

13.58hrs.

Title: Discussion regarding threat to international peace due to mounting tension between USA and Iraq.
(Concluded)

MR. SPEAKER: We now go on to the Discussion under Rule 193. The discussion is to be raised by Shri Nawal Kishore Rai. Since he is not present in the House, the next name is that of Shri Ramji Lal Suman. I would request him to initiate the debate but, let me make it clear to the Members that, as decided in the Business Advisory Committee, this debate will continue for two hours. Since the hon. External Affairs Minister is not in India, the former Minister for External Affairs has agreed to reply to the debate. Therefore, we will be calling him immediately after the discussion is over or he may come and sit in the House even before that.

14.00 hrs.

Or he may come before that and sit in the House. But I want that after two hours, we should start the reply to the debate.

SHRI SHIVRAJ V. PATIL (LATUR): This is an important debate and in the Business Advisory Committee, as far as allocation of time for this subject was concerned, we did not pay any attention to it and we did not discuss it also. Two hours should be sufficient. But if it is not sufficient, let us discuss it for some more time.

MR. SPEAKER: As far as possible, we should complete it in two hours.

डॉ.विजय कुमार मल्होत्रा (दक्षिण दिल्ली) : अध्यक्ष महोदय, कोई खास बात ही हो जाए तो अलग बात है, नहीं तो दो घंटे काफी हैं।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : इसीलिए मैंने कहा है कि यदि हो सके तो दो घंटे में पूरा करेंगे।

डॉ.विजय कुमार मल्होत्रा : इसमें पोलिटीकल पार्टीज का और कंट्री का यूनैनीमस ओपीनियन है, कोई डिफरेंस ऑफ ओपीनियन नहीं है। The difference of opinion is only in the expression of our views. So, two hours' time should be sufficient.

MR. SPEAKER: Let us try to complete it in two hours.

श्री रामजीलाल सुमन (फिरोजाबाद) : अध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं आपका आभार प्रकट करता हूँ कि एक महत्वपूर्ण मुद्दे पर, जिससे सारी दुनिया चिंतित है, बहस प्रारम्भ करने का आपने मुझे अवसर दिया। दूसरे विश्व युद्ध के बाद यह सोचा गया था कि अंतर्राष्ट्रीय व्यवस्था का लोकतंत्रीकरण हो और यह प्रयास किया जाए कि यदि कहीं विवाद हो तो उसका हल बातचीत के जरिये निकाला जाए। एक राजनीतिक कार्यकर्ता होने के नाते मैं स्वयं यह मानता हूँ कि अगर हमारी नीयत साफ हो तो दुनिया की कोई ऐसी समस्या नहीं है जिसका हल न निकाला जा सके।

आज अमरीका इराक पर हमला करने के लिए उतावला है। हम युद्ध के परिणामों को जानते हैं। युद्ध तबाही और बरबादी देता है। युद्ध से किसी का हित नहीं होता, अहित ही होता है। जिस देश के विरुद्ध युद्ध होता है, वहां की जनता को उसके परिणाम भोगने पड़ते हैं। लिहाजा पूरी दुनिया में जितनी लोकतांत्रिक शक्तियां हैं, जितने अमनपसंद लोग हैं, उनका यह दायित्व है कि दुनिया के किसी भी हिस्से में युद्ध न हो, इसका प्रयास हम लोगों को भी करना चाहिए।

हिन्दुस्तान गांधी जी का देश है और हम अहिंसा के पुजारी हैं। हमारा यह दायित्व और धर्म है कि इराक पर हमला न हो। दुनिया के किसी देश पर कोई दूसरा देश हमला न करे। इसलिए इसका हम न सिर्फ विरोध करें, बल्कि उसमें सार्थक पहल करें, हस्तक्षेप करें और अगुवाई करें। इसलिए मैं आपकी मार्फत यही कहना चाहूंगा कि आज जो अमरीका की दादागिरी है, जो रवैया है, अमरीका जो इराक में करना चाहता है, उसमें भारत को सार्थक पहल करनी चाहिए।

अध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं विनम्रतापूर्वक यह भी निवेदन करना चाहूंगा कि खाड़ी का मामला या इराक का मामला इराक तक सीमित नहीं है। खाड़ी में हिन्दुस्तान के भी तीस लाख लोग रहते हैं। लिहाजा प्रत्यक्ष या अप्रत्यक्ष तौर पर अगर वहां तनाव पैदा होता है तो उसका शिकार हमें भी बनना पड़ेगा। जहां तक देश के प्रधान मंत्री जी का सवाल है, उनका हम बड़ा सम्मान करते हैं। उनका और सरकार का दृष्टिकोण साफ है कि इराक का मामला संयुक्त राष्ट्र संघ तय करेगा। दूसरी तरफ अमरीका का दृष्टिकोण यह है कि अगर संयुक्त राष्ट्र हमें सहयोग नहीं करेगा तो भी हम इराक पर हमला कर सकते हैं।

अध्यक्ष महोदय, जब अमेरिका ने अफगानिस्तान पर हमला किया तो हिन्दुस्तान पहला देश था जिसने बिना किसी शर्त के अमेरिका का साथ दिया और उसका परिणाम यह हुआ कि विश्व में जनमत अमेरिका के पक्ष में बना। हमारा फर्ज बनता है, धर्म बनता है कि हम भी अमेरिका पर दबाव डालें और यही प्रयास आज हम लोगों को करना चाहिए। अफगानिस्तान में कौन शासक था, कौन राजा था, कौन प्रधान मंत्री था, कौन राष्ट्रपति था, वह एक अलग सवाल है। लेकिन जब कोई युद्ध होता है तो परिणाम वहां की जनता को भुगतना पड़ता है और उसके परिणाम बड़े दुखदायी होते हैं। मैं समझता हूँ कि अगर युद्ध होता है तो इसी तरह की पुनरावृत्ति इराक में होगी।

