 'you are dealing with a very clever man and you have to be careful' and I am afraid that you have not shown that caution, you have not shown that maturity in dealing with Pakistan and you carry on. Let all the talks be held. We have nothing against that. After all, it was the initiative that we had started. But for god's sake, make Pakistan, stick to the commitments that Pakistan made in the January 6th Statement. Don't dismiss it because it was signed or adopted when the NDA was in power. We never adopted this kind of attitude with respect to the initiatives that you have taken. Sir, I do not know what the Government's policy are with regard to the gas pipeline from Iran via Pakistan to India. We see the Petroleum Minister saying something, somebody else saying something one statement, background briefing. Complete chaos and confusion is there with regard to whether we are going ahead with the pipeline or whether we are not going ahead with the pipeline, what are the terms and conditions and I am sorry to say that it finds mention in the Statement that the Prime Minister signs. The gas pipeline is so important that there are 3-4 paragraph statements where the gas pipeline is mentioned. There was no MFN then and there is no MFN now. And, we say all our options are open. My Colleague, Shri Arun Shourie, had dealt with it. When he was participating on internal security, all options were open. 'Track two' diplomacy between India and Pakistan, is there all over in the newspapers. What kind of 'Track two' is this? I have never heard of this kind of Track. The National Security Advisor is meeting the Advisor to Pakistan President, where he is meeting, when he is meeting, what they are going to discuss, it is all in the public domain. Nothing will come out of this if it is all dealt within this kind of fashion. Sir, the hon. External Affairs Minister made a Statement that the Munnabao-Khokrapur Rail link will be in operation from Second October, 2005 until it was promptly denied by the Pakistani side the rail

link had not been laid, and therefore, there was no question of its becoming operational. Sir, much was made of the fact that we have progressed in our relationship with ASEAN. The Prime Minister, the Foreign Affairs Minister were there and I was a little surprised when I heard the Prime Minister say on the television while addressing some gathering there that this was the policy started by Congress Government in 1991. There has been a very healthy unwritten rule which every Government has followed that whenever you are abroad, you don't discuss partisan political issues of home. We talk about the Government of India. We talk about the Governments which have performed/done something before, but, never in a critical tone and never refer to or take credit for ourselves. Sir, just for the information of this House I would like to quote from a letter which was written by Mr. Thomas Abraham, who was the Charge-de-Affairs of the Indian Embassy in Bangkok, in 1966. What does he say? He says, "the Thai Foreign Office sounded me out on the Indian response should an invitation be extended to India to join this new Group in ASEAN. I referred the matter to Delhi and was informed that I should indicate India's lack of interest politely but clearly." some in our establishment said, 'we do not want to join this Group of 'Coca Cola countries.' This is the disdain with which we treated the ASEAN. Otherwise, India would have been a founding-Member of ASEAN. We have made progress. We started Free Trade Agreement with the ASEAN. And, I am glad that this Government is following our initiative. But, it is not merely ASEAN, BIMSTEC, Ganga-Mekong, India-Myanmar-Thailand Trilateral Road Project and the Car Rally, which was held recently, was a suggestion of the former Prime Minister in the last ASEAN Summit. All this was to integrate an area of Asia, region of Asia that we had neglected with disdain. Now, we are doing it. But, we are not merely stopping here. Even with regard to the Gulf Co-operation Council we started a Summit-level dialogue with them in New York last year, and I hope it will continue to make progress. But, Sir, the most worrisome thing that we notice is this. We notice this in our immediate neighbourhood and not merely Pakistan. I will be glad if the hon. Minister informs this House as to how many countries in the neighbourhood he has visited since he has taken over. We have the Maoist in Nepal. We have the LTTE in Sri Lanka, with linkage through our territory. We have Pakistan on our West. We have Bangladesh in our East. We have Myanmar in our East. And, it appears, as if Indian insurgent groups are surrounding India from all sides. From all around us, we see a great deal of failure on the part of our neighbours. I am

concerned and I would like to express that concern publicly in this House about the security and safety of our Prime Minister when he travels for the SAARC Meeting next month in Dhaka, because Bangladesh has been in denial on this. When you raise issue before them, they raise counter-issues before you. If you say that the Indian insurgent groups are operating out of Bangladesh, they will tell you that anti-Bangladesh elements are operating out of India. If you talk about criminals, they will talk about criminals. If you talk about the illegal immigration, they will also talk about illegal immigration. Now, I am concerned because the whole security situation in Pakistan, Afghanistan, Central Asia, Bangladesh, Nepal, Myanmar, Sri Lanka and with what is going on with regard to Islamic terrorism in the South of Thailand, is changing. A ring of terrorist activity surrounds us. I would like to know from the hon. Minister about this, because these are not internal security matters. These are foreign policy issues. So, I would like to know from the hon. Minister as to what exactly the Government of India is doing to ensure that this country remains safe.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Sinha, time allotted to your party is over.

SHRI YASHWANT SINHA: Yes, Sir. I am concluding. The kind of nexus that we have seen developed between terrorist organisations all around us is not allowed to flourish in the manner in which it has flourished during the last few months.

I know this is a subject which is very dear to the hon. Foreign Minister. This is Non-Alignment or South-South Cooperation. We have taken a number of steps, when we were in office to promote the South-South Cooperation. The India-Brazil South Africa initiative, the T-9 initiative in Western Africa, then, all the FTAs and the preferential tariff arrangements that we were promoting. We had covered the entire Latin America, the entire Africa, and most of Asia through this network of free-trade agreements and preferential trade agreements. There can't be any Non-Alignment, there can't be any South-South Cooperation unless we take a lead and promote South-South Cooperation like our colleague, Shri Arun Jaitley, had done in Cancun. The whole world is aware how through India's efforts the group of twenty came into existence, which is standing in such a good stead in our negotiations in the WTO. Now, what exactly is happening to the various initiatives that we had started to promote South-South Cooperation? But, as I said, Sir, a large number of problems in our Foreign Policy have been left behind by

history, and that history does not go back beyond 1947. It started when India became independent. It started when India was partitioned. And, all our problems, except the boundary question with China, are a result of that partition. Very serious unpardonable mistakes have been made in dealing with these issues. When we were in office we tried to deal with these historical issues, whether it is with Pakistan, whether it is with China, whether it is with Bangladesh, whether it is with Myanmar, whether it is with Central Asia or any other country in our neighbourhood. But we are concerned -- and, I would like to say this absolutely unambiguously -- when we see the same mistakes being repeated again today. I have referred to some of the statements. The hon. Minister stood shoulder to shoulder with the Secretary of State of the USA and made a statement about Iraq, which caused avoidable confusion in this country. Even our friends on the Left were compelled to take the Government to task on that statement. If the BJP had criticised it, they would have said, "You are in Opposition". But most of the criticism is coming from them. Dismiss our criticism if you want to. But, what about their criticism? So, where is the Foreign Policy of this country heading? I dare say, in seven months it is in shambles. I was going through one of the statements which hon. Natwar Singhji had made in 1998. He referred to one of the Members of the Government and said, "He is *el nino*". He described him as '*el nino*'. And, he said "This *el nino* has been making statements, which are not in India's interests." I dare say, the present Government is full of such *el ninos*. The Defence Minister is saying something, the Home Minister is saying the other thing, the External Affairs Minister is saying the other thing. There is no clarity. The PMO is saying something else and doing background briefing, which is in complete contradiction with what the Minister says in the Parliament of this country. Why is it that the Foreign Policy is marked by this chaos, this confusion, these contradictory statements? What is happening? So, my charge is that this Government has lost its way on Foreign Policy. Nobody knows today in this country who runs Foreign Policy. Is it being run from the Foreign Office; is it being run by the PMO; is it being run by the Home Ministry; is it being run by the Defence Ministry? Who is running the Foreign Policy of this country? And, why is there no coordination? If all are running, Sir, then, it becomes the Prime Minister's focussed responsibility to ensure that there is coordination. I have never seen such a confusion. As I said right in the beginning, I am, perhaps, totally inexperienced, as far as Foreign Policy is concerned, before my much

more experienced colleague; but, I am sorry to say, this is no way to run the Foreign Policy of country. Thank you.

DR. KARAN SINGH (NCT of Delhi): Mr. Chairman, Sir, this is a welcome first opportunity since the last elections for this House to debate Foreign Policy in some depth. In fact, we should have an opportunity earlier, but it is good that even at the fag-end of this Session, we are having a debate on Foreign Policy. I am not sure when the last debate in the last Government was. But, Sir, I would like to say, at the outset, that the hon. Member, who just spoke, seems to be very disturbed, worried and somewhat disoriented by the new developments that have taken place. It is true that a lot of challenges have emerged. These are not new challenges. These are new dimensions of challenges which continue to develop because Foreign Policy, essentially, is continual, and our Foreign Policy, from Independence, goes all the way back to Jawaharlal Nehru, who was the architect of our Foreign Policy. And, more or less, on the basis of a national consensus, the Foreign Policy has been continued down to the present day. Certainly, there are challenges. There is no doubt about it. We are living in difficult times. If you recall, Sir, the Chinese pictogram for 'challenge' is the same as the pictogram for opportunity. Everytime there is a challenge, there is also an opportunity to make a breakthrough and a new development. We should realise that what is happening is that India is emerging as a power to be reckoned with, not only in the region but around the world, as a result of our economy, as a result of our pluralistic polity, as a result of our democratic traditions. Therefore, as we emerge into this new dimension, we, have to confront the various problems that face us, and we will do that. I can assure the hon. Member that we will do that in an integrated manner and without any dissidence. Certainly, in a democracy, there is a scope for a difference of opinion but there will be no dissidence, there will be no negativism. Janeshwarji talked about the people whose courage had failed. I do not think that is a correct description of India. India has always risen to the occasion down through the corridors of time; and I have no doubt whatsoever, that we will meet the challenges boldly and bravely.

[MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN in the Chair]

Sir, the Minister will reply, no doubt, to the specific points that have been raised by the Opposition. I would like to make some general points

with regard to the overall situation that we are facing today in the world. I would like to look upon it as a sort of model of concentric circles. Let us begin with SAARC. SAARC is the closest regional grouping to us and it is important that we strengthen our relationships with SAARC. I do not want to go into the details. With Pakistan, we have had a long and troubled history even since independence. I once mentioned in the House, whether you call Jammu and Kashmir a core issue or call it a sore issue? Jammu and Kashmir has been a Central issue. There is no pretending that it is not a Central issue. Therefore, it has to be addressed, and I think all Governments have said; that they are prepared to address it and enter into a dialogue with Pakistan. We are aware, Sir. I happen to come from the mouth of the volcano. I have grown up with this problem even since I was a boy. My, friend, Dr. Farooq Abdullah, only a few years junior to me, both of us have lived through the situation. About Pakistan, I would say only two things. One is, there is a famous film song अजीब दासतां है ये, कहां शुरू कहाँ खत्म, ये मंजिलें हैं कौन सी, न वो समझ सके न हम। This continuing story, goes on and on. I have got my own views in the matter which I am not going to express, but, certainly, we should have a dialogue. The second is a शेर from शकील बदायूनी—

“हर चीज नहीं है मरकज, पर एक जरा इधर, एक जरा उधर,
नफरत से न देखो दुश्मन को, शायद वह मौहब्बत कर बैठे।”

Therefore, we must hope, while keeping our powder dry, while keeping up our defences, while being extremely wary, as Yashwantji has said that we are dealing with somebody who is certainly an unusual political person. We must, nonetheless, always hope that there will one day be a *detente* because, it is my personal conviction, Sir, that unless there is a *detente* between India and Pakistan, neither will SAARC take off nor will our country really be able to rise to the heights to which it is destined. Now, what happened throughout, I am not going into that detail; that is a very complex issue; I will not touch it. I will just try to make this point that the dialogue began a long time ago. In fact, the dialogue started from Panditji's time. After that, there have been many ups and downs; then the previous Prime Minister made some gestures in Kashmir, and we have been following it up. And we can only hope and pray for the sake of the people of India and people of Pakistan, for the sake of those people of India, Indian citizens

living in Jammu & Kashmir. They are the ones who are suffering. If I heard Janeshwarji correctly, he said that the attack on the World Towers was not meant to kill people. I don't understand what else it was meant to do.

SHRI JANESHWAR MISHRA: It was not aimed to kill someone.

DR. KARAN SINGH: Was it not aimed to kill people? Thousands of people died. I don't understand it. ... (*Interruptions*)...

SHRI JANESHWAR MISHRA: Not aimed to kill 'someone'.

DR. KARAN SINGH: Well, around 4000 or so people died in that. My friend, Dr. Farooq Abdullah, himself has escaped assassination attempts. Therefore, let us not denigrate the danger of terrorism and militarism also. So, while we certainly wish that our relations with Pakistan will improve, there should be no fear that we are going to, in any way, compromise the national interest. The broader national interest, certainly, lies in a *detente*, and one hopes and prays that will come about.

As far as SAARC is concerned, also, I must mention Nepal. The situation in Nepal is extremely dangerous and extremely disturbed. There are several factors involved there. There are the *Maovadis*; there are the political parties, who, unfortunately, don't seem to be able to get their act together, and there is the King. Now, all these factors have to be kept in mind because a destabilisation in Nepal will have a direct impact upon us. Our neighbouring States of Bihar and Uttar Pradesh, particularly, with their very porous borders are very vulnerable to the growth of militant and terrorist activities, and, therefore, this is a matter which concerns both internal security as well as foreign policy, and it is most fitting that the first visit that our Foreign Minister made, after his appointment, was to Nepal.

Sir, we move into the next concentric circle, ASEAN. Certainly, we must develop our relations with ASEAN. They were historically somewhat neglected for various reasons into which I need not go. But, now, I think, there is an awareness that ASEAN is tremendously important for us. And, if you travel in South-East Asia, the impact of Indian culture is indelible there. It is astounding. I went last year, for the first time, — I do not know whether you, Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, have been there or not — to Angkor Wat. Angkor Wat is an absolute revelation. It is that the largest place of worship in the world, a Hindu, Shaiva, Vaishnav, Buddhist temple, a huge temple built in a tiny country of Cambodia. The Indian culture influence in

4.00 P.M.

ASEAN is great. If you go to Java, a Muslim majority country, the way they do the Ramayana is much more effective and much more dramatic even than the way we do it here. So, it has nothing to do directly with religion, it has to do with culture, and the whole of South-East Asia down through the centuries has been impacted by Indian culture in a friendly manner, not through the force of arms. Therefore, ASEAN is very important to us and we must develop that.

We come then to China. Bilateral talks certainly are continuing. My own view is that we should, as soon as possible, clinch the border talks with China, if we can.....because there are ups and downs in internal Chinese' politics, and when the situation is favourable, we can clinch it. I would like to mention one point that President Putin also made, and if I remember correctly, Prime Minister Primakov had also made that point as Prime Minister—the possibility of an India-China-Russia axis. It is a very intriguing point. I was there because we had organised the Jawaharlal Nehru memorial lecture when President Putin, in his speech, mentioned this point. So, committed as we are to a multi-polar world, to a pluralistic world, it is important for us to build up a positive relationship with China and with Russia, and, if possible, a sort of tripartite axis. None of these are mutually exclusive. SAARC has its own position; ASEAN has its own position. Our bilateral talks with China, our bilateral agreements with Russia, which were referred to, have their own significance. But, the possibility of these three countries working in tandem, for important international events and situations should, certainly be explored because that could, conceivably, bring about the development of a new Pole, of a new centre, for the somewhat imbalanced situation in which we find ourselves.

Sir, as far as the European Union is concerned, that is another astounding development in our own lifetime. In countries, that were at daggers' drawn for hundreds of years, for centuries -- millions of people died on the battlefields of Europe -- today, you can travel from Portugal to Poland, and you can travel from Norway to Greece, without a passport. We are developing a strategic partnership with the European Union. It is tremendously important. Also, because the European Union is a sort of model upon which SAARC one day, hopefully, can develop. It is only if we develop on the model of European Union, that our problems in SAARC will be solved. That was the way the problems in Europe were solved and that is what we must aim at.

Sir, in passing, I would like to make a mention of Central Asia. Central Asia is an area of tremendous importance. With the collapse of the Soviet Union, with the emergence of these erstwhile dominated countries into independence, there is a tremendous demands in those countries. They want material on India. They want Indian professors. They want books. Tashkent University has hardly got any books from India. We have got to send people; we have got to go to Dushanbe; we have got to go to Almaata; we have got to go to the Central Asian republics where there is a great vacuum at present as a result of the collapse of the Soviet Union. Sir the developing nations of Asia, sub-Saharan Africa, are subsumed in this whole movement. Non-aligned Movement is, obviously, new now. It is not the old Non-Alignment because one Pole collapsed. But, if we look upon Non-Alignment in a new articulation, as camaraderie between developing nations, as a South-South dialogue, as a possibility of some combined activity in certain fields, I think, you will find that it can still be of some value.

Sir, the Arab world is in turmoil. Just yesterday, there was a very interesting speech by a leading Arab intellectual in India International Centre on the emerging global scenario and Arab perspective. The Palestinian question, of course, remains still unsolved. Our stand on that has been very clear. But, generally it seems to me now that our relations with the Arab world are getting attenuated. I seem to remember in Jawaharlalji's time, President Nasser was coming here you had all these great leaders from Arab world coming in. Now, there seems to be less contact, less academic contact, fewre University professors coming. How many times, do you read of an Arabic University professor coming and giving a lecture in India? Or, how many times, do our people go abroad? In think, here again, we need to revive, as it were, the ancient ties between the Arabs and Indians and develop new relationships with the regimes.

Sir, there are several other dimensions of foreign policy. There are economic and commercial dimensions which are, obviously, very important now in the emerging global society. There is a diaspora dimension, for which we now have a separate Ministry apparently although frankly. I still have not fully discovered what that Ministry is doing or is supposed to do, but, presumably, it will do something worthwhile including organising a *Pravasi Bharatiya* Summit in Bombay. The importance of the diaspora is well known.

Any of us who have travelled around the world are aware of how brilliantly Indians are doing abroad. It is a matter of pride. You take the United States. You saw the review three days ago. In the United States, people of Indian origin now are leading in income, they are leading in the number of graduates, and they are leading in the number of scientists. We are proud of the diaspora, and, they can be of a very valuable help to us in our foreign policy.

Then we come to cultural diplomacy. Cultural diplomacy is tremendously important. India has been one of the few countries in the world that has not only imbibed cultures; it has given culture to the world. आ नोः भद्राः यन्तु विश्वतः। We have imbibed good cultures but we have also spread our cultural peacefully. Whether it is Buddhism which travelled all the way from Kashmir, all the way through Tibet, China, Korea, and, all the way to Japan, and, down in the southern areas Sri Lanka, Indonesia, Thailand, whether it is renewed interest in the Hinduism, or, whether it is the islamic connection, the Sufi connection; Maulana Jalaluddin Rumi, Khwaja Nizamuddin and all, there is lot of culture in our history.

And, this is where, Sir, I feel that the ICCR must play a much more significant role than it has done so far. In our Committee, we are recommending that the expenditure on the ICCR, the whole ambit of the ICCR, must grow. It is not the question only of sending a few musicians and dancers; they are very good. But, we must have an overall view of India's role as the creator of culture. The role that Greece and Rome between them played in the West, India has played in the East. And, therefore, this whole efflorescence of Indian culture must now, in the new context, be spread as far as possible, and that will help tremendously. The respect that Indian intellectuals and philosophers have in the West is quite unique. I don't think there is any other country, which can boast of that sort of heritage, and, we must use that creatively in our foreign policy.

Sir, this question of restructuring the United Nations is on, and, I am sure the Minister will answer that, But, I would like to end on the note that ultimately it is our internal situation that will determine our international stature. Despite what the hon. Member sitting that side said, I think the Manmohan Singh Government is doing well in foreign affairs, and, it will continue to clarify and deal with the various issues that come up from time to time, which should be based on a national consensus.

Sir, a great, strong, mature, pluralistic democracy like India can, I am sure, make a positive contribution to the emerging architecture of the new global society, that is the goal to which our party, which this Government is committed.

SHRI NILOTPAL BASU (West Bengal): Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, the other day, in one of the newspapers there was a column by Mr. Inder Malhotra, a very reputed columnist who has been writing for the last 50 years about this welcome development that Parliament, after all, is going to discuss the foreign policy issue.

Actually, we have discussed foreign policy. It is not that we have not discussed it during the last regime. But we discussed it in the context of sudden specific developments like 9/11 incident, the American invasion of Iraq, and, things like that. But the whole gamut of issues covered in a comprehensive discussion on the foreign policy really has not taken place in the Parliament for a long, long time and I think this is a welcome development.

Though I will also concede to *Yashwantji* -- I agree with him not in the combative sense that he said -- that the Prime Minister must also come out with a statement in this House about his visits, and, the achievements that have taken place in terms of the Summit discussions, because there we get the possibility to have really a focussed discussion, and, clarifications on specific issues.

