

Even in the month of April, the temperature in many places like Bhubaneswar, Jharsuguda, Sambalpur, etc. in the State of Orissa is more than 40 degree Celsius. One person died in Badchan block in Jaspur district of Orissa due to sun stroke. It may cross more than 48 degree Celsius this year. Hence, there is an apprehension of large scale deaths due to sun stroke. We all know that in the year 1997-98, around 4000 people died in Orissa due to sun stroke.

On the other hand, there is a scarcity of drinking water in all the districts of Western Orissa in addition to thirteen coastal districts and all districts of KBK district area. So, it is necessary to ensure safe drinking water, by way of digging deep tube wells. In all the villages, ponds and tanks are completely dry, there is no water to drink or for sanitary use. Even the cattle are dying because of the scarcity of water.

I, therefore, urge upon the Government of India to sanction a minimum amount of Rs. 100 crores immediately for making arrangement of drinking water in all districts, and also to meet the future challenge of any possible casualties due to sun stroke. If no suitable action is taken for the supply of safe drinking water in all the districts of Orissa, and if proper precautions against sun stroke are not taken, I am afraid, thousands of poor people may die. Thank you, Sir.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Shri Raj Kumar Dhoot; not available.

RESOLUTION ON IRAQ

श्री सभापति : "राष्ट्रीय भावनाओं को व्यक्त करते हुए यह सदन प्रभुसत्ता संपन्न इराक के विरुद्ध अमरीका के नेतृत्व में गठबंधन सेनाओं द्वारा की जा रही सैनिक कार्रवाई की निंदा करता है। इराक में सत्ता परिवर्तन करने हेतु की गई सैनिक कार्रवाई स्वीकार्य नहीं है। युद्ध के फलस्वरूप इराक के मासूम लोगों, विशेषकर महिलाओं और बच्चों की वेदनाएं एक गंभीर मानवीय मसला है। यह कार्रवाई संयुक्त राष्ट्र सुरक्षा परिषद की विशेष मंजूरी के बिना की गई है और यह संयुक्त राष्ट्र चार्टर के खिलाफ है। अतः यह सदन इराक के लोगों के लिए गंभीर संताप और गहन सहानुभूति प्रकट करता है।

यह सदन संतोष व्यक्त करता है कि संयुक्त राष्ट्र द्वारा इराक के संतापग्रस्त लोगों के लिए तत्काल मानवीय सहायता की अपील पर भारत ने नकद और सामग्री के माध्यम से 100 करोड़ रूपए की सहायता देने का फैसला किया है, जिसमें विश्व खाद्य कार्यक्रम के लिए 50 हजार मीट्रिक टन गेहूँ देना भी शामिल है और यह विश्वास करता है कि आवश्यकता पड़ने पर अतिरिक्त सहायता भी दी जाएगी।

यह सदन तत्काल युद्ध समाप्ति का आह्वान करता है और गठबंधन सेनाओं की शीघ्र वापसी की मांग करता है।

यह सदन संयुक्त राष्ट्र से इस बात की भी मांग करता है कि वह इराक की प्रभुसत्ता की रक्षा करे और यह सुनिश्चित करें कि इराक का पुनर्निर्माण संयुक्त राष्ट्र की देखरेख में हो।

SHRI K. NATWAR SINGH (Rajasthan): Mr. Chairman, Sir, I rise on behalf of my party to support the Resolution that you have just read out. Sir, some people may find shortcomings with this Resolution, but a unanimous Resolution of both Houses of Parliament has very great importance and significance. It reflects not only the views of the two Houses of this great Parliament of India, but we here, as Members of these two Houses, reflect the passions, the feelings and the emotions of the one billion people of India. Therefore, it is in the fitness of things that on such a grave issue Parliament has come out with a Resolution, which reflects the sentiments of our people. Sir, I have respect for the shrines of the minds of the people and I would like here to mention that the hon. Prime Minister and his two ministerial colleagues who are here, played a seminal role in producing a draft, which was acceptable to all of us. Now, we live in an era where events overtake ideas—diplomacy overtakes foreign policy. Hence, foreign policy must continuously be explained; must reflect national consensus. We have to have a clear, creative and flexible but not a pliant foreign policy. Parliament and the country must be told why a particular course has been adopted and this resolution reflects why this particular course has been adopted. Now we all want the closest possible relations with the United States, but we also expect that, as our friends, the United States should look for partnership of nations and not a hegemonistic relationship. What is happening in Iraq even today all of us have been witnessing the heart-rending scenes of massive bombardment by the latest technology that the American nation can employ. What is the objective of this continuous bombarding of Iraq? Who is suffering? It is the innocent people of Iraq, the children, the women, the old men and innocent civilians who are not involved in any military activity whatsoever. The aim, we are told again for the second time, of the bombardment is to assassinate the President of Iraq and his family. What does one say to this kind of a thing when the greatest power in history, the most powerful country, the richest country and technologically the most advanced country, which should be an example of responsibility and restraint, has undertaken this mass

slaughter of innocent human beings? This is contrary to the United Nations Charter. This is contrary to all the values human beings stand for. Now the reason for the war was that Iraq possesses weapons of mass destruction. That was the principal reason given apart from the assassination of the Head of the State of Iraq. Now Mr. Saddam Hussein's fate is not known. But it is now quite clear that weapons of mass destruction have not been discovered so far. So, what is the legitimacy of this war? If weapons of mass destruction had been discovered, then I would have been speaking in a different language. But the fact of the matter is, with all the resources that they have to find out if there are any weapons of mass destruction, the attacking forces have not been able to find out any weapons of mass destruction. So, the legitimacy of the war has been destroyed. We have been saying from the very beginning that it was contrary to the U.N. Charter. I have got a copy of the U.N. Charter with me. I do not want to read out portions from it. But, it is quite clear that articles 1, 39, 41 and 51 have been totally ignored. The United States is a Founder Member of the U.N. and so are we. We were a Member of the League of Nations even as a part of the British Empire, and we became a Founder-Member. Other countries had to apply for its membership. We did not apply. So, being a Founder-Member, we have a voice and a role, and that is why, I attach the highest importance to the Resolution that has been adopted in the other House and will be adopted by this House.

Now, we have heard a great deal about a Coalition. I do not know whether the hon. Members are aware of the fact who constitute this Coalition. Apart from the important countries, which are Australia, Italy, Japan, Kuwait, Netherlands, Poland, Singapore, South Korea, Turkey, United Kingdom and United States, the others are Albania, Angola, Azerbaijan, Costa Rica, Czech Republic, Dominican Republic, El Salvador, Eritrea, Estonia, Georgia, Honduras, Iceland, Latvia, Lithuania, Macedonia, Marshall Islands. Does anybody know where the Marshall Islands are? Micronesia, Nicaragua, Palau. Palau is apparently a country. Then, Panama, Portugal, Rwanda, Slovakia, Solomon Islands, Tonga. We have very good relations with Tonga. It is in the Coalition. Then Ukraine, Uganda, Uzbekistan. This is the great Coalition, which we are supposed to applaud.

Sir, first of all, our hearts go out to the valiant and brave people of Iraq, and I think the entire House will express its profound grief and

[9 April, 2003]

RAJYA SABHA

anguish as this Resolution mentions. Now, I would like to mention one or two things, which are of grave concern, and I am sure, the distinguished External Affairs Minister will throw some light on this. I might also mention that America's close neighbours, Canada and Mexico, have not joined the Coalition. Canada is next door to America, so is Mexico. They have not joined this Coalition. The distinguished External Affairs Minister had made a statement about pre-emptive strike. He has said that logically the United States could take pre-emptive action against Iraq, India would be justified in taking pre-emptive action, and have a pre-emptive strike against Pakistan. Now, I have regard and affection for you. I do not know whether you had thought this through or not. But, I think, you might have created difficulties for yourself, because if you take your argument to the logical end, then you are justifying the American intervention. I do not think this was your intention because if you say that we can take a similar action, that means, you are justifying the Americans' attack. That is not your intention. That is not the intention of this Resolution. But, this is what the White House says. Maybe, you might have not thought this through, and I would be grateful and the House would appreciate if you could enlighten us on this as to the reasons why you made this statement. You are a cautious and careful person and that is to be welcomed. Now, one other thing that all of us are deeply concerned about is the observations of the distinguished Secretary of State of United States, Mr. Collin Powell. He said that after the conclusion of this horrible war in Iraq, the United States would turn its attention to India and Pakistan with regard to Jammu and Kashmir. The exact words are available with you in the Ministry of External Affairs and are also available to some of us. On the 12th of March, when we discussed this issue in this very House, I mentioned "who next, when next" and knowing that the United States has responded promptly to your suggestion of India having the right to have pre-emptive strike. They have rejected your point of view and their view was that there was an overwhelming difference between the situation in Iraq and the situation in Jammu and Kashmir. Therefore, India is not entitled to make pre-emptive strike. I mean the United States is not in a position to make policy decisions for India and that is for you to deal with this particular matter with the United States, the White House, the State Department. But what we are concerned with, and, I am sure, you are also concerned with here is that suppose the

President of the United States were to write to the Prime Minister of India and the President of Pakistan to say that both the countries should sit down and find a solution for, what they call the 'dispute' on Jammu and Kashmir. We do not consider it a dispute. The whole of Jammu and Kashmir is a part of India. I would like to know the views of the Government, because this is not a figment of my imagination. If you read the security document issued by some in the United States last year, whatever is being done in Iraq and other countries is only a prelude to what they intend to do in other countries and Mr. Rumsfeld has made it quite clear that Iraq is being taken care of and if we find evidence that Syria has been helping Iraq, Syria will also have to face the consequences and the axis of evil also includes Iran and North Korea. Now, I do not want to take much time of the House discussing the merits of what American policy is in North Korea for obvious reasons, because it is not as simple as walking into Iraq, to take on North Korea with China next door and South Korea, not even two minutes flight. But I think the country would like to know and the House would like to be assured that in such an eventuality, what would be your reaction? The American mood is—if I may use a religious term—'evangelical fervour' of President Bush who has invoked God to his side, now we all believe in God, but it is for the first time probably in 80-90 years that this 'evangelical' zeal to shape the world in the manner they want the world to be, to say the least, is a matter of deep concern and must alarm all of us. Especially, in the last few years our relations with United States of America have improved. The process was started by Mrs. Indira Gandhi and carried forward by Mr. Rajiv Gandhi, Mr. Narsimha Rao, Dr. Manmohan Singh and now Prime Minister Vajpayee and his colleagues. Therefore, I think, since we are friends—I know that we are discussing matters with the United States which we have not been discussing with them during the last 50 years—there is a willingness, on both sides, to speak to each other frankly and to share our anxieties and concerns with our American friends. We are entitled to do so because we consider ourselves as their friends. So, I think the House would be interested to know whether you applied your mind to this particular possibility, which, as I said, is not a figment of my imagination. You would, probably, be facing this situation in a few weeks or a few months ahead. Now, I have no doubt that no Government of India will accept this kind of a situation or dictat howsoever well meaning it may

be. Why I am saying this is. We were told for a number of months by your predecessor that there had been a paradigm change in Indo-US relations. Now, if there has been a paradigm change, why are the United States still persisting in their view that they consider Pakistan as their stalwart ally? President Musharraf made a speech on 12th January last year where he gave an undertaking to the whole world that he would not allow the soil of Pakistan to be used for exporting terrorism anywhere in the world including part of India, that is, Jammu and Kashmir. But he has not fulfilled these promises. The United States say that it has not been able to persuade President Musharraf to stop cross-border terrorism in Jammu and Kashmir. Now, the same United States was able to persuade President Musharraf in October, 2001, on their invading Afghanistan, President Musharraf made a 360 degree turn and changed Pakistan's fundamental policy regarding Talibans. If the Americans could persuade the Pakistan Government and the Pakistan President to make such a fundamental change in Pakistan's policy with regard to Afghanistan and Taliban, why are they not able to persuade President Musharraf that he must, in the larger interest of peace and tranquillity in the Indian subcontinent, stop cross-border terrorism? We would be very grateful to you if you could take the House into confidence and tell us whether these matters have been taken up with them and whether you were satisfied with the response you had.

While concluding, I would like to mention one more thing. The Prime Minister was good enough to tell us, both here and in the all-party meeting, that he had been in touch with the five Permanent Members of the Security Council. I think it was before the Iraq war started. The House will be interested to know, I am sure, whether the Prime Minister had any conversations, in the last few days, with Mr. Kofi Annan, President Jacques Chirac, President Vladimir Putin, Chancellor Gerhard Schroeder, Mr. Hu Jintao of China, Dr. Mohammad Mahathir and other non-aligned leaders. Newspaper reports say that Mr. Kofi Annan, President Chirac, Chancellor Schroeder and President Putin will be meeting in St. Petersburg some time this week or early next week to take up the issue of post-war Iraq.

Now, the Resolution has mentioned that the Government of India has given Rs. 100 crores in cash and 50,000 metric tons of wheat. I don't know what is the amount in terms of rupees is for the wheat. But I think it is a substantial amount and more is needed.

Obviously, there is a difference of opinion. Yesterday, the President of America and the Prime Minister of the United Kingdom met in Belfast in the Northern Ireland where the United States said—it was a great relief to all of us who heard it—that the United Nations will play a pivotal role in post-war Iraq developments. But we also know that when it comes to reconstruction process, certain companies have already been allocated their share. That is not going to solve the problems of Iraq because you know as Finance Minister that Iraq has a debt of nearly \$ 380 billion. Add to it \$ 100 billion for reconstruction, add to it the cost for telecommunications, road construction, etc. We are talking in terms of seven to eight hundred billion dollars. Where is it going to come from or is it all going to be given to a particular country's companies?