अध्यक्ष महोदय, सही मायनों में झगड़ा हथियारों का नहीं है, अणु बम या परमाणु बम का नहीं है। सही मायनों में अमेरिका की नीयत इराक के तेल भंडारों पर कब्जा करने की है। इसी दृष्टि से ये सब काम किया जा रहा है। इराक के खिलाफ सुरक्षा परिषद में प्रस्ताव 1441 आया कि इसके पास परमाणु हथियारों का जखीरा है। संयुक्त राष्ट्र में पांच सुरक्षा परिषद के स्थायी सदस्य हैं और दस अस्थायी सदस्य हैं। सभी 15 देशों ने इस पर सहमति जताई कि इसकी जांच होनी चाहिए और एक एक्सपर्ट हैन्स ब्लिक्स को जांच करने के लिए कहा गया। जब उन्होंने जांच की तो जांच के बाद उन्होंने बताया कि हमें इराक में कुछ नहीं मिला। इसके बाद भी कार्रवाई की बात कही जा रही है। ब्रिटेन, बेल्जियम और इटली को छोड़कर मैं नहीं समझता कि दुनिया का कोई देश अमेरिका की इस दादागिरी के हक में है। जर्मनी, फ्रांस और रूस, ये सभी लोग युद्ध के विरोधी हैं और संयुक्त राष्ट्र संघ के महासचिव कोफी अन्नान साहब ने एक बार नहीं, अनेक बार कहा है कि युद्ध किसी भी कीमत पर नहीं होना चाहिए। हैन्स ब्लिक्स की जो रिपोर्ट है, उस पर हमें विचार करना चाहिए।

अध्यक्ष महोदय, मेरे पास कतरन है। दुनिया के नोबल पुरस्कार विजेताओं ने संयुक्त रूप से अपील की है दुनिया से कि अमेरिका जो इराक पर हमला करना चाहता है, उसका हर कीमत पर विरोध होना चाहिए। यह बात सही है कि सुरक्षा परिषद में अमेरिका की दादागिरी थी। लेकिन इस सवाल पर सुरक्षा परिषद में भी अमेरिका अकेला पड़ गया। अमेरिका इराक पर हमला करना चाहता है। वियतनाम युद्ध के बाद, युद्ध के संबंध में इतना विरोध दुनिया में कभी नहीं हुआ। संयुक्त राष्ट्र संघ का जो

कार्यालय न्यूयार्क में है, उसी के पड़ोस में ढाई लाख लोगों ने प्रदर्शन किया और युद्ध विरोधी नारे लगाए। शिकागो में विरोध हुआ। यूरोप, बेल्जियम, ब्रिटेन में लाखों लोगों ने प्रदर्शन किया। लंदन की सड़कों पर पांच लाख लोगों ने प्रदर्शन किया। इटली की राजधानी रोम में दस लाख लोगों ने मिलकर प्रदर्शन किया।

अध्यक्ष महोदय, अब तक कुल मिलाकर जो विरोध-प्रदर्शन हुए हैं, वे 600 शहरों के लगभग 60 लाख लोगों ने किए हैं और अमरीका को इराक पर हमला नहीं करना चाहिए, इस प्रकार के नारे भी लगाए गए हैं। एक सर्वेक्षण के अनुसार अमरीका के 60 फीसदी लोग युद्ध नहीं चाहते। अमरीका के लोग भी युद्ध के खिलाफ हैं और उन्होंने नारा लगाया है कि बुश को हटाओ, बम नहीं गिराओ। पूरा विश्व जनमत इस लड़ाई के खिलाफ है। भाई दिग्विजय सिंह जी यहां बैठे हैं। वे विदेश राज्य मंत्री हैं। वे अभी पिछले आठ महीने में दो बार इराक हो आए हैं।

इराक हमारा दोस्त है। इराक का उदारवादी दृष्टिकोण है। अमरीका अपने को सबसे बड़ा लोकतांत्रिक देश मानता है, लेकिन इराक पर हमला करना चाहता है और हमें रोज सबक सिखाता है कि हिन्दुस्तान और पाकिस्तान को आपस में मिल बैठ कर बात करनी चाहिए। मैं पूछना चाहता हूँ कि उत्तरी कोरिया के बारे में अमरीका का क्या दृष्टिकोण है। अमरीका हर काम अपनी सुविधा के अनुसार करना चाहता है।

महोदय, आज संयुक्त राष्ट्र संघ की जो स्थिति है वह ठीक नहीं है क्योंकि जैसा मैंने पहले निवेदन किया, अमरीका ने कह दिया कि उसे संयुक्त राष्ट्र संघ की कोई परवाह नहीं है। संयुक्त राष्ट्र संघ में हमारी क्या स्थिति है, हमें इस तरफ भी देखना चाहिए। हम संयुक्त राष्ट्र संघ के संस्थापक सदस्यों में से हैं। संयुक्त राष्ट्र संघ के निर्माण में मार्शल टीटो के साथ-साथ पं. जवाहर लाल नेहरू का भी बड़ा भारी योगदान रहा है। हमने बार-बार गुहार की, बार-बार प्रार्थना की है कि हमें संयुक्त राष्ट्र संघ का स्थाई सदस्य बनाया जाए, लेकिन हम अभी तक संयुक्त राष्ट्र संघ के स्थायी सदस्य नहीं बन पाए। हम सात बार संयुक्त राष्ट्र के अस्थायी सदस्य रहे, लेकिन पिछली बार वॉ 1996 में हम जापान से अस्थायी सदस्यता में भी हार गए। दुर्भाग्य की बात यह है कि अब हम सुरक्षा परिषद के अस्थायी सदस्य भी नहीं हैं, लेकिन आगे आने वाले दो वॉ के लिए पाकिस्तान सुरक्षा परिषद का अस्थायी सदस्य बन गया है। यह अत्यन्त गम्भीर मामला है। संयुक्त राष्ट्र संघ की जो प्रभावी भूमिका, जो प्रभावी रोल होना चाहिए, वह नहीं है।