But, not really to expose the Himalayan blunders that the Government has committed in these last seven months, which *Jaswantji* thinks, it has done. But, I was awestruck with his performance, I must say. He was sounding almost biblical. We know that before me the darkness and after me the deluge kind of assertion that he has made in terms of foreign policy performance of his Government. That is a little bit difficult for me to digest. It is not that I see eye-to-eye with this Government on all issues, I will definitely come to that. But, I think, it is a very important point that was made in the National Common Minimum Programme that our foreign policy would be independent and it will be promotive of multilateralism. This was very, very important because we have seen the drift. There is no doubt that there was a framework of a foreign policy in this country since independence which broadly proceeded on the basis of a national consensus. The other day, I also mentioned in this House, in the context of the Leader of the

Opposition raising a point on the reported statement of the hon. Foreign Minister in Seoul, that nobody can deny the fact that the first major discord in our perception of the foreign policy came about in the wake of Pokhran-II. There has been an animated debate in this House, when the entire House was badly divided on the question of foreign policy. That had never happened in the past. This is a fact which nobody can deny. Now, whether it is good or bad, I am not going into that. But, of course, foreign policy proceeds on the basis of the situation available to you. Certain things which we cannot avoid become a *fait accompli*, and, we have to proceed on the basis of that. But on the basis of that, we cannot deny the fact that the first major breach in the national consensus, that was obtained in this country, was when we went in for Pokhran-II. This is a fact, and, therefore, the subsequent developments which took place, and the letter that was written to the President Clinton on the very next day, actually did not really betray a sense of independence in our foreign policy-making. If that decision was really independent and there was not need for an explanation, I think, the letter would also not go. But the fact that the letter went, pointing out to two of our neighbours as our security concern to go for that project, indicated that there we people beyond the shores of this country who had to be explained about our position lest they do not get angry with us. Therefore, I think, it is very apt for the new Government and the ruling coalition to evolve in this Common Minimum Programme that there is a need for an independent foreign policy which will be promotive of multilateralism. Now, Sir, so far as multilateralism is concerned, this a new word which we are using, I think, more frequently as distinct from non-alignment, for obvious reasons, because here that the context in which the nomenclature 'non-alignment' came about really does not exist because there is a single pool, there is a single super-power. Therefore, 'multilateralism' is 'non-alignment' of our times, of the present times, when there is a situation, in security terms, in foreign policy terms, a single power, a uni-polar reality is there, multilateralism has to be the essential transformed nomenclature of what we used to consider non-alignment. Now, in that sense, I think, the fact that we have raised this whole question of democratisation of the UN structures, particularly that of the permanent Security Council, in a very big way and it has gathered momentum and our intervention in the whole debate is a major important development.

It did not happen two years back. It did not happen a year back. But with the opening of the General Assembly and the systematic manner in which the Indian Prime Minister, Indian delegation as a whole, made this point, has also forced the issue, and with some of our colleagues, I also had the opportunity of being present, and it is an issue which is being talked about. Now, of course, I think that whatever has been recommended in that blue report, which was instituted by the Secretary-General, what would be our approach should not be decided by the Government alone. Not because the Government does not have the authority, but this Government is committed to restore the sense of national consensus in terms of foreign policy-making, which had got breached in between. Therefore, this is an important question on which there has to be a national position. Therefore, I think in evolving and firming up the views of the Government, there has to be a national consultation on this, and there should not be any unilateral decision by the Foreign Ministry Office, or the Government as such. That I think is very, very important. In what way should we intervene in the situation? Because there is no denying the fact that in the proposal itself, having a section of the Permanent Members without voting power and a section of Permanent Members with voting power, this kind of an open discrimination within the Security Council is there. Whether it really strengthens our overall struggle in restructuring and democratising the UN and the Security Council is a question on which there can be a debate and, I think, we should factor in the views of all political shades in this country before finalising this time.

But, Sir, the most important point is : Where from shall we start? Where from shall we start in developing a multipolar world? We are in a situation of unipolarity, and we are trying to develop multilateralism. Now, there were some views, in the past, to suit ourselves, to adjust ourselves with the unipolar world and the kind of trappings that went with that kind of a unipolar system. It is a very important first step towards multilateralism. I remember, we debated here after September 11, and it was told that there was a great change in the struggle against global terrorism. There was terrorism before, there is terrorism now, and there will be terrorism thereafter. No doubt about that. But, I think, a contention was made here in this House by the Government in the past that there was a qualitative change in the direction, in the fight against terrorism. Therefore, we should hitch ourselves to that effort. It was a very important step, the Government

suggested at that point of time, in fighting terrorism. But we say that the way it is being sought to be dealt with, at the international level, cannot really arrest terrorism, far from it if anything, it will lead to further terrorist acts all over the world.

We remember, and, I think, the hon. Foreign Minister will definitely remember the two days of impasse in this very House on the passing of a unanimous resolution, and Indian Parliament was the only Parliament which condemned the U.S. occupation of Iraq, which openly called for withdrawal of troops of the coalition forces. Therefore, the efforts that we are taking, and the way we try to redefine the need for changing the direction of the anti-terrorism struggle globally, has to come out more sharply, consistent with our idea of independent policy-making, consistent with our idea of promoting multipolarity. Surely, describing President Bush as a champion of struggle against terrorism is not the way to promote multilateralism and our fight against global terrorism. I think that point has to be understood by us.

I will watch everybody appropriately, I have no problem in that. We have an understanding about that. But I think that is the point. Now, in the context of this attempt to democratise the United Nations, I think it is very important for us to understand on what basis we are asking, on what basis India is asking, for a permanent seat on the Security Council. Our basis is that we are more representative of the concerns of the developing countries. Sometimes, confusion arises because, I think, we have also sort of become unconscious victims of this campaign that India has become a super-power. From "Shining India", we became a "Super-power India" in the later stage of our election campaign. Therefore, unless we also have clarity as to what is the platform on the basis of which we are asking for democratisation of the United Nations or a permanent seat on the Security Council, there will be confusion. Now, if we are representative of the concerns of the developing countries, surely we will not get that on the basis of the magnanimity of some super-powers, we will get that on the basis of the support from majority of the developing countries and the fact that our emphasis has slightly shifted can be seen from the results of the United Nations Economic and Social Council that we have got overwhelming support, but there are irritants. Sir, if you see the language of the National Common Minimum Programme on West Asia and the formulation this Government has made in the Presidential Address, the change will be

clear. The whole reference to Israel which has come in the President's Address, which, unfortunately, we could not discuss thanks to Jaswantji and his friends in this House, that reference was there that with Israel, we have developed good relations and nothing will happen in our Indo-Israel relations which will negatively affect our traditional ties with Palestine and other West Asian countries. Now, why the question of Israel comes? Nobody is shouting from the rooftop that we will not have any diplomatic ties with Israel. Israel is a State we have recognised. But, at the same time, those Indo-Israel ties could become a threat to our position on Palestine issues. Why that concern had to be expressed in the Presidential Address? Because, again, I have data with me, in 1998, when the earlier Government was in power, I think we had about 250 million dollars worth of trade with Israel in defence equipment. In 2004, when this Government has come, it has already grown to, I think, 1-1/2 billion or 2 billion dollars. And there is a projection that by the next year, it will go up to four billion dollars and it goes into several areas -- avionics, ammunition, rifles, night-vision goggles and so on and so forth. Now, the point is, and I am given to understand, that many of the deals had gone through earlier even without a tendering process. And defence magazines like the Zennets, even the Janes Digest, tell us that Israelis are paying the highest amount of commission, 30 per cent average, for securing orders from the countries to whom they sell their equipment. This is the general position. Israel has in the past, after having dealt with China in terms of arms, had suddenly stopped supplies because the Americans were saying, the point that you were making in the last -- endues. That endues is against the American interests, so you cannot sell to the Chinese. Now, therefore, is it proper on our part to go on depending increasingly heavily on the Israelis? I am a little surprised at the great eloquence of Jaswantji on our ties with the Russians because the people who were most sour with our growing defence relationship with Israel were the Russians. Now, therefore, if something had upset the Russians really, which I do not know, which the hon. Foreign Minister has to clarify, that would surely be our increasing defence relationships with Israel. Now, whose brain-child was this in foreign policy-making? The US-Israel-New Delhi Axis, Washington-Tel Aviv-New Delhi Axis, and whether it was a result of an independent foreign policy-making, and whether, as the new Government has said it in the Common Minimum Programme, with some of these people who are knowingly smiling here, because they had some role in drafting it...

THE MINISTER OF LAW AND JUSTICE (SHRI H. R. BHARDWAJ): Whom are you referring to?

SHRI NILOTPAL BASU: There are so many friends here. This dilution that you have made in the President's Address in dealing with the West Asian situation, is quite clear, because, apart from anything else, look at the numbers. In West Asia, we have about 54 votes for the Security Council, and Sir, I must tell you very frankly, that whoever has prepared the Prime Minister's intervention in the U.N. General Assembly, our failure to mention our solidarity, our support to the Palestinian did not go down well with those countries. Therefore, we have to take a very balanced and nuanced approach on all these issues, because it is a complicated world, it is also a very difficult world, where we are trying to work out a foreign policy, which is promotive of multilateralism, yet, we are in a situation, which is the unipolar world, where we do not know people who befriend us at a certain point of time. How long will they go along with us? How long will they stick to us because, Yashwantji was referring to Arun Shourieji's achievement in Cancun? But we have also seen that there are ditherings, because, the developing countries get together, stick together for some time, and then they tend to fall away. So, our approach has to be, how long and how far we can carry with whom. We have allied ourselves at a certain point of time. Therefore, I think, Sir, it is very important to start the whole issue in the neighbourhood, and we have no doubt that we have progressed, and the rancour in Yashwantji's intervention I could understand, because, the Government is really unlike "Yashwant". (*Interruptions*)

SHRI YASHWANT SINHA: Sir, I know about the accent of the people from that part of the country from where he comes.

SHRI NILOTPAL BASU: That is what I am saying. You bear with the accent that we have in that part of the country, because, none of us really speak British English. Either we speak Tamil English or Telugu English or Bengali English. The point is, therefore, Yashwantji's contention in most part of his speech was preoccupation with Pakistan is understood because, the Indian foreign policy became a mirror image of Pakistan's India policy, and we have to go beyond it. Therefore, there was terrorism there, there is terrorism now, notwithstanding POTA, notwithstanding the spending of taxpayers' money to the tune of Rs. 1,000 crores by mobilizing our forces for ten months along the border. But the point is, nothing has happened.

There was no progress. On the contrary, the SAARC process itself was frozen, in a suspended animation, for two years. That is a fact, which nobody can deny. There, the name of the game today is 'engagement'. You have to engage, not that you always come to an agreement. But engagement has to be there, relationship has to be there. The most positive part that we are now discussing is gas. Well, there may be differences in the perception, there may be differences in the manner of articulation done by different Ministers, but we are not discussing when and where we will bomb the other country with our nuclear arsenal. That we are not discussing. We are discussing gas or we are discussing the MFN status or certain other economic issues. That in itself, I think, is a major positive development.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Basu, how much more time will you take?

SHRI NILOTPAL BASU: Sir, I think the hon. Chairman was very forgiving about former speakers. So, if you have even a fraction of that for me, I will wind up.

SHRI V. NARAYANASAMY: Sir, it is a very important matter. Please extend the time.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I am just asking him how much time he will take.

SHRI NILOTPAL BASU: Therefore, the SAARC process and the BIMSEC process are welcome developments. These have started, and these are being followed up. The ASEAN process has started; that is also going to be followed up. There may be some differences, but what is very important is as and when we are going to have a new emphasis in our Foreign Policy because ultimately, our objective is to open up the economy, is to have more trade and bilateral business engagements with many parts of these regions or with many other countries, our country's infrastructure should also change. Yashwantji has said that there was a great interest shown by the earlier Government towards the ASEAN and BIMSEC. But when it comes to the infrastructure in the eastern part of the country, we feel that no investment is being made by the Government. Today, Foreign Policy is also an extension of the domestic policy; I mean, always it was, and today, perhaps, more so. When you are actually reorienting your Foreign

Policy towards a particular region of the world, that part of the country should also get your attention in terms of capacity building, in terms of infrastructure building, and whenever the opportunities fructify, we should be able to make use of that. Sir, it is a very welcome development today; Karan Singhji was also making a mention of the Primikov idea of Russia, China and India, because increasingly, in this world what do we see when we are talking of unipolarity, when we are talking of hegemonism? In Iraq, we are seeing that every day; we do not know what kind of elections will take place. I would like to know from the hon. External Affairs Minister what is India's approach because on this, Parliament has passed a unanimous Resolution. Unless it is amending that, how are we going to translate the idea incorporated in the Resolution into a reality? What will be our approach on Palestine? I am asking this because there is a new situation there, post-Arafat. We have to play a major role in this because these are all issues which are related to our central position, central question of trying to restructure the U.N. and its Security Council. We cannot have a global of articulating the concerns of the developing countries. On the other hand, the main issue which constitutes a very important part of the global discourse, on which where the developing countries will stand, should be decided. The kind of thing that on other issues, we will not articulate, we will not keep ourselves relatively silent, does not go well together, does not gel well together. I say this because earlier, the Government jumped to the bandwagon of the United States... *(Interruptions)*.

SHRI K. NATWAR SINGH: Which Government?

SHRI NILOTPAL BASU: The earlier Government.

SHRI K. NATWAR SINGH: Define clearly.

SHRI NILOTPAL BASU: I go by Yashwant Sinha's definition that the Government is a continuous process. In that sense, I say 'the Government'.

SHRI YASHWANT SINHA: You don't believe in it? You don't think so?

SHRI NILOTPAL BASU: I think people are our masters, and they have decided that whatever policy that Government was pursuing has to be rejected... *(Interruptions)* ... to the extent it is necessary, to the extent the people did not agree with that. Surely, people did not vote for the continuation of those policies. *(Interruptions)* ...

DR. ALLADI P. RAJKUMAR (Andhra Pradesh): People did not vote for others also. You don't forget that. *(Interruptions)*...

SHRI NILOTPAL BASU: But surely they did not vote for those policies. *(Interruptions)*...

DR. ALLADI P. RAJKUMAR: Let us be fair in this august House. *(Interruptions)*...

SHRI YASHWANT SINHA: Which policy did they reject in Kerala? *(Interruptions)*... Which policy did they reject in Kerala? *(Interruptions)*...

SHRI NILOTPAL BASU: I am coming to that. *(Interruptions)*... I am coming to that. *(Interruptions)*...

SHRI RAVI SHANKAR PRASAD: (Bihar): Which policy did they reject in Madhya Pradesh, Rajasthan, Orissa and Punjab? *(Interruptions)*...

SHRI NILOTPAL BASU: I will reply to that question. *(Interruptions)*...

श्री रुद्रनारायण पणि (उड़ीसा): केरल में कौनसी पॉलिसी ने काम किया?

श्री उपसभापति: जो सवाल वह पूछ रहे हैं, वही आप रिपीट कर रहे हैं।

श्री रुद्रनारायण पणि: केरल में या बंगाल में कौनसी पॉलिसी ने काम किया?... (व्यवधान)...

श्री उपसभापति: अब आप बैठिए, उन्हें बोलने दीजिए।

श्री नीलोत्पल बसु: मेरे ख्याल में यह बोलना इसलिए जरूरी है क्योंकि यह नयी पॉलिसी है। यह सिर्फ कांग्रेस की नहीं है, यूपीए की नहीं है, इसे हमारा समर्थन प्राप्त है। हम सिर्फ यही कह रहे हैं कि लोगों ने यह बात उजागर कर दी है कि चीज उसे नापसंद है और क्या पसंद है। इस पर हमने एक स्ट्रक्चर खड़ा करने की कोशिश की है और आने वाले दिनों में लोग तय करेंगे कि वह ठीक थी या नहीं। वह भविष्य तय करेगा। That is precisely what they do not understand because the previous Government was a unilateral coalition. Whatever some people thought should be done, that became the national policy and that made the national consensus on the foreign policy. On the contrary, now, we have a real coalition, in the sense of ideas, where ideas clash and, therefore, we also have to articulate openly and publicly our differences with the Government, whatever they are, so that, overall, we can have a much more balanced and nuance position on the foreign policy issues. That is there. But this time is a complex time. Nobody can claim, like Yashwantji, that finally truth is with me and I am the repository of all wisdom. Through trial and error you have to learn.

SHRI YASHWANT SINHA: Sir, I take it back. After he has taken off is jacket, I am a little scared of him. I don't know what he will take off now.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Basu, please conclude.

SHRI NILOTPAL BASU: Therefore, Sir, I would say that we have made a beginning. But we need to be very careful.

Sir, I begin from where I digressed. The Government, in the past, jumped into the US bandwagon of creating a missile shield. I have a report, which appeared in the NEW YORK TIMES of 17th December. They have commented that even the latest attempt by the administration in having a missile shield has failed. That experiment has failed. They say that 85 million dollars have been wasted down the drain on that experiment of creating a missile shield. Yet, Yashwantji, became a party to that unilaterally. Therefore, while winding up my speech, I would say that the need of the day is to have an independent foreign policy. There is a need, today, for promoting multilateralism in a hostile world, which is dominated by a superpower, where our concerns will have to be juxtaposed with the concerns of the developing countries at large. We have to proceed very carefully while befriending with those countries which also stand to gain and we should try to have multipolarism instead of unipolarism. Russia will have to be there with us; China will have to be there with us; South Africa will have to be there with us; Brazil will have to be there with us because the common reality of a unipolar world is threatening their existence also. So, our approach has to be to diplomatically recognise areas where there could be a common ground and on the basis of which we can proceed without picking up quarrels with anybody. There is no point in shouting from the rooftops that we are opposed to any particular country. But, in a positive manner, we have to demarcate ourselves from all attempts by the unipolar forces to have the global hegemony and try to have a more civilised democratic world. What is going on in Iraq is not the way to fight terrorism. But there should be more decent and civilised engagement between nations. There may be differences at a given point of time. But engagement is the route through which we have to try. I think, this should be the policy which would be broadly endorsed by the people. Thank you.

†*SHRI S.S. CHANDRAN: Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, If I speak in English, you all will be confused whether it is Tamil-English or Telugu-English. That is why I am speaking in my mother tongue Tamil. If I speak English you are there only to find fault with. There is no problem if I speak in my mother tongue. There are 12 Ministers and 40 MPs from Tamil Nadu. It is with their support that you are running the Government. I am proud to speak in Tamil. You may choose to speak in British English. You may also speak in Hindi. We will be proud of that.

Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, thank you very much for giving me this opportunity. I am proud to put forth my views on behalf of AIADMK on the foreign policy of the country. When we speak of foreign policy, the first Prime Minister of India, Pt. Jawaharlal Nehru who laid the foundation for our foreign policy through the policy of non-alignment comes to our mind. The credit goes to Pt. Jawaharlal Nehru for getting India a place of pride in the international arena in the 1950's and 1960's through this policy of non-alignment. The importance of the External Affairs Ministry could be known from the fact that Pt. Jawaharlal Nehru had kept this portfolio with him. By saying this, I am not trying to say that the present Prime Minister Dr. Manmohan Singh should keep the External Affairs Ministry with him. The Hon'ble External Affairs Minister is a very capable person who has had long innings in foreign affairs.

Sir, after assuming the office of the External Affairs Minister, he addressed a press conference on 25th May this year wherein he said, there will not be much change in the foreign policy because foreign policy is evolutionary, not revolutionary. I liked his statement because, rather than accusing the previous Government, he rightly gave importance to national interest. If foreign policy is not well formulated and properly pursued, it could be disastrous for the nation. Afghanistan and Iraq are the recent examples of this.

Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, we had almost a levelheaded foreign policy right from the time of independence till around 1990. But after the end of cold war era, it is a fact that our foreign policy has not been steady and firm. Even during the cold war era, though we have been pursuing non-aligned policy, it is a fact that the former Soviet Union and the present Russia exercised its Veto power in favour of India whenever Kashmir issue was raised in the United Nations. We cannot forget this. Today,

†English translation of the original speech delivered in Tamil.

the two-block theory is gone and the USA has become the centre of discussion globally. This is still worse a situation and India should tell its allies about this. Sir, what did the USA say when cross border terrorism tried to attack Parliament, our symbol of democracy? It said India should exercise restraint, be patient. When should we be patient? When we are attacked, when we are about to die! This is what America said. *(Interruption)*.

When you speak you tell your policy. If the Hon'ble Deputy Chairman gives me time, I can speak for 5 hours. You speak about Congress and I will speak about AIADMK. That is not the issue now. We are discussing foreign policy now.

Sir, I was saying about the US. But what the US did in Iraq. India has 100 more reasons than what the US is said to have had for attacking Iraq. I wish to make one thing clear to the Hon'ble Minister. Message should not go that no matter by whom and how terrorism is unleashed on India, we will be patient. Such thinking about India in the international arena should go. From being defensive, we should send a message that if roughed on the wrong side, we will punish them. At the same time, I welcome the statement of the Hon'ble Minister that India would not send forces to Iraq.