I think, it is important that in this exercise, India be in touch with the five permanent members of the Security Council, with the Secretary General of the United Nations and with the senior leaders of Non-Aligned Movement so that the views of a large part of the world are conveyed at the highest level. It is not necessary for us to be hard on words, but we have to be hard on facts. We want to know that if the new international order is to be formulated by the United States, without consultation with anybody else, then, we are living in a world, which is much worse than the world of 19th century, or, the earlier part of the 20th century. This should be done in the name of democracy and of the value system, which is spelt out in inspiring and soaring language in the American declaration of independence.

I think, it will be right to say that the spirit and the letter of the American Constitution are being violated and this is not being said by me, or, anybody else, but by senior Members of the American Congress. So, once again, I thank you for giving me this opportunity to speak on this very important decision that the Parliament has taken to have a unanimous resolution on the illegal and unjustified war in Iraq.

श्री मुख्तार अब्बास नकवी (उत्तर प्रदेश) : सभापति महोदय, धन्यवाद । आज इराक पर अमरीका के हमले के संबंध में संसद के दोनों सदनों में निश्चित तौर से जो प्रस्ताव कल लोक सभा ने पास किया, आज हम यहां इस पर चर्चा कर रहे हैं । यह महत्वपूर्ण है । आज सवाल केवल इराक पर अमरीका या ब्रिटेन के हमले का नहीं है । मैं आदरणीय नटवर सिंह जी की बात से सहमत हूँ कि सभी देशों से मित्रता का माहोल बरकरार रखना चाहिए, आगे बढ़ाते

रहना चाहिए। आज अमरीका ने इराक पर हमला किया और हमले का कारण रासायनिक हथियार और लोगो को सत्ता सौंपने की बात बताई गई है। इराक के पास आज तक रासायनिक हथियार नहीं मिले हैं। जो हथियार निरीक्षक रहे हैं, इससे पहले 1991 और 1998 तक जो संयुक्त राष्ट्र के हथियार निरीक्षक रहे हैं, उनके प्रमुख स्काट रिट्टर ने स्पष्ट रूप से कहा है कि इराक के महाविनाश के हथियार और उसके निर्माण की क्षमता 95 प्रतिशत तक समाप्त हो चुकी है। 1991 और 1998 के बीच में जो इराक में संयुक्त राष्ट्र के निरीक्षकों के प्रमुख थे, यह उनका कहना है। उसके बाद भी 1998 में इराक पर अमरीका हमले के बाद भी जो शस्त्र निरीक्षक वहां गए थे उनके प्रधान हैन्स ब्लिंक्स भी अपनी रिपोर्ट में स्पष्ट रूप से कह चुके थे कि इराक में विनाश के हथियार नहीं हैं। महोदय, यही नहीं खुद अमरीकी राष्ट्रीय सुरक्षा परिषद के सदस्य, डैनियल बेंजामिन ने अपने न्यूयार्क टाइम्स में प्रकाशित लेख में स्पष्ट रूप से कहा कि अल – कायदा और इराक के स्वाभाविक संबंध नहीं हो सकते। क्योंकि अल – कायदा आतंकवाद पर विश्वास करता है, अल – कायदा अलगाववाद पर विश्वास करता है, अल – कायदा तोड़ – फोड़ में विश्वास करता है और इराक आज भी सैक्युलर मान्यताओं पर विश्वास कर रहा है। सभापति जी, मैं आदरणीय नटवर सिंह जी की बात सुन रहा था। उन्होंने अपनी पार्टी की तरफ से विचार रखे हैं। निश्चित तौर पर मैंने जो उनके विचार समझे हैं, उनमें यही है कि उन्होंने विदेश मंत्री से कई सवाल पूछे हैं। लेकिन उनकी पार्टी की इस पूरे मुद्दे पर क्या नीति है, क्या विचार है, यह मुझे खास तौर से समझ में नहीं आया है। इराक पर हमले को उनकी पार्टी किस मूड में है, उनकी पार्टी क्या कहना चाहती है, यह भी समझ में नहीं आया है।

आदरणीय सभापति जी, ग्यारह सितम्बर को पेंटागन और वर्ल्ड ट्रेड सेंटर पर आतंकवादी हमला हुआ। उस आतंकवादी हमले के बाद अमरीका ने आतंकवाद के खिलाफ अंतर्राष्ट्रीय युद्ध छेड़ने की बात की। उसके अंतर्राष्ट्रीय आतंकवाद के खिलाफ युद्ध को पूरी दुनिया ने समर्थन दिया। भारत और भारत के लोगों ने सबसे पहले उस अंतर्राष्ट्रीय आतंकवाद में खिलाफ युद्ध का समर्थन किया। इसलिए नहीं किया कि अमरीका के इस आह्वान से, अमरीका के इस नारे से भारत में जो आतंकवाद चल रहा है, पाक प्रायोजित आतंकवाद का खात्मा होने वाला है। हम दो दशकों से उन आतंकवादियों से लड़ रहे हैं, उन्हें कुचल रहे हैं, उन्हें तबाह कर रहे हैं और आगे भी करेंगे। हमें इसमें कोई मदद नहीं मिलने वाली थी। हमें केवल यह राहत मिली थी कि अमरीका, जो जाने – अनजाने में पाकिस्तान की आतंकवादी हरकतों को कहीं न कहीं प्रत्यक्ष या परोक्ष रूप से समर्थन दे रहा है, हो सकता है कि उसके इस समर्थन में कमी आए। हो सकता है कि उसे यह महसूस हो कि आतंकवाद का दर्द क्या होता है। हो सकता है कि उसे यह महसूस हो कि हिन्दुस्तान, जो दो दशकों से आतंकवाद से लड़ रहा है। पाकिस्तान प्रायोजित आतंकवाद को झेल रहा है, वह क्या होता है। लेकिन मुझे अफसोस के साथ कहना

पड़ता है कि आतंकवाद के विरुद्ध युद्ध खत्म नहीं हुआ है। क्या अल – कायदा खत्म हो गया है ? क्या पूरी दुनिया में आतंकवाद की समस्या खत्म हो गई ? वह समाप्त नहीं हुई है। उसका जो आव्हान था, जो नारा था – उसने कहा था कि पूरी दुनिया में आतंकवाद के खिलाफ एक युद्ध होना चाहिए, व आज भी अधूरा है। इस बीच इराक पर अमरीका और ब्रिटेन का हमला हुआ। मैं केवल यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि ब्रिटेन और अमरीका का इराक पर जो हमला हुआ है, उसमें पूरी दुनिया को जो सबसे बड़ा नुकसान, सबसे बड़ा धक्का लगा है, वह उस नारे को लगा है जिसमें उसने ग्लोबल फाइट अगेंस्ट टेरोरिज्म की बात कही थी इससे कई तरह के प्रश्न चिह्न, कई तरह के सवालिया निशान लग गए हैं कि उसकी आतंकवाद के खिलाफ लड़ाई क्या है ? जब तक उसकी सुविधा के अनुसार आतंकवाद होता रहे, तब वह आतंकवाद आतंकवाद नहीं है लेकिन जब उसकी सुविधा के अनुसार आतंकवाद न हो तब वह आतंकवाद हो जाए। सभापति जी, मुझे लगता है कि यह एक महत्वपूर्ण सवाल है। आज पूरी दुनिया यह महसूस कर रही है कि पहला ऐसा युद्ध है जिसमें पूरी दुनिया में लोग इतनी मजबूती और आक्रोश के साथ इसके विरोध में खड़े हुए हैं। इसके विरोध में समर्थन में कहीं से आवाज नहीं उठ रही है, लेकिन इसके विरोध में लोगों की आवाज मजबूती के साथ गूँज रही है। मैं मानता हूँ कि अमरीका की इस कार्रवाई से यू.एन. की स्थिति पर कई तरह के सवाल खड़े हुए हैं। उसकी सेनटीटी को नुकसान पहुंचाने की कोशिश की गई है। आज दुनिया को इस बात को समझाना होगा कि क्या इस तरह की कार्रवाइयां विश्वशांति के लिए या आतंकवाद को कुचलने में सहायक हो सकती हैं या ये आतंकवाद को और कहीं न कहीं बल देती हैं। मानवता को कहीं न कहीं नुकसान पहुंचाती हैं।

आज रासायनिक हथियारों को खत्म करने की बात कही गई है लेकिन आज तक रासायनिक हथियार कहीं नहीं मिले हैं। आज भी कहा जा रहा है कि वहां रासायनिक हथियार ढूंढे जा रहे हैं। मुझे लगता है कि इस तरह की जो सोच है उससे पूरी दुनिया और भारत के लोगों में कई तरह की शंकाएं पैदा हुई हैं। अभी आदरणीय नटवर सिंह जी ने पाकिस्तान की बात की। पाकिस्तान के बारे में अमरीकी विदेश मंत्री द्वारा जो सवाल उठाए गए, उसके बारे में जो वक्तव्य दिया गया उसकी बात की, उसका जवाब विदेश मंत्री जी अवश्य देंगे। मैं केवल इतना पूछना चाहता हूँ कि आज पाकिस्तान में जो आतंकवाद की फैक्ट्री फल – फूल रही है, पाकिस्तान जो आज पूरी दुनिया का सबसे बड़ा आतंकवाद का संक्षर्ण केन्द्र बना हुआ है, क्या अमरीका को वह आतंकवाद का संक्षर्ण केन्द्र नजर नहीं आ रहा है ? आतंकवाद की वह फैक्ट्री पाकिस्तान में आज भी फल फूल रही है, बढ़ रही है। वहां से रोज आतंकवादी पैदा हो रहे हैं। आज भी तमाम सबूत मिले हैं कि अल – कायदा की गतिविधियां पाकिस्तान में चल रही हैं, जैश – ए – मुहम्मद की गतिविधियां पाकिस्तान में जारी हैं। क्या अमरीका और ब्रिटेन को वह नजर नहीं आ रहा है? आतंकवाद की फैक्ट्री को खत्म करने के बजाय, आतंकवाद पर काबू करने के बजाय,

अभी अमरीका ने पाकिस्तान के एक अरब डॉलर के ऋण को माफ किया है। यह आतंकवाद खत्म हो रहा है या आतंकवाद की फैक्टरी को बढ़ावा मिल रहा है ? आज यह एक ऐसा सवाल है जो कि तमाम लोगो के लिए है और बहुत महत्वपूर्ण सवाल है। भारतीय जनता पार्टी ने सब से पहले ...**(व्यवधान)**...

श्री सभापति : बोलने दीजिए, बोलने दीजिए।

श्री मुख्तार अब्बास नकवी : भारतीय जनता पार्टी की राष्ट्रीय कार्य समिति ने सब से पहले इस अमेरिका कार्यवाही की निंदा की है और कहा था कि युद्ध तुरन्त समाप्त किया जाना चाहिए। संबंधित पक्ष संयुक्त राष्ट्र के ढांचे के अंतर्गत शांतिपूर्ण राजनीतिक समाधान ढूँढ़ने का प्रयास करें। ...**(व्यवधान)**... अंतर्राष्ट्रीय समुदाय इराक से परामर्श करके इराक के कष्ट पीड़ित लोगो के लिए तेजी से मानवीय सहायता भेजने के लिए तुरन्त कदम उठाए। इराक की संप्रभुता और अखंडता बनाए रखी जाए। अपना राजनीतिक भविष्य और अपने प्राकृतिक संसाधनों पर नियंत्रण रखने के इराकी लोगो के अधिकार का पूरा सम्मान होना चाहिए। यह भारतीय जनता पार्टी का स्पष्ट मत है। इस प्रस्ताव में हमने स्पष्ट रूप से सीधी लाइन ली है और स्पष्ट शब्दों में कहा है कि देशों की संप्रभुता की रक्षा होनी चाहिए। हमने कहा है कि मानव अधिकारों की रक्षा होनी चाहिए। हमने कहा है कि जो मानव अधिकारों का हनन हो रहा है जो बेगनाहों का खून बह रहा है, वह रुकना चाहिए। निश्चित तौर से भारतीय जनता पार्टी ने अपनी राष्ट्रीय कार्य समिति में जो प्रस्ताव पास किया है उससे पार्टी की नीति और पार्टी के विचार इस पूरे मुद्दे पर स्पष्ट है।

सभापति जी, आज जब हथियारों की बात होती है और हथियारों के खत्म करने की बात होती है, तो मुझे कभी – कभी लगता है कि मॉस डिस्ट्रैक्शन का खतरा आज हथियारों से है या उन लोगो से है, जो कि यूएनओ की भावनाओं की कहीं न कहीं अवहेलना कर रहे हैं और उसके अधिकारों को कहीं न कहीं नुकसान पहुंचा रहे हैं। आज खतरा उन लोगो से है जो कि अपने हितों के लिए मानव अधिकारों की कहीं न कहीं अनदेखी कर रहे हैं, अपने स्वार्थ के लिए आतंकवाद का खतरा दिखा कर, रासायनिक हथियारों का खतरा दिखा कर, मानवीय मूल्यों को नुकसान पहुंचा रहे हैं। मैं अपनी बात खत्म करने से पहले कहना चाहूंगा कि आज दुनिया में बदलाव आया है। अमरीका की इस कार्यवाही से आज सारी दुनिया में बहुत ज्यादा आक्रोश है, वहीं सभी देशों ने बहुत संभल – संभल कर इस पर अपनी अधिकारिक प्रतिक्रिया व्यक्त की है। यहां तक कि जो अरब देश सब से ज्यादा प्रभावित है उन्होंने भी इसके विरोध में कडी या स्पष्ट प्रतिक्रिया व्यक्त नहीं की है। मैं सरकार द्वारा इस दिशा में शुरू से व्यक्त की गई प्रतिक्रिया को बिल्कुल ठीक मानता हूँ और यह मानता हूँ कि अपने राष्ट्रीय हितों की रक्षा होनी चाहिए। मैं मानता