महोदय, खुशी की बात है कि फ्रांस और जर्मनी जैसे देश भी आज अमरीका के विरोध में खड़े हो गए हैं, लेकिन सब से दुखद पहलू यह है कि सुरक्षा परिषद को वीटो पावर का अधिकार है और भारत को हर कीमत पर इराक पर युद्ध करने के अमरीका के प्रयास का विरोध करना चाहिए। पांच महाशक्तियों में से कोई भी एक महाशक्ति यदि किसी सवाल पर वीटो कर दे, तो कितना भी गम्भीर मामला हो, उसको टाला जा सकता है। दुनिया के तमाम देशों ने इराक पर अमरीकी हमले का विरोध किया है और जहां तक मुझे जानकारी है, फ्रांस की संसद ने तो प्रस्ताव भी पास किया है। सही मायने में जो अब दस्तावेज प्रकाश में आए हैं उनसे लग रहा है और एक समाचार पत्र वाशिंगटन पोस्ट में छपा है, उसके मुताबिक 1980 के दशक में स्वयं अमरीका ने ही इराक को इन हथियारों को बनाने और प्रोत्साहित करने में मदद की थी। दिनांक 20 दिसम्बर, 1983 को डोनाल्ड रम्सफैल्ड, जो इस समय अमरीका के डिफेंस सैक्रेट्री हैं, सही नाम क्या है, इस बारे में दिग्विजय सिंह जी जानते होंगे क्योंकि वे बगदाद गये थे और 90 मिनट तक बातचीत की थी।

अध्यक्ष महोदय, यह बहुत गंभीर सवाल है। जैसा मैंने पहले विनम्रता के साथ निवेदन किया कि युद्ध तबाही एवं बर्बादी देता है। दुनिया के जिन हिस्सों में तनाव है, उस तनाव को दूर करने के लिए भारत को अहम भूमिका का निर्वाह करना चाहिए। पाकिस्तान के साथ हमारी जो समस्या है, मैं समझता हूँ कि वह समस्या इराक से ज्यादा गंभीर है। हमें हर बार यह समझाया एवं बुझाया जाता है कि अमेरिका कोई मध्यस्थता नहीं करेगा, अमेरिका का कोई रोल नहीं है। हिन्दुस्तान और पाकिस्तान को आपस में बैठ कर बात करनी चाहिए। जब यह सबक हमें अमेरिका सिखा सकता है तो हम अमेरिका से ही क्यों नहीं कह सकते कि दुनिया की कौन सी ऐसी समस्या है जो बातचीत के जरिए हल न हो सके, बशर्ते हमारी नीयत साफ हो। हमारे साथ अमेरिका और पाकिस्तान का क्या रिश्ता है, मुझे ज्यादा जानकारी नहीं है। वि. वक्त मंत्री जी यहां तशरीफ रखे हुए हैं। आपका जो 2004 का बजट बनने वाला है, संभवतः अमेरिका ने भारत को 53.25 मिलियन डालर और पाकिस्तान को 326.25 मिलियन डालर देने की बात कही है। इसका मतलब यह है कि उसे हिन्दुस्तान की तुलना में पाकिस्तान के साथ ज्यादा हमदर्दी है।

महोदय, हम आपका संरक्षण चाहते हैं, यहां किसी पार्टी का सवाल नहीं है। यह संसद पूरे देश के सभी वर्गों और धर्मों का प्रतिनिधित्व करती है। मैं सत्तारूढ़ दल के लोगों से बड़ी विनम्रता के साथ निवेदन करना चाहूंगा कि उनके जो सहयोगी एवं मित्र हैं, वे इराक के सवाल पर, हमले के सवाल पर यह बयान भी देते हैं कि भारत सरकार को अमेरिका का समर्थन करना चाहिए। वे समाज का कोई भला नहीं कर रहे हैं। अभी प्रवीण तोगड़िया जी का बयान छपा। मल्होत्रा जी, आप क्यों हाथ हिला रहे हैं? (व्यवधान) आप पढ़े-लिखे हैं, लेकिन मैं भी थोड़ा-बहुत जानता हूँ। आपका काम सरकार को बचाने का है। आप सरकार को बाद में बचा लेना। एक बार नहीं बल्कि अनेक बार बयान छपा कि भारत को अमेरिका का साथ देना चाहिए। अगर इराक पर युद्ध होता है तो मैं समझता हूँ कि ये सब ठीक नहीं है। विजय कुमार मल्होत्रा जी, यह आपकी सेहत के लिए भी ठीक नहीं है। अखबार आप भी पढ़ते हैं और मैं भी थोड़ा-बहुत जानकारी रखता हूँ। आप जब अपनी बात कहें तो निश्चित रूप से इन सवालों पर चर्चा करिए।