Sir, as many Hon'ble Members have spoken about the Indo-Pak relations and the policies pursued, I wish to make some points about our relation with Srilanka. I request the Hon'ble Minister to kindly spell out our foreign policy in respect of Srilanka while replying to the discussion. On 2nd October 1974, Kachchathevu Island was gifted to Srilanka by the rulers of the day at the Centre. The party that was in power in Tamil Nadu at that time did not prevent this action of the Centre. But now it is shedding crocodile tears for Tamil Nadu fishermen. According to the Agreement of 1974, Tamil Nadu fishermen enjoyed all their traditional rights such as fishing around Kachchathevu, drying up their nets and resting on the island and going to the Church on the island for prayer. But these rights were curtailed through a circular by the Centre in the year 1976. Even then it was made clear that fishermen would not be harmed for going there. But what is happening? Even yesterday, a mechanised fishing boat was shot and damaged by the Srilankan Navy. They had also taken away the catches of prawn the fishermen had. I don't know whether it is Navy or sea pirates? Sir, it is said by same political wizards' that Kachchathevu was donated

because it is a barren land without water resources. But let me quote what the Secretary of Defence and Foreign Affairs of Srilanka at the time of donating Kachchathevu has the say. In his book titled *Kachchathevu: the Maritime Boundary of Srilanka*, WT Jayasinghe says, (*Interruptions*).

What I just said is Singhalese and you won't understand. I know all that.

Sir, I was referring to what WT Jayasinghe had to say. He says, in a world where nations go to war a tiny dry land, we have succeed in getting Kachchathevu from India through negotiation diplomatically. The Hon'ble Minister knows what he means. This island is more important for us because, there are about 10 lakh fishermen along the 1076-km. long coast of Tamil Nadu. As these fishermen depend on fishing for their livelihood, it would be injustice to say that they should not go to see for fishing. So far Tamil Nadu fishermen have been attacked and killed several times by Srilankan Navy. Yet, not even once the Indian Navy or the Coast Guard returned fire. Could you not even threaten them? If the foreign policy pursued towards Srilanka stands in the way of taking action, then we don't want such a policy.

Sir, the Centre volunteered to help Bangladesh for its liberation, raises voice in favour of Palestine and flies forces to Maldives to retrieve the island from mercenaries (*Interruptions*).

Nobody is giving any letter! There is nothing wrong in giving some points I. (*Interruptions*).

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: No, no, you please conclude.

SHRI S.S. CHANDRAN: Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, I was I I. (*Interruptions*).

Sir, many leaders are reading them why not I? I can show photograph of someone reading a speech tomorrow in the House. Sir, some 6 months before, over 200 workers from Tamil Nadu faced lot of problems in Malaysia. The Indian Embassy did not provide them any help. Even people die while in foreign countries. All our Embassies should be instructed to provide help to our people there in time of need. I hope the Hon'ble Minister will take necessary steps in the matter. With these words, I conclude. Thank you.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Chandran, please conclude. *(Interruptions)*

SHRI RAJEEV SHUKLA (Uttar Pradesh): Sir, she is writing and giving it to him. *(Interruptions)*

SHRI V. NARAYANASAMY: Sir, she is... *(Interruptions)*

SHRIMATI S.G. INDIRA (Tamil Nadu): I am not writing. Also, if I am writing, what is wrong in it? *(Interruptions)*

SHRI V. NARAYANASAMY: Sir, ... *(Interruptions)*

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: No, Mr. Narayanasamy. *(Interruptions)* ...no cross-talks in the House. *(Interruptions)*

श्री रुद्रनारायण पणि: किसी वक्ता को डिस्टर्ब करने का यह कोई तरीका नहीं है। ...*(व्यवधान)*...

श्री उपसभापति: बैठिए। बैठ जाइए। ...*(व्यवधान)*... I am here to control the House. You sit down. *(Interruptions)*

श्री रुद्रनारायण पणि: सर, किसी वक्ता को डिस्टर्ब करने का यह कोई तरीका नहीं है। ...*(व्यवधान)*...

श्री उपसभापति: आप बैठिए। बैठिए। आप ऐसे बीच-बीच में उठिए नहीं। ...*(व्यवधान)*...

श्री रुद्रनारायण पणि: आप यह उनको भी बोलिए। ...*(व्यवधान)*... उनको पहले बोलिए, वे पहले डिस्टर्ब करते हैं। ...*(व्यवधान)*...

श्री उपसभापति: आप बैठिए न। ...*(व्यवधान)*... आप क्या बात करते हैं। सब अच्छा होगा, आप क्या बात करते हैं। ...*(व्यवधान)*...

SHRI S.S. CHANDRAN: The hon. Member spoke in Tamil.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Generally, in a debate, Members are not expected to read. That is the procedure. You can take points and speak. *(Interruptions)*

SHRI S.S. CHANDRAN: I am taking points only, Sir.

SHRI S.S. AHLUWALIA (Jharkhand): Sir, there is nothing wrong. Everyday, Ministers are replying while reading the statements. *(Interruptions)*

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Ahluwaliaji, I am talking about the general rule. *(Interruptions)* You please conclude. *(Interruptions)*

SHRI V. NARAYANASAMY: Sir, ...*(Interruptions)*

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I would request the Treasury Benches also because your responsibility is to see to it that we finish it in time. Two-and-a-half hours are fixed for this debate. Already, two-and-a-half hours' time is over. There are 14 more speakers. The more you disturb the House, the more will you get the punishment of sitting longer today.

SHRI RAASHID ALVI (Andhra Pradesh): It is the question of the dignity of the House. Just because of time-limit, you cannot go against the rules. It is against the convention of the House to read a paper. *(Interruptions)*

SHRI S.S. AHLUWALIA: What is he talking about *(Interruptions)*

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Ahluwalia, why are you taking cognisance of it? You please sit down....*(Interruptions)*... Now, why are you all getting up? Please sit down.

SHRI S.S. CHANDRAN: The hon. Member spoke in Tamil.

डा० अलादी पी० राजकुमार: उपसभापति जी, धन्यवाद। Mr. Narayanasamy should know that his leaders are reading in Lok Sabha.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You are speaking on foreign policy, not on Narayanasamy. *(Interruptions)*

DR. ALLADI P. RAJKUMAR: Don't forget that Mr. Narayanasamy. Everybody has got the right to read. Some people may be intelligent.*(Interruptions)* We are following the British system of Parliament.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Let me clarify. Mr. Narayanasamy, ...*(Interruptions)* Except with the prior leave of the Chair, no Member should read out a written speech. Notes may be referred. So, if a Member wants to read, he can take the prior permission of the Chair and do so. Now, let us not enter into this argument. Let us concentrate on the debate.

श्री मूल चन्द मीणा (राजस्थान): तेलुगू में बोलिए न आप।

SHRIMATI S.G. INDIRA: Sir, Mr. Narayanasamy always disturbs him at the time of his speech. Mr. Deputy Chairman has got every right to give direction on anything. *(Interruptions)*

5.00 p.m.

डा० अलादी पी० राजकुमार: अगली बार मैं अवश्य तेलुगू में बोलूंगा और श्री जय राम रमेश जी से भी तेलुगू में बात करवाऊंगा because he represents Andhra Pradesh. (*Interruptions*)

श्री उपसभापति: आप फॉरेन पॉलिसी पर बात कीजिए।

डा० अलादी पी० राजकुमार: मैं उसी पर बात कर रहा हूँ, सर। सबसे पहले मैं सभापति महोदय को धन्यवाद देता हूँ कि आपने मुझे विदेश नीति पर चर्चा करने के लिए अनुमति प्रदान की। नई सरकार के आने के बाद विदेश नीति में क्या चल रहा है, इस बारे में सांसदों को कोई जानकारी नहीं दी जा रही है। मैं आपके द्वारा प्रधान मंत्री महोदय को और विदेशी मंत्री महोदय को...

श्री जय राम रमेश (आन्ध्र प्रदेश): विदेशी नहीं, विदेश।

DR. ALLADI P. RAJKUMAR: You should encourage me when I speak in Hindi.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Please encourage him. (*Interruptions*)

[THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRIMATI SARLA MAHESHWARI) in the Chair.]

डा० अलादी पी० राजकुमार: महोदया, मैं पूछना चाहता हूँ, आज सच्चे दिल से, इन्सानियत से, ईमानदारी से, पड़ोसी देशों से हमारे संबंध किस प्रकार के हैं, यह एक बार इस सदन को अवश्य बताया जाना चाहिए। महोदया, आपको मालूम होना चाहिए कि तेलुगू देशम पार्टी हमेशा फॉरेन पॉलिसी को सपोर्ट करती रही है, right from the days of late Shri N.T. Rama Rao to Shri Chandrababu Naidu, we have been supporting the foreign policy. Sir, when the National Front Government was in power, when the United Front Government was in power, or when the NDA was in power, as and when it was required, the Telugu Desam Party used to give suggestions on the foreign policy.

Sir, I would like to know, today, what is the stand of the Government as regards Bangladesh? Sir, we know very well that India played a major role in Bangladesh's achievement of Independence. Today, in Bangladesh, there are anti-India groups and their activities in Bangladesh, and terrorist groups are giving threats to our cricket team during its recent visit to Bangladesh.

There is a lot of infiltration of Bangladeshi nationals entering India on the borders. Sir, there are incidents of attacks on our security forces. There are terrorist camps in Bangladesh that are responsible for the terrorist activities in the North-Eastern States. Sir, in view of all these happenings, we have to have a re-look or re-visit our relations with Bangladesh. Sir, we have very good relations with Nepal which is now in the grip of Maoist terrorism. What is our Indian role with Nepal? What is our relationship with Nepal, our neighbouring country? Sir, kindly, enlighten us on Nepal issue also. Although Myanmar is having dictatorship but we are having cordial relations with them. But there is one point of concern that is the running of terrorist camps in Myanmar. Sir, kindly answer this also. Sir, regarding Pakistan, Yashwant Sinha has quoted and Janeshwar Mishraji has also quoted. I have also the same idea. Today, what is the relationship we have with Pakistan?

Recently, we had an occasion to visit Pakistan along with my Leader, Mr. Chandrababu Naidu. Sir, there was a rousing reception when we landed in Lahore. We went to Islamabad, we met the Prime Minister, we met some of the Ministers, we met the Press media, we met the Pakistani Administrative Officer, and we met the common people. So many cross sections of people we met. They had only one slogan, 'we want peace with India.' How far are you negotiating? How far are you working on those lines? Sir, recently Musharraf visited seven countries. When we were in Pakistan he was on a foreign tour. So, a different picture was given there. For example, when Mr. Musharraf met Mr. Tony Blair, he was saying something different. When he met the French President he was saying something else. Kindly watch Pakistani news channel, you will get the real picture about what is in their mind. Still terrorist camps are actively participating in Kashmir. Even a Major was killed. You know it very well. So many hundreds and thousands are being killed. So today, you should have a dialogue with Pakistan. Please kindly give enlightenment on Pakistan also. On China, after the war of 1962, we are having strained relations with China, most of the time. Although, of late, some breakthrough has been made in order to restore peace between the two countries which needs to be pursued keeping in view—Sir, I would like to give you four or five points, kindly enlighten us—1. China is occupying quite a lot of area of Arunachal Pradesh in North-East. 2. It has also occupied some area of Aksai Chin in Karakoram Range. 3. China has given some occupied areas in Aksai Chin

to Pakistan and, in connivance with Pakistan, has built the Karakoram highways which is a threat to our security. 4. We must take up the cause of autonomous region of Tibet with China. About Sri Lanka, Sir, today our relations with Sri Lanka are so-so. Our fishermen are being caught and their vessels are being captured. They are in jail for the last two or three years in Pakistan and in Sri Lanka. Kindly negotiate. See that those fishermen come out of these countries. You have to negotiate on this. Sir, about India's claim for a permanent seat in the Security Council, there is a lot of discussion about India's Membership in the Security Council. A committee of the UN has recommended for extension of the membership of the Security Council. We have to decide whether we are going to accept the membership of the Security Council with or without Veto power. India should not accept the Membership without Veto power as we have all the qualifications to be a permanent member. If we become the permanent member with Veto power, we can enjoy a lot of benefits which are exclusively available to the group of five permanent members. I would like to talk about re-orientation of persons implementing the Foreign Policy. Now, eminent persons are required. We are, on the basis of the Non-Aligned Movement and the Panchsheel, guiding India's Foreign Policy. Now, after fifty-five years of our Republic, the time has come that we should re-look at our Foreign Policy.

The hon. Minister and the House are aware of the number of Indians living in the Gulf countries. They are facing a lot of problems there. Would the hon. Minister enlighten this House about the safety and other aspects of Indians in Gulf countries? We have discussed many a time about the Indian nationals in Gulf countries. The hon. Minister is very well aware that five people were abducted recently in Afghanistan and how the Government of India was able to release them. I would only appeal that such a kind of situation should not recur again.

Madam, with your permission, I wish to place two or three suggestions for kind consideration of the hon. Minister. My first point is regional parties are totally neglected. I request the hon. Minister that the regional parties should be taken into confidence at the time of taking any decision on foreign policy matters. I would like to ask when did you hold the meeting of the National Development Council? After seven months in office, did you ever call for a meeting of the National Development Council? Why don't you discuss the important Foreign Policy issues in the National

Development Council? If you have such meetings, only then you will have the views of others. That is why I am requesting the hon. Minister to take regional parties into confidence. Today, the national parties have been reduced to regional parties and the regional parties are becoming national parties.

The other point is, the hon. President, the hon. Vice-President, the hon. Prime Minister, the hon. Minister of External Affairs should take up extensive tours to other countries....

DR. FAROOQ ABDULLAH (Jammu and Kashmir): Along with Members of Parliament.

DR. ALLADI P. RAJKUMAR: Yes. They should take Members of Parliament along with them as has been suggested by Dr. Abdullahji because discussions will always pave the way for solution. Now, if the hon. President goes abroad, he takes some Members of Parliament along with him. So, unless we take up extensive tours to other countries, it is difficult to establish friendly relations with them which also helps us in getting a Permanent Seat in the UN Security Council.

Lastly, I request the hon. Minister to take measures for the SAARC meeting once in every six months. If this is done, we will have more fruitful deliberations with the SAARC countries and can also solve the outstanding issues among the SAARC countries.

With these words, the Telugu Desam Party support the policies of the Government of India. But, at the same time, the Government of India should also take into confidence regional parties while deciding issues on the Foreign Policy. Thank you.

DR. P.C. ALEXANDER (Maharashtra): Madam Vice-Chairman, the subject of discussion, today, is Foreign Policy and, I thought I should make two or three general points on Foreign Policy in the context of the change in the concept itself of foreign policy in almost every part of the world.

The first point is, Foreign Policy, has today ceased to be just only a political policy. Days were, when Foreign Policy meant primarily or heavily what is described as political relations. But, during the last two decades, the whole concept of Foreign Policy has undergone a radical change.

Today, commercial diplomacy has emerged as important as political diplomacy. Today, issues like investment and transfer of technology have become as important as Political dealings or foreign trade. Therefore, today, the complexion of Foreign Policy is different from what it had been in the past when we all started working in the Government offices. This brings me to the second point. Foreign Policy, has to be a coordinated effort of different senior political leaders in the Cabinet. There can't be a Foreign Policy entirely guided, directed or managed by only one Minister in one Ministry. The Ministers in charge of Commerce and Industry, the Minister for Defence and the Minister for Finance, of course, will have a dominant share in shaping the Foreign Policy of the country, almost equal to that of the Minister in-charge of political relations, who is the Minister for External Affairs. This is a change that has taken place all over the world. Gone are the days when a Henry Kissinger and before him an Anthony Eden, in their era, could dominate foreign policies of their country. That pattern of foreign ministries and foreign policies has disappeared. Today it is a coordinated, composite, joint effort of five or six senior members of the Cabinet. Foreign Policy will have to be handled with great care and a very high degree of coordination almost on a day-to-day basis as otherwise we will commit mistakes and *faux pas* and land ourselves in a greater trouble. That brings me to the third general point, that is, the primacy of the Prime Minister in giving directions and leading the coordination within the Cabinet and representing Foreign Policy outside the country. It was evolving over the last few years. It is not anything new. It had become very prominent in the previous dispensations as well Prime Ministers, like Indira Gandhi, Rajiv Gandhi and in recent history, Atal Bihari Vajpayee were great expert in directing a coordinated Foreign Policy. When we speak of a country's foreign policy, we must always remember that the Prime Minister is the chief person responsible for giving shape to the Foreign Policy, for giving voice to the feelings and concerns of the people abroad. And, that primacy of the Prime Minister has to be observed by the present government as well. These were the general points I wished to make.

Now, I want to come to some specific points relating to the countries in our neighbourhood. I am not going to comment on anything else. I have a feeling—I may be wrong; if I am wrong, I would like to be corrected—that we are now not giving the attention that our immediate neighbouring countries deserve, or, as we have been giving them in the past. And, I

think, it is a very unwise and dangerous development. In fact, one of the first concerns of any Foreign Ministry or of any Prime Minister, I will say, should be to maintain very cordial and friendly and close relationship with our neighbours, in whose interest we have an interest; and on whose future we have a stake.

I come specifically to the issue of our relations with Nepal. I am not blaming anybody. I am not saying as if something has happened in the last six months. The position, today, that I see is the result of probably a couple of years of continuing policy of neglect as far as Nepal is concerned. There was a time when we used to select the best civilians, the best diplomats, the best politicians to be our ambassadors in Nepal. I do not know whether that precedent is being followed now also last two months. There was a time when the Foreign Secretary, the administrative head in the similar line used to be himself handling the relations with Nepal. If that much importance had been given, in the past, to Nepal, it was not merely because of our consideration for Nepal alone, not because only of our concern for the people of Nepal, but for our own self-interest itself. What happens in Nepal is our concern, and we cannot forget that. And, if we can't understand the dangers that are taking place, dangerous trends are setting in Nepal, we will regret as much as the people in Nepal will regret. Today, when I analyse our relationship with Nepal, I find that we have succeeded in displeasing, practically, every power Centre in Nepal and left with nobody who will place trust on us. The Monarch and the Army which he controls is one power centre, there are two or three major political parties—another power centre—and the Maoist movement, a third power centre, we cannot ignore the facts. I find that we have, practically, ended up by not being friends with anybody or not being trusted by anybody fully. If we allow Nepal to sink down further, how can we protect our own borders with that efficiently? Do you think we can inspire confidence in other small countries who are, our immediate neighbours? So, we have a great stake in Nepal. Let us be very plain and very honest about it. That is the only other Hindu country in the world. We share the same culture; we share the same history and traditions. Can we afford to have that country disappeared from the map of the world or being taken over by a group which believes in armed struggle, and internal armed struggle round the world? I want to raise this issue; at this forum, when we are discussing Foreign Policy because in our own interest, our Nepal Policy should be

our primary concern. My esteemed friend, the MP belonging to Telugu Desam, expressed his annoyance at the conduct of Bangladesh, or expressed his annoyance and to some extent at the conduct of Nepal, also but I would, in all humility, not claiming to be an expert in this subject, advise him, and, through you, advise all those who are dealing with our neighbours, that we should learn to live with these small countries complaining against us, criticising us expressing their annoyance with us. That is the price we have to pay for being a big nation. We are a large country, a powerful country, militarily, the third largest power in this world. We have to be conscious of the fact that small neighbours will always have a complex. And if they criticise us, we should not take it out on them. We should try to bring them round, and make them feel happy. We should not expect gratitude from our neighbour for what we did in 1971, for example, for Bangladesh. We should always keep our own interest in view. We want help in controlling insurgency in our country. It is not by shouting at them, or criticising them that we will make them our friends, by understanding their sentiments, trying to reach out to them and even walking an extra mile we should to get our neighbours on our side. Madam, Vice-Chairman, I am not going to continue beyond this point. I only want the Foreign Ministry and the Prime Minister to give a little more serious attention to our neighbourhood than we have been giving at present. Thank you.

SHRIMATI AMBIKA SONI (Punjab): Madam, Vice-Chairperson, I have listened to such eminent Members speaking extensively on Foreign Policy issues that I thought, when I stand up I would say, that if one has grown up in public life, looking at foreign affairs, one has always thought of Foreign Policy as having emerged from a certain national consensus. And irrespective of Governments in office, we have held that there should be a continuity in the conduct of foreign affairs. As political parties, we might—outside Government—take certain stands which stand out, but we cannot forget the sense of pride successive generations in India have felt when Jawaharlal Nehru, Indira Gandhi, Rajiv Gandhi and other Prime Ministers raised India's voice and prestige to great heights in the international fora, and made Non-Aligned Movement, a Movement of the developing world, take a place in international affairs which could not be brushed aside. But, in the last 6-7 years, since 1998 especially, constant attempts, as we see it, have been made to change this system, to break with this tradition of consensus and continuity. I am not going to make a speech, Madam,

because a lot of points have been discussed, but I would like the Foreign Minister, in his reply, to allay some of our fears on those breaks with continuity and consensus which took place in the last few years.

[MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN in the Chair.]

I recall that the NDA Government constantly claimed that we were natural ally of the US, and that there was a paradigm shift in our relations with the United States of America. Sir, I would like you to explain to us what you consider, looking back at the least 6-7 years, what was that shift. I do recall Mr. Colin Powell coming to India; he was wined, dined, and feted! The next day he went to Pakistan, and he announced that Pakistan was a valued non-NATO ally, much to the surprise of the Indian Government!

Sir, I would also like to bring up a point which has happened in recent times when General Musharraf visited the US, when the administration of Bush, the new administration, had not yet officially taken over and landed up with a 1.3 billion military aid. Was this in the same context, as the NDA viewed it as a paradigm shift and a natural ally's efforts to befriend India? I am sure, your Government, our Government, has protested because as the Defence Minister very ably put it that you don't need F-16s to fight terrorists, and we also know that all such arms to Pakistan in the past have violated an earlier code long ago when SEATO stipulated that they would not be used against India. I was very amused when Mr. Yashwant Sinha spoke of the Prime Minister, Dr. Manmohan Singh's letter to President Bush on his getting re-elected. He tried to create an impression in the House that it was something extraordinary what had happened. A letter had been written by the Prime Minister of India congratulating the President of the United States on his re-election to the Office of President. He tried to create an impression as if it was lowering the dignity of our country, whereas most of us who had read about it had taken that letter, as in the normal course, a letter written to a Head of State or Government who gets re-elected. I wouldn't like to read out because it will take a long time; I have with me a letter that Vajpayeeji wrote to Mr. Clinton. It was a letter written on the 11th of May, 1998 after the Pokharan-II explosion. He tried as hard as he could, in this whole letter, to explain, to placate, to cajole and little short of going on his knees; to assure the President of the United States, and I quote, "I assure you that India will continue to work with your country in a multi-lateral or bilateral framework to promote the

cause of nuclear disarmament. Our commitment to participate is non-discriminatory. In particular, we are ready to participate in all the conventions and negotiations of the Geneva Conference", and so on and so forth. I mean, the Prime Minister of a Government in which Mr. Yashwant Sinha was a Minister wrote this. Mr. Yashwant Sinha was then the Finance Minister and Mr. Jaswant Singh was the Foreign Minister when Mr. Clinton came, the then President of the United States, and addressed the joint Houses of Parliament in the Central Hall. None of us here has forgotten the patronising, condescending references to his role in bringing about a ceasefire in Kargil. Mr. Yashwant Sinha, who has brought this point up, I thought, was extremely amusing, to put it as mildly as I can. Sir, I am confident that the Government of India has strongly conveyed its displeasure, a sense of irk, and anger that the U.S. Administration has tried to sabotage, I would say mildly, Indo-Pakistan peace talks which were going on. The Foreign Minister of Pakistan was present, in India when this \$ 1.3 billion aid was given to Pakistan. Sir, I would also like to congratulate you and the Government for, again, rectifying a distortion which had come in the way of interpreting our relations with Pakistan. I have not, at the moment, the exact quotes, but I do recall on several occasions, Mr. L.K. Advani, had made statements equating good Indo-Pak relations with good Hindu-Muslim relations. I am sorry to repeat this because it hurts. But, he said it not once but quite a few times. The most powerful man of the NDA Government tried to polarise the people of this country and elsewhere on the warmth, or otherwise, of Indo-Pak relations. I am glad that you have given it the right perspective. Mr. Yashwant Sinha had also said something while talking about the emphasis, Sir, you, and the Prime Minister and the Government, have given to what was definitely a Congress policy of 'Look East'. He said that it wasn't a Congress policy. He gave some references and said that this was part of the NDA agenda and had never happened before. He also went on to sound a critical note in saying that when we go abroad, we should not really try and make a difference between one Government and another Government and spoke of some kind of continuity. Sir, I would like to mention here, and he has provoked me to do this, that the first Foreign Minister of the NDA Government, Mr. Jaswant Singh, when he went to Israel to participate in a conference hosted by the Israel Council on Foreign Relations he had said, among other things—I am not quoting exactly because I have what is a synopsis of his speech—that for him, a visit to Israel was almost like a

pilgrimage because relations between Israel and India are 'intuitive', while, with others natural. I mean, our relations with different countries were defined in different ways. But, what is more upsetting was, which also contradicts what Mr. Yashwant Sinha said, that Mr. Jaswant Singh went on to say, that "India's relations with Israel became a captive to our domestic politics." And, on it, they came to be unwittingly a kind of an unstated veto of India's larger West Asia policy. I recall when he said this, he also went on to explain, which, unfortunately, has not been incorporated in this diplomatic synopsis of his speech, that India was playing vote bank politics by being friends with West Asian countries. This much was spoken by one foreign Minister about an earlier Foreign Minister, an earlier Government, and on foreign soil. Sir, I am glad, as I said earlier also, that you have put on rails the Indo-Pak talks. The Foreign Minister has been here, the Foreign Secretaries are going to meet, the Prime Minister met the President of Pakistan in the United States and we all know the talks he had. We are all aware of the fact that the speech of President Musharraf at the UN General Assembly, after a very long time, had no mention of the word 'Kashmir', which really was a positive development, and, relations are certainly back on the rails as Congress always claimed our relations with neighbouring countries should be.

At the time when the NDA Government was talking of *aar-paa ki ladai*, at the time when the NDA Government, after having failed to engage in fruitful, purposeful negotiations in Agra, had talked of putting conditions that there will be no further talks till certain conditions, or, certain situations are in place, at that time also, the Congress Party, the leader of the Opposition, Shrimati Sonia Gandhi, the President of the Congress Party, Shrimati Sonia Gandhi had held that while none of us can condone any kind of terrorism, when all of us are against any kind of infiltration, we still cannot close our doors and windows to negotiations because dialogue is the only way of resolving issues.

I would like to remind Mr. Yashwant Sinha that I don't think that the Government of India today, I don't think Dr. Manmohan Singh, has negated the 6th January discussions which took place between the then Prime Minister and the Pakistan authorities. In fact, very clearly the negotiations, the talks, which took place between the Prime Minister of India Dr. Manmohan Singh and President of Pakistan General Musharraf in New York, mention that from 6th January onwards, we want to hold and make it a continuing process.

Sir, I would also like to congratulate you, and, your continuing policy of being a part of the reconstructions process in Iraq, and, I would like to take credit on behalf of our Party. In 2003, because of the timely interventions, and, a strong protest by the then Leader of the Opposition, Shrimati Sonia Gandhi that Indian troops should not be sent to Iraq—thereby the Parliament accepted that—Indian troops did not land in Iraq, and, it is a matter of taking credit for that ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI YASHWANT SINHA: It is completely untrue...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRIMATI AMBIKA SONI: Anyway, you had your chance ...*(Interruptions)*... It saved the prestige of India; it saved the traditional ties and bonds of friendship that Indian people have had with the people of Iraq.

Sir, I would also like to congratulate you, your Ministry, your colleagues on the way you successfully negotiated the release of Indian hostages in Iraq. It helped us to live down the shame of what happened earlier in Kandahar. So much for putting the foreign policy back on rails.

Sir, I have spoken probably little longer than what I thought I would *(Time-bell)*. I will conclude in one minute, just one minute. Sir, we are seriously concerned, and, in your reply, I would like you to tell us exactly at what stage we are involved in the reconstruction process of Iraq as it is of great concern, especially, when there is almost a virtual occupation of Iraq. I would like you to tell us, Sir, in our neighbouring country, in our friendly country, how are we helping the powers there in rebuilding Afghanistan.

Sir, I would also like you to tell us about the Gas line project with Iran. I would like you to tell us about the steps which the Petroleum Ministry has taken. Is the Ministry of External Affairs giving it full backing, and, have you brought up their proposals in your negotiations with Pakistan because as has been stated by Mr. Alexander, 'Economics does form the basis of foreign policy today more than ever before'.

But it is of great importance that we know whether these important things are being discussed. Sir, I congratulate you again at your policy which you took to strengthen and forge closer ties with ASEAN during the Prime Minister and your visit to Laos. I would also like you to enlighten us on the initiatives you are planning to take in the month of January 2005 when you attend the SAARC Conference in Dhaka. And, Sir, I would like

to request you, and, through you, the Government of India, that we have traditionally been friends with West Asia, and we should build those ties still stronger. But, Sir, I would like to request you that the world is becoming a smaller place to live in. Please don't ignore Latin America; please do not ignore the Caribbean. These are the countries which share the same problems as India does. These are the countries which are living in this day of economic imperialism, so to speak, and are trying to retain their self-respect and national integrity and work for the development of their people. Sir, no one knows better than you, 43 years as an IFS probationer to the Foreign Minister of India, a post occupied by Shri Jawaharlal Nehru, Shrimati Indira Gandhi, Shri Rajiv Gandhi and so many others. I know that the foreign policy cannot be negotiated through the columns of newspapers. But, Sir, I would like you to assure us and enlighten us so that we feel more at ease than we had in the last so many years that you are going to take mid-course corrective measures so that India's foreign policy is truly reflective of India's commitment to secularism and national sovereignty. Thank you.

SHRI RAVI SHANKAR PRASAD: Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, I have been listening to very eloquent speeches of all the preceding speakers. Some issues have been mentioned, time and again, namely, two fundamental features have governed the conduct of our foreign policy—one, a substantial political consensus, and, two, continuity with change. The first and foremost query, which I have to ask the hon. External Affairs Minister, about whom I have great regard and respect being a man of letters and understanding, is, as to what he meant, when, immediately in the wake of becoming the External Affairs Minister he stated, "No shift in foreign policy—Natwar"? There are series of newspapers stating this fact. Should we presume, Mr. Minister, Sir, that the conduct of the foreign policy of India under Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee was being conducted in the manner in which your esteemed colleague, Mrs. Ambika Soni, has alleged just now? Should we presume that we were pandering to American interests, as she has just alleged in substance? Should we accept that we were on the verge of sending troops to America and it was only because of ...*(Interruptions)*. Yes, to Iraq. If that be so, Mr. Minister, may I ask what was your first statement when you went to America, where you almost stated that there was a scope for review which was clearly objected to by your friends of your own coalition? Those are the matters which have been

widely reported. But, I would like to take this charge very seriously that we were supposedly pandering to American interests. Sir, you may recall, in the year 1998, when Shri Vajpayee became the Prime Minister, we went in for Pokhran explosion. Sanctions were imposed. All the political formations were alleging that these sanctions by all the major countries of the world would break the backbone of India. We stated we shall face it head long and it was the consummate diplomacy of India conducted at the highest level; that sanctions could not bend us at all. And, we did not compromise on the fundamentals of our nuclear policy, namely, we are a responsible nuclear power, we shall always insist upon a non-discriminatory, non-proliferation and we shall not sign the NPT. All the sanctions were lifted on their own. Some comments were made about some letters having been written to Mr. Clinton. I would like to remind the hon. Member that Mr. Clinton in his autobiography has stated, when Mr. Nawaz Shariff was called to Washington, that he was keen Mr. Vajpayee should also come. Then Mr. Vajpayee conveyed, "I would not, let Pakistan withdraw first." That was the clear response given which is all a matter of record. When I say so, Sir, let me place on record the high consummate manner in which Shri Jaswant Singh, the then Foreign Affairs Minister, conducted all these negotiations at the summit level. It is not a mere conjecture. You may recall that Shri Jaswant Singh and Mr. Strobe Talbott had a long engagement—in seven countries, they met 14 times.

Now, it has come in a book form. ...(*Interruption*).. Mr. Minister, I hope I have a lot of questions to ask of you. You kindly wait for your turn.

SHRI K. NATWAR SINGH: We are waiting. (*Interruptions*)..

SHRI RAVI SHANKAR PRASAD: Sir, I am quoting from pages 4 and 5 of this book. These two paragraphs are very important. It completely demolishes the contention of my very esteemed colleague, Shrimati Ambika Soni, about our pandering to American interests. I am quoting from the bottom of page No. 4.

"For their part, the Indians saw the matter in terms of sovereignty, security, and equity: if those other five powers had an internationally recognized right to be nuclear armed, why did India not have the same prerogative?"

"My Government attempted to finesse that question with what was essentially a compromise. But the Indian Government was, from the outset, disinclined to compromise. Its short-term goal was to resist precisely the sort of abnegation the United States proposed. Its strategy was to play for the day when the United States would get over its huffing and puffing and, with a sigh of exhaustion or a shrug of resignation, accept a nuclear-armed India as a fully responsible and fully entitled member of the international community."

"The Indians conducted their test knowing that it would provoke American castigation but also hoping it might have another consequence; perhaps it would force the United States to pay them serious, sustained, and respectful attention of a kind the Indians felt they had never received before. Engagement gave the Indians a chance to resist the Americans' pressure face-to-face. In that sense, the dialogue could be its own reward."

And then he says in the third paragraph. These two lines are very important. "As one of the architects of the Indian strategy, Jaswant Singh came closer to achieving his objective in the dialogue than I did to achieving mine."

Now, here is a case where the senior most officer of the American administration is saluting the manner in which India conducted the entire negotiation with sovereignty in mind, with a clear right of India to be nuclear, as a responsible power and did not budge in spite of repeated requests, submissions and suggestions. I think, there can be no greater evidence than this to completely, I would say conclusively, reject the charge that 'you are seeking to pander to American interest.'

Sir, when we went nuclear, there was a more fundamental issue: Is a consensus available in the quest of our Atomic Policy or not? Because certain jarring notes came from my friends in the left. My query to the hon. Minister is: Should we presume that there exists, or does not exist a consensus in the quest for our Nuclear Policy? Sir, there have been many slips from the very respected hon. External Affairs Minister, but the stirrings from soul recently were most jarring.

[20 December, 2004]

RAJYA SABHA

I would like to ask him a question. Is it appropriate to compare our nuclear strategy with a test tube, something which has come out and cannot go back, therefore no regret? Maybe the first statement would have been a slip, but there have been many slips in the past. I have with me a copy of a statement to *The Hindu* which you made in Singapore, when the matter was raised in the Parliament in Singapore, he had stated and I am quoting from *The Hindu*, "Noting that his purported remarks were raised in Parliament in New Delhi today, the Minister said: 'When I was asked: 'Does India regret being a nuclear power?', I said: 'The question of a regret did not arise. It is now out of the tube and you cannot put it back.'" Mr. Minister, there is a clear apprehension emanating from this that you are not sure as to our nuclear strategy, should we go or should we not go? Do you accept it under compulsion or you accept it openly? I would say that by stating it, in effect, you have negated even *Pokharan-I*, a long well-established norm as to when Indian can go nuclear, no right of first option, right from Nehru's days to Indira Gandhi's days and this has given a cause for serious misgivings. I would presume for the sake of argument that you have your doubts and, in a way, you share your concern with the friends from the Left that there is no consensus. Even if that be so, then we are proud that Shri Atal Behari Vajpayee decided to go for *Pokharan-II* because this was in the best interest of the country and we are proud of that achievement; we have not the least problem on that score. Others can have. I can understand the problem of certain formations who are happy when China goes nuclear, but they have problem when we go. Good luck to them; we need not worry.

Sir, there are two issues more about which I must be very specific.....(*Interruptions*)...

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You address the Chair only...(*Interruptions*)...

SHRI RAVI SHANKAR PRASAD: Through you Sir, I would like to ask the hon. Minister: What is the policy of the present Government *vis-a-vis* Israel? What is the policy of the present Government as far as coalition against terrorism is concerned? Does this Government accept the validity of the defence supplies from Israel or it has its reservations? Does it accept the role of Israel in the fight against terrorism or it has its reservations? These are my very pointed queries which I need to raise in the context of certain observations made by my friends from the left. Sir, hon. Member

Shri Alexander has already stated about the commercial economic content and here I must say that under the regime of Shri Vajpayee, the economic content given to the conduct of our foreign policy in the light of entrepreneurial ability, investment destination, technical power was there for the whole world to see. And, Sir, why this happened? Because under the initial days of Non-alignment, even though the intellectual content was there, the world took a very charitable view of us in assistance, aid and security. But here was a case that India has something to contribute by its economic performance and, therefore, today we have been taken seriously by the world. Sir...*(Interruptions)*... Mr. Jairam Ramesh, you can speak...*(Interruptions)*... Sir, my hon. friend is a man of some letter and intellect. I think, he can speak well. You better wait for your turn.

Sir, about Pakistan, Shri Yashwant Sinha has already explained everything, but I have three very specific queries. Does Pak-sponsored terrorism exist as an agenda of importance or not in our bilateral conduct? If that be so, why it was not reflected in the September 24 statement when hon. Prime Minister met President Musharraf? Secondly, what happened when the Prime Minister of Pakistan came to India because the picture is quite hazy and what is the response of the present Government of India on the proposal of President Musharraf about geographical alterations of Jammu and Kashmir? Sir, the fundamental problem is the fact that the root cause theory against the spread of terrorism has got serious takers in the Government today, the terrorist organisations are finding and experiencing that perhaps the fight against terrorism is not an important agenda of the present Government and it is my very serious charge against the present Government because of the manner in which the January 6 bilateral document for the first time was ignored on September 26. And lastly, Sir, we are living in troubled times. There are troubles from neighbours. All has been explained, what is the response? Are we lacking in self-assurance in the conduct of our foreign policy? Sir, I was just going through an editorial. Both are hon. External Affairs Ministers. The first news-item has appeared in **The Indian Express** of 17th December, 2004. It says: "Not on Natwar, he cannot, as Minister, contradict Government's policy on India's nuclear status." The second news-item has appeared in **The Indian Express** of 11th December, 2004. It says: "India needs to address its foreign policy concerns with greater self assurance." Sir, it is our very serious charge today, as has been made by the esteemed speakers, that

the present Government is lacking in self-assurance and self-confidence. India is not that weak. The whole approach has to be full of confidence, assurance and straightforwardness, which is completely lacking. Thank you.