हूँ कि आज जो हालत है इराक में आज जो अमरीका और ब्रिटेन की फौजों ने हमले किए हैं, निश्चित तौर से उससे सभी लोगों को पीड़ा हुई है और सभी लोग दुखी हैं। लेकिन मुझे लगता है कि सरकार इस दिशा में कदम उठा रही है। इस दिशा में उसने जो स्टैंड लिया है वह राष्ट्रीय हितों को सर्वोपरि रखते हुए लिया गया है और आज दुनिया के सभी देश इस तरह के स्टैंड ले रहे हैं। हम अपनी पार्टी की तरफ से इस प्रस्ताव का समर्थन करते हैं।

SHRI C. RAMACHANDRAIAH (Andhra Pradesh): Sir, I rise to support this Resolution on Iraq. On behalf of my Party, Telugu Desam, I convey deep sense of anguish and concern over the ongoing American and British naked aggression on Iraq. Sir, this is like bolting the stables after the horses have fled. And, the entire world has become a mute spectator, including our country. Ignoring the requests from more than hundred countries, the U.S.A. and U.K. have decided unilaterally to invade a sovereign country like Iraq under the pretext to change the Saddam Hussein regime. And the reason that has been given is that Iraq possesses Weapons of Mass Destruction, inspite of the United Nations' inspectors making a statement that no such weapons could be found, the allies led by the United States have indulged in this sort of adventurism. Sir, in this span of 50 years, I was always dreaming* that we should not be threatened with the return of the world order where the mighty could subjugate the weak and prey on them. We have been at the receiving end for centuries together. Lodhis, Khiljis, Sayyads, bahamains, Tughalaqs, they have all invaded this country, and after them, the Portuguese, the Dutch and the East India Company, all foreigners rules this country, and we had been put to a lot of subjugation, and they have been maintaining sovereignty over this country. And, we had lost renaissance; we had lost two great industrial revolutions. And we should have known the value of the country's sovereignty, individual freedom. What I am trying to say is, we should have reacted long time back. That is why I say, it is like bolting the stables after the horses have left. There is absolutely no justification for waging this war, excepting to serve a warning to the world, "We are the real bosses, and we can dictate everything in the world." There is no parallel to this sort of naked aggression. And , the U.S., by staging this war has taken the world to the medieval age. Sir, the U.S. has got a history. It was responsible for the creation of multilateral agencies at the global level. It is the United States which has played a role in creating institutions like the World Bank, United Nations and the I.M.F., and it is the United States, which was responsible for signing the Atlantic Treaty on

[9 April, 2003]

RAJYA SABHA

14th August, 1941. We may kindly recall the history that when President Roosevelt was asked to participate in the World War, he said, "Why should we do it? How do I convince my People? Then, he sought an assurance that after this World War, the British would declare independence of all the colonies under its rule. In fact, that was one of the turning points in India's freedom movement. What I am trying to say is, such a mighty country, such a country which has been giving more importance to democratic values, which has been championing the free market and concepts like globalisation, and a country which seeks a level-playing field in all respects, in all walks of life, such a country is indulging in violation of international law. It is a matter of grave concern, no matter how meritorious and justified the reasons that are being extended. This is a blot on our foreign policy also. It reads in the newspapers the Foreign Minister's statement that what the U.S. has done to Iraq, we should do to Pakistan. Now, has it got a bearing in our foreign policy in future, or, is the Government justifying what the U.S. has done in Iraq? And, do you want to replicate it in Pakistan? Sir, there were some concessions in our Foreign Policy earlier. I regret to say that inconsistencies have become the hallmark of our Foreign Policy in recent years, for which the nation is paying the price. What prompted the External Affairs Minister to say what the US did on Iraq, India can do on Pakistan? Sir, I have seen the rebuttal also from the State Department and the White House. Never, have we been treated with such a snubbing, I should say. They never dared to treat India with such a statement! Can I presume that there is some element of impracticability in our Foreign Policy, or our diplomacy to assess the situation and act promptly? Sir, I heard the Prime Minister saying that war was not going to break out. But ultimately it broke out and it is now going to be concluded. But that statement has been made on the wrong inputs that have been provided by the Ministry of External Affairs, Sir, what I am trying to say is, what is the consideration that the Government of India has got in condemning it now, or, not condemning it early, or, giving an impression by saying that we can also indulge in adventurism as America has done it on Iraq? What is the Government's intention? If the Government wants to have such an adventure then, why have you withdrawn our forces from the border after a period of ten months? Sir, these are all confusions which the people are living in. This has to be clarified by the Government.

SHRI DIPANKAR MUKHERJEE (West Bengal): This is all for domestic consumption.. *.(Interruptions)*

SHRI C. RAMACHANDRAIAH: Sir, for today, Saddam is not the factor, it is only a factor. It is not the factor; the factor is Bushism. He has become a tyrant in this world. His propensity to be the global sheriff should ring alarm bells in our minds, because the US has been generally toeing the Pakistan line in Kashmir and, recently I read in newspapers that they have waived more than a billion dollars. We have been pleading with the Government of India, if at all we are defending America, you try to influence the United States, not to finance Pakistan, which is financing in turn the ISI and which is indulging in and abetting all sorts of terrorism in this country and, which is responsible for cross-border terrorism in our country. Sir, I do not see much substance in passing a Resolution at this stage, but we are supporting it. Materially, it does not make much difference except showing our solidarity with the victims of the genocide that has happened. But let us have a clear Foreign Policy to subserve our national interest, in a realistic way and, accept providing relief to those innocent people who have been affected by this war. I request the Government. We have 50 million tonnes of buffer stock, 50,000 tonnes is a pittance. Let us be very generous and spend as maximum an amount as possible to alleviate the sufferings of these people. Sir, with these remarks, I fully support this Resolution on Iraq.

श्री सभापति : सदन की कार्यवाही दो बजे तक के लिए स्थगित की जाती है।

The House then adjourned for lunch at one of the clock.

The House reassembled after lunch at two of the clock, MR. CHAIRMAN in the Chair.

श्री सभापति : माननीय सदस्यगण, जिस प्रस्ताव पर अभी सदन में चर्चा हो रही है, वह सर्वसम्मति का प्रस्ताव है और उसको चेयर की तरफ से रखा गया है। चेयर की तरफ से यदि कोई प्रस्ताव रखा जाता है तो उस पर किसी प्रकार की चर्चा हो, इसका कोई औचित्य नहीं है, लेकिन सदन के माननीया सदस्यों का आग्रह था कि हम इस पर चर्चा करना चाहते हैं, इसके कारण अनुमति दी गई। इस चर्चा में यदि हम इस प्रस्ताव के बाहर की बातें लाएंगे तो इस प्रस्ताव का महत्व अपने आप खत्म हो जाएगा ऐसी स्थिति में माननीय सदस्य जो बोले, इस प्रस्ताव के आधार पर ही बोलें। यह सर्वसम्मति का प्रस्ताव है और इस पर सब लोग चर्चा करें, इसकी आवश्यकता भी नहीं है। एक – एक पार्टी के एक – एक सदस्य इस पर बोल लें और इंडिपेंडेंट्स की

[9 April, 2003]

RAJYA SABHA

तरफ से एक माननीय सदस्य बोल लें तो मैं समझता हूँ कि इस चर्चा पर जो निर्णय सदन का होना है, वह निर्णय निश्चित रूप से होगा इसलिए इस बात को ध्यान में रखते हुए श्री नीलोत्पल बसु जी अब इस पर बोलेंगे।

SHRI NILOTPAL BASU (West Bengal): Sir, it gives us extreme satisfaction that, notwithstanding the avoidable delay, the fact that the hon. Chairman has moved the Resolution—which, I am sure, is going to be supported by the entire House, which represents not only the political spectrum of this country, but also, overwhelmingly, mirrors the national opinion and the public mood in this country—goes to show the maturity and the resilience of our parliamentary system.

Having said that, we have to also to consider that the kinds of issues and political processes that have been thrown up as a result of the unilateral invasion by US—led forces in Iraq, have ramifications which will lead to developments in the future, which will engage our attention, and which will also require our national response in the future.

Therefore, while agreeing with the suggestion of the hon. Chairman that normally the Members speaking here should try to confine to the Resolution, I think reference to issues, which are pregnant in the formulation of the Resolution will indeed, come in for the consideration; a sharing of the concerns and experiences of different parties will have to be articulated, which, I think, will not weaken but actually strengthen the Resolution.

Now, Sir, why was there the need for this Resolution? As the hon. Members of this House will recall, some of us had raised the need for adoption of such a Resolution in the first half of the Budget Session but, somehow, there was an understanding among a section of the House that adoption of such a Resolution will inhibit the diplomatic latitude, the diplomatic elbow-room that was needed by the Government to intervene in the situation. But, nevertheless, we had discussed that issue in this House on 12th of March, and it was the hon. Prime Minister, who at that point of time had very emphatically and unequivocally reassured this House that a military action will never take place. But, notwithstanding that reassurance, some of us had said that the tendency that was already on evidence suggests otherwise. Therefore, it is very vital for the Indian Parliament to express itself in very unambiguous terms because the problem is, the Iraq developments have shown failure of global diplomacy. Had the sequence of evidence underscored the need for greater diplomatic

efforts, we would have tended to agree with the Government at that point of time. But the Iraq crisis underlined the very failure of global diplomacy which is leading to apprehensions about the relevance of the U.N. system itself. If one analyses the sequence of events, which is being detailed out, not only by the critics of America, but even by the media in the United States itself has pointed out that there is a very, very disturbing trend in what is happening.

Sir, I refer to an article in the Time magazine, dated 31st March where they have given the graphical accounts—why the U.S. Administration have targeted Iraq and what is the political and ideological basis of this attack. There, it has been pointed out that one of the Deputy Secretaries of the U.S. Administration, Mr. Paul Wolfowitz, who represents and reflects the core of neo-conservative political thoughts has been a person who has been instrumental in shaping the U.S. policy towards Iraq, and how he has won over important Administration officials like the Vice-President, Mr. Dick Cheney and the Defence Secretary, Mr. Donald Rumsfeld. If one goes into the core of the theory of neo-conservatism, one finds a chilling similarity with what was articulated in terms of Nazism in the mid-30s, the same concept of supremacy of master race, the articulation for the need to accept American way of life, for the acceptance of the American values as the prerequisite for stability and collective security of the world. This is something which poses a grave threat which goes beyond Iraq. Therefore, Mr. Chairman, Sir, with the greatest deference to your wish that one need not go beyond the words of the text of the Resolution, one has to refer to these implications which will affect particularly countries like India. We would like to point out that this kind of unilateral aggression is actually knocking out at the very foundational principles of international jurisprudence. For example, the justification of this aggression. Americans are saying that they are doing this to find out weapons of mass destruction. This is a charge which has been laid at the doors of Iraq by the U.S. Administration without any respect for the internationally established procedures to justify that charge. In effect, the U.S. has acted in this case, both as a prosecutor and as a judge. The same entity is the prosecution and the judge! Now this is a breakdown of the very principle of natural jurisprudence which has been known to human civilization. This is unacceptable to us. While we see Operation Iraqi

Freedom has been launched with the purported aim of finding weapons of mass destruction, there are evidence that in this blatant aggression, weapons of mass destruction have been used by the U.S. and the British forces, which are banned by the Geneva Convention. There has been the use of shells which have been enriched by uranium waste which, indeed, constitutes weapons of mass destruction. The cluster bombs, which have killed thousands of civilians at one go, are weapons of mass destruction. The huge loss of civilians cant be justified by the claim of precision technologies which the U.S. have been claiming to have used.

The other disturbing trend is that the messengers have been shot at. The incident of yesterday, targeting the media which was trying to give a version of the war which differed with the American perception of the war, the bombing and destruction of the Al-Jazeera Television Centre in Baghdad, shooting down of journalists who have been acting independently, and the removal of Peter Arnett, are all against the very grains of human civilisation and the requirements of the millennium.

We have raised these questions earlier in connection with the developments in the aftermath of 9/11. Therefore, Sir, today, we are faced with a very, very critical situation. Natwarji was referring to the pronouncements after the Belfast Meeting, but, at the same time, we have seen the BBC, which was transmitting to us the agreements which was reached between President Bush and Donald Rumsfeld on the transfer of money which was sanctioned by the U.S. Congress, that is to be used by Pentagon. Now, strife is taking place within the U.S. Administration on who is going to use this money-whether it is the State Administration or the Pentagon. The Bush Administration has decided that Pentagon would use the money now.

Therefore, this is a very serious situation. It has implications for the future. Therefore, unless the Indian political process thinks today on how to appropriately respond to the emerging situation, we would be failing in our duties to exhaust the possibilities that are inherent in this Resolution.

We expect that our Government would respond to portents of the U.S. national strategy document which was finalised. It was not an

unofficial document by a think-tank, but it was the official document of the U.S. Administration which was finalised; it underpins the future U.S. strategy for the whole world.

[THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN in the Chair]

We have seen that in order to further the objectives of that strategy document, the US has decided it, because it is in keeping with the administration report which was led during the Senior Bush administration that countries which are defenceless will be chosen particularly. Therefore, apparently there was some surprise why the US is not responding to North Korea. But this appropriately dovetails that formulation in the security document of the US that particularly defenceless regimes will be selected so that there can be a speedy 'victory'. We have seen this that the UN Security Council was being used to disarm Iraq so that speedy results could be there. All the formulations that were being tom-tom before the attack have all proved to be a myth that in spite of the weakness, in spite of the defenceless nature of the Iraqi regime that ultimately the military action has continued so long and till now full political control has not been established. But the point here is that whatever irrespective and regardless of the military outcome of this action, the political situation, I have seen, that nations, the so-called permanent allies of the US administration have also not been in a position to express their opinion on this and to oppose this. They have been backed by a huge mobilisation of the street. The redeeming feature, I think, is that there was a danger of that Huntington's theory, of Clash of Civilisations. But even the God that President Bush invokes every time, we have seen that the very clan to which Mr. Bush belongs, they have condemned this action. The Pope has come out, and cutting across religious affiliations, people have opposed this. This has taken place in Europe, in the Arab countries and the world over. Therefore, there is a galvanisation of process, which is not accepting the kind of unilateralism that the US administration is trying to impose on the whole world. I think there are reasons to take heart from this because there are contradictions which one cannot overlook. The American Congress interestingly, as a sideshow, during the four days of the Iraq invasion was debating. What they were debating was that Afghanistan where the American administration had given its commitment to reconstruct in the original budget papers, which were presented to the US Congress, had

not kept a single penny for the reconstruction of Afghanistan. Then the US Congress intervened and it said, "At least, we have to keep some money." and 300 million US dollars were ultimately allocated. We know that American economy today is on a daily basis. The hon. Minister would know with his background in finance that daily they are running a deficit of 1.5 billion dollars. Their overall budgetary deficit is 432 billion dollars, which is exactly the defence budget to the US. Now, who is financing this budgetary deficit? While we hear sermons about controlling our fiscal deficit, but the fact of the matter is that American economy is being financed by the surplus economies of Europe and Japan. We will also see efforts to coerce European nations, Japan, the other Gulf countries and the devastated Iraqi economy itself to spend money to reconstruct Iraq. Therefore, in this situation, there are possibilities, there are tendencies, which can provide us with space to intervene and try to have a very broad-based political, diplomatic initiative in the international sphere to try and reverse this ominous and outrageous unilateralism that has emerged. It is, in this context, I agree with what Mr. Ramachandraiah has said about the adoption of the Resolution and about the shortcomings of our Government in intervening appropriately in the situation. But, I think, this Resolution was very necessary. It is more than necessary for sending some message outside and to get the unity of our view. There has been a criticism on Parliament for not adopting this Resolution. But, adopting this Resolution too late is not good. The people of our country, the entire political establishment of this country and the entire political process of this country should act firmly, act unitedly and act in a very, very rapid manner. As such, we have been delayed in our reaction and, therefore, I think Resolution should trigger off a process by which we can galvanise the unity of purpose and the unity of thinking among our people in carrying on this process forward whereby we can appropriately reflect the political will of this country. And, at the same time, I think, it is a very unique feature that we have asked for the withdrawal of the U.S.-led military force immediately. That is very vital. That is one of the areas on which a great debate is taking place in the international sphere. That is where our Resolution becomes more contemporary. Even within the U.S. administration, there is a difference of opinion. There is a fight between the Neo-Conservatives and the Liberals where people are saying, 'America cannot risk by using its own administration to deal with the post-invasion situation in Iraq.' Therefore, India could take the lead in voicing this concern that the process for restoration of democracy, contrary to the claims of Mr. Bush administration, should be overseen by the international community

and the institutions which are internationally accepted - precisely, the U.N. And, it is one of those issues where India can play an important role in galvanising the resistance to unilateralism. I agree with hon. Mr. Natwar Singh that we need to take a principled position. Our Pakistan-centric approach to every international development is not going to help us. We cannot justify or we cannot claim to indulge in unilateralism and unilateral adventure by drawing parallels with what U.S. has done to Iraq. We are, inadvertently, trapping ourselves to the traps and norms' which are being sought to be established by the Bush administration. Therefore, our foreign policy and our traditions in foreign policy have always been informed of the need about the global peace. Our concerns for removal of weapons of mass destruction have been premised in the need for global disarmament. Now, those positions had given to the Indian establishment and to the Indian nation the kind of leverage which we exercised in the past. I think, we shall have to reinvent our foreign policy based on those basic principles which have paid us rich rewards in contributing to the global process.

Finally, Madam, I think, the other issue that should be taken up by the Indian Government and our political establishment is the civilizational aspect. The great civilization, which had been housed by the soil of Iraq, and which dates back to the 3rd millennium B.C., the Assyrian Civilization, was subsequently followed by the Sumerian and the Mesopotamian Civilizations. They are saying that about one lakh sites are there in Iraq, out of which only 12,000 sites have been discovered.

SHRI B. P. SINGHAL (Uttar Pradesh) : Madam, we should not go beyond the Resolution. I think, the discussion is moving beyond the Resolution. I draw your attention towards it.

उपसभापति : वे उसी पर बोल रहे हैं । Iraq is in Mesopotamia.

SHIR NILOTPAL BASU : Madam, I would be concluding, now. So, these one lakh historical sites, which are supposed to be there, which are housing the evidence of this great civilization over the years, is under serious jeopardy. The Gulf War-I, because of the kind of bombing that had taken place there, had already given rise to serious concerns among the historians and the intellectuals all over the world. And, now, we don't know what has happened to this. So, it is also a matter of

defence of the civilization, which is under physical threat as a result of this invasion. This also needs to be articulated, because the world would go on, the human civilization would go on, if we can protect this great civilizational heritage. Therefore, in conclusion, I would like to say that the core of the neo-conservative theory, which informs the American invasion, has also created the space for a big platform of resistance against the global and complete unilateralism and terrorism that has come about. Therefore, I think, when we would pursue policies, which are friendly to all countries of the world, unless the principles can actually inform the expectations of the human race all over the world, those principles need to be brought back to the centre stage of the paradigm and the discourse that will henceforth follow in this world. We have to strengthen this process. And, with that, I think, our Resolution will contribute to this process. I commend this resolution for adoption by the House. Thank you.

श्री शाहिद सिद्दिकी (उत्तर प्रदेश) : डिप्टी चेयरमैन साहिबा, आज हम यहां इराकियों के और इराकी अवाम के अज्मो – हौसले को सलाम करने के लिए खड़े हुए हैं। यह रिजॉल्यूशन कहा जा सकता है कि बहुत देर में आया लेकिन देर आयद दुरुस्त आयद। सवाल यह नहीं है कि इराकी अवाम बारह साल के सैंक्शन्स के बाद और बारह साल तक लगातार मगरिबी हिसार में रहने के बाद अमरीकी साम्राज्य का मुकाबला करने के बाद आज किस हद तक और कब तक यह जंग लड़ पाएंगे, कब तक अपने मुल्क की और अपने अवाम की हिफाजत कर पाएंगे, सवाल यह नहीं है क्योंकि आज इराक में सिर्फ इराक की लड़ाई नहीं हो रही है, इंडिया की भी लड़ाई हो रही है। आज पूरी दुनिया के तहफफुज की लड़ाई है, आज आने वाला जो वर्ल्ड ऑर्डर इम्पोज़ किया जा रहा है, उस वर्ल्ड ऑर्डर में दुनिया कहां खडी होगी, प्रिसिपल्स कहां होंगे, युनाइटेड नेशन्स कहां होगा, इंटरनेशनल लॉ कहां होगा, हिंदुस्तान का और डेमोक्रेसीज का उसमें क्या मुकाम होगा, इसकी लड़ाई लडी जा रही है। इसलिए आज हमें अपनी बात कहना जरूरी है। हमारे बहुत से साथी कहते हैं कि हमारे कहने से कोई फर्क पड़ने वाला नहीं है। हम क्या रिजॉल्यूशन पास करते हैं उससे कोई फर्क पड़ने वाला नहीं है। लेकिन मैं कहता हूं की बहुत फर्क पड़ेगा क्योंकि लड़ाई अभी खत्म नहीं हुई है, लड़ाई अभी शुरू हुई है। आज इराक के ऊपर कब्जा हो जाएगा और ये इराक का एंग्लो अमेरिकन इनवेजन कामयाब हो जाएगा। इससे जंग का खात्मा नहीं होगा बल्कि जंग की शुरूआत होगी। जैसा कि किसी शायर ने कहा है, “कल्ले हुसैन असल में मरगे यजीद है”

†मौलाना ओबैदुल्लाह खान आजमी (मध्य प्रदेश) : इस्लाम जिंदा होता है हर करबला के बाद।

†Transliteration of urdu script.

श्री शाहिद सिद्दीकी : जी, इस्लाम जिंदा होता है लेकिन यहां इस्लाम से मुराद सिर्फ मजहबी ताल्लुक से नहीं है, बल्कि इस्लाम से मुराद

†**मौलाना ओबैदुल्लाह खान आजमी** : शेर यही है

श्री शाहिद सिद्दीकी : जी, शेर यही है। इसके साथ यह भी है कि "शकस्ता फतहा मुकदर की बात है, लेकिन "यज़ीद मोर्चा जीता है, जंग हारा है।" यज़ीद मोर्चा जीत सकता है

†**मौलाना ओबैदुल्लाह खान आजमी** : यह कह दीजिए कि "सरजमीनें करबला से यह कहा सद्दाम ने, सर कटा सकते हैं लेकिन सर झुका सकते नहीं।

श्री शाहिद सिद्दीकी : लेकिन हमारी सूरते हाल यह है कि आज जो खतरा है, वह हिन्दुस्तान के लिए भी है। आज इराक की बारी है, कल हमारी बारी हो सकती है। लेकिन हमारी सूरते हाल यह है कि इन्होंने सर झुकाने की बात की। हमारा हाल यह है कि हम से घुटने टेकने को कहा जाता है, हम माथा टेक देते हैं। इस तरह से अगर हम मौका परस्ती की डिप्लोमेसी पर काम करेंगे, हम यह कहेंगे कि आज डिप्लोमेसी में प्रिंसीपल की कोई जगह नहीं रह गई है तो इससे हिन्दुस्तान का भला होने वाला नहीं है। हम यह समझते हैं कि हम पाकिस्तान के खिलाफ और पाकिस्तान जो हमारे देश में आतंकवाद भेज रहा है, और जो बैनुल अकवामी आतंकवाद है, उसके खिलाफ इस तरह से लड़ सकें हम अमरीका के सहारे या अमरीका की गोद में बैठकर इस लड़ाई को लड़ सकेंगे, डिप्टी चेयरमैन साहिबा, मैं कहना चाहूंगा कि ऐसा नहीं होगा। हम आहिस्ता – आहिस्ता जो एक बैनुल अकवामी सत्ता पर अपनी कयादत की हैसियत थी, हमारी जो एक हैसियत थी नान एलाइन्ड लीडर की हैसियत से एक डेमोक्रेटिक कन्ट्री की हैसियत से एक ऐसे देश की हैसियत से जहां हमने महात्मा बुद्ध और महात्मा गांधी दिए थे, जो दुनिया की कयादत करते थे अमन – शांति के लिए, वह भी हम खो देंगे। यानी "न खुदा ही मिला न बिसाले सनम" वाला हमारा मामला हो जाएगा। मैं यह कहना चाहूंगा कि बगदाद में कल जो मीडिया पर हमला हुआ है और जिस तरह से राइटर्स के दो जर्नलिस्ट मारे गए हैं, पांच फलस्तीन होटल में जख्मी हुए हैं, इसके अलावा अल – जजीरा के दफ्तर पर बाकायदा मिसाइल बरसाई गई है, अबुधाबी टीवी पर हमला किया गया है, यह कोई अचानक या गलती से होने वाला हमला नहीं है। बहुत साफतौर पर वहां मौजूद तमाम सहाफियों ने इस बात को कहा है, तमाम पत्रकारों ने इस बात को कहा है कि जानबूझकर हमले हुए हैं। इधर से कोई किसी किस्म का खतरा अमरीका को या अमरीकन टैंको को या अमरीकन फौजों को नहीं था, जो इस वक्त बगदाद में घुस गई है। इस हमले का मकसद उस आवाज को बंद करना है, जो आने वाले चंद दिनों में, चंद हफ्तों में जो बगदाद में इंसानी लहू बहाने वाले हैं, जो वहां पर जुल्म होने वाला है ताकि दुनिया उसे देख न पाए, ताकि सच्चाई जान न पाए, ताकि सच्चाई की यह तस्वीर सामने

†Transliteration of urdu script.