अध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं आपकी मार्फत एक ही विनम्र प्रार्थना करना चाहता हूँ, पूरे सदन की तरफ से यह भावना जानी चाहिए कि अमेरिका की जो खलीफागिरी, दादागिरी है, वह इराक पर हमला करना चाहता है और हमला ही नहीं करना चाहता है बल्कि डेढ़ लाख फौजें वहां इनकी तैनात हैं, उसके जो मित्र देश हैं, उनकी फौजें वहां तैनात हैं, अमेरिका का जो इरादा है, इनके उस इरादे की हम सिर्फ आलोचना नहीं करते, भारतीय संसद को प्रस्ताव पास करना चाहिए। महोदय, हम आपका संरक्षण चाहते हैं, आपकी तरफ से यह प्रस्ताव आना चाहिए कि अमेरिका का जो रवैया है, हम उसकी आलोचना करते हैं और किसी भी कीमत पर अमेरिका को इराक पर हमला नहीं करना चाहिए। मुझे विश्वास है कि सदन में सब लोगों की भावना इसी के अनुकूल होगी। अगर इस तरह का संदेश भारत की संसद के मार्फत हम दुनिया को दे सकें तो मैं समझता हूँ कि आपकी बड़ी कृपा होगी। मुझे यही निवेदन करना था।

डॉ. विजय कुमार मल्होत्रा (दक्षिण दिल्ली) : अध्यक्ष महोदय, इस समय सदन जिस विषय पर चर्चा कर रहा है, यह विषय बहुत ही महत्व का है। संसार में युद्ध की विभीषिका इस समय छाई हुई है और सारा विश्व इस बात से त्रस्त है कि क्या आने वाले दिनों में कोई युद्ध होगा। निश्चित रूप से भारत युद्ध के खिलाफ है। चाहे कैसा भी युद्ध हो और कहीं पर भी हो, जब तक कि उसमें कोई अनिवार्यता न हो जाए। युद्ध की विभीषिका से सारा विश्व परिचित है। जितने युद्ध होते हैं, उनमें हजारों लोग मरते हैं, स्त्रियां विधवा होती हैं और बच्चे अपाहिज एवं अनाथ हो जाते हैं। खेत एवं खलिहान उजड़ जाते हैं। ऐसे में युद्ध से बचना हरक का काम है। हम भी निश्चित तौर पर चाहते हैं कि किसी तरह से भी युद्ध टालना चाहिए, युद्ध नहीं होना चाहिए। यह जो बात कही जा रही है कि इराक के पास मॉस डिस्ट्रक्शन के हथियार हैं, कैमिकल वैपंस हैं, इस प्रकार की चीजें उसके पास हैं, जिनके आधार पर युद्ध की बात की जा रही है, अभी तक ऐसे कोई सबूत नहीं मिले हैं। संयुक्त राष्ट्र संघ के वैपन इन्स्पेक्टर ने भी यह बात आकर कही है कि ऐसे कोई हथियार वहां पर हैं, इसकी कोई जानकारी उन्हें प्राप्त नहीं हुई। ऐसे हालात में जबकि इस प्रकार के कोई सबूत भी नहीं हैं, कोई ऐसी बात नहीं है और कुछ है भी, उसका भी अगर डिसआर्मामेंट करना है, इराक के इन हथियारों को नष्ट भी करना है तो वह संयुक्त राष्ट्र संघ के माध्यम से होना चाहिए। किसी एक देश को ऐसा कोई अधिकार नहीं मिल जाता कि वह इस प्रकार की बातों को लेकर अपने आप सारे विश्व का दरोगा बन जाये या सारे विश्व का सम्राट बन जाये। सारी दुनिया का केवलमात्र वही एक नेता है, ऐसा सोचने का कोई कारण नहीं है।

हम चाहते हैं कि अगर कोई कैमिकल वैपंस हैं या दूसरे वैपंस हैं तो उनको नष्ट किया जाना चाहिए। उसके लिए भी विश्व जनमत तैयार हो और इसका कोई सबूत मिल जाये तो इस बात को देखा जाये। हम इस बात से भी सहमत हैं कि आतंकवाद के खिलाफ युद्ध रहना चाहिए। अलकायदा, बिन लादेन ने जो कुछ किया है, उसके खिलाफ कार्रवाई विश्व में सब को मिलकर करनी चाहिए। आतंकवाद के खिलाफ एक युद्ध चल रहा है, परन्तु आतंकवाद के युद्ध में अगर अमेरिका ईमानदार है और अमेरिका की ईमानदारी है कि वह आतंकवाद के खिलाफ युद्ध करना चाहता है तो उसे अपना टार्गेट, अपना निशाना इराक के बजाय पाकिस्तान को बनाना

चाहिए। इराक को उन्होंने इस समय अपना निशाना बनाया हुआ है, जिसके यहां कोई सबूत नहीं मिल रहा है, परन्तु पाकिस्तान के सबूत तो जगजाहिर हैं। सारी दुनिया जानती है कि पाकिस्तान क्या कर रहा है। जितने पाकिस्तान में अफगानिस्तान से अलकायदा के लोग भागकर आये, जितने तालिबान आये, सब पाकिस्तान में शरण लेकर बैठे हुए हैं। जितने लोगों को आबूघाबी में छोड़ा गया, वे सब आकर पाकिस्तान में शरण लिए हुए हैं। पाकिस्तान ने जिनको पकड़ा था, उनको रिहा कर दिया है। पाकिस्तान हिन्दुस्तान के खिलाफ क्रास बोर्डर टैरिज्म में जो कुछ कर रहा है, उसके बारे में सदन में अनेक बार चिन्ता प्रकट की गई है। मैं सहमत हूँ, अभी जो बात कही गई कि अमेरिका ने पाकिस्तान को मोस्ट फेवर्ड नेशन बना रखा है, 326 मिलियन डालर की उसे सहायता दे रहा है। यह रुपया पाकिस्तान के पास जाता है तो वह क्रास बोर्डर टैरिज्म पर खर्च होता है, वह आतंकवाद को बढ़ाने में खर्च होता है, वह दुनिया में आतंकवाद फैलाने में खर्च होता है, वह अलकायदा और बिन लादेन की मदद के लिए खर्च होता है। वहां पर बैठी हुई ये ताकतें जो इस समय कर रही हैं, अमेरिका उसकी तरफ ध्यान नहीं दे रहा।