SHRI SHANKAR ROY CHOWDHURY (West Bengal): Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, I was very happy a few days ago with two statements of the hon. Prime Minister. The first is, when he told President Musharraf during his meeting with him on 24th September, 2004 that India would not be a party and he would not be a party to any solution of Kashmir which involves redrawing of map. It was a statement of supreme confidence, which a big power like us, should show. I was equally happy with his statement in Thailand, in Bangkok, when he had said, again, with what I think, was a supreme confidence, as indeed, we should be behaving: Look, we are discussing the Sino-Indian problem, the ground reality must be taken into account. I think, it is the first time when the Prime Minister of India has expressed himself in clear, unambiguous and forthright terms, *vis-a-vis*, a power like China, with whom, unfortunately psychologically, ever since 1962, we have had an unstated inferiority complex. The question is, foreign policy, was being discussed recently by many speakers in terms of what the previous Government has done and what this Government is doing; the fact of the matter is, as we have said before, foreign policy, external affairs, are an on-going issue. But what is more important is that, whichever Government is there, the present Government or the previous Government, how comfortable we are as a large country, with the exercise of power. That is the crux of the issue. There are categorised powers, and recently, these powers have been categorised into two major categories, hard power and soft power. I think, India is very comfortable with the soft power, that is, entertainment, technology, IT and culture. We are very comfortable with it because it is a part of our culture. I have this suspicion, I hope, I am wrong, we are not that comfortable with the exercise of hard power, which we have. We are a very strong country, and we have got sufficient hard power. What is hard power? Hard power is the basic essentials which provide the hard edge, the hardcore bargaining strength, the ultimate strength to diplomacy, things like defence, nuclear capabilities and such other things, and I do think that over the years, there have been many occasions when as Indians, we have been proud. We were proud with the war with Bangladesh in 1971, followed immediately thereafter in 1974 by

our first nuclear explosion, because it established us as a big nation. We came of age, I should say. We were proud, Sir, when the previous Government carried out Pokhran-II. As Indians, we were proud. But we were not proud immediately thereafter, when the then esteemed Prime Minister thought it fit to write what seemed to be a letter of explanation to President Clinton. We were not proud of that. We have to define ourselves: Are we a regional power? Do we have aspirations to become a superpower? What are our problems, today's problems, tomorrow's problems? How is our Foreign Policy handling it? I think, we are handling it pretty well. Yes, for criticism's sake, we can keep on saying all these things, but, I think, we are quite comfortable. Much is being made of the proposal for India to have a seat in the United Nations, whether in model 'A' or in model 'B' This is a fact which I have noticed, from time to time. I have not had as many opportunities, perhaps, as some of my esteemed colleagues have had. We are in the Asia Pacific Group. In the Asia Pacific Group, my impression—which may be corrected—is that we are isolated. As far as the Asia Pacific Group is concerned, we are outnumbered by the nations of South East Asia, by the nations of the Pacific rim which, time after time, I do not think, will really support us in our bid for a seat of the Asia Pacific bloc. That would, rather, support one of that specific Sub-Region, rather than anyone from South Asia, which is India. We will not be supported by the South American bloc, no matter how good relations we have on the crunch issue of a seat in the Security Council. If you pit Brazil against India, in that context, it is extremely doubtful whether we will be supported by a separate Continent altogether, and we should have no illusions and no regrets; we are a big country, we are a self-reliant country; we do the best we can; we have a good record for ourselves, and we should not be dependent on anybody's support for lack of support. I think what we should be looking at, and the hon. the External Affairs Minister knows very well, is the very old adage, 'there are no permanent enemies, no permanent friends, only permanent interests, and as long as we pursue our national interests, whether our friend today is 'a' country or whether our enemy today is another country, does not matter. We are big enough to look after ourselves. We can take friends and enemies in our straight. Immediately, today, I think, the point was made very clearly by my respected colleague, Dr. P.C. Alexander; what are the little problem areas which are at our doorsteps? One of them, of course, is Nepal. What are we doing about it? There are no easy answers. It is all right for us to get up and say that he should do

this and he should that, but ground relations are different. And within the parameters of what is going on, I do hope that we are trying to work out; it is like walking on a tight rope; the assassination of the former King and his family has introduced such a jolt into the entire relations that it will take a lot of readjustment, a lot of remanoeuvring, to establish some kind of a balance in the Indo-Nepal relations, which are further complicated, of course, by the *Maobadi* movement in Nepal, and which has its repercussions inside India. It was discussed earlier. We will be discussing it further when we take up the internal security situation. Regarding Pakistan, we have hopes. Of course, we have hopes because there is a lot of interaction going on at the people-to-people level, but, ultimately, it will boil down to Kashmir. It will boil down to Kashmir. What best can we do with it? We will have to realise how much diplomacy can serve us, and how much hardcore power serves us will have to be decided at that time. Yes, we will talk. We will talk about Kashmir, we will talk about seven regions, five of which are in India, and two are in Pakistan. Ultimately, this is the crux of the issue between India and Pakistan. Whatever the people of Pakistan may want, successive Governments in Pakistan do not go along with their own people. Let us also be clear on that. I don't see, in the near future, the prospect of the Army going out of power in Pakistan. As long as the Pakistan Army stays in power, consciously or subconsciously, they will have this quest for revenge for Bangladesh. It can take them 50 years or 100 years. In this sub-continent, we have this culture in a different context of feud, which goes on for hundreds of years. That is the sort of thing we have to take greater care of. Undoubtedly, the hon. Minister of External Affairs and the Government of India are looking into it.

What is tomorrow's problem? Really, you can't lay your hands on the several problems that can confront you tomorrow. Here, I will refer to, on our doorstep, the so-called peaceful rise of China. Yes, we have good relations with it. We have many meetings with it. We are on the path of friendship. But, again, there are no permanent friends and no permanent enemies. A major, a gigantic, power is sitting on your doorstep. It is not only an economic power, but also a very substantial military power. I do hope that our present efforts are going towards peace. We should not forget the underlying elements of these various issues which are going to confront us. I do believe, not today, 20 or 30 or 40 years hence, the

Government of India, through its Ministry of External Affairs, through its Ministry of Defence and through its various economic Ministries, is preparing for that day.

Sir, I would like to say that there is an atmosphere, an environment, of peace all over the world. It is a good thing. We have to manage the peace. How can we manage the peace? We can manage the peace basically in two ways. One way by which we can manage the peace is to go along with the present and devote our valuable resources for developing the infrastructure required for peace time activities. that is one way. It is a sensible way. There is another way. It is to continue paying our life insurance for the nation. The life insurance is defence expenditure, even in times of peace, because we are trying to plan for 20 or 30 years hence. None knows what is going to happen 10 or 15 years hence. Surely, we want to continue as friends with everybody.

Sir, finally, I would like to conclude my speech with one sentence which I have mentioned on a previous occasion also. I would, through you, Sir, commend it to the hon. Minister of External Affairs and the Government of India, "speak softly, but carry a big stick". Thank you.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Hon. Members, this debate has to be concluded by 7 o'clock because the hon. Minister of External Affairs has an important meeting. He has to attend to the Malaysian Prime Minister, who is here. he has to go by 7 o'clock. There are 10 more speakers. I am afraid, I will not be able to give more than three minutes each. The debate has to end by 7 o'clock. Mr. Anand Sharma.

SHRI K. NATWAR SINGH: Then, I will reply tomorrow, Sir.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Yes, the reply will be tomorrow.

SHRI ANAND SHARMA (Himachal Pradesh): Mr. Deputy Chairman, I think, we still have some time left. So, I request you to give me some more time.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: No. Let me make it clear that no party has any time left over. All the principal parties have utilised their time. I would request Members to adhere to the time so that it will be easy for us to conclude the debate in time.

SHRI ANAND SHARMA: Sir, still I request you to give me some more time.

The fact that the foreign policy is being discussed in this House is a very welcome development. Those who have spoken before me from this side, that is, Dr. Karan Singh and Ambikaji, have highlighted what this Government has been able to do in the last seven months — certain initiatives; certain course corrections. I was also listening very intently to Shri Yashant Sinha who himself was a Minister of Foreign Affairs and also to Shri Ravi Shankar Prasad. Few issues have come up about the continuity and also allegations of dilution, whether from this side or from that side. A foreign policy of a country like India, for that matter of any country, takes care of its strategic interest, its domestic interest and is also based on certain principles. India's foreign policy was evolved during the Freedom Movement and it took a firm shape after Independence. The principled position which we took was clear that we will follow a policy which is independent, a policy of equality with other sovereign nation States, a policy which identified us with those countries which had shared experiences of being subjugated and colonised in Asia, in Africa and in Latin America which led to the formation of the Non-Aligned Movement. It is a different matter that in the last six years we did not hear much about it and we were being repeatedly told that it has lost its relevance. I will only submit, given the paucity of time, that it is as relevant today as it was in 50s, perhaps more relevant if we subscribe to the concept of multi-polarity, in a world which has changed dramatically after 1990, when the universal impression is that there is unipolarity, there is one power dominance. It is not only the military power; it is not only the economic power, but also the moral power which India enjoyed. We were not a major economic or military power when we were looked up with respect by the rest of the world, but it was because of the policies, principles, convictions and certain values which were enshrined in our foreign policy.

Sir, in the last few months, what we have been informed and what we have followed is, that this Government has ensured the continuity of those policies which had put India on the world map. Much has been said about it; about the relations with our neighbours. Dr. Alexander expressed concerns about it. Yes, the relations with our neighbouring countries are very important. It is clear that this Government is paying due attention to that, though they are not in the same bracket — our relations with Pakistan or

our relations with China. With Pakistan, there has been deep distrust of over five decades. But there is a composite dialogue going on. This Government is clear in ensuring that we engage them in a constructive dialogue and at the same time, not compromising where the vital interests are concerned. Shri Yashwant Sinha was talking about a dialogue with Pakistan that there has been a dilution of statement of 6th January. There has been no dilution. The Prime Minister, when he met Gen. Musharraf, made it very clear that any dialogue with Pakistan will not mean redrawing the boundaries, the geographical boundaries and not any compromise on the issue of terrorism. The Minister of External Affairs, Shri Natwar Singh is sitting here. I would like him to confirm or correct me that our subsequent statement was also a reaffirmation of January 6 *vis a vis* cross border terrorism. There was no dilution. There was no compromise.

Sir, regarding Hurriyat much has been said. Yashwant Sinhaji — I have great regards for him — during your time the Hurriyat leaders did come here. They were also encouraged to go out. You are talking of lack of dialogue. First, let us be clear in the House whether we consider the Hurriyat as the sole representative of the people of Jammu and Kashmir. I disagree. Dr. Farooq Abdullah is sitting here. He might have his own views. But you are forgetting one thing while accusing the present Government that they came here and went to the Pakistan High Commission. The Hurriyat leaders also met Gen. Musharraf when he came to New Delhi for the famous Agra Summit. Let there be no selective loss of memory just to score a debating point. There are many areas where we can disagree or you may have well founded reasons to criticise us. That is what Parliamentary debate is all about. But a foreign policy has to be backed by national consensus. It has to be bi-partisan. Now, was that bi-partisan consensus kept or not? Sir, be it the policy pertaining to the Middle-East, be it pertain to our independent foreign policy, there was dilution of that national consensus during the last six years. When we talk of the Middle-East and West Asia, it is not only age-old relationship but also a very vital and crucial relationship which we have, whether in the field of economy, energy co-operation or the historical bonds which we have and with three million of our people working there. India had rightly pursued a policy which respected and recognised their aspirations especially of the Palestinian people, and we were apologetic about it during the last six years. Yashwant Sinhaji, you yourself quoted from your esteemed

colleague's, Shri Jaswant Singh's speech in Israel which he termed as a pilgrimage. I don't see that there was a national consensus to say that his visit to Israel was a pilgrimage; bilateral relations with one country is one issue; but that does not mean that you compromise completely your principled stand and support to the just cause of the Palestinian people or demean it by terming it as vote bank politics. Was Mahatma Gandhi's politics one of vote bank when he opposed the Belfour Declaration? Were Gandhi and Nehru pursuing vote bank politics when the State of Israel was created, and India took a very clear position? Yes; we have relations. Ravi Shankarji was asking whether we are together in the fight against terrorism or not. Sir, the question is that there are different definitions of 'terrorism' unfortunately being doled out today. There is the U.N. Resolution. But this is what we have been telling the United States of America too that there cannot be one form of terrorism which targets them and another form of terrorism which is targeting my country. But to draw a parallel, let me tell you; when we talk of foreign policy, it is not just with one country.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: There is no time, please.

SHRI ANAND SHARMA: I just have two or three points to make....

SHRI RAVI SHANKAR PRASAD: As for this double-standard in the fight against terrorism, which Government took it in a very strong measure at the international level? It is only the Vajpayee Government.

SHRI ANAND SHARMA: I welcome it...

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Don't react. You will only be losing your time. You will not be able to make your points.

SHRI ANAND SHARMA: Sir, first of all, when we talk of strong measures, what were the strong measures? What was the effect of these measures? The country knows it, and that is why because the people did not have faith in the policy pursued by you that we are sitting here and you are sitting there.

Sir, when it comes to foreign policy matters — there are some very important points which I have to make — we had the National Security Advisor in the NDA Government, Shri Brajesh Mishra. I will just refer to one statement which he made in Washington. He said, "India, U.S. and Israel are strategic partners in the war against terror." Now, did that policy

have national consensus? Yashwant Sinhaji, did you endorse that policy, the statement which Shri Brajesh Mishra made from Washington? Now, they have also said, Sir, and it is my duty to respond. He was also talking about...

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You need not. The Minister will respond to everything.

SHRI ANAND SHARMA: I just have to make a very few important points. Now, Ravi Shankar Prasadji also talked about the nuclear explosions of 1998; and he was also having a dig at our hon. Foreign Affairs Minister. From what he was saying, he was trying to give an impression as if in 1998 they created something; they really liberated India; they made a statement that 'India has arrived'. Let me remind you, in a few weeks you did not make India nuclear-capable; India was made nuclear-capable because of decades of a consistent and firm policy, a visionary policy, pursued by Indira Gandhi and Rajiv Gandhi; India was made nuclear-capable by the work of scientists, from Homi Bhabha to Ramanna; India made that statement by Pokhran-I in 1974. You did not bring it with you, pardon my saying so, along with... (*Interruptions*)

श्री जयन्ती लाल बरोट (गुजरात): इंदिरा गांधी ने पहला ... (व्यवधान)...

श्री आनन्द शर्मा: देखिए, बीच में मत बोलिए। ... (व्यवधान) ... Come on! I did not disturb you. (*Interruptions*)

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Anand Sharma, please conclude. (*Interruptions*)

SHRI V. NARAYANASAMY: You had the courage and you wrote a letter to the President. (*Interruptions*)

श्री जयन्ती लाल बरोट: किसी ने ... (व्यवधान)...

श्री आनन्द शर्मा: कृपा करके सुन तो लीजिए। ... (व्यवधान)...

एक माननीय सदस्य: इतनी हिम्मत थी ... (व्यवधान)...

श्री जयन्ती लाल बरोट: हिम्मत से सामना करना चाहिए ... (व्यवधान)...

श्री आनन्द शर्मा: हिम्मत तो सन् 71 में इंदिरा गांधी ने दिखाई थी, जब वाजपेयी जी ने दुर्गा कहा था। ज्यादा मत बुलवाइए। ... (व्यवधान)...

प्रो० रामबख्श सिंह वर्मा (उत्तर प्रदेश): उसके बाद भी किसी ने ...(व्यवधान)...

श्री आनन्द शर्मा: उसके बाद आपने क्या किया? दस महीने फौज खड़ी रखी।
...(व्यवधान)... रहने दीजिए ...(व्यवधान)...

श्री शाहिद सिद्दिकी (उत्तर प्रदेश): उन्होंने तो हिम्मत दिखायी थी। ...(व्यवधान)...

SHRI ANAND SHARMA: Sir, I don't want to remind him कि हमने यह नहीं कहा था कि एक दिन आर-पार की लड़ाई होगी। दस लाख की फौज खड़ी कर दी और अगले दिन आसमान साफ हो गया। हमने ये गलतियाँ नहीं की। ...(व्यवधान)...

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Please conclude.

SHRI ANAND SHARMA: But, Sir, one thing was that we never surrendered the nuclear option; we never signed the NPT and CTBT. Throughout, we were clear, and we made it clear that India will exercise the option.

You were quoting Mr. Strobe Talbot. On two important issues, I must quote a few sentences. You quoted about the long engagement of Jaswant Singhji with Strobe Talbot. First of all, nobody knew what happened in those 14 meetings, what was the substantive part of it.

AN HON. MEMBER: Sanctions were lifted?

SHRI ANAND SHARMA: Please, please. Sir, Strobe Talbot, in the same book, which my friend, Shri Ravi Shankar Prasad was quoting, has said, On CTBT, "I had come to London fully expecting Jaswant to tell us to forget about Indian signature on the CTBT, especially after Bruce Waddell and Mark Tully had heard from Mishra" — the same Brajesh Mishra. "If that had been Jaswant's message, I would not have had much ground for protest. Since we could not even keep our own Senate from rejecting the Treaty, we could hardly insist that Jaswant gets his Parliament to accept it. To my surprise, he told me that Vajpayee was still prepared to try to put India on par with the United States, that is, to sign the Treaty before Clinton came in March". You were on the verge of signing the CTBT. This is what Strobe Talbot has written. You were quoting about the long engagement. You never took the country into confidence; you never took the Parliament into confidence. And this is in the same book, 'Engaging India', which you were quoting, and this is the foreign edition. It is the same book. Sir, he was also talking about F-16s...

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You have to conclude now.

SHRI ANAND SHARMA: Sir, I will omit a couple of other quotes. They are talking about this Government diluting our position on Jammu and Kashmir in agreeing to any redrawing of the map, which we have made clear, the Prime Minister has made clear, the hon. External Affairs Minister has made clear. But, Sir, the same Strobe Talbot, in the same book, has written on Kashmir and his dear friend, Jaswant. As a preview of what he was prepared to talk about, he mentioned that his Government might consider converting the Line of Control which was based on the 1949 ceasefire line between the Pakistani and Indian portions of the territory into an international boundary" and, Talbot writes, "...a significant departure from the long-established BJP position that India should persist in seeking the integration of Pakistan Occupied Kashmir". There is much more of that long engagement...

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Please conclude.

SHRI ANAND SHARMA: I am concluding. So, we have to be very clear about where the compromises were.

SHRI RAVI SHANKAR PRASAD: There are many things in this, which I did not quote.

SHRI ANAND SHARMA: Yes. We can have another debate on this.
(Interruptions)

SHRI RAVI SHANKAR PRASAD: We can.

SHRI ANAND SHARMA: Yes. We can. I am willing.

SHRI RAVI SHANKAR PRASAD: Yes. I am willing too.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Please conclude.

SHRI ANAND SHARMA: Sir, I have to make two points for the consideration of the Foreign Affairs Minister. Sir, the first point is about the Indian Diaspora. We have talked about their importance — the creation of a separate Ministry — that they can be the ambassadors of this country. They have attained a lot in the countries which they have adopted, they have enriched those countries, and many of them have excelled in the various fields. Sir, this Government has also endorsed the policy of granting dual citizenship. Now, whether that dual citizenship is confined to a select

group of countries — from what we have read in the newspapers — the people of Indian origin in the United States where there are two million, in the United Kingdom where they are almost the same number, and some other country in Europe, Will only people get the dual citizenship? I don't find any reference to the people of Indian origin in South Africa, which has 1.6 million, to Malaysia, which has 1.8 million people of Indian origin. So far, in these countries, Indians have actually contributed a lot to the freedom movement and to the social and cultural enhancement and why should they not be included in the list.

Sir, the last point is about the United Nations Security Council.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Much has been said about it.

SHRI ANAND SHARMA: Much has been said. We would like to make clear one thing. I would like to place my views on record. The United Nations Security Council, as it is constituted today, is unrepresentative and undemocratic. As we have said, India has a rightful claim, which many of my other colleagues have said. And the Minister had, on the floor of this House categorically had rejected any second rate membership offered to India without the veto power. I am surprised, therefore, why Yashwant Sinha ji brought it up, because on the floor of this House the Minister had said... *(Interruptions)*

Sir, my concluding word is that today, when we have a Government which is rooted in the realities of India's foreign policy evolution, I would like to urge upon the Minister to ensure our re-identification with the Third World, with the developing countries, with our natural allies, from whom we had drifted during the BJP-NDA regime. Thank you.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Hon. Members, now that all the parties have exhausted their time, we will take up only 'others' and 'nominated' Members. If time permits, then 'others' will be given time.

Now, Shri Chandan Mitra.

DR. FAROOQ ABDULLAH: Sir... *(Interruptions)*

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You come under 'other'; your name is there. *(Interruptions)*

DR. FAROOQ ABDULLAH: Sir, with his consent, I would take only three minutes.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: If he yields, I don't mind. (*Interruptions*)

DR. CHANDAN MITRA (Nominated): Will I be called immediately after him?

MR. DEPUTY Chairman: Yes.

DR. FAROOQ ABDULLAH: Sir, I am not here to score points either on this side or that side. What I would like to say is very clear. One has to remember, it is India that is important. If we don't consider India is important, then, whether you are on this side or that side, it doesn't make any difference. My views are very clear. To become a Member of the United Nations, you don't have to bow and don't bow for the United Nations Security Council membership. I agree with General Chowdhury. You have the might; and the might is the Army's might and the economic might. When you have these two might, I can assure you, they will beg you to become a Member of the Security Council with the veto power. Without that, you will always beg and you will go to small, small countries with a begging bow, "Please vote for us." I, as an Indian, would not accept it.

The second point I would like to make is, Sir, we have forgotten the Arab world. I am not against the Israelis. For us, to make friendship with every country is important for India, and it is India that has to decide this thing. Therefore, I would only request you, Sir, that with the Arab countries we have failed in growing stronger. Let us again grow stronger with the Arab countries that are nearer to us.