न आने पाए। इसलिए वे चाहते हैं कि मीडिया के लोग आज बगदाद को छोड़कर चले जाएं। उनको डराने और धमकाने के लिए यह हमला किया गया है। यह लड़ाई, जिसे आजादी के नाम पर लड़ा जा रहा है, लोकतंत्र के नाम पर लड़ा जा रहा है। इसमें अमेरिकन टोमहाक मिसाइलों के ऊपर बिठाकर लोकतंत्र को इराक में उतारा जा रहा है। वहां हमला प्रैस के ऊपर है, मीडिया के ऊपर है और मीडिया की आवाज को खत्म करने की कोशिश की जा रही है। अम्बेडिड जनर्लिस्टों को पूरी छूट है। लेकिन जो लोग आज आपनी जान पर खेलकर बगदाद में काम कर रहे हैं उनके लिए रास्ते बन्द होने की कोशिश हो रही है। उनको वहां से भगाने की कोशिश हो रही है। आज सुबह मैंने देखा कि ज्यादातर जनर्लिस्टों ने जो बगदाद में हैं, उन्हें अमरीकन फौज से कहा है कि उन्हें बगदाद से निकालने का रास्ता फराहम करें। शायद यही इनकी कोशिश थी, शायद यही इनका मकसद था। मैं कहना चाहूंगा कि इस जंग की बुनियाद क्या थी? इस जंग की बुनियाद यह थी कि पूरी दुनिया को इराक से खतरा है क्योंकि इराक के पास वैपन्स आफ मास डैस्ट्रक्शन है। इराक उनका गैर जिम्मेदारी से इस्तेमाल करता है। इराक में जम्हूरियत नहीं है, बावजूद इसके कि यूनाइटेड नेशन्स में, अकवामे मुतेहदा में जो इन्स्पैक्टर्स थे, लगातार कोशिशों के बाद वे इस नतीजे पर पहुंचे कि कोई वैपन्स आफ मास डैस्ट्रक्शन नहीं है। उसके बाद भी इराक का यह इनवेजन हुआ। एंग्लो-अमेरिकन इनवेजन हुआ। लेकिन इस इनवेजन के बाद भी आज तक का सूरतेहाल यह है कि किसी किस्म का कोई वैपन नहीं मिला है। कोई केमिकल वैपन वहां से नहीं मिला है और न ही मिलेगा। अगर केमिकल वैपन होते तो इस तरह से जारीहाना तौर पर, इस तरह से बेरहम तरीके से अमेरिकी फौजें इराक में नहीं घुसती। वे जानते थे कि इनके पास हथियार नहीं हैं इसलिए इतने दनदनाते हुए दाखिल हुए। उनकी हिम्मत नहीं है कि वे नॉर्थ कोरिया में इस तरह से चले जाएं। उन्हें पता है कि नार्थ कोरिया के पास वैपन्स ऑफ मास डिस्ट्रक्शन है, इराक के पास नहीं है। वहां इस वक्त जिस तरह से डिप्लीटेड न्युक्लियर वैपन का इस्तेमाल हो रहा है, वहां पर जिस तरह से कलस्टर बम का इस्तेमाल हो रहा है, वह तमाम इंटरनेशनल कन्वेंशन्स के खिलाफ है। इंसानियत के खिलाफ है। इसके बावजूद, पूरी दुनिया कि तमाम आवाज के बावजूद भी यह हो रहा है। आज पूरी दुनिया पूरी ताकत के साथ अपनी आवाज उठा रही है। लोकतंत्र बोल चुका है। जब दुनिया के लोग बोलते हैं तब दुनिया के करोड़ों लोग सड़कों पर आते हैं। इतना बड़ा मजमा, इतने लोग किसी तारीख में कभी किसी जंग में नहीं आए। वियतनाम की जंग के मौके पर भी इस तरह से सड़कों पर नहीं आए थे। आज दुनिया की आवाज आई है कि क्या यह लोकतंत्र है। इस लोकतंत्र का गला घोटकर जो इराक में हो रहा है वह सारी दुनिया के लिए खतरा है। मैं समझता हूं कि हम सबको, खास तौर पर हिंदुस्तान को ज्यादा सतर्क और होशियार रहने की जरूरत है।

जहां तक कर्बला का ताल्लुक है, कर्बला की सरजमी का ताल्लुक है तो कर्बला की सरजमी अपने एक-एक बूंद खून का हिसाब लेगी। यह सरजमी उस खून को भूलने वाली नहीं है जो वहां पर

बहाया जा रहा है, जिस तरह से कर्बला को लहुलुहान किया जा रहा है, जिस तरह से कर्बला में बच्चों की जान ली गई है, जिस तरह से आज अस्पतालों में दो – दो साल के बच्चों का ऑपरेशन किया जा रहा है, बगैर एनीस्थिया दिए, बेहोश किए बगैर उनका ऑपरेशन किया जा रहा है, जिस तरह से आज बसरा, नसीरिया और दूसरे शहरों में लोग बिना पानी के तरस रहे हैं। हकीकत यह है कि अभी तक अमरीका का किसी एक शहर पर भी पूरी तरह से कब्जा नहीं हुआ है। इराक जिंदा है। सद्दाम हुसैन जिंदा है। जंग जारी है। हमारे लोग पहले से हथियार डालकर बैठ गए कि जंग खत्म हो गई। इराक हार गया। लेकिन इराकियों ने हिम्मत की। वे आज भी जंग को जारी रखे हुए हैं। आप हैरत में मत पड़िएगा अगर यह जंग आने वाले कई हफ्तों में भी जारी रही। उपसभापति महोदया, मैं साहिर की एक नज्म पढ़कर अपनी बात खत्म करूंगा कि –

ए शरीफ इंसानों

खून अपना हो या पराया हो
 नसल – ए – आदम का खून है आखिर
 जंग मशरिफ़ में हो के मगरिब में
 अमन – ए – आलम का खून है आखिर
 बम घरों पर गिरेंगे के सरहद पर
 रूहे तामीर ज़खम खाती है
 खेत अपने जलें के औरों के
 ज़ीस्त फाकों से तिलमिलाती है
 टैंक आगे बढ़े, कि पीछे हटें
 कोख धरती की बांझ होती है
 फतह का जशन हो
 के हार का सोग
 जिदगी मय्यतों पे रोती है
 जंग तो खुद ही एक मसला है
 जंग क्या मसलों का हल देगी
 आग और खून आज बख़्शोगी
 भूख और एहतियाज कल देगी
 इसलिए ए शरीफ इंसानों
 जंग टलती रहे तो बेहतर है
 आप और हम सभी के आंगन में
 शमा जलती रहे तो बेहतर है।

[9 April, 2003]

RAJYA SABHA

बहुत – बहुत शुक्रिया । मैं और मेरी पार्टी इस रेजोल्यूशन का समर्थन करते हुए इतना ही कहेंगे कि यह रेजोल्यूशन देर से आया लेकिन अभी भी इसकी जरूरत है ।

SHRI RG. NARAYANAN (Tamil Nadu): Madam Deputy Chairperson, I rise to support the Resolution on Iraq. On behalf of the All India Anna DMK, I express my regrets and anguish on the war waged by the United States and the U.K. on Iraq, inspite of the opposition by majority of the nations in the world, and, also, in violation of the advice given by the United Nations. It is a matter of great regret that, -in this war, innocent people are being killed. On behalf of my Party, I strongly condemn the unilateral decision of the United States, supported by a few nations like the United Kingdom, to enforce war on Iraq, without any basic reason and in utter disregard of the world opinion. I appeal to the Government to take appropriate action to stop the unjustified war on Iraq forthwith, and to bring international pressure on America and its allied in order to bring peace in the world and to render justice. I also appeal to the Government to mobilise opinion of like-minded nations and bring this unjustifiable war waged by America and its allied to immediate halt, and make them quit Iraq with their forces and weapons at once, through the intervention of the United Nations. Thank you, Madam.

SHRI C.P. THIRUNAVUKKARASU (Pondicherry): I thank you, Madam Deputy Chairperson for giving me this opportunity.

For the past three days, we had discussions whether to condemn the American action or deplore the action of America. Ultimately, we are passing a resolution deploring the action of America. On behalf of the DMK Party. I welcome this Resolution and support it. But, America is still interested in destroying the humanitarian feelings and human beings, and damaging the properties of Iraq. Bombs are dropped on the babies, children, men and women of Iraq, and the artilleries are attacking to annihilate the Iraqi race and their properties. Air strikes have been carried to demonstrate the American arrogance against the ordinary citizens of Iraq. Thousands of people are running for shelter here and there. There is no food to eat, no water to drink, no shelter to sleep. There are no media persons. There are no medicines to treat the injured and small children whose legs are amputated, hands are amputated. Big operations have been carried out without Anaesthesia. Under these misgivings and sufferings, we are thinking whether the war is essential against Iraq at this juncture. America

is raising a lot of hue and cry and repeated the slogan that 'Iraq is having chemical weapons and the most destructive weapons of mass destruction in its hands'. America said that they have not complied with the United Nation's Resolution of 1441. It further said that Iraq is having all the weapons of mass destruction with it, and it should be destroyed. But, Iraq denied it and said, "We are not having any such weapons in our hands." In spite of that, America pressurised the United Nations and asked it to appoint inspectors to search and seize the weapons, if they are available in Baghdad and other places of Iraq. The inspectors went and searched the Baghdad and other places of Iraq and also submitted a report saying that nothing like the weapons of mass destruction is available in Iraq. In addition to that, Iraq also said, "We are not having any weapons like that." Then, the war broke out. Even today, America has not been able to recover any weapons of mass destruction in Iraq. So, the theory on which this war was initiated that the weapons of mass destruction are available in Iraq has been falsified by the invasion of America itself, and also by the statements of the inspectors of the United Nations.

Madam, I would like to say that not only Indians are having the feelings against America, but even American people are also having the same feeling that America should not have waged war against Iraq. Even though we are not having any print media, but the electronic media and the websites have clearly shown that the people of America are not interested in war as it is. The women's groups, religious leaders including the Nobel Prize winners have marched on the streets, raising slogans against war. A large number of journalists, intellectuals, NGOs are also marching on the streets of America saying that there should not be any war. Even the political parties of America opposed the war. It was said by one of the Members of the American Senate that it is a political arrogance of the America in waging a war against Iraq, and he said, "Today, I wept, with tears rolling down." Another Senator, Edward Kennedy said, "We will certainly win the war, but how do we win the peace?" So, even the American people themselves are condemning and deploring the actions of America. Our Poet Bharati Dasan said, I quote: "If the world waged a war against humanity, we will destroy the world itself when time comes." So, I say before this august House, peace and prosperity was there in Iraq prior to the invasion of America on Iraq. America is invading Iraq and saying, "We want peace and prosperity in Iraq". After the destruction of so many houses, so many buildings and so many things, is there any possibility of

maintaining any peace in Iraq? It can be said, it is just like selling the eyes to purchase the picture of Mona Lisa for Iraq. So, the whole Iraq has been torn into pieces. Nothing is available as it is. There is no peace, no prosperity as it is which America wanted to restore in this particular place. Our leader, Dr. Kalaignar, said, from the beginning, that there should not be a war with Iraq. Iraq is living peacefully and it is a prosperous country, it should be allowed to continue* But in spite of that, war has been declared. Ultimately, I say, America has torn Iraq into pieces. Restore the peace in the country. Firstly, withdraw military per force. Secondly, repair and construct all the buildings and structures that have been damaged by the coalition forces at the expense of America. And it should be provided by the United Nations. At the same time, America should not rule Iraq and the Iraqi people should be allowed to rule themselves. With these words I conclude.

प्रो. राम देव भंडारी (बिहार) : आदरणीय उपसभापति महोदया, सब से पहले मैं माननीय चैयरमेन साहब का आभार व्यक्त करता हूँ कि उन्होंने अमरीका द्वारा इराक पर हमला करने का निंदा प्रस्ताव राजभाषा हिंदी में प्रस्तुत किया। आम तौर पर इस प्रकार के प्रस्ताव अंग्रेजी भाषा में लाए जाते हैं, मगर आज यह पता चल गया कि अंग्रेजी भाषा कितनी गरीब है कि निंदा प्रस्ताव लाने के लिए अंग्रेजी भाषा में शब्द नहीं मिले और यह निंदा प्रस्ताव हिंदी में लाना पड़ा।

महोदय, अमरीका द्वारा इराक पर हमले का आज 21 वां दिन है और इन 21 दिनों में हम प्रस्ताव की भाषा और प्रस्ताव के शब्द ढूंढ रहे थे और उधर अमरीका इराक को राख के ढेर में बदल रहा था। आज भी जो कुछ बचा है, उसको भी वह ढेर कर रहा है, कब्रगाह बना रहा है, वहीं हम प्रस्ताव की भाषा और शब्दों का चयन कर रहे थे। दर असल यह निंदा प्रस्ताव तो बहुत पहले आना चाहिए था, मगर देर से ही सही माननीय चैयरमेन साहब की ओर से यह निंदा प्रस्ताव लाया गया है और इस का भी दुनिया को एक संदेश जाएगा।

महोदय, इराक एक स्वतंत्र, सम्प्रभुता संपन्न देश है और कुछ ही दिनों पहले तक बहुत ही जिंदा दिल और खुशहाल देश रहा है। वह दुनिया का दूसरा तेल उत्पादक देश और हमारा हमेशा का दोस्त रहा है। हम पर जब भी कोई मुसीबत पड़ी हमारी ओर उस ने दोस्ती का हाथ बढ़ाया और आज उसी इराक को अमरीका घातक अस्त्रों और मिसाइलों से राख के ढेर में बदल रहा है, कब्रगाह बना रहा है। आज इराक पूरी तरह से तबाह और बर्बाद हो चुका है। वहां के हजारों निर्दोष नागरिक, बूढ़े, बच्चे और औरतें मौत के घाट उतार दिए गए हैं। जो बचे खुचे इराक के नागरिक हैं, अस्पतालों में भरे पड़े हैं। विश्व स्वास्थ्य संगठन ने जिनेवा में

कहा कि आपकी टैंकों के शहर में प्रवेश करने के बाद से हर घंटे में करीब सौ घायल अस्पताल में आ रहे हैं। ये घायल हर घर से हरेक अस्पताल में पहुंच रहे हैं। जो वहां मेडीकल स्टाफ है, वह भी लड़ाई की चपेट में है और घायलों की पूरी सेवा नहीं कर पा रहा है। अस्पताल में जो घायल पहुंच रहे हैं, जो वहां डाक्टर हैं, नर्स हैं, उनके लिए भी इन हालात को संभाल पाना कठिन हो रहा है। दवाइयों की भारी कमी है, दवाइयों के भंडार खत्म हो चुके हैं। वहां लोगो को बिजली नहीं मिल रही है, लोगो को खाना नहीं मिल रहा है, पीने को पानी नहीं मिल रहा है। डायरिया से हजारों बच्चे वहां मर रहे हैं। इराक की जनता के दुख-दर्द को शब्दों में बयान नहीं किया जा सकता।