बंगलादेश का एक नया केन्द्र बन गया है। पश्चिम बंगाल के मुख्यमंत्री बुद्धदेव भट्टाचार्य ने भी उसके बारे में बड़ी चिन्ता प्रकट की है, आसपास के लोगों ने भी चिन्ता प्रकट की है कि बंगलादेश एक नया सैण्टर बनता जा रहा है। अमेरिका को इसकी कोई चिन्ता नहीं है। अमेरिका दुनिया भर में अगर आतंकवाद खत्म करना चाहता है तो जो सचमुच में आतंकवाद भड़का रहे हैं, उसके बारे में भी उसे चिन्ता करनी चाहिए। अमेरिका को यू.एन.ओ. को भी देखना चाहिए, संयुक्त राष्ट्र संघ को देखना चाहिए, उन पर दबाव नहीं डालना चाहिए। यूरोप के अधिकांश देश उसे कह रहे हैं और उस समय जब यह कह दिया गया है कि कोई हथियार हैं ही नहीं, वहां हथियार नहीं पाये गये तो और समय दिया जाये। वहां इंस्पेक्टर्स देखें और हथियार मिल जायें तो सारी दुनिया मिलकर उन हथियारों को नट करने के लिए प्रयास करे। डेमोक्रेटिक रिलेशंस से भी इस दिशा में कोशिश की जा सकती है, और तरीके अपनाये जा सकते हैं।

हमारे तो बहुत से आर्थिक हित भी इससे जुड़े हुए हैं। आज पेट्रोल एकदम से महंगा होता जा रहा है। अमेरिका इराक पर अपना वर्चस्व स्थापित करने के लिए या अपनी जिद पूरी करने के लिए उस पर हमला कर दे और यह दिखाये कि उसने इराक के ऊपर दो महीने, चार महीने के लिए कब्जा कर लिया तो उसका क्या असर होगा। हमारे लाखों लोग कुवैत में फंसे हुए हैं, हमारे लाखों लोग सऊदी अरब में हैं, और जगह पर हैं, उनकी सुरक्षा खतरे में पड़ती है, हमारे आर्थिक हित खतरे में पड़ते हैं। हमारे इराक से भी बहुत से आर्थिक हित जुड़े हुए हैं और इराक ने बहुत समय तक भारत की सहायता की है।

मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि यह कोई सिविलाइजेशन कान्फ्लिक्ट नहीं है। हम इसे बिल्कुल सिविलाइजेशन कान्फ्लिक्ट नहीं मानते, क्योंकि पहले भी जब अमरीका इराक का युद्ध हुआ था तो कई मुस्लिम देश अमरीका के साथ मिलकर लड़े थे। उस समय अमरीका और उन्होंने मिलकर कुवैत पर हमला कर दिया था। इस समय कोई सिविलाइजेशन कान्फ्लिक्ट है, कोई सभ्यताओं का संघर्ष हो रहा है या कोई मजहबों की लड़ाई हो रही है, ऐसा इसमें कुछ नहीं है। इस कारण इसे ऐसा नहीं माना जाना चाहिए। सारे विश्व के जनमत को देखकर इस समय वहां युद्ध नहीं होना चाहिए। अगर कोई हथियार हैं तो उनके लिए समय दिया जाये, उसे देखा जाये। इसके साथ-साथ केमिकल वैपन्स या मास डैस्ट्रक्शन वैपन्स को खत्म करने के लिए विश्व जनमत तैयार करें। अमरीका अगर सचमुच आतंकवाद के खिलाफ लड़ाई लड़ना चाहता है तो पाकिस्तान के ऊपर वह अपना निशाना साधे, यही मैं आपसे कहना चाहता हूँ।

SHRI MANI SHANKAR AIYAR (MAYILADUTURAI): Mr. Speaker, Sir, ever since the hon. Minister of State Shri Digvijay Singh and his senior colleague assumed office in South Block, the distortions that have been introduced in the foreign policy by their predecessor have begun to be rectified. I must, in all fairness, add that the enormous mistakes which Shri Yashwant Sinha committed in the Ministry of Finance have begun to be rectified by Shri Jaswant Singh. Perhaps, the original sin lay in the decision of the Prime Minister to have placed them in the wrong places. But because I see that the ghost of the past is likely to be responding to this debate, I would urge Shri Digvijay Singh to please counsel restraint upon his senior colleague and ensure that India's foreign policy continues along the lines he and Shri Yashwant Sinha are laying down, rather than the distortions which we had to suffer during Shri Jaswant Singh's tenure.

I particularly wish to draw the attention to the fact that after Shri Jaswant Singh demitted the office, we have had one extremely important statement made about the situation obtaining in Iraq by the Permanent Representative of India in the United Nations. It was made in the Security Council on October 17, 2002. I do not think that statement could be bettered. I think it does provide a basis for the restoration of a national consensus on foreign policy specifically in respect of Non-Alignment which, I regret, has been absent between 1998 and 2002-03. So, we had hoped that the Treasury Benches would, in the new wisdom that has dawned upon them, agree to carry the voice of all of India to Kuala Lumpur instead of only the voice of the Government of India. I do not know what reasons have prevented them from taking this path of national consensus, for, foreign policy has traditionally been a matter of consensus and not a matter of confrontation in this House.