Sir, the third point I would like to make, and that is important, is, I have seen in Britain when we had High Commissioners who may not have been from the elite Foreign Ministry but from the public life, as was one of the lawyers who was there as an Ambassador for a long time, appointed by the then Congress Government and continued by the Government that is now out of power, Mr. Singhvi. Sir, he did an excellent job. Sir, I can assure you that there were hundred Members of Parliament who became pro-India and there was an 'Indian Group' in the British Parliament who spoke of us and fought for us. I would request you, Sir, that I think this you should practice that in future also, some of these important countries just do not

choose diplomats in the way, the Americans do, that they do choose from outside who can have some influence and can manoeuvre many voices which probably at a diplomatic level they are unable to do. The third point which I would like to make to you is, while as I welcome friendship with Pakistan but I would also like to request you Sir, Kashmir you are not going to give, you have no right to give. This you should make absolutely clear that we are going to talk, yes, we are ready to talk, we are ready for peace. but I cannot understand how you can have peace when the Defence Minister says that there are 57 launching pads, so many active camps going on and we are there talking of friendship. I cannot see how these two things go together. It is just an impossible thing in my mind. Maybe I am so small that I cannot understand it. I also do criticise this Government that when they had put Army for ten months on the border, there was nothing done. Mrs. Gandhi took the decision in Bengal when East Pakistan was in trouble and she became Durga. Sir, had they taken the decision to move those armies at that time, I can assure you that you would never have been in power. They would be like durga. The would probably be Shiva, if Shiva was the one with power. But, unfortunately, Vajpayee could not become Shiva. That is unfortunate. But I can assure you one thing, Sir, our relationship with Nepal which was aptly put by him. Sir, I can assure you one thing, it is a Hindu nation. I went to Nepal one year and I would like to tell this House that there was every Nepali who hated India. I asked myself, 'why'? that day went because we had small, small differences in our various Ministries and thus we stopped the port entry of theirs, wherein various things that would come from Bengal port to them and the suddenly realised that India could close their lifeline and they had to open the borders with China. I am sure you remember, Sir, because you have been in the foreign Ministry and very closely associated with whatever happened at that time. So you know that they felt that 'we have been pushed up'. This policy of India should go. Our neighbours should never feel that because we are a mighty power we could knock them off. Sir, so that is important for you, Sir, since you had been to Nepal. I do not know what is a Maoist movement and whether Chinese are involved in Maoist movement, I cannot tell you that. But one of the dangers that I see with the Maoist movement, Sir, is that the entire country right from Nepal, Bihar, Madhya Pradesh, down to Andhra, down to Tamil Nadu will be the Naxalite movement which will be coming through with this chain. Please take not of this as an External Affairs Minister, I agree with the Members here that

External Affairs Ministry is no longer with the relationship with one type only. It has to have a composite relationship, economic and all other things combined together in the interest of the country and I hope, Sir, that you would be able to do so. I will not go into what you have said, what you have not said, we are a nuclear power and I am proud Indian to say, yes, we are nuclear whether America accepts that or not, we are nuclear and it is with that power we can hit. I can assure you, Sir, we will stand behind the country, behind the Government, everyone of us with this feeling that we have to strengthen India. Let us not score points against you, against your Ministry, against your Government. It will be the people in five years time that will decide whether you did right or wrong. But one thing you must make clear. Peace with dignity and honour, not peace by giving land and giving here and there. Hurriyat does not represent me; it does not represent every Kashmiri. So, don't take them into consideration. There are people in Laddakh, there are people in Jammu. And, there are people in the Valley. Therefore, they are not the masters. They did not stop them from going to Pakistan High Commission. They did not stop them from meeting President Musharaff. Neither you have been able to stop them, nor you have been able to stop their money. I wonder whether you will ever be able to stop it. Therefore, let us be clear on one point. Kashmir is a part of India; will remain a part of India and will strengthen India so long as we remember one thing that while you talk to them you take this Parliament into consideration as to what you are doing. Thank you.

DR. CHANDAN MITRA: Thank you Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, for giving me this opportunity to speak on this. I will be very brief since the time allotted to me is very less. Sir, a lot has been said on the subject. Therefore, in fact, a very few issues remain and I just want to make a few pointed queries which, I hope the hon. External Affairs Minister, will take into account while replying to the debate. But, before that I wish to make one general observation. I am very glad that we are having a discussion on the foreign Policy in the House. this is a very, very happy and positive development. But, I must also add that I am somewhat distressed by the point-scoring exercise that has happened. I do believe that Foreign Policy requires continuity and consensus. Of course, there will be nuances that every Government will bring in into this continuity and consensus. But, continuity and consensus are essential because the foreign Policy is a part of country's strategic planning for itself, not over one year, two years or five years, but something that goes on for 20, 50 or even 100 years.

For instance, I do remember the various statements made by Chinese leaders with regard to their claims on some parts that are not part of China today. One of the former Prime Ministers said that it does not matter even if it takes 50 years or 5,000 years but some day we shall occupy that place because it belongs to china. This is the kind of strategic vision that is required in our foreign Policy. Therefore, without continuity and consensus, it is very difficult to achieve that. So, I appeal to all the hon. Members of all sides that if we work towards this consensus, rather than scoring points, it will benefit the country.

Now, I will come to a few specific issues. The issue of getting a permanent seat in the UN Security Council has been discussed at length. But, I just want to draw the attention of the hon. Minister to one point. We were all very happy and proud when he said on the floor of this House that India was not prepared or, rather the country would not be prepared to accept a veto-less permanent Membership of the UN Security Council. Subsequently, however, what was disappointing was the statement issued by his Ministry. The Ministry of External Affairs said, when the Report on the Reforms was submitted, that it welcomed the Report and issued a statement, which had the consent of the other Members—Germany, Brazil and Japan—of the G-4 Group. Being a part of it, India welcomed it. I think it requires clarity. Are we going to go by the consensus in this Group of four countries, or, if that consensus does not agree with our position that we do not wish to accept a veto-less Membership, are we going to break with this Group and take our independent position? Some clarification is required on this.

Another point I would like to bring before the House is this. While we are discussing—rightly so—the issues of economic ties with Pakistan as a part of cur improvement in relations and the issue of pipeline has already been brought up. But, what was disturbing was, when the Pakistani Prime Minister was in Delhi, he made it abundently clear that progress on transit of Indian goods through Pakistan to Central Asia and in-bound traffic would depend on India's acceptance of certain pipeline proposals. Now, this is something which is a matter of concern. I think, we need to take a specific position as to whether we are going to accept this position that only after there is an agreement on the pipeline and we accept the Pakistan's position on that, only then Pakistan will agree to allow our goods to be transported to the Central Asia and back? I would like to know whether we are prepared

to accept that or whether we have seriously conveyed our views that this cannot be a kind of arm-twisting mechanism. Unfortunately, it is happening again and again. At one stage, the Pakistan's Minister saying that Iran-India pipeline, through Pakistan, will be devoid of all politics. Subsequently, we got another statement saying it would depend on how much progress is achieved on Kashmir. So, in view of this continuously shifting position that Pakistan does take from time to time, I think, a certain clarity and taking the House into confidence would help a great deal in this matter. Another point on which I would also like to seek the Minister's response is that India had, for many years, been pressing for a global conference on terrorism. Now, we have not heard about this for a long time. This was aimed at defining or redefining 'terrorism' and getting the world community, particularly those who have been perpetrating acts of terrorism against India and certain other countries to agree to certain common positions and get their consent on the dotted line so that we could hold them responsible, the international community could hold them responsible, for transgressions of that. What is the status of this global conference on terrorism? Are we pursuing this effectively any longer or not? This is something on which I would like clarification. On this subject, I would like to point out that in view of what has happened in Russia, especially after the busan incident, they have strengthened their anti-terror apparatus. And, when the senior Chinese foreign ministry officials visited this country, they talked about China's concerns over what they themselves now admit is the East-Turkistan Movement in Sinkiang. Now, in this area, whether we plan to collaborate further on the question of anti-terrorism with Russia and China because they have become affected, along with India, in this entire region. I would like to know whether we have been discussing and negotiating this point or not.

Finally, I come to my concluding point. It has been said by many hon. Members here. So, I don't wish to go into details. On the issue of Bangladesh there is a matter of very, very great concern that has been expressed in this House again and again. Also, through newspaper and every kind of venue of public opinion this has been brought up. We find a situation, as many hon. Members have said, that we should not get disturbed by the kind of pinpricks or minor things that people will say or criticise. We should be prepared to accept it. I agree; yes, as the biggest country in this region, we have to be tolerant of many of these things. but

when a country actively connives or supports the activities against us, I don't think it is possible to keep quiet. In this context, I would like to ask the hon. Minister whether we have a fallback strategy as far as Bangladesh is concerned because Bangladesh seems to be in a perpetual denial mode. They say that there is no infiltration that is happening. They say that there are no terrorist camps. They say that they are not sheltering any terrorists from the North-East and they are not supporting them. Anything that is put up, there is a complete denial unlike Pakistan where they accept a few things. But on the question of Bangladesh, we find complete stonewalling. In view of this, has the Government of India thought of some fallback strategies that if they continue to stonewall our genuine concerns and what are they going to do about them? Are you only going to talk to them and urge them to accept these realities; or, do we have other mechanisms that we might be looking at to bring into operation?

Sir, there were many other points, but I think a lot of them have been covered. I would say that we have one of the most experience persons, in the country, handling this Ministry. And, I would expect that the doubts and clarifications that have been sought by the hon. Members and their concerns would be adequately handled by him. Thank you very much, Sir.

श्री बशिष्ठ नारायण सिंह (बिहार): उपसभापति महोदय, आप इस बहस के दौरान बार-बार साथियों को समय-सीमा की याद दिला रहे हैं, इसलिए मैं ज्यादा बिंदुओं पर अपनी बात नहीं रखूंगा। महोदय, जब नटवर सिंह जी इस देश के विदेश मंत्री बने तो मुझे इस बात की प्रसन्नता हुई कि चलिए, इस सरकार में एक ऐसा व्यक्ति देश का विदेश मंत्री बना है, जिसके पास ब्यूरोक्रेटिक एक्सपीरियेंस भी है और साथ-साथ वह व्यक्ति राजनीति में भी सक्रिय रहा है। जब वह व्यक्ति विदेशों में जाएगा तो ब्यूरोक्रेटिक चैनल पर जो बात होने वाली है और होती है, उसको राजनयिक टेबल पर आसानी से और बुद्धिमतापूर्वक ले जाने का काम करेगा। इसलिए मुझे प्रसन्नता हुई। यह स्वयं भारत के पूर्व प्रधानमंत्री श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी का अनुभव था कि चाहे चीन का संबंध हो, चाहे जिस कन्ट्रीज में वे जाते थे, तो ब्यूरोक्रेटिक लेवल पर जो बात होती थी, उसको राजनयिक टेबल पर ले आने का काम करते थे। यानी इंडिया के व्यू प्वाइंट को लीडरशिप के स्तर पर डिस्कस कर देने की उनके अंदर क्षमता थी, जो एक बड़ी खूबी भारत की विदेश नीति में देखने को मिली। उपसभापति महोदय, और कई उदाहरणों को कोट नहीं करना चाहता। श्रीमती इंदिरा गांधी का और अन्य कई उदाहरण हैं और उन उदाहरणों को यदि मैं कोट करूंगा तो सदन का समय जाएगा। जब वह अमेरिका गई थीं, अमेरिका में उनसे एक कार्यक्रम में शामिल होने को कहा गया तो उन्होंने उस समय उसे रिफ्यूज कर दिया। उस समय नेशनल प्राइड रिफ्लेक्ट हो रहा था। जब चेकोस्लोवाकिया

पर रूस का आक्रमण हुआ, और ड्यूबेक जब रूस में वार्तालाप के लिए जा रहे थे, तो उस देश के लोगों ने लाखों की संख्या में इकट्ठा होकर एक ही बात ड्यूबेक को रिमाइंड कराई थी कि जाना, लेकिन देश के स्वाभिमान के साथ कभी समझौता नहीं करना, चूंकि रूस सुपर-पावर है। इसलिए उपसभापति महोदय, जब आनन्द शर्मा जी भाषण दे रहे थे, उन्होंने बड़ी अच्छी बात कही और मुझे भी इसमें विश्वास है। यह देश जो उसी रास्ते पर चल रहा है, जो मोरल वैल्यू उन्होंने इस पालिसी के साथ जोड़ा, उन्होंने जो कॉन्क्वेशन की एक बात कही, हमें तो लगता है कि भारत की विदेश नीति की सबसे बड़ी खासियत, खूबी यह हो सकती है कि उस विदेश नीति के प्रवक्ता को सत्य कहने का साहस हो जाए, उस विदेश नीति के प्रवक्ता को किसी भी सुपर-पावर के साथ बराबरी के स्तर पर बात करने की क्षमता हो जाए। भारत की विदेश नीति आज इसी चौराहे पर खड़ी हो गई है, जहां चारों ओर नेबरिंग कंट्रीज में या तो इंटरनल ट्रेंड्स हैं, या फिर हमारे बार्डर के साथ ट्रेंड्स हैं। मैं विशेष रूप से एक बात का उल्लेख करना चाहता हूं। पाकिस्तान की, बर्मा की, श्रीलंका की चर्चा तो मैं नहीं करूंगा, लेकिन चीन और तिब्बत की चर्चा जरूर करूंगा। अपने दलाई लामा जी सरकार यहां चल भी रही है। दलाई लामा जी ने तिब्बती लोगों के लिए स्वशासन की जो मांग उठाई थी, आज उसमें बदलाव भी आया है। क्या उनके लिए जो इस देश में निर्वासित अतिथि बन कर रह रहे हैं, उनके कॉज को टेक-अप करने की भारत के विदेश मंत्री, उनकी सरकार, कोशिश करेगी और ये राजनयिक स्तर से यह प्रयास करेंगे कि चीन के साथ दलाई लामा जी का मीनिंगफुल डायलॉग हो? तिब्बत के अस्तित्व को भारत का कोई भी व्यक्ति अस्वीकार नहीं कर सकता है। भारत ने इसे स्वीकार करके ही दलाई लामा जी को यहाँ शरण देने का काम किया था। आज तिब्बत में पर्यावरण का संकट पैदा हो रहा है, और वहां की जो नदियां हैं, भारत से जुड़ी हुई हैं, एक बार चीन पानी छोड़ दे तो कई प्रदेश उसमें डूब सकते हैं। ऐसे संकट भी हैं। उपसभापति महोदय, तिब्बत की सुरक्षा, भारत की अस्मिता, भारत की सुरक्षा के लिए, भारत की संस्कृति के लिए, बहुत ही आवश्यक है। इस देश में रह कर मानवाधिकार के सवाल पर, शांति के सवाल पर, जिसकी आनन्द शर्मा जी बार-बार चर्चा कर रहे थे, दलाई लामा जी को नोबल पुरस्कार मिला है और उसी दलाई लामा जी के साथ और तिब्बतियों के साथ चाईनीज़ गवर्नमेंट का क्या एटीच्यूड रहा है, इसको देखने पर बड़ा आश्चर्य होता है। क्या हमारी विदेश नीति इतनी प्रभावशाली हो सकती है? क्या हमारी विदेश नीति में चीन के साथ संबंधों को सुधारने के बाद भी राजनयिक टेबल पर दलाई लामा जी से बात करने के लिए हम आग्रह और प्रभाव नहीं डाल सकते हैं? यह भी हमारे लिए एक बड़ा काम है और इसको करना चाहिए।

उपसभापति महोदय, अमनेस्टी इंटरनेशनल की रिपोर्ट आयी है कि तीन-चार कंट्रीज में सजा-ए-फांसी बड़े पैमाने पर हो रही है और विश्व में जितनी फांसियां हो रही हैं, उसमें दो-तिहाई फांसियां चीन के निर्देश पर तिब्बत में हो रही हैं। महोदय, मैं एक उदाहरण देना चाहता हूं। उसका

नाम तेनतिंग डेलेके रिम्पोचे हैं महोदय, इनकी एक ही कमी है कि इन की आस्था दलाई लामा में है और इस आस्था के चलते वह प्रचार में लगे रहते हैं। उन को दो वर्ष पहले सजा दी गयी थी और वह सजा 25 जनवरी को पूरी होने वाली है मैं जानता हूँ कि वैदेशिक मामलों की हैंडलिंग में काफी कूटनीति का परिचय देना पड़ता है। महोदय, ताशकंद और कई उदाहरण हैं, जिन्हें मैं कोट नहीं करना चाहता हूँ कि एक व्यक्ति जो दलाई लामा में, पीसफुल को-एक्जिस्टेंस में और शांति में विश्वास करता है, उस को फांसी की सजा न हो जाये, क्या इस के लिए भारत सरकार के विदेश मंत्री पहल करेंगे? मैं आग्रह करता हूँ कि वह पहल करें और दलाई लामा जी से चाइनीज गवर्नमेंट की बात करवाने में अपनी भूमिका अदा करें, इतना ही कहकर मैं अपनी बात समाप्त करता हूँ।

SHRI EKANATH K. THAKUR (Maharashtra): Sir, thank you very much for having given me the opportunity to speak on this issue.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You have got three minutes.

SHRI EKANATH K. THAKUR: Sir, I know. I have been learning from this debate. The two things that I learnt today, I must share with you, and, through you, with the hon. Members. One is that when Ekanath Thakur speaks, one minute is of sixty seconds and when Mr. Anand Sharma speaks, one minute is of three hundred seconds.(Interruptions).....

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Please, please.(Interruptions).....

SHRI EKANATH K. THAKUR: Another thing which I learnt was from Mrs. Ambika Soni.(Interruptions)..... No; no; I am talking on the debate. I am talking on the point.(Interruptions)..... It was Mrs. Ambika Soni(Interruptions).....

SHRI VAYALAR RAVI (Kerala): Sir, this is a reflection on your decision. It is not correct(Interruptions).....

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: No; no; regarding the time(Interruptions).....

SHRI EKANATH K. THAKUR: Sir, I am only saying that if NDA's External Affairs Minister, Shri Yashwant Sinha, had listened to the consensus in the nation and also had agreed and taken a decision not to send troops to Iraq, it was a bad foreign policy, according to some, but if the Congress Government had not listened to the whole of India and sent the Indian Peace Keeping Mission Forces to Sri Lanka, it was a great foreign policy. This is the second thing which I have learnt. Sir, I believe, that this type of

partisan debate where one side is telling the other that it is your Prime Minister who is cowering before the USA, the other side is saying 'no;no; it was your former Prime Minister who was cringing before the US President, does us no good. We are a nation of one billion people, and an erudite scholar who is our External Affairs Minister today is a person who represents one out of six human beings on this planet, who are Indians. And, that confidence and that strength must inform all our actions and all our decisions. Sir, in my opinion, our foreign policy has to project a very strong independent nation; the second thing the foreign policy has to do is to see that we remain a very important member of the international community; the third thing that we have to ensure is that we project our cultural identity among the nations of the world - 190 members of the United Nations - and, fourth, we subserve and we ensure that our interests in defence, in commerce and economics are furthered. Sir, I would not like to repeat issues already mentioned, but within the three minutes which you have kindly given me, I would like to refer to two books - one is the 'End of History'. This was a book of Francis Fukuyama. And, it says that hereafter, probably, there is no chance of ideological conflicts and of ideological wars, and, therefore, there is end of history. There is another important book which is now dominating the thinkers of the world, 'The Clash of Civilisations' by Samuel Huntington. And, Sir, this book, 'The Clash of Civilisations' points out, and thinkers around the world are looking at this book very carefully. This book is dominating even the American thinkers —This says that all future conflicts will come across the fault lines of basic human civilisations. And, therefore, the threat, that has emerged to India, will emerge out of certain forces who are enemical to the identity of the Indian nation. Sir, if you put on the Pakistani TV, they refer to us every time as Hindustan. Whenever any news item is given, they refer to our Prime Minister, or, our Foreign Minister as that of Hindustan. And, we are apprehensive of referring ourselves as Hindustan. When I say Hindu, I am not using that concept as a religious concept, but as our national identity. Even Dr. Farooq Abdullah, who was here, referred that we are Hindustanis. I believe unless we project that cultural identity of our in the world and become one amongst the many nations, try to survive by being dominant, by being strong, our foreign policy will not be respected in the world. Sir, I would only like to say, in this context, that if you look at the foreign policy of India today - seven months is too short a period to judge this —We have to give time to the new govt. I understand — either from the prism of a large nation like U.S.A. or from

the prism of a small nation like Bangladesh, none seem to be accepting us. Other day, there was a news item that on a minor matter like some video film or something that Condoleeza Rice will be sending a message to our External Affairs Minister. I do not know whether that is true and, I am sure, the hon. External Affairs Minister will enlighten us whether he has already received a message or an instruction from Condoleeza Rice to see and ensure that Mr. Bajaj of *Bazee.com* is given a fair treatment in India. *(Time-bell)* Now, if this is the kind of thing we see that in the international arena, we are playing second tune to somebody and Condoleeza Rice is dictating us in a small matter, whatsoever, when there is a problem. Sir, *vis-a-vis* Bangladesh also, so many Bangladeshis are coming to our country through our borders. It's a reality, but Government of India has accepted that because of our porous borders and because of corruption there, millions of Bangladeshis have come to India. And, we are not in a position to settle this issue with Bangladesh. I hope that this issue will be taken up with Bangladesh Government very strongly.

Sir, about Nepal, I would like to say only one thing. This was at the time when Shri Yashwant Sinha was the External Affairs Minister. I had written to him. I attended a political conference of all political parties of Asia in Bangkok, which was attended by 78 political parties. Six political parties from Nepal were there. And, all those six political parties met my colleagues and me and told us that only India could save Nepal from the Maoist attacks and mediate between the political parties and the King there. Even today, I believe, India has a role to play in Nepal and Nepal is very important to us and I urge the External Affairs Minister to give a priority to this issue of Nepal so that in that Hindu State, a kind of order is maintained as our neighbour remains precious and valuable to us.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. R.S. Gavai, You have three minutes. hope, you will adhere to the time limit.

SHRI R.S. GAVAI (Maharashtra): Sir, I will finish within three minutes. I will be very brief. At the outset, I whole heartedly support Foreign Policy of the UPA Government. Since the Government is there for the last six months, I describe the policy as purposeful, result oriented, and that too, keeping with the spirit of the foreign policy laid down by Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru. Sir, anyhow, during my college days, I had particular fancy for foreign policy laid down by the late Prime Minister, Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru. It has been appreciated and accepted by the people. I know the feelings

7.00 P.M.

amongst people also regarding the policy adopted by the UPA Government, and, it is being accepted and appreciated by the people at large.