महोदय, अमरीका का इराक पर यह हमला बिल्कुल एकतरफा और अनावश्यक हमला है। इसका कोई औचित्य नहीं है। यह हमला संयुक्त राष्ट्र घोषणा – पत्र के विरुद्ध है, सुरक्षा परिषद से भी इसकी कोई मंजूरी नहीं मिली है। यह हमला करके अमरीका ने संयुक्त राष्ट्र और सुरक्षा परिषद की अवहेलना की है। सुरक्षा परिषद के इंसपेक्टर अभी वहां जांच कर रहे थे रसायनिक हथियारों की, जैविक हथियारों की और इसी बीच अमरीका ने दुनिया को धत्ता बताकर, दुनिया के सारे कानूनों को तोड़कर इराक पर हमला कर दिया। कहां है जैविक हथियार ? एक जैविक हथियार नहीं मिला, एक रासायनिक हथियार नहीं मिला। स्पष्ट रूप से यह अमरीका की दादागिरी है। दुनिया के कानून की अमरीका को कोई परवाह नहीं है। एक देश पर हमला करके वह दुनिया को भयभीत कराना चाहता है कि हम दुनिया के सबसे शक्तिशाली राष्ट्र हैं, या तो हमारी बात सुनो या फिर गद्दी से हटो। आज अमरीका इराक में इस प्रकार की कार्रवाई कर रहा है, कल किसी दूसरे देश में इस प्रकार की कार्रवाई करेगा। ऐसा लगता है कि अमरीका विश्व को जंगल-राज बनाना चाहता है, पूरे विश्व में जंगल का कानून चलाना चाहता है। इसलिए ऐसे समय में यह निंदा का प्रस्ताव, देर से ही सही, दुनिया को एक संदेश देगा, भारत की ओर से दुनिया को एक संदेश जाएगा। अब जबकि इराक की जनता का, इराक का इतना बड़ा नुकसान हो चुका है, इतनी बड़ी बर्बादी हो चुकी है कि एक खुशहाल देश गरीब और विपन्न बन गया है, उसके नागरिक आज खाने और पीने के पानी के लिए तरस रहे हैं, तो ऐसी स्थिति में इराक की हर प्रकार से हमें मदद करनी चाहिए और यह कहना चाहिए कि यह हमला इराक पर नहीं बल्कि संपूर्ण मानवता के विरुद्ध एक जघन्य अपराध है, जो अमरीका द्वारा किया जा रहा है।

महोदय, जब 11 सितंबर को अमरीका पर आतंकवादी हमला हुआ था तो पूरी दुनिया ने अमरीका के साथ सहानुभूति जताई थी। उस आतंकवादी हमले की मजम्मत थी, मगर आज वही अमरीका, उस घटना को ज्यादा दिन नहीं हुए, वही अमरीका आज इराक को मटियामेट कर रहा है। यह बहुत ही गंभीर मामला है, जिसकी पूरी दुनिया को मजम्मत करनी चाहिए और

[9 April, 2003]

RAJYA SABHA

कहना चाहिए कि तुरन्त अमरीका अपनी फौज वापस करे। इसके साथ ही इराक की तकदीर अमरीका न लिखे बल्कि इराक की तकदीर लिखना इराक की जनता का काम है। संयुक्त राष्ट्र संघ को अपनी देखरेख में इराक में नव – निर्माण का काम करवाना चाहिए और हर हाल में अमरीका की फौज को इराक से वापस जाना चाहिए। भारत को इसमें पहल करनी चाहिए कि आने वाले समय में संयुक्त राष्ट्र संघ, जो दुनिया की सबसे बड़ी पंचायत है, उस पंचायत के माध्यम से ही झगड़ों का निबटारा हो ताकि कोई भी ताकतवर देश, जिसके पास हथियारों की ताकत हो या मिसाइलों की ताकत हो, वह उस ताकत की बदौलत दुनिया में जंगल – राज न ला सके। दुनिया का एक कानून है और उस कानून का पालन चाहे कोई कितना भी शक्तिशाली राष्ट्र क्यों न हो, उसे करना चाहिए।

महोदया, यह जो निन्दा प्रस्ताव आया है उसके लिए मैं अपनी पार्टी कि ओर से तथा अपनी ओर से चेयरमैन साहब को धन्यवाद देना चाहता हूँ। इसके साथ ही मैं सरकार से कहना चाहता हूँ कि जब पूरा राष्ट्र, पूरा देश आंदोलित था, अमरीका द्वारा इराक पर हमले के कारण जब पूरे देश में धरने और प्रदर्शन हो रहे थे, तो सरकार इतने दिन तक जो चुप बैठी हुई थी, इससे दुनिया में एक गलत संदेश गया और भारत, जो हमेशा अमन और शांति का पुजारी रहा है, अमन और शांति के लिए प्रयास करता रहा है, इससे उसके सम्मान को भी ठेस पहुंची है। देर से ही सही, चेयरमैन साहब की तरफ से जो प्रस्ताव आया है, इससे इस देश के सम्मान की रक्षा होगी और इराक के नागरिकों के प्रति हमारी पूरी सहानुभूति है। 100 करोड़ रूपए की मानवीय सहायता देने का जो फैसला किया गया है, यह एक अच्छा फैसला है। 50 हजार मीट्रिक टन गेहूँ देने का फैसला भी एक अच्छा फैसला है और भविष्य में भी इराक के पुनर्निर्माण में हमें पूरी मदद करनी चाहिए।

इन्हीं शब्दों के साथ मैं अपनी बात समाप्त करता हूँ। बहुत – बहुत धन्यवाद।

SHRI J. CHITHARANJAN (Kerala) : Madam Deputy Chairperson, even though I am of the opinion that this Resolution is having certain weakness and has also left out some very important issues, I support this Resolution because there is a consensus, or, a general agreement in this House. We are passing this Resolution towards the fag end of the war. We are passing the Resolution at the eleventh hour. In fact, we have discussed this issue in the two all-party meetings held by the Prime Minister-before the war was started and after the war had started-and also in this House. In these meetings, proposals were made that we should pass a Resolution. Before the war was started, we demanded that the Government of India should come forward with an appeal that

3.00 P.M.

no country shall resort to a war to solve this problem. Otherwise that it should be settled within the Security Council through peaceful means. But, at that time, the Government evaded moving such a Resolution. In fact, they were opposed to it. The second time also, in the all-party meeting, the same proposal was made. It was disagreed there also. Again when this matter was discussed in this House also, they disagreed. Even regarding this Resolution, for the last three days a joint discussion was going on as to what should be the text, whether the Resolution should be adopted or not. It was mainly because of the stand taken by the Government. In fact, now a Resolution has come out, mainly because of the fact that the Opposition parties-even though they were holding certain very definite views-have attempted and compromised in bringing about a common Resolution. It is not that it was brought by the Government on its own.

The main issue, Madam, was that Iraq was possessing Weapons of Mass Destruction. The United Nations Inspection Team have been inspecting for years together and a lot of armaments were destroyed. Thereafter, again, the Inspection Team was allowed to inspect the places where it suspected that the armaments were kept. Six hundred such places were inspected by it. It did not find any atomic weapons or nuclear weapons or biological weapons or chemical weapons. That may be their suspicion. In that case, the Inspection Team should have been allowed to carry on with its inspection for some more time and find out whether there are any Weapons of Mass Destruction. Instead of doing that, the United States, along with some of their allies, had started a war. They unilaterally decided it. It was not decided in the Security Council of the United Nations. In fact, majority of the Security Council Members were against waging a war on Iraq. The United States did it by bypassing or ignoring or undermining the United Nations. Apart from that, they also made the United Nations ineffective not only for the time-being but also for the future.

Now I come to the post-war issues. Why did the United States start such a high-handed action unilaterally? It is quite clear. I don't want to go into the details due to want of time. It has already become clear that they are out to establish their hegemony all over the world and they are out to establish a world order where they will be in control of the oil

wealth of the whole world. This is what they are aiming at. They are of the view that no country should have the military strength that they have and President Bush has himself categorically stated, "We will never allow any other country, in the matter of weapons, to come nearer to us. We will not allow it and we will prevent it." That is what is being aimed at.

Now, three or four questions come to my mind. When the war ends, who shall govern Iraq? This is an important issue. Now, there is a discussion going on. America has made it clear that they would continue to play an important role in Iraq for some time. There is a difference of opinion among the allies on that issue. The United States and other countries made known their views on who should govern Iraq. But what is the view of our Government? Of course, we will definitely stand for a Government responsible to the people of Iraq, not to a Government which is being imposed by some other country. It should not be allowed.

Then come the issues of relief and rehabilitation. Some very relevant points have been raised. This is an area where one of the earliest civilizations of the world existed. There are a lot of archaeological institutions. Most of them might have been destroyed in a war like this, where lot of high-tech weapons are being used continuously for days together. And if that happens, most of them might have been destroyed the same way, the entire buildings, houses and everything have been destroyed. Even the hospitals are destroyed. Therefore, the question of rehabilitation is there, question of relief is there. Now, certain theories are already being propagated that the whole thing will have to be done at the expense of Iraq; utilising the oil of Iraq, the whole thing will have to be done.

The United States and British army could march into their country, destroy their properties, inflict injuries, cause deaths to thousands and thousands of people of the country and then say that the reconstruction work will have to be done at the expense of Iraq; the burden will have to be borne by Iraq. These people have to bear and they were saying that Saddam Hussein will have to be declared as war criminal. If a person is to be declared as a war criminal in the present day, it is none other than the President Bush of America. It is he who has done it. Therefore, these problems are there. I am very much doubtful what our Government is going to do. Our Government has made it almost clear

that their main attempt is to somehow achieve or gain the support of America at any cost. In that case, when the question of reorganising or restructuring of the United Nations or building up a new world order under the leadership of United States of America comes, what attitude will the Government take? I have my own doubts.

You are taking a position, which is diametrically opposite to the policies that we had been pursuing at the time of our freedom movement and also after the freedom movement when we came to power and became independent. Therefore, my request is that the Government will have to seriously consider all these things and they will have to review the foreign policy that they are pursuing at the moment. With these words, I support the Resolution.

SHRI EKANATH K.THAKUR (Maharashtra): Madam, I thank you for giving me the opportunity. Madam, we are passing through momentous times. I personally believe that we are not completing a mere formality in passing this Resolution to declare that we have discharged our responsibility. There are two issues that have to be stated at the beginning of this Resolution. First thing is our concept as a Nation. What are we as 'Hindustan'? The great poet Rabindra Nath Tagore wrote a poem and that complete poem was devoted to what our country should look like after freedom. It began with the words, "Where the mind is without fear and the head is held high". Rabindra Nath wanted us to have a mind without fear and to hold our heads high and that poem ended by saying, "Father, into that heaven of freedom, let my country awake."

I am not very sure whether we merely learnt the poem by heart or whether our decision-makers and the policy-makers realise that their views and their mind have to be without fear. I personally believe that in relation to Pak, we have a policy where we are 'willing to strike but are afraid to wound'. In regard to the world affairs, we have a policy where we are "willing to speak, but afraid to utter". If this is the direction of our foreign policy, I think a time will come when the Ministry of 'External Affairs' will have to be renamed as 'Foreign Ministry'. Foreign Ministry was named as the Minister of External Affairs because we wanted to show the independence of our policies. If we, in the world matters, dither, fear or shiver, then probably it has to be rechristened again as 'Foreign Ministry'. Madam, this war by all accounts is the most heinous war. I for one, - speaking on behalf of my party, the Shiv

Sena - support this Resolution and cannot think of Bush without branding him as a war criminal and a mass murderer. When I say this, I am aware that in my own situation my daughter, my grand-daughter and my son-in-law are in the USA. Madam, this war has no sanction or sanctity in the international law. It is against the wish of the United Nations. It is against the wish of the people of the world. The destruction and devastation it has caused; the children, the civilians that have been mayhemed, bruised, marred and tortured, has no parallel. How can we look at Bush in any other way than we look at Mussolini and Hitler? He should be lodged in the same cabin where Milosevic is lodged right now in the International Criminal Court. This war has been in violation of the UN Charter. If the USA condemned the Iraq's aggression on Kuwait, the US can have no right to intervene in Iraq. There are a few issues which come up because of this uni-polar world, the world that is dominated by the USA as gendarme of the world, as a policeman of the world. The issue is whether we accept that the USA can strike any country, any time, at will. I would like to know whether that kind of right can be conceded to the USA and whether the sovereignty of nations is a disposable and dispensable commodity that it can be tampered with impunity in the way in which George Bush has tampered with the authority and sovereignty of the Iraqi people. This has arisen out of the fact, in my opinion, that America is trying to show to the world that this is an 'American Century' and they are trying to impose the doctrine of 'Pax Americana' on the whole world. If we countenance this situation, we are likely to be only toys in their hands and therefore, our foreign policy must be a strong policy and we must say what we want to say, at that critical time when it is to be said. I feel in bringing this Resolution, we are doing something. But it is too little and too late and all the same in the current situation, it has to be welcomed. I must mention here that we have lost another initiative that is in relation to the NAM Movement. When Panditji, Nasser and Tito conceived of the Non-Aligned Movement, it was not an independent ideology. It was a spirit of freedom and the extension of the same spirit of freedom by which we wanted to go beyond the yoke of foreign rule, beyond slavery that took us to the Non-Aligned Movement. If that spirit of freedom has to be preserved in this world, then we have to ensure that the Non-Alignment Movement remains strong. It was this time when George Bush was claiming that he is supported by a coalition of 30 or 40 countries of the world, our