It seems to me that the speech made by Shri V.K. Nambiar in the United Nations Security Council in October, 2002 contains most of the elements that are required for putting together a consensus view of this Parliament which, had it been made, could have reverberated in the Conference Hall in Kuala Lumpur. But as the Government is not willing to do that, all that we can do is to urge Shri Digvijay Singh to kindly ignore the gentleman sitting to his right and listen carefully to those who are standing opposite him so that he could perhaps move forward in the direction of making this country a great country.

The tragedy between 1998 and 2003 is that in the realm of foreign policy, this country, whose voice was listened to with utmost respect in the councils of the world, has become something of a lap-dog. We have a Prime Minister whose knees had happily been surgically corrected but we have a Government whose knees are still knocking against each other and falling upon those knees.

What we need to understand is that the foreign policy is the external expression of our internal sovereignty. Unless we have the courage and unless we have the conviction to be able to say what we want to say in international affairs loudly, clearly and with the best articulation, our voice will not be heard. Let us not forget that we are not a country of great military might; we are not a country of great economic power; we are not a country of huge political clout. What we are is a country, a civilization, which has taught the world in contemporary times the meaning of morality in international affairs.

In 1946, even before we became independent, our Foreign Minister at that time, Pandit Jawahar Lal Nehru, articulated non-alignment and although there was a time when non-alignment came to become the foreign policy of the world at large. Let us not forget that between 1947 and 1961, we were alone in expressing our views in the world in contradistinction to the two blocs. The Non-Aligned Movement consisted of one member from 1947 till 1956. Only after nine years did five countries get together in Brunei and started the embryo of what became the Non-Aligned Movement. The first summit of the Non-Aligned Movement was held in 1961 in Belgrade, a good 14 years after we became independent and a good 16 years after we first started articulating the principles of Non-Alignment. During this period, when we were really all alone in the world was when we counted for the most. Let us not forget that the war in the Korean peninsula was brought to an end only after India was persuaded to accept the Chairmanship of the Neutral Nations Repatriation Commission and the war in Indo-China was ended only after India was persuaded to accept the Chairmanship of the International Control and Supervision Commission in the three countries of Indo-China. We mattered in the world because we used the one currency which we could parley in international affairs, which is the currency of morality. If we wish to merely be a second-rate power, acting as a photocopier in international conferences, repeating what other people have to say, being frightened of the power that bigger countries exercise, then, I am afraid we will not be articulating our view in the world and, therefore, we will be extinguishing independence in external policy which is the external expression of our internal sovereignty. So, in effect, if we start getting speeches in South Block dictated from Foggy Bottom, Washington, we cease to be an independent country. That is the key issue before us. Now, in the last 10 years, there has been confusion in foreign policy. I deliberately take 10 years because I do not think this is a partisan matter. It was a little over 10 years ago that the Soviet Union began its long process of collapsing and getting extinguished from the world stage. So, since the word 'Non-Alignment' had come out of not being aligned with the one bloc or the other, the conundrum that foreign policy makers have faced in India for the last decade or so is how do we remain non-aligned in an unaligned world. This has been the moral dilemma. And because we have not succeeded as a nation in resolving this, and because the Non-Aligned Movement as a movement has not come to grips with this fundamental issue, the voice of the non-aligned and the voice of India as the founding genius of the Non-Aligned Movement has become so soft and so inaudible as to not matter in world affairs. But, we are at a historic new conjunction and it is for the Ministry of External Affairs to cease this new opportunity which has just arisen in international affairs.

Sir, I draw your attention and that of the House to a very interesting article that was reproduced in *The Indian Express* a couple of days ago by an Indian who has turned American and is regarded as something of a foreign policy *guru* in the United States of America because he is the editor of the prestigious foreign policy journal. He is the son of one of our well-known colleagues, Shri Rafiq Zakaria. His name is Farid Zakaria. Farid Zakaria has pointed out in a fascinating article that the concept of the West is an artificial construct with no bases really in history.

It is only in the face of a hostile East that the idea of the West emerged. Otherwise, through thousands of years of Western history, the West has mostly been embroiled in internecine conflicts among itself. So, a homogenous Western position is, in historical terms and civilisational terms, an aberration. It existed because of the Cold War. Now that the Cold War is genuinely over and people are beginning to realise how completely finished it is, the West is going back to its traditional internecine differences. And we see this reflected first in the differences that are taking place and are so obvious between the bulk of the people of the West on the one hand and the Governments of the United States and the United Kingdom on the other, as also between the London-Washington axis on the one hand and the Paris-Berlin axis on the other. West Europe has at long last found its voice. There is an old Europe which is reasserting itself and a new Europe which cannot because it is economically dependent upon Washington, but otherwise the genuine voice of the West, the voice of the enlightened, the voice of the renaissance, the voice of John Stuart Mill, the voice of Winston Churchill, the cry for democracy and the end of oppression and of peace is beginning to arise once again in Europe.