Sir, we had the historical background to support the struggle of people for liberation in countries like Vietnam, Laos, Cambodia, South Africa, Palestine, and, so on. We are keeping the same spirit, and, this is being observed for the last five decades. But, I am sorry to mention that the NDA Government during their regime diverted from the policy of non-alignment, and, it is diluted, though openly they have not declared so.

I am happy now that the UPA Government is now implementing the same policy adopted by Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru. Sir, the foreign policy indicates our political and economical independence, and, I am happy that the present UPA Government is still continuing this policy. Of course, Sir, as far as the world's scenario and changing circumstances are concerned, there may be some change, but at the same time, India will remain a non-aligned country to judge between truth and untruth, merit and demerit, right and wrong. It was a wider impression amongst the people during the NDA regime that the USA was taking the Government of India for granted. That is not situation now.

Madam Soniaji read the letter indicating the language of the earlier Prime Minister as if we are bowing our head before the USA; that is not the case now. Sir, India secured her rights in the world and contributed to the promotion of world peace and welfare of the mankind.

The UPA Government is making efforts to get a permanent membership of the United Nations Security Council for India. Of course, there are two opinions. There is no doubt that we are a powerful force and have a strong military. I would request the hon. Foreign Minister to inform the international community that since India has fulfilled the obligation and criteria for a permanent seat in the United Nations Security Council with veto power, we will not accept the second-rate membership. Sir, in spite of the differences regarding USA invasion of Iraq, I am happy to say that the present UPA Government observed the spirit of the Resolution passed by both the Houses of Parliament and have not sent troops to Iraq. Sir, recently I visited Nepal. I need not highlight the situation. But, the grave situation in Nepal is a matter of great concern. Nepal being an adjoining country to India, I will just request the hon. Foreign Minister to take abundant care in this respect. Sir, on the issue of Bangladesh, but for Shrimati Indira Gandhi,

the Bangladesh would not have been liberated. Contrary to this now, sabotages and atrocities are being committed on the Indians in Bangladesh. So, I urge upon the Foreign Minister to look into the matter. I would also suggest that completion of the fencing wall along the Bangladesh border is the need of the day. Sir, I congratulate the UPA Government for developing a purposeful discussion with China, Pakistan and, of course, for reorienting the old friendship with Russia. Sir, the people....

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Please, conclude Mr. Gavai.

SHRI R.S. GAVAI: I would congratulate the hon. Home Minister for the qualitative change in releasing the hostages. People noticed the hostages at Kandahar being released and the hostages released by the UPA Government by diplomacy from Iraq. There is a qualitative change between the two Governments. Mr. Natwar Singh and his colleagues deserve the congratulation in this respect. Thank you.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Samadani, you have got only three minutes.

SHRI M.P. ABDUSSAMAD SAMADANI (Kerala): Yes, Sir, considering the constraint of time, I am not going to make a speech. I am only enumerating certain points which I wanted to mention here. Sir, we all agreed that our foreign policy is very much related with our great ethos of national heritage. Especially, it is very much linked with our struggle for freedom. Sir, if that is the condition, then it need not be mentioned that our freindship with the Arab countries, as has already been mentioned here, is also a part and parcel of our foreign policy. Then, Sir, in that background, we cannot understand the enthusiasm that has been shown to make relationship with Israel. Sir, Israel is a country which is making all trouble in the Middle East. Not only that, we have to consider about five million India people who are living in the Middle East when we formulate our foreign policy. Sir, if it is very much compulsory for our Government that there must be trade with Israel, it should not mean that we should make relationship and make friendship with Israel. If we go to a shop to purchase something, it is not necessary that we should marry the lady sitting there for selling the things. Sir, it is wrong, it is an insult to us to say that Israel is the only country that can give us military advice. India is a great country. Our Military power is great. We have our own position in the Comity of Nations. Then, spreading this kind of a notion is deplorable. During the

NDA régime this was the justification made by our hon. comrade sitting on the other side. What kind of military strategy is Israel putting into the practice in the Middle East? It is creating trouble, banishing people, attacking the women and the children; it is a State terrorism. That is why, India is the first non-Arab country that recognised the PLO. And, Sir, Mahatma Gandhi, Father of the Nation, said, "As France belongs to the French people, as Britain belongs to the British people, Palestine definitely belongs to the Palestinians." So, Sir, it is my humble request, it is the ardent desire of the people living in India that any move to make friendship with Israel, will be disastrous, will be suicidal for a country like India. We hope that our Government, our esteemed External Affairs Minister, will consider this point and undo the mistakes and wrongs done by the previous Government.

Sir, regarding the attempts made by our Government to bring peace in the sub-continent, I am not going into the details, these are praiseworthy moves. Our Government should go forward to bring peace, especially in the sub-continent with our neighbouring countries.

Finally, our Foreign Policy is based on certain values. Values of humanism, international understanding representing our stand against oppression, imperialism, injustice and exploitation. If these are the cardinal points of our Foreign Policy, then in the present world scenario of a unipolar hegemony, we have a greater role to play in international relationships. What is taking place in the present world condition is sharing the coffin and sharing the shroud of the dead body, attacking nations and sharing the dead bodies. The hon. External Affairs Minister is fond of *Urdu ghazals*. I am reminded of a couplet, Sir.

जिन्दा लाशों की इक भीड़ चारों तरफ मौत से भी बड़ा हादसा जिन्दगी।

This is the condition created by the so-called 'super-power nations' in the world. For this kind of policy of violence, they have coined theories like 'The Clash of Civilisations'. When we went to the Middle-East countries, in a delegation of Members of Parliament, I was surprised to see that every leader of the country, we visited, were all discussing this theory of Huntington, 'The Clash of Civilisations'. I cannot understand how a theory of this kind was received greater political attraction. It is a book written by Huntington titled 'The Clash of Civilisations'. But that is a theory formulated by imperialists to justify their attacks on other developing nations, the

oppressed countries. I request the Government, (*Time-bell*) that our Foreign Policy's cultural content must not be 'Clash of Civilisations' but 'dialogue among civilisations'. Sir, there is a great relevance for this 'dialogue of civilisations'. I conclude by requesting the External Affairs Minister that our role must be to unify nations, to bring the people together, like the great poet Iqbal had said,

हवस ने कर दिया है, टुकड़े टुकड़े नौ-ए-इन्सान को

उखवत का बयां हो जा, मोहब्बत की जबां हो जा।

This is the international scenario, Sir.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Hon. Members, all the principal parties and 'Others and Nominated Members' have spoken. Now, there are only three names...(*Interruptions*)...Let me complete...(*Interruptions*)....There are only three names left out. All the political parties have completed their allotted time ...(*Interruptions*)... Please, listen to me. (*Interruptions*).....If the House agrees, we can sit up to 7.15 p.m. ...(*Interruptions*)... You should realise that some of the Members have a commitment to go to meet the Speaker of the Lok Sabha at 7.30 p.m....(*Interruptions*)...

SHRI V. NARAYANASAMY: Sir, five minutes for each Member....(*Interruptions*)...

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Why five minutes? Take three minutes each. When 'Others' have taken three minutes each, you should also take three minutes each.

SHRI ASHWANI KUMAR (Punjab): The hon. Chair has been asking people to stick to the time. If somebody does not stick to the time, why should....(*Interruptions*)..

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: That is the problem of the Chair. People do not stick to the timings..*(Interruptions)*... and then make comments....(*Interruptions*).. Prof. Soz... (*Interruptions*)... No speeches please.

PROF. SAIF-UD-DIN SOZ (Jammu and Kashmir): Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, it is the tragedy that I have to speak at the fag end of the debate. (*Interruptions*).

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: What can we do?

PROF. SAIF-UD-DIN SOZ: I may avoid it next time. (*Interruptions*)... So, is an established fact ...(*Interruptions*)...

श्री जयन्ती लाल बरोट: सर, आपने समय दे दिया है क्या इनको

श्री उपसभापति: बैठिए आप।...(*व्यवधान*)... आप बोलिए।

PROF. SAIF-UD-DIN SOZ: Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, it is an established fact that our foreign policy is based on continuity and consensus except when the NDA Government went wrong. I can narrate it...(*Interruptions*)...

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Don't narrate it.

PROF. SAIF-UD-DIN SOZ: Sir, very briefly, and I must congratulate Mr. Natwar Singh that he has sustained the traditions, he has strengthened the rich traditions established over a long period of time. As the tradition of flexibility and firmness which was laid down, that policy was broadly laid down by Shri Jawaharlal Nehru, and since I have to finish within a couple of minutes, I can say that there was a classic example how we can be very firm when Mrs. Sonia Gandhi raised a powerful voice against sending troops to Iraq. Since there is no time, otherwise I could cite so many examples. When Mr. Natwar Singh came on the scene. He didn't waste time. He started dealing with neighbours very effectively. His first visit was to Nepal. Thereafter, he has been vigorously in touch with the neighbouring countries, Bhutan, Bangladesh, Pakistan and other neighbours. With Pakistan, he has opened what he calls comprehensive dialogue. Of course, he will do it in different fashion. Since I have promised, I have to say very quickly. Mr. Natwar Singh will do it differently. I will not take much time. He will definitely do it differently than his counterparts did earlier and I want to remind Mr. Jaswant Singh who is, unfortunately, not here that why Mr. Natwar Singh will do it differently because he has understood the policy formulations laid down by Mr. Jawaharlal Nehru over a period of time.

He has gone through the mill himself. And he will definitely do it differently. Since Talbott has been extensively quoted, I would say why Mr. Natwar Singh will do it differently and let me say about Kashmir because I can't talk without mentioning Indo-Pak discussions. I have some knowledge of Kashmir. But I would say what Talbott has said on his meeting with Mr. Jaswant Singh...(*Interruptions*)...

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: It is available in the Library.

PROF. SAIF-UD-DIN SOZ: No, kindly listen to me. ...(*Interruptions*)...

श्री एस०एस० अहलुवालिया: लीडर आफ दी अपोजिशन का नाम लेने के बाद ...(*व्यवधान*) ... यह क्या है कि टेलबॉट ने क्या बोला ...(*व्यवधान*) ...

†प्रो० सैफुद्दीन सोज: क्योंकि डिप्टी चेयरमैन को पता है कि ...(*व्यवधान*) ... MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN....(*Interruptions*)..All right, I will not quote it ...(*Interruptions*)...

پروفیسر سیف الدین سوز: کیوں کہ اپنی چیئر مین کو پتہ ہے کہ مداخلت.....

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I think at 7.15 p.m. I will adjourn the House, as promised ...(*Interruptions*)... If you don't stick to the timings, I will adjourn the House at 7.15.

श्री रुद्रनारायण पाणि: सर, इस समय ...(*व्यवधान*) ...

श्री उपसभापति: आप बैठिए न। ...(*व्यवधान*) अगर आप बोलना चाहेंगे तो ...(*व्यवधान*) ...

†प्रो० सैफुद्दीन सोज: ये किस चीज पर शोर कर रहे हैं, मुझे समझ नहीं आता। ...(*व्यवधान*) ...

پروفیسر سیف الدین سوز: یہ کس چیز پر شور کر رہے ہیں، مجھے سمجھ نہیں آتا..... مداخلت.....

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: (*Interruptions*)....even though I have not gone wrong.....(*Interruptions*).

श्री रुद्रनारायण पाणि: सर, ये ...(*व्यवधान*)...

श्री उपसभापति: आप बैठ जाइए। ...(*व्यवधान*) जब चेयर खड़ी रहती है तो आपको बैठ जाना चाहिए। अगर आप बोलना चाहेंगे तो मैं आपको ...(*व्यवधान*)...

†PROF. SAIF-UD-DIN SOZ: All right, in order to save time through interruptions, they have spoiled the time further ...(*Interruptions*)...

श्री एस०एस० अहलुवालिया: हुर्रियत के बारे में क्या बोल रहे हैं वह बोलिए। ...(*व्यवधान*)...

†प्रो० सैफुद्दीन सोज: आप तशरीफ रखिए पहले, मैं। जो बोलूंगा ...(*व्यवधान*)...

پروفیسر سیف الدین سوز: آپ تشریف رکھئے پہلے۔ میں جو بولوں گا..... مداخلت.....

†PROF. SAIF-UD-DIN SOZ: All right, in order to save your time, I will not quote all. Out of three quotes, I will quote Talbott only once, but I was going to tell you that Shri Jaswant Singh discussed with Talbott that Kashmir could be decided on Actual Line of Control. And then, he celebrated with Talbott. Although we had expected him to be brave at that moment, he proved to be a very weak man. *(Interruptions)*

श्री जयन्ती लाल बरोट: उपसभापति महोदय, ... (व्यवधान)... यह चेयर का अपमान है।
.... (व्यवधान)...

श्री उपसभापति: सोज साहब, आप, खत्म करिये। (व्यवधान)....

श्री रुद्रनारायण पणि: उपसभापति महोदय, पांच मिनट का समय हो चुका है। (व्यवधान).
... इनका समय समाप्त हो गया है। (व्यवधान)....

PROF. SAIF-UD-DIN SOZ: Sir, I have only one quotation from Talbott, and that is necessary. I request you to give me three minutes. ... *(Interruptions)*...

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Soz, I have already given you three minutes. But you don't complete. You complete it. ... *(Interruptions)*...

श्री एसएस अहलुवालिया: सर, ये क्या बोल रहे हैं? (व्यवधान).. वह क्या बोल रहे हैं?...
(व्यवधान)....सर, वह क्या बोल रहे हैं? सर, वह बार-बार लीडर आफ द अपोजीशन का नाम बोल रहे हैं। क्या आप इनको ऐसे अलाऊ करेंगे?.... (व्यवधान)...आप ऐसे अलाऊ करेंगे?...
(व्यवधान)...

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Prof. Soz, you go ahead. Whatever you say will go on record. The other things will not go on record.

PROF. SAIF-UD-DIN SOZ: I also found ... *(Interruptions)*... Sir, this is very important. *(Interruptions)* Let me conclude. India is great. India is not great because they brought POTA on the statute book. India is great because of our commitment to democracy, our commitment to secularism, our commitment to pluralism, and Mr. Jaswant Singh with Talbott had a different view on diversity. He did not accept it. Finally, I quote... *(Interruptions)*

SHRI V. NARAYANASAMY: Mr. Ahluwalia, he is quoting from the book. *(Interruptions)*

SHRI S.S. AHLUWALIA: Sir, are you giving a right to answer the questions raised by Soz? ... *(Interruptions)*... He should not be allowed to raise it. *(Interruptions)*

†प्रो० सैफुद्दीन सोज: आप तशरीफ रखिये। मैं जो बोलूंगा, वह सही बोलूंगा।...(व्यवधान)...

پروفیسر سیف الدین سوز: آپ تشریف رکھئے، میں جو بولوں گا..... مداخلت.....

श्री उपसभापति: आजमी साहब, आप दो मिनट बोल लीजिए।...(व्यवधान)... आपको पार्टी का समय समाप्त हो गया है। आप बोलिये..(व्यवधान).. Whatever Mr. Soz says, will not go on record. ...(Interruptions)...

PROF. SAIF-UD-DIN SOZ: Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, you never permitted me to raise my point. ...(Interruptions)...

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Prof. Soz, please co-operate with the Chair.

श्री एस० एस० अहलुवालिया: सर, वह...(व्यवधान)...

श्री उपसभापति: मैं रिकार्ड देखूंगा। आप बोलिए। आप बोलिए।...(व्यवधान)...

†प्रो० सैफुद्दीन सोज: सर, कोई बात तो रिकार्ड में आनी चाहिए। एक बात तो मुझे कोट करने दीजिए।...(व्यवधान)...

پروفیسر سیف الدین سوز: سر، کوئی بات تو ریکارڈ میں آنا چاہئے۔ ایک بات تو مجھے کوڈ کرنے دیجئے..... مداخلت.....

श्री उपसभापति: देखिये। आप वक्त का अच्छा यूज कीजिए।...(व्यवधान)...

प्रो० सैफुद्दीन सोज: सर, रिकार्ड में कुछ तो जाना चाहिए।...(व्यवधान)...

پروفیسر سیف الدین سوز: سر، ریکارڈ میں کچھ تو جانا چاہئے..... مداخلت.....

श्री उपसभापति: आजमी साहब, आप बोलते क्यों नहीं हैं?...(व्यवधान)... I will go through the record. (Interruptions) If there is anything objectionable, I will delete it. (Interruptions) Prof. Soz, your time is over. (Interruptions). Now, whatever Mr. Soz says, will not go on record. ...(Interruptions)...

श्री एस० एस० अहलुवालिया: सर, यह क्या है? सर, वह क्या बोल रहे हैं? सरकार के...(व्यवधान)...

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Ahluwalia, I will go through the record. (Interruptions)

†Transliteration of Urdu Script.

श्री एस० एस० अहलुवालिया: सर, इन्होंने कोट किया है कि ... (व्यवधान)... That is not the way. (Interruptions) The way you are talking, is not proper. (Interruptions)

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Prof. Soz, it is not a conversation between you and Mr. Ahluwalia. Please conclude. (Interruptions) क्या बोला है? ... (व्यवधान)... आजमी साहब, अगर आप नहीं बोलेंगे तो हाउस ... (व्यवधान)...

† प्रो० सैफुद्दीन सोज: सर, इन्होंने इंटरप्ट किया है। ... (व्यवधान)...

الپروفیسر سیف الدین سوز: سر، انہوں نے انٹریپٹ کیا ہے مداخلت

श्री उपसभापति: आप बोलिए। यह तीन-तीन मिनट का समय एक्सटेंड नहीं हो सकता है। ... (व्यवधान)... आप बोलिए। ... (व्यवधान)...

† श्री अबू आसिम आजमी (उत्तर प्रदेश): सर, इनकी स्पीच पूरी हो गयी। ... (व्यवधान)...

شری ابوعاصم اعظمی : سران کی اسپیچ پوری ہو گئی

श्री उपसभापति: आप बोलिए। ... (व्यवधान)... आजमी साहब, आप बोलिए। ... (व्यवधान)...

श्री एस० एस० अहलुवालिया: सर, आप इसको सदन की कार्यवाही में जाने की परमीशन देंगे? ... (व्यवधान)... सर, आपको विपक्ष के नेता को बोलने का मौका देना पड़ेगा। ... (व्यवधान)... आप इन्हें बोलने दीजिए। लेकिन नेता विपक्ष को भी बोलने का मौका देना पड़ेगा। ... (व्यवधान)...

श्री उपसभापति: आजमी साहब, आप बोलिए। ... (व्यवधान)... मैं रिकार्ड देखूंगा। ... (व्यवधान)... मैं इसका रिकार्ड देखूंगा। ... (व्यवधान)...

PROF. SAIF-UD-DIN SOZ: I also found troublesome the way Islam fit into Jaswant's world view ... (Interruptions)... Or, more to the point, the way it seemed to be inherently at odds with his concept of Hindu civilization. ... (Interruptions)...

श्री एस० एस० अहलुवालिया: सर, इन्होंने बार-बार बोला है। ... (व्यवधान)...

श्री उपसभापति: अहलुवालिया साहब, आप बैठ जाइये। ... (व्यवधान)... आजमी साहब, अगर आप नहीं बोलेंगे तो ... (व्यवधान)... I am seeing the watch. (Interruptions)

PROF. SAIF-UD-DIN SOZ: I will conclude within two minutes. See the clock.

† Transliteration of Urdu Script.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I am seeing the clock. It is before me. Please conclude now.

श्री रुद्रनारायण पणि: आपकी रूलिंग हो चुकी है।...(व्यवधान)... आपने कहा कि नथिंग विल गो ऑन रिकॉर्ड ... (व्यवधान)... आपकी रूलिंग हो चुकी है।...(व्यवधान)... मेरी बात भी रिकॉर्ड होनी चाहिए।...(व्यवधान)... मैं भी ... (व्यवधान)... इस देश के ... (व्यवधान)... .. इन लोगों के कारण विदेश में हमारी ... (व्यवधान)... पाकिस्तान से ... (व्यवधान)... हास हो चुका है ... (व्यवधान)...

PROF. SAIF-UD-DIN SOZ: Sir, I will conclude by just referring to a quotation. *(Interruptions)*

"I also found troublesome the way Islam fit into Jaswant's world view - or, more to the point, the way it seemed to be inherently at odds with his concept of Hindu civilisation."

एक माननीय सदस्य: माननीय उपसभापति जी, यह जो हो रहा है, यह गलत हो रहा है। ... (व्यवधान)...

प्रो० रामबख्श सिंह वर्मा: ये अनुशासनहीनता कर रहे हैं। ... (व्यवधान)...

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: That is over. ... *(Interruptions)*...