Government could have taken an initiative, held a meeting of the Non-Aligned Movement and shown to the USA that if there are 30 countries with you, there are 160 countries against you. That initiative I believe has been lost. Therefore, even now our Government should take some initiative in the NAM and try to lead them together and declare that these kind of atrocities on the world committed by Bush are unacceptable to the whole world. I must congratulate France, Germany and Russia. France and Germany are NATO members. Even then they stood up. We have counted them as one amongst the many. They could do it though they are members of NATO, though there is an agreement between them. On the other hand Hindustan could not have a say till today *i.e.* after 21 days of the invasion. I must compliment the Iraqi people. The spirit of patriotism they have shown has only a few parallels in the history of the world. They are Arabs. They are Muslims. I and my party Shiv Sena go ahead and congratulate them. I salute them because they are true to their motherland and true to their soil. Unpatriotic Muslims, everywhere, should take a lesson from these patriotic Muslims. They are laying their lives on the altar of the patriotism and altar of their motherland. There are unpatriotic Muslims in other parts of the world including Hindustan, let them realise that the true path to eternity is to die for one's land and to stand by one's motherland. There are some Muslims who think just as George Bush thinks. He is thinking of Pan Americana, they think of some Pan-Islamic fundamentalism. They must take a lesson from Iraqi people who are true to their nation, to their soil and to their patriotism and, therefore, we congratulate the Iraqi people. Madam, this is not only a stand which I am taking in the Parliament, my Party leader, respected Shri Bala Saheb Thakre, has openly taken the stand and that stand shows that we Hindus, in Hindustan, are not against Muslims because they are Muslims, *lahu ka rang lal hai*; we are against only those Muslims who are working against the nation and we are with all those Muslims who are true to their nation and, therefore we congratulate the Iraqi people for their commitment to their nation, their sacrifice on the altar of the freedom and sovereignty. Madam, as you are from Mumbai, please permit me to say this, you will be surprised to know that my party newspaper, *Samna*, has manifold Muslim readership these days because day-in-and-day-out, we are writing articles against invasion of Iraq. We are writing because we feel that is an atrocity committed against the Arab people of Iraq and everyone of us

is against this. Madam, our External Affairs Minister made a statement that now we could also make premature strikes. My party's opinion is that if you cannot make premature strikes against the camps where terrorists are being bred, trained and generated, why announce it? Make an attack and show that you can make that attack. Madam, there are camps not only in Pakistan, but there are camps in Myanmar, and we are told that there are camps in Bhutan (*Interruptions*). It is relevant because after the statement by our External Affairs Minister, the U.S. Secretary of State, Mr. Colin Powell had to tell us that we cannot do that, as if he is the headmaster of the world. How could he retort to the statement made by our External Affairs Minister - Minister of a sovereign nation. And, we stand by the statement made by our Minister. How could Mr. Powell, as if he is the headmaster of the world, tell him, "No, no, this is not correct"? Is he there to interpret the law of the world and the international statute? We condemn the statement that Mr. Powell has made. We welcome the statement that our External Affairs Minister has made and we say that let him match his words with his actions and let Govt, attack those camps where terrorists are being bred, trained and generated, because they are a threat to the world. In this world, we not only have one thing. We like the Iraqi people who are fighting for their freedom. But, we do not like the thing that some people from other parts of the world, in the name of *Jehad* and Islam, go and fight in that country. That is also a threat to this world. Just like George Bush is a threat to this world, the other fundamental Islam and, in that name, Muslims leaving their respective countries and going to Iraq to fight for *Jehad*, is also a threat to this world and a threat to India, and, therefore, that must be berated, deprecated and condemned at all costs. Madam, Shri Arjun Singh had very wisely mentioned. Now, they call it reconstruction. But, Madam, it is a 'feast of vultures'. I will never, in my life forget, that characterisation of the post-war Iraq as 'a feast of vultures'. Madam, let that feast of vulture not take place. Let us intervene in the comity of nations as a leader of the Non-Aligned Movement; let us stop this war now; let us push Americans out. India is a country of hundred and ten crore people, one out of every six human being on this planet is a Hindustani and in this country - China has taken a stand; Russia has taken a stand; Germany has taken a stand; France has taken a stand and now let us take a stand. Madam, if we join together, America has to withdraw here and now.

With these words, I once again solemnly stand by this Resolution,

support this Resolution, and congratulate the Government of India for bringing in this strong, significant and unambiguous Resolution condemning the aggression on Iraq by the blood-thirsty Americans and their leader George Bush. Thank you.

SHRI SHANKAR ROY CHOWDHURY (West Bengal): Madam Deputy Chairperson, the Resolution that has been brought forward today, which is a joint Resolution of all sections of our political class, is a Resolution of great satisfaction and of great significance. It is significant due to a number of things.

[MR. CHAIRMAN in the Chair]

Firstly, I think, this is, perhaps, one of the very few times, if not the only time, that this House has passed such a Resolution. There have been other aggressions in our vicinity, equally one-sided, equally unjust, but our Houses, in those times, did not pass such resolutions. So, I am very satisfied, I am very happy, that at least now we are, perhaps, starting a trend when we shall make our feelings on such issues, on such occasions, very clear before the world, because our Resolution would reflect the feelings of our people, the feelings of our political class. So, I think, we must compliment not only the Government but also ourselves that we have brought forward such a Resolution, and I hope, this will be a trend for the future as well.

The second reason for the significance of this Resolution is that it has been passed after some delay. The delay, initially, was due to, what I feel, a somewhat undignified controversy over the choice of words. It would have been better if we had resolved this issue of the choice of language, without seeming to reflect a split within the political class as to the true feelings of the House and to the true feelings of the people. But, as people have said, 'We are very happy that the sentiments, the feelings, across the House have been made clear, and this Resolution has been brought forward. The delay has also been, I feel, due to some compulsions on the part of the Government. And there is nothing wrong with that. The other Governments, under other circumstances, had compulsions. Every Government had its own compulsions. In those cases, such resolutions were neither brought nor passed. So, I must say that I would compliment the Government that in spite of these compulsions, they have overcome them; they have

come forward, and we have today a Resolution with which we are all fully satisfied. But, I think, the most important part of this Resolution is that it is delayed. It is delayed not because of the fact that we are bringing it today, on the 9th of April, when the attack on Iraq started on the 21st of March. If we study the history of the conflict in Iraq, this conflict in Iraq, the aggression against Iraq, has been started with the establishment of 'No fly zones' almost 12 years ago. If you really wish to condemn the aggression against Iraq, we should go back in time. The establishment of the 'No fly zones' when Iraqi sovereignty has been violated with impunity by America, by the British, started not on the 21st March this year, but right after the termination of the Gulf War in 1991-92. So, when we say it is delayed, it is not merely because of certain minor, shall I say, 'adjustments', which we have had to carry out. But I think we have delayed bringing forward this Resolution. We have not taken a sense of history on this occasion and, we might have referred to the on going aggression, the on going restrictions, the on going sanctions, which have played a very important part in bringing misery, a prominent part in bringing misery to the Iraqi people, and we should have reflected that somewhere in this Resolution. But the most significant and the most important part of this Resolution is, its lessons for the future. It has brought up India and other countries of the world with America's new strategy. It was referred to by our colleague Shri Nilotpal Basu and this is the concept of the new American century. It is a document which was drawn up in 1993 by a group of 25 neo-conservative American think-tanks. It was signed by 25 people, noteworthy amongst them were, Mr. Donald Rumsfeld, who is today the Defence Secretary of the United States, Mr. Dick Cheney, the Vice-President, Mr. Jeb Bush, brother of the President of America, and the author of the entire concept, Mr. Paul Wolfowitz, who is today the Deputy Secretary of Defence for the USA. And what indeed does this document say? This document, Sir, has projected the National Security Strategy for the United States of America which was released on the 23rd of September 2002. With your permission, Sir, I would like to quote from it to a certain extent. It is divided into nine sections and the last section of it says, 'one of the principles of American National Security is to transform America's National Security Institutions to meet the challenges and opportunities of the 21st century. Amongst its provisions, it says, 'assure our allies and friends, dissuade future military competition,

deter threats against the US interests, allies and friends and decisively defeat any adversary, if deterrence fails." And one of its cardinal issues are, 'our forces will have to be strong enough to dissuade potential adversaries from pursuing a military build-up in the hopes of surpassing or equalling the power of the United States.' Elsewhere, Madam Condoleezza Rice, the National Security Adviser to the President of the United States has stated the intentions of the USA by saying, 'to support all these means of defending the peace, the United States will build and maintain 21 st century military forces that are beyond challenge. We will seek to dissuade any potential adversary from pursuing a military build-up in the hope of surpassing or equalling the power of the United States and our allies. What none of us should want is the emergence of a militarily powerful adversary who does not share our common 'values.' So, I do believe the biggest lesson of the Resolution that we are to draw is its lesson for the future. And that lesson is that we have to be prepared. In the past, the imperialists were the British Empire. In the present, it is the United States of America. So, now we have to be prepared for the future imperialism, and the future imperialists can come from all quarters, all over the world. It could be the present imperialists carrying on; it could be other factors, which Shri Ekanath Thakur had mentioned; it could be the neighbours to our east, who are our competitors today; but what happens tomorrow is a question mark.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That is enough, Mr. Chowdhury.

SHRI SHANKAR ROY CHOWDHURY: Sir, with these words, I conclude my comments on this Resolution. I support the Resolution totally and I compliment the Government. I also compliment ourselves, all of us here, because it is an all-party Resolution.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Manoj Bhattacharya. You have only five minutes.

SHRI MANOJ BHATTACHARYA (West Bengal): I will try.

MR. CHAIRMAN: You should; otherwise, I will have to try.

SHRI MANOJ BHATTACHARYA: Sir, I must begin with thanking you for moving this Resolution. I agree with what you had told us in our private conversation that, ideally, this sort of Resolution should not have been discussed; this should have been passed; and that we should have a different discussion on the situation in Iraq.

[9 April, 2003]

RAJYA SABHA

However, I really find it difficult to understand what could be the appropriate word in the dictionary to express my anguish and my strong sense of resentment at this blatant invasion by hawks in the White House and their cohorts like Tony Blair and others. I do not know how to explain and describe the horrendous situation that has been existing in Iraq over a period of more than 20 days. I remember, Sir, that we had a discussion on 28th November, 2002, where I categorically told that war had been going on, the aggression had been going on-on Iraq, ever since the conclusion of the first Gulf War. The U.S. and the British forces were attacking the people of Iraq at will. We had a full fledged discussion on 28th November. We also had a discussion on 12th March. I remember very fondly the assurance given by the hon. Minister of External Affairs, Shri Yashwant Sinha, when he joined us emotionally and told us that Saddam Hussein, or Iraq, is our traditional friend, and we shall not let Saddam down. Sir, I would like to seek a clarification. What exactly has been done by the Government of India to ensure that Saddam Hussein is not let down, or Iraq, which has been our traditional friend and which has supported us in our times of need, is not let down.

Sir, I salute the patriots of Iraq who are fighting a pitched battle against the hawks of US imperialism, and I have no hesitation in saying that they are the newo-Nazis; after the Third Reich, the Fourth Reich has been established by Mr. Bush and his cohorts. Sir, this savagery has been perpetrated over a very, very long period. But much more savagery than that is being perpetrated now. They have huge arsenal, worth \$ 450 billions. An economy that is based on its military production and arsenal is out to throttle the voice of democracy in the world, through the indiscriminate use of these arsenals against one of the poorest nations. I don't consider, Sir, that even with a sanction of the U.N. Security Council, had US attacked, it would have been moral. I cannot purchase that idea. It would have been equally immoral, had there been a sanction from the U.N. Security Council because, Sir, I agree with the noted philosopher of today, Noam Chomskey when he says that it is not the failure of international diplomacy; it is the failure of coercion. All through these years, America coerced decisions in the Security Council. The United Nations Organisation was acting almost as an appendage of American Foreign Policy, for over a period of time.

Sir, at this hour, I am remembering Mark Toyen, the noted historian. After the Bamiyan Buddha was desecrated by the fundamentalist forces, by the hooligans of Talibanism, the very next day, we resolved in this House, a Resolution was moved by none else than the Deputy Chairperson of this House, Or. Namja Heptulla and we all joined, we unequivocally condemned the desecration of history, the desecration of heritage sites by the name of Bamiyan Buddha. I felt sorry, Sir, that when historical sites are being desecrated, when they are trying to force a situation when you forget the history of this world—what My friend, Nilotpal Basu has referred to, the Syrian, the Babylonian, Mesopotamian history; out of lakhs of sites, hardly some 12,000 sites could be excavated. The people could know the Asian history where the civilisation bloomed. When they were not at all civilised, the people of America, the civilisation bloomed in this part of the world. They are trying to rewrite the history, Sir. They are trying to rewrite the history that they are the master race, the same Nazism. What Hitler tried to propound, the same Nazism is nowadays evident in the form of American imperialism and their cohorts, the British imperialism. Sir, Mark Toyen had described, as long back as in 1916, I just quote him here.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Bhattacharya, your time is over.

SHRI MANOJ BHATTACHARYA: Sir, I am quoting Mark Toyen who is a very noted historian. I am just quoting him, Sir.

"Next the statesmen will invent cheap lies, putting the blame upon the nation that is attacked, and every man will be glad of those conscience-soothing falsities, and will diligently study them, and refuse to examine any refutations of them, and thus by and by convince himself that the war is just and will thank God for the better sleep he enjoys after this process of grotesque self deception."

I wish that the people of this world, the intellectuals of India, of any hue, the intellectuals of the world, of any hue, they don't suffer from this grotesque self-deception.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Please conclude.

SHRI MANOJ BHATTACHARYA: Sir, I am just concluding. I would just ask the hon. Foreign Minister who is present over here that what will be our role, what will be the decision of the Government of India,

[9 April, 2003]

RAJYA SABHA

whether we shall recognise the new regime that would be established by the hawks of the White House and imperialist forces, the puppet Government that will be established in Iraq, to oversee the reconstruction, so-called reconstruction, whether we shall recognise them or not. My feeling, the feeling of my party, the Revolutionary Socialist Party is very straight that we should not recognise that; we must not recognise that Government that will be installed by the American imperialism to subserve the interests of the American imperialism and to subserve the interest of the Western capitalism. We must not recognise that Government. Sir, I want a specific assurance from the hon. Foreign Minister to this extent.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Bhattacharya, that is over. Now, Dr. Raja Ramanna.