During the founding years of the Non-Aligned Movement, Europe was an indistinguishable part of the West. Today, Europe is beginning to assert itself and we have the historic opportunity of bringing about a union of hearts and minds between the Non-Aligned Movement and this emergent European Union. They need our numbers. We are 114 countries and we need them because of reasons of race, politics and economics. Washington listens more to what Europe has to say than perhaps it has to the under class of Asia, Africa and Latin America. In these circumstances, Shri Digvijay Singh and his colleagues have a historic opportunity to convert the challenge of Iraq into an opportunity to restructure our foreign relations in such a manner as to make the voice of India count once again. But this is not an opportunity which comes on a daily basis. I think, it was Shakespeare in *Hamlet* who says: "There is a tide in the affairs of men, which, taken at the flood leads to great things" and if not, we get drowned in that tide.

Sir, the Non-Aligned Summit is before us. In just three days from now, the hon. Prime Minister will be appearing upon the largest international stage in the world, short of ceremonial summits of the United Nations, 114 countries, of whom 113 would be wanting to hear the voice of Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee as the voice of the country that

founded the Non-Aligned Movement. Will he rise to the occasion? That is the question which our countrymen and women are asking themselves, and, at this point, if we purse our lips, if we revert to the distortion of thinking that our irons will be pulled out of the fire by Washington or London, then, of course, we will miss this opportunity. We are at crossroads and, I think, the Government is simply not understanding how important is this crossroads by this petty partisan attitude of saying that they, who came into power five years ago, know more about the Non-Aligned Movement than we who brought this country to freedom, created the philosophy of Non-Alignment and converted it into a Movement. They do not have the courage to just reach out across the table, shake the hand which is available and make the whole world listen to what the Parliament of India has to say. This is a deep psychological feeling which reflects the inferiority complex which has started inflicting South Block ever since 1996.

Having said that, where do we need to go from here? Again, what we need to understand is that the fundamental, central point of the philosophy of Non-Alignment is upholding the UN Charter and preserving the United Nations as the one and only forum for the resolution of international differences.

It is not that we are satisfied with the structure of the United Nations. Indeed when one looks at the composition of the United Nations and the kind of powers that had been given to the UN Security Council but denied to the UN General Assembly, and the special veto powers that had been given to the Permanent Members of the UN Security Council, who were all just accidentally allies in the Second World War which ended 57 years ago, the fact is that the UN Charter itself, rather like the Constitution of India, has a provision for effecting changes. If the Constitution of India can be amended nearly 100 times in 50 years, there is a possibility of amending the UN Charter appropriately to make it a more democratic organisation.

14.41 hrs. (Mr. Deputy-Speaker *in the Chair*)

So, I am not praising the UN in itself but saying that as a concept, it is invaluable to world peace. The history of the West, for a very long time has been that of ignoring the United Nations and bypassing it whenever it does not suit their particular interests. Thus, when it came to Palestine, the creation of Palestine, the partition of Palestine and the creation of Israel, the Soviet Union and the United States of America joined hands together to deny the Indian voice, which pleaded in 1947: "The tragedy of partition is upon this sub-continent. Please do not repeat the tragedy of partition in Palestine because you cannot divide in order to unite."

The colonials went on to do exactly the same thing in Cyprus. They had been doing it for a long time in Ireland. No problem has been resolved by partition. It was India which said at that time in 1947: "The only way of preserving peace in the whole of West Asia is to create a Federal State of Palestine-Israel where there will be autonomy in the Palestinian and Israeli regions respectively, but a democratically elected Government of Palestine-Israel to run the larger national issues in that particular State." We were not at issue. We were overwritten. But when it came to 1950 and the Korean War was about to start, the United States took advantage of the absence of the Soviet Union from the United Nations to pass the Uniting for Peace Resolution under which they acted in Korea. But once they had done that, when the Soviet Union returned, they never agreed to going back to the Uniting for Peace Resolution of 1950. Therefore, the whole of Vietnam War was fought without reference to the United Nations. Again and again, we are seeing that the United Nations is being bypassed by the Permanent Members of the UN Security Council. But that was also true of the Afghans on both sides.

In these circumstances, there is a need for a voice of peace which bases itself on the principles of the Charter of the United Nations. That voice for peace is the Non-Aligned Movement. Shrimati Indira Gandhi, as Prime Minister, on the occasion of her being elected as the Chairperson of the Non-Aligned Summit in 1983 here in New Delhi, described the Non-Aligned Movement as the biggest peace movement in the world. Can we say today that NAM is the biggest peace movement in the world? It seems to have become an organisation where they meet in order to decide that they will meet again. Life has to be given again to this Movement. That life can come only in two ways. One is through the Indian Prime Minister raising his voice loud for peace at a time when the United Nations is being threatened, when the United Nations is being bullied, when the United Nations is being intimidated, when the United Nations is being told that if you do not do our will, then we do not care for you. If, at this juncture, we do not raise our voices loud and clear in Kuala Lumpur, the Non-Aligned Movement will fail to be true to the purposes for which it was created.

At the same time, this is the moment for us to reach right across to Europe remembering that Europe is the western peninsula of Asia, even as South Asia is the southern peninsula of the Asian mainland. We are linked to Europe. We are geographically linked to them. There we find that there is a new voice that is rising. Yet when we had the French Prime Minister in India only a few days ago, there was so little attention paid to the great historical revolution that is taking place in Western Europe led by France that, apart from some anodyne words about Iraq and the United Nations, there was almost nothing to signal a new alliance between New Delhi and Paris to raise the voice of peace.

That is why, I am extremely nervous, even though the hon. Shri Digvijay Singh instructed his Permanent

Representative correctly in the month of October 2002, whether in February 2003 he will so advise the Prime Minister as to have India's voice ringing loud and clear in favour of peace and against this obscene suborning of the United Nations which we see going on at the present moment. I used the word "obscene" advisedly. The kind of language which we have seen emanating from Washington, the kind of minatory attitude adopted by US representatives at the United Nations are completely unacceptable to civilised behaviour.