PROF. SAIF-UD-DIN SOZ:*

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Nothing will go on record.

PROF. SAIF-UD-DIN SOZ:*

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: What Mr. Soz said will not go on record. ... *(Interruptions)*... It is not going on record. Even if you speak, it will not go on record. आजमी साहब, आप बताइए ... (व्यवधान)... आप बोलिए। ... (व्यवधान)... आजमी साहब, आप बोलिए। आप जो बोलेंगे, केवल वही रिकॉर्ड में जाएगा। आपके लिए सिर्फ दो मिनट का समय है।

† श्री अबू आसिम आजमी: डिप्टी चेयरमैन साहब, मैं आपका बहुत शुक्रिया अदा करता हूँ कि आपने मुझे बोलने का मौका दिया। मैं दो मिनट में अपनी बात खत्म कर दूंगा। मैं फॉरेन मिनिस्टर को मुबारकबाद देते हुए कहना चाहता हूँ कि समाजवादी पार्टी इस उम्मीद के साथ इसका सपोर्ट कर रही है कि जो पिछले दस सालों से इस देश की नीति चल रही है, फॉरेन नीति चल रही है, उसमें

*Not recorded.

कुछ बदलाव जरूर होगा। सर, जवाहर लाल नेहरू जी, इंदिरा गांधी जी के ज़माने की जो हमारी फॉरेन नीतियां थीं, वे दस सालों से बिल्कुल बदल गयी हैं। नरसिंह राव जी के ज़माने से जो नीतियां शुरू हुई हैं, इस देश में रहने वाले बीस करोड़ मुसलमानों, इस देश के रहने वाले सेक्युलर हिन्दुओं को इस बात का बहुत दर्द है कि जो मुस्लिम कंट्रीज़ हैं, फलस्तीन जिसमें छोटे-छोटे बच्चे हैं, वहां पर किस तरह से आज ह्यूमेन राइट्स का वॉयलेशन हो रहा है और किस तरह से तोप और बंदूकें लेकर उनका मुकाबला किया जा रहा है। जहां मस्जिद-ए-आक्सा के ऊपर कब्ज़ा किया जा रहा है, उसमें नमाज़ नहीं होने दी जा रही है, ऐसी कंट्रीज़ के साथ हमारे मुल्क का जो राबता बढ़ रहा है, कांटेक्ट्स बढ़ रहे हैं, वहां से डिफेंस की जो डील हो रही है, हमें इस बात का बहुत दर्द है। मैं फॉरेन मिनिस्टर साहब से कहना चाहता हूं कि आपको आए छः महीने हुए हैं, कम से कम इस बात को आप जल्द से जल्द खत्म करें क्योंकि यहां रहने वाले बीस करोड़ मुसलमानों को इस बात की बहुत तकलीफ है।

आज जिस तरह से हमला हो रहा है, एक शायर ने लिखा है:

अच्छ ये तुमने खेल किया, खेल खेल में।

माचिस की तीली डाल दी, मिट्टी के तेल में।

बढ़ती हुई मशीनगन पीछे हट गयीं,

ताकत कहां से आ गयी इतनी गुलेल में?

देखा आपने, बच्चे गुलेल से लड़ाई कर रहे हैं और दूसरी तरफ मशीनगन चल रही हैं। मगर हमारा मुल्क इतना बड़ा मुल्क है, हमारी जो फॉरेन पॉलिसी है, हमारे नेता, जिन्होंने इस मुल्क को आज़ाद कराया था, उनकी बनायी हुई पॉलिसी को खत्म करके नरसिंह राव जी के ज़माने से एक ऐसी नफरत वाली पॉलिसी आ रही है कि उस मुल्क से हमारा कॉन्टेक्ट बढ़ रहा है इसलिए मैं कहना चाहता हूं कि वह पॉलिसी खत्म होनी चाहिए। आज हमारी पॉलिसी यह होनी चाहिए कि जो अरब कंट्रीज़ हैं, जो पाकिस्तान है, जो हमारे सार्क कंट्रीज़ हैं, इन मुल्कों से हमारा रवाबित बढ़ना चाहिए और अगर अरब कंट्रीज़ से हमारे रवाबित बढ़ेंगे, हमारे लोग वहां नौकरी करने जाएंगे, उनको नौकरियां मिलेंगी तो वहां से फॉरेन करेंसी आएगी, इस पर ज़ोर देना बहुत जरूरी है। जहां तक अमेरिका का सवाल है, अगर हिस्ट्री के पुराने पन्नों को उठाकर देखा जाए तो जब लाल बहादुर शास्त्री जी की हुकूमत थी, वे इस देश के प्रधानमंत्री थे, तब इस देश की पाकिस्तान से लड़ाई हुई थी। हमारी फौज़ पाकिस्तान में मीलों दूर तक घुसकर पाकिस्तान पर कब्ज़ा कर चुकी थी। लेकिन उस वक्त रूस का ज़माना चलता था। लाल बहादुर शास्त्री जी को ताशकंद में बुलाकर कहा गया कि जीती हुई ज़मीन वापस करो और अपने सिपाहियों को बुलाकर वापस ले जाओ।

अभी जब कारगिल की लड़ाई हुई, कारगिल में भी यही हुआ है। अब अमेरिका का ज़माना चल रहा था और नवाज़ शरीफ को बुलाकर कहा गया कि आप अपनी फौज को वापस ले जाओ और हिन्दुस्तान की ज़मीन वापस दो। इसलिए मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि दोनों मुल्क आपस में मिलना चाहते हैं।

मुहब्बत करने वालों में ये झगड़ा डाल देती है,
सियासत दोस्ती की जड़ में मट्टा डाल देती है।

दोनों मुल्कों के लोग मिलना चाहते हैं, लेकिन सियासी लोग उनको मिलने नहीं देना चाहते। हम चाहते हैं कि आप इस बारे में इतनी ज्यादा ट्रांसपेरेंसी लाइए कि पाकिस्तान और हिन्दुस्तान में आने-जाने के लिए खुले रास्ते हो जाएं। अगर यह हो जाए कि वीज़ा और पासपोर्ट भी खत्म हो जाए तो इससे अच्छी कोई और चीज़ नहीं हो सकती है। हमारे पड़ोसी मुल्कों से जितने ताल्लुकात बढ़ेंगे उतनी हमारे मुल्क में तरक्की होगी। इस बात को आपको मानना पड़ेगा। अमेरिका आज पूरी दुनिया में चिल्ला रहा है, 11 सितम्बर के वाक्ये के लिए। हमारी पार्लियामेंट पर जब हमला हुआ तो अमेरिका ने क्या किया? अमेरिका पूरी दुनिया में चिल्ला रहा है लेकिन मेरी इस बात को याद रखें कि

तुमने हर खेत में इंसा के सर बोए हैं,
अब ज़मीन खून उगलती है तो शिकवा कैसा।

उस इज़राइल को आपने हमेशा सपोर्ट किया है जो इज़राइल इस दुनिया में, फिलीस्तीन के अंदर आज तबाही और बरबादी कर रहा है। फिलीस्तीन में लोगों की ज़मीनें छीनकर कालोनियां बनाई जा रही हैं। इसलिए अमेरिका जब तक उसको सपोर्ट करेगा, मुझे लगता है कि इस तरह की आतंकवादी गतिविधियां, चाहने के बाद भी खत्म नहीं हो सकती हैं आतंकवाद का जन्म जुल्म और नाइंसाफी की कोख से होता है। जब तक जुल्म और नाइंसाफी खत्म नहीं होगी, आतंकवाद खत्म नहीं होगा।

महोदय, आपने मुझे बोलने के लिए वक्त दिया, लेकिन मैं माननीय नटवर जी से कहना चाहता हूँ कि लोगों की उम्मीदें लगी हुई हैं, हम आपको न चाहते हुए भी सपोर्ट कर रहे हैं। इसलिए सपोर्ट कर रहे हैं कि हम चाहते हैं कि वे लोग जो नफरत फैला रहे थे, वे चले गए हैं और हमें आपसे बड़ी उम्मीदें हैं। आप ऐसी फॉरेन पॉलिसी बनाइए कि कम से कम हमारे तमाम पड़ोसी मुल्कों से अच्छे ताल्लुकात हो जाएं। जो अमेरिका आज पूरी दुनिया में डेरर फैला रहा है, अमेरिका के मुकाबले में भारत एक बहुत बड़ी ताकत बन सकता है अगर हमारे तमाम सार्क कंट्रीज़ के साथ, अपने तमाम पड़ोसी मुल्कों के साथ अच्छे ताल्लुकात हों। इन शब्दों के साथ मैं अपनी बात खत्म करता हूँ।

شری ابو عاصم اعظمی ”اتر پردیش“ : ڈپٹی چیرمین صاحب، میں آپ کا بہت شکریہ ادا کرتا ہوں کہ آپ نے مجھے بولنے کا موقع دیا۔ میں دو منٹ میں اپنی بات ختم کر دوں گا۔ میں وزیر خارجہ کو مبارکباد دیتا ہوں کہ سماجوادی پارٹی اس امید کے ساتھ سپورٹ کر رہی ہے کہ جو پچھلے دس سالوں سے اس دیش کی نیقی چل رہی ہے فارین نیقی چل رہی ہے۔ اس میں کچھ بدلاؤ ضرور ہوگا۔ سر، جواہر لعل نہرو جی اندرا گاندھی کے زمانے کی جو ہمارے فارین نیقیات تھیں وہ دس سالوں سے بالکل بدل گئی ہیں۔ نرسہارا اوجی کے زمانے سے چ نیقیات شروع ہوئی ہیں، اس دیش میں بنے والے ۲۰ کروڑ مسلمانوں، اس دیش کے رہنے والے سیکولر ہندوؤں کو اس بات کا بہت درد ہے کہ جو مسلم کنٹریز ہیں، فلسطین جس میں چھوٹے چھوٹے بچے ہیں، وہاں پر کس طرح سے آج ہیومن رائٹس کا دایولیشن ہو رہا ہے اور کس طرح سے توپ اور بندوقس لیکران کا مقابلہ کیا جا رہا ہے۔ جہاں مسجد اقصیٰ کے اوپر قبضہ کیا جا رہا ہے، اس میں نماز نہیں ہونے دی جا رہی ہے، ایسی کنٹریز کے ساتھ ہمارے ملک جو راستہ رابطہ بڑھ رہا ہے، کنٹیکٹ بڑھ رہے ہیں وہاں کے ڈفینس کی جو ڈیل ہو رہی ہے، ہمیں اس بات کا بہت درد ہے۔ میں فارین منسٹر صاحب سے کہنا چاہتا ہوں کہ آپ آئے چھ مہینے ہوئے ہیں کم سے کم اس بات کو آپ جلد سے جلد ختم کریں کیوں کہ یہاں رہنے والے ۲۰ کروڑ مسلمانوں کو اس بات کی بہت تکلیف ہے۔ آج جس طرح سے حملہ ہو رہا ہے، ایک شاعر نے لکھا ہے۔

اچھا یہ تم نے کھیل کیا کھیل کھیل میں
ماچس کی تیلی ڈال دی مٹی کے جیل میں
بڑھتی ہوئی مشین گنیں پیچھے ہٹ گئیں
طاقت کہاں سے آگئی اتنی غلیل میں

دیکھا آپ نے، بچے غلیل سے لڑائی کر رہے ہیں اور دوسری طرف مشین گنیں چل رہی ہیں۔ مگر ہمارا ملک اتنا بڑا ملک ہے، ہماری جو فارین پالیسی ہے، ہمارے عیتا، جنہوں نے اس ملک کو آزاد کرایا تھا، ان کی بنائی ہوئی پالیسی کو ختم کر کے نرسہاراؤ جی کے زمانے سے ایک ایسی نفرت والی پالیسی آرہی ہے کہ اس ملک سے ہمارا کالمیکٹ بڑھ رہا ہے اس لئے میں کہنا چاہتا ہوں کہ وہ پالیسی ختم ہونی چاہئے۔ آج ہماری پالیسی یہ ہونی چاہئے کہ جو عرب کنٹریز ہیں، جو پاکستان ہے، جو ہمارے سارک کنٹریز ہیں، ان ملکوں سے ہمارے روابط بڑھنا چاہئے اور اگر عرب کنٹریز سے ہمارے روابط بڑھیں گے، ہمارے لوگ وہاں نوکری کرنے جائیں گے، ان کو نوکریاں ملیں گی تو وہاں سے فارین کرنسی آئے گی، اس پر زور دینا بہت ضروری ہے۔ جہاں تک امریکہ کا سوال ہے، اگر ہسٹری کے پرانے پتوں کو اٹھا کر دیکھا جائے تو جب لال بہادر شاستری جی کی حکومت تھی، وہ اس دیش کے پردھان منتری تھے، تب اس دیش کی پاکستان سے لڑائی ہوئی تھی۔ ہماری فوج پاکستان میں میلوں دور تک گھس کر پاکستان پر قبضہ کر چکی تھی۔ لیکن اس وقت روس کا زمانہ چلتا تھا۔ لال بہادر شاستری جی کو تاشقند میں بلا کر کہا گیا کہ جیتی ہوئی زمین واپس کر دو اور اپنے سپاہیوں کو بلا کر واپس لے جاؤ۔ ابھی جب کارگل کی لڑائی ہوئی، کارگل میں بھی یہی ہوا ہے۔ اب امریکہ کا زمانہ چل رہا تھا اور نواز شریف کو بلا کر کہا گیا کہ آپ اپنی فوج کو واپس لے جاؤ اور ہندستان کی جیتی ہوئی زمین واپس دو۔ اس لئے میں کہنا چاہتا ہوں کہ دون ملک آپس میں ملنا چاہئے ہیں۔

محبت کرنے والوں میں یہ جھگڑا ڈال دیتی ہے

سیاست دوستی کی جڑ میں مٹھا ڈال دیتی ہے

دونوں ملکوں کے لوگ ملنا چاہتے ہیں، لیکن سیاسی لوگ ان کو ملنے نہیں دینا چاہتے۔ ہم چاہتے ہیں کہ آپ اس بارے میں اتنی زیادہ ٹرانسپیرینسی لائیے کہ پاکستان اور ہندستان میں آنے

جانے کے لئے کھلے راستے ہو جائیں۔ اگر یہ ہو جائے کہ ویزا اور پاسپورٹ بھی ختم ہو جائے تو اس سے اچھی کوئی اور چیز نہیں ہو سکتی ہے۔ ہمارے پڑوسی ملکوں سے جتنے تعلقات بڑھیں گے، اتنی ہمارے ملک میں ترقی ہوگی۔ اس بات کو آپ کو ماننا پڑیگا۔ امریکہ آج پوری دنیا میں چلا رہا ہے، 11 ستمبر کے واقعہ کے لئے۔ ہماری پارلیمنٹ پر جب حملہ ہوا تو امریکہ نے کیا کیا؟ امریکہ پوری دنیا میں چلا رہا ہے لیکن میری اس بات کو یاد رکھیں کہ۔

تم نے ہر کھیت میں انسان کے سر بوئے ہیں

اب زمیں خون آگتی ہے تو شکوہ کیا

اس اسرائیل کو آپ نے ہمیشہ سپورٹ کیا ہے جو اسرائیل اس دنیا میں، فلسطین کے اندر آج تباہی اور بربادی کر رہا ہے فلسطین میں لوگوں کی زمینیں چھین کر کالونیاں بنائی جا رہی ہیں۔ اس لئے امریکہ جب تک اس کو سپورٹ کریگا، مجھے لگتا ہے کہ اس طرح کی آنک وادی گئی ودھیاں، چاہنے کے بعد بھی ختم نہیں ہو سکتی ہیں۔ آنک واد کا جنم ظلم اور نا انصافی کی کوکھ سے ہوتا ہے۔ جب تک ظلم اور نا انصافی ختم نہیں ہوگی، آنک واد ختم نہیں ہوگا۔

مہودے، آپ نے مجھے بولنے کے لئے وقت دیا، لیکن میں ماننے نورجی سے کہنا چاہتا ہوں کہ لوگوں کی امیدیں لگی ہوئی ہیں، ہم آپ کو نہ چاہتے ہوئے بھی سپورٹ کر رہے ہیں۔ اس لئے سپورٹ کر رہے ہیں کہ ہم چاہتے ہیں کہ وہ لوگ جو نفرت پھیلا رہے تھے، وہ چلے گئے ہیں اور ہمیں آپ سے بڑی امیدیں ہیں۔ آپ ایسی فارین پالیسی بنائیے کہ کم سے کم ہمارے تمام پڑوسی ملکوں سے اچھے تعلقات ہو جائیں۔ جو امریکہ آج پوری دنیا میں ٹیرر پھیلا رہا ہے، امریکہ کے مقابلے میں بھارت ایک بہت بڑی طاقت بن سکتا ہے اگر ہمارے تمام سارک کنٹریز کے ساتھ، اپنے تمام پڑوسی ملکوں کے ساتھ اچھے تعلقات ہوں۔ ان شہدوں کے ساتھ میں اپنی بات ختم کرتا ہوں۔

”ختم شد“

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Ashwani Kumar. You have five minutes only. The House will be adjourned at 7.30 P.M.

SHRI ASHWANI KUMAR: Mr Deputy Chairman, Sir, I don't think it is possible for any speaker to do justice to the foreign policy debate when the sword of guillotine is hanging over one's head. But I will make only three points with no illusion as to the satisfaction of myself and Members of the House that I have done justice to my brief. But let me, in four or five minutes, complete what I have to say.

Sir, we are debating this very important subject of the nation's foreign policy in a particular context. The context is the undisputed emergence of India's pre-eminent position in the comity of nations. This pre-eminent position of India is as much a product of the way we have pursued our foreign policy, the way our diplomacy has conducted itself, as it is of our inherent resilience as a nation. Foreign policy, in the ultimate analysis, is no more and no less than an extension of a nation's national agenda. Therefore, there are three non-negotiable principles on which the pursuit of a nation's foreign policy is perched. (a) Does it ensure independence of action? (b) Does it subserve the non-negotiable interests of a nation? (c) Does it secure the relevance of a country in the portals of power, in the corridors of power in the comity of nations? Sir, I beg to state that judged by all these three parameters, India's foreign policy has stood the test of time. We continue to remain relevant and that is exemplified in the visits that we are now seeing, of President Putin, Prime Ministers of Malaysia, Nepal and Pakistan, Foreign Ministers of Japan and France. There is no country which is not wishing to engage itself with India at the highest levels. That itself shows that this nation has ensured its relevance and our foreign policy is something we must take pride in.

Sir, the second point which I want to make is this. Are we pursuing our national agenda which is non-negotiable? The answer is "yes". While we must consolidate our relationship with our traditional allies, it must not thwart our independence of action in engaging with new friends and in soliciting new friends. Israel is a case in point. Our relationship with Western Asia must not prevent us from pursuing a relationship a constructive dialogue, with any nation, including Israel.

Sir, the third point is that foreign policy is as much a function of a nation's soft power as its hard power. We have always, perched our foreign

policy, since the days of Jawaharlal Nehru including Rajiv Gandhi's plan of disarmament, on moral imperative. So was the case in the days of Mrs. Indira Gandhi. But, at the same time, conscious of the ground realities, we have also pursued the hard power path and that is why we are today a nuclear power. A point was well made that India did not attain the nuclear capability overnight, not in five years or six years. It was a product of a process set in motion since the days of Apsara; these were the Jawaharlal Nehru-Homi Bhabha days. Therefore, it is only right to say that the foreign policy is a continuum. It must always remain a continuum. That is why it is based on national consensus. That is why Foreign Policy is kept above partisan politics and convention was breached when the distinguished former Foreign Minister stated in Israel that our policy towards Israel was captive to domestic politics. No, Sir. Our foreign policy has never been captive to domestic politics, but it has been captive to domestic interest and it will always remain captive to domestic interest, our overarching national interests. The distinguished External Affairs Minister is here. Nobody is better equipped to project India's foreign policy priorities. I would only ask the Minister for Foreign Affairs to take care the following. We need to strengthen the nexus between Russia, China and India just as we continue our dialogue with the United States. Our relations with Iran must improve. Sir, our neighbours must not live in fear of us. They should respect us. There should be a commonality and they should see India as someone who would come to their aid in time of need. Increased cooperation with Japan is an absolute imperative. This is the Asian Century. I invoke the doctrine of economic power as the final testament to our power. In this Asian Century, this decade must therefore be a decade of India-Japan axis. Japan is willing and prepared. Prime Minister Koizumi has gone on record to say that his most important visit will be a visit to India early next year, so has the Chinese Prime Minister who said, "He is looking forward to coming to India early next year." Sir, all these indicia demonstrate conclusively and decisively that India's foreign policy has delivered. Thank you.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: So the debate is concluded. The House is adjourned till 11.00 a.m. tomorrow.

The House then adjourned at thirty-two minutes past seven of the clock till eleven of the clock on Tuesday, the 21st December, 2004.