SHRI MANOJ BHATTACHARYA: Sir, with these words, I support the Resolution moved by you.

DR. RAJA RAMANNA (Nominated): Mr. Chairman, Sir, I will be as short as one can be. My first reference is to the Resolution, which I welcome heartily and as mentioned in other speeches, this is, perhaps, one or two days, already too late. But it is a good thing that it is supported by everybody and I join in it.

If you ask me which is the most tragic event that has taken place in all that has happened in the last few weeks, it is the way the United Nations has been treated. I feel particularly bad because I was a student in London, attending the first session of the United Nations. We thought, "Now, really somebody has come to control peace." And what did we do with it? We asked the United Nations to go and act as an inspector in a country. It is not a normal thing for the United Nations group. What did they find? There are no weapons of destruction. There were many good scientists in that group. Mr. Blix is a friend of mine, I know him. He is not a scientist, he is an organizer; but with him, he had some excellent scientists. And when they say there are none, that should have been enough. No, there were further continued searches, leading to war which is so unnecessary. But will these weapons ever be found? I don't know, because while Iraq, among all the Arab countries, is one of the most advanced in scientific matters, which people, sometimes, forget, because, as Nitotpalji pointed out, even the

renaissance came from the other side, the knowledge came from the other side, and they were almost founders of the renaissance, in a way. All this is part of the history, but never referred to.

I was hoping that this war would turn into a war against terrorists. But I don't know who is a terrorist and who is a warmonger, and who is a person we can rely on. I also thought that war was essentially for oil benefits. Whether it is true or not, I don't know. But I have read somewhere a statement by Woodrow Wilson, the President at the end of the First World War, where he said that wars are fought because of industrial reasons. Even at the end of the First World War (1914-18) he said this. This looks like that. But it seems to be very cruel, because some of the most severe weapons, newly developed with latest technologies, have been used, and they are used for killing babies! I see so many pictures in the TV, but you can imagine how the men have also suffered. You call them 'people' and may say, "Oh! Let them die." But they are also suffering; they are also many young people.

So, war should be completely stopped. How do we do this? In this 21 st Century, we have to build up stability of countries and see that use or exchange is done in a peaceful way and not lead up to a war. How are we going to do this? I think, the first analysis we have to perform is the new United Nations; if ever it will come again. We hope it will. 1 But we must have something equivalent from now on, that will take charge of such violent situations. But when asked, democracy is a great thing; we are a great democracy, but democracy itself produces all types of people. What do we do to the earth?

I will not take too much time, Sir, because I know you are very short of it. You were kind enough to give me time to say these few words. I hope this has been of some use. Thank you very much.

श्री सभापति : माननीय मंत्री महोदय । आप क्लैरीफिकेशंस करना चाहें तो कर दीजिए, वैसे बोलने की आवश्यकता तो है नहीं ।

मौलाना अबेदुल्ला खान आजमी : सर, निगाहे लुत्फ के उम्मीदवार हम भी है ।

श्री सभापति : मैं आप का उम्मीदवार हूँ । माननीय मंत्री जी ।

THE MINISTER OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS (SHRI YASHWANT SINHA): Sir I rise in support of the Resolution, which you have very

kindly moved from the Chair. I do not rise, let me clarify, to participate in a debate because I do not think we have debated here an issue in the spirit of Treasury Benches and Opposition. It is a Resolution, which has the support of all Members of this House, cutting across political party lines. I am sure at the end of it, it will be passed by acclaim. Sir, as I mentioned in the beginning, I rise in support of the Resolution and to say a few words which need some clarification. But before I proceed to do that, Sir, I would like to deeply mourn on my behalf, on behalf of the Government of India....and I am sure the whole House will join me....the precious lives of media people which have been lost in this war in Iraq. Lots of lives have been lost. I believe at least a dozen media people have lost their lives in this war. Three journalists died only yesterday when the hotel in which they were staying was attacked. I would also like to compliment the Doordarshan Team of Satish Jacob and Syed Nizami who despite all these dangers in Baghdad have stayed on to report on what is happening in Baghdad. I am sure the whole House will join me in complimenting them for this courageous act. Sir, the world has been deeply divided on the issue of Iraq. I am not sharing a secret with this House when I say that the United Nations is divided, the Security Council of the United Nations is divided, the Non-alignment Movement is divided, the OIC is divided, the Arab League is divided, the NATO is divided, the European Union is divided. Think of any major group of nations and we find that there is a deep fissure. a deep division which has prevented them from speaking in one voice on this issue. I am, therefore, particularly happy that the Iraq issue has not succeeded in dividing us. This whole House, the entire Parliament of India stands as one person behind the Resolution, Sir, that you have moved. Once again, we have demonstrated that when it comes to national interests, when it comes to a matter of such import as the present Iraq crisis, then we have the genius to demonstrate our wisdom and also our unity. And this has been proved repeatedly in our history. Sir, therefore, I will not like on this occasion to reply to some of the issues which have been raised *vis-a-vis* the attitude of the Government or any other political party. I think ultimately we need to compliment you, Sir, and we need to compliment ourselves on the fact that it has been possible for us to agree on a Resolution, which is not cast in a language, which meets the requirement of all shades of thinking. Sir, there have been one or two issues which have been raised and specially

by my distinguished colleagues Shri Natwar Singhji, Ramachandraiahji and others. I think it will create misunderstandings if I do not respond to those issues. And that is why I am responding to them so that those misunderstandings, if any, are removed. Sir, the first is the question, the right of pre-emptive strike and did I say that India had the right of pre-emptive strike against Pakistan, and, therefore, was I supporting the American led pre-emptive strike against Iraq even by implications. I would like to clarify, Sir, that in this age and time wherever you go, there is media waiting for you. They ask you questions. You cannot always say that I will not answer any questions. Questions are asked which are of immediate topical interest and are of importance. It was in that spirit, a question was put to me that if weapons of mass destruction, terrorism or export of terrorism and absence of democracy are reasons for a country to go into another country, militarily, then don't you think that Pakistan is a fitter case and don't you think that India has got all the arguments in its favour to do what the U.S. had done or the U.S.-led coalition has done? And, I am quite sure, nobody in this House will disagree with me when I say that I genuinely believe the possession of weapons of mass destruction, absence of democracy and export of terrorism are the criteria. Then, no country deserves more than Pakistan to be tackled in this way compared to any other country in the world. We have said, and, I am not trying to conceal anything, that we, in the Government of India, have not come across any evidence to link Iraq with either weapons of mass destruction or export of terrorism. And, therefore, we have differed with many other powers on this particular issue. But, we know from experience, we know on the basis of evidence, that Pakistan does not fall in the same category as Iraq, it is in a much worse category. And, therefore, it was in that context, that this reply was given by me that if these are the criteria then Pakistan is a fitter case.

SHRI N.K. PREMACHANDRAN (Kerala):Media has already published it

SHRI YASHWANT SINHA: I am sure the media will correct it. That is why I am stating this on the floor of this House. But, I would like to say, Sir, ever since the issue of a pre-emptive strike against Iraq has been talked about, there have been commentators, there have been writers, not only in India but elsewhere in the world, who said that if

there was a pre-emptive attack case, India has a better case against Pakistan than any other country. This is an opinion which has been expressed, repeatedly, in articles that have been written even in the foreign media.

Now, having clarified that point, Sir, I would like to say, again, an issue was raised that the U.S. Secretary of State has said that after they had done with Iraq, they are going to turn their attention to the Indian Sub-continent. When that question was put to me, I responded by saying that the only issue, according to us, which we are discussing with the international community, is the issue of cross-border terrorism and I would like everyone in this House, in this country, to be clear about it that there is an international coalition after 9/11. There is a Security Council Resolution No. 1373 against international terrorism, and, under this Resolution and within the international coalition, there is supposed to be going on a global war against terrorism. We are partners in that. Therefore, when we find that 'another country' is in clear violation of Resolution No. 1373 that 'another country' is indulging in cross-border terrorism with impunity, then this is an issue, under that international coalition, under that U.N. arrangement, within the ambit of the Security Council Resolution. We have not hesitated in discussing that with other countries. We have discussed with them the issue of cross-border terrorism. But, let me be very clear that what is not discussed and what will not be discussed is the issue between India and Pakistan, whether it be Jammu and Kashmir or any other issue under the Shimla Accord. That is to be resolved bilaterally between India and Pakistan and that is how, if at all, it will be resolved. There is no third party role in these bilateral issues between Pakistan and India and we will not permit any third party to play any role. So, let there be no doubt about this particular issue that any one is being invited by us to play a role on the bilateral issues with Pakistan, or, that anyone will be permitted to play that role. Having said that, I would also like to say that we should not, perhaps, be too sensitive about the things. We are a nation of over a billion people. We are a nation of a great deal of confidence. We should be able to reflect that confidence. If somebody says, "We will try to take care of India and Pakistan", let them say what they want to say. Let's also not be too sensitive about who is responding to a statement that I have made. Let me tell you that when a joint statement was made by

the U.S. Secretary of State and the British Foreign Secretary, it was our official spokesperson who had responded to that. This is something;— Mr. Natwar Singh will bear me out—which happens repeatedly across the world. The Foreign Offices respond to statements which are made by Ministers, Heads of Government, Heads of State. So, if somebody has responded from the US State Department, however mistakenly, to a statement, which I have made, or, which is perpetrated to have been made by me, I don't think we should take it as a snub or a great humiliation of India or anything of that kind. We have also responded in a similar manner. Therefore, Sir, I would say that we should show the confidence that we have, as a nation. Yesterday, I had said in the other House that we have economic strength, we have military strength, but more than any other strength, we have the strength of Indian democracy. This is the strength that will stand us in good stead. Therefore, nobody can caste an evil eye on India. If anyone tries and does anything that we are not willing to accept, India has the capacity with the same degree of unity, which this House is demonstrating, today, in passing and adopting this Resolution. The same unit will come to our help in tackling that problem. I will also hasten to add that our Foreign policy has never been Pak-centric. It is not Pak-centric even today. We tend to talk about Pakistan all the time. When I held my first Press Conference as the Minister of External Affairs to the Government of India, I had to plead with the media three-fourths of the way that let's talk about other issues because Pakistan is not the only issue of Indian Foreign Policy. Today, we are discussing Iraq. Pakistan came in tangentially. We will have an opportunity to discuss issues of Foreign Policy, I am sure, sometime within this session, or, at some other session. Then, I will get an opportunity to clarify so many other points that have been raised in the course of the discussion, today. But Let me, once again, compliment the entire House, the membership of this House, and you, Sir, in particular, for the wisdom that has been demonstrated by us, for the unity that has been demonstrated by us. And, I am quite sure that the world will take notice of the Resolution, which is going to be adopted unanimously by this House. And I would like to assure the House, through you, Sir, on behalf of the Government of India that it is an exceptional situation that the Parliament of India is adopting a Resolution. We have adopted Resolutions in the past, Sir, in equally exceptional situations. We are bound by those Resolutions. And, we will continue

to work energetically; we will continue to work sincerely in the Government of India to ensure that the sentiment of this Resolution is translated at the international level. Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: No clarifications, now.

4.00 P.M.

में सभी माननीय सदस्यों के प्रति आभार प्रकट करता हूँ कि उन्होंने इस संकल्प का समर्थन किया है। सामान्यता सभापति द्वारा प्रस्तुत किए गए संकल्प पर चर्चा नहीं होनी चाहिए परन्तु माननीय सदस्यों के आग्रह पर इस पर चर्चा हुई है। यह चर्चा भविष्य के लिए परंपरा का कोई आधार नहीं होगी। अब आपकी अनुमति से और सदन की सम्मति से मैं घोषणा करता हूँ कि यह संकल्प सर्वसम्मति से स्वीकृत किया गया। धन्यवाद।

GOVERNMENT BILLS

The Constitution (Scheduled Tribes) (Union Territories)

Order (Amendment) Bill, 2003

जनजाति कार्य मंत्री (श्री जुएल उराम) : सर, एक छोटा सा परिवर्तन है।

श्री नीलोत्पल बसु (पश्चिमी बंगाल) : हमें बताया गया था कि ...**(व्यवधान)**...

श्री जुएल उराम : मैं खाली बतला रहा हूँ कि इसमें और भी कंसलटेशन की आवश्यकता है। इसलिए अभी इसको पारित न किया जाए, इसको थोड़ा डेफर कर दिया जाए। इसमें थोड़ा और भी सलाह मशविरा किया जाना आवश्यक है।

श्री जीवन राय (पश्चिमी बंगाल) : सर, बाकी कल कर लेंगे, अब छुट्टी कर दी जाए।

श्री सभापति : मेरी सुन लीजिए। कई बार बच्चे आग्रह करते हैं कि आज की छुट्टी कर दी जाए। मैं समझता हूँ कि अपना व्यवहार बच्चों जैसा नहीं है गंभीर व्यक्तियों जैसा होना चाहिए। आपको कहने से दो दिन की छुट्टी पहले कर दी है और आज की छुट्टी करूँ तो लोग कुछ और ही बातें कहेंगे।

श्री खान गुफरान ज़ाहिदी : अगर आज आप हाउस एडजोर्न कर दें तो बेहतर रहेगा।

श्री सभापति : आपको कहीं जाना तो नहीं है।

श्री खान गुफरान ज़ाहिदी : नहीं, सर।

श्री सभापति : तो आप बैठे रहिए।