Sir, it is true that we are a developing country. And it is also true that the United States is a developing civilisation. But for that reason it is necessary that the United States be made to listen to the voice of this ancient land, that is a voice of peace, pronounced without the influence of baubles. I am afraid this Government is so keen on the handouts it gets from Washington, and it has so lost its will to confront our enemies that it is looking to Washington to pull its irons out of the fire, that we do not have the kind of will in the Government necessary to infuse the Non-aligned Movement with the spirit that is required to make Non-alignment count again and to take advantage of the new configuration in international relations which is making Western Europe a friend of India, a friend of the Non-aligned.

Now, the Government lacks the will but this nation does not lack the will, this Parliament does not lack the will. We know how without fear to raise our voices. We raised them when Gandhiji was leading our Freedom Movement. He was confronted with the mightiest military empire that world history has ever known. It was a much stronger empire than Chengiz Khan's or Tamerlanes. It was a much stronger empire than the Hun's, it was the strongest military empire known to humanity and Gandhiji stood up in one single voice and said that 'none of your goals is my goals, none of your means is my means and I will answer your military might with the only weapon in my armoury, which is moral mind'. It was the values of the Freedom Movement that we translated into the Non-aligned philosophy which formed our Foreign Policy after Independence.

Non-aligned Movement is the extension in international affairs of non-violence and truth and so long as we remained firm on those principles, our voice was heard with respect. It is when we departed from those principles that we ceased to be heard. But certainly, it is true that never at any time, when we have subordinated our voice to the voice of others, subordinated our interests to the interests of others, subordinated our capacity to dominate our destiny to others that we have mattered. We cannot matter as a 'B Team'. We cannot matter as a second class country. We have to have a certain uniqueness to ourselves at all times, a certain asymmetry in our goals and means vis-à-vis the super power because if we are symmetrical with them then either our goals get subordinated to their goals or their means are superior to ours.

The genius of Jawaharlal Nehru lay in inventing this asymmetry in foreign policy which came to be known as the philosophy of the Non-Aligned Movement. That is what took our influence from one country, India, to 114 countries who are assembling now in Malaysia. Bearing in mind the enormous historical responsibility that rests upon the shoulders of our hon. Prime Minister, we wish him well, but we do so with very little comfort, for there is nothing in the record of the NDA Government to suggest that the hon. Prime Minister is capable of rising to this historic occasion. We are disappointed that the hand of co-operation which we extended to the Treasury Benches has been so summarily rejected by them. The loss is not ours. The gain is not their. The loss is that of this country and the gain is that of the war-mongers whose inability to understand the real world, whose insatiable lust in the quest for dominance is endangering not only the people of Iraq but also endangering the people everywhere.

They, the biggest military power in the world, attacked Afghanistan, the most helpless country in the world, blasting it from the sky. They managed to kill a lot of sheep, they managed to murder a large number of Afghans, but their target, Osama Bin Laden, got away. In 1991, we saw the same thing. They rained their bombs on Baghdad, but they did not have the courage to follow it up with an infantry attack, for they knew from history that Baghdad was liberated from the Turkish Empire, not by the Americans, but by the Indian Army. Which is why, the most important quarter in the city of Baghdad, where I had the honour of being posted for two years from 1976 to 1978, is still today called Arassat Al India—the Indian camp. It was we who liberated Baghdad under Captain Downsen, going all the way up from Basra to Baghdad, losing so many of our soldiers on the way.

I do not know whether the Treasury Benches are aware of it. I would certainly like to remind the House, through you, Sir, that in the period of the British mandate over Iraq from 1919 to 1932, Iraq was governed as a district of the Bombay Presidency from Bombay. That is how close Iraq is to us. I am not talking of Governments, but I am talking of people, I am talking of civilisation. Iraq and India are intertwined in their destiny. Therefore, an attack upon Iraq, which is unjustified and unmandated by the United Nations, is tantamount to an attack upon us. This is the kind of intrusive inspection that is taking place. It is for this one reason that Indira Gandhi refused to sign the Non-Proliferation Treaty. She said that this is what is going to come. Her voice sounds prophetic 20 years after she passed away, for, when she said it, people wondered what was meant by intrusive inspection. This was the word we used in the Ministry of External Affairs without quite knowing its meaning. It has taken us till today now to discover what is meant by intrusive inspection.

If this is the level at which inspection can take place, then surely a proposal made by India as many as 15 years ago, which is based upon a satisfactory inspection regime, should be at the top of the UN agenda, that is, the action plan for a nuclear weapons-free and non-violent order put forward by Rajiv Gandhi in the United Nations on the 9th of June, 1988. It is based on this idea that all kinds of inspections are now taking place. The Americans then said, 'such inspections cannot take place. So we reject your action plan.' Today, they have taken up all that system of inspection provided for them, but not done anything about disarmament. The country that is bristling with arms but without an enemy is the United States of America. There are more weapons of mass destruction in the United States than in all the rest of the world put together. So lunatic is that policy that they were capable of destroying the world 17 times over.

Now, they have entered into an agreement or a set of agreements with Russia, the consequence of which is, they can destroy the world three times over. Even the most lunatic human being would not want to destroy the world once over and this is the country towards which we are genuflecting in a situation where in order to establish their dominance, they are subverting the United Nations.

I leave the House with this historical memory. In the 1930s, Benito Mussolini ignored the League of Nations; the consequence was the World War II. In this century, it is the United States imitating Mussolini, which is, ignoring the United Nations. Then, it was the League of Nations; now, it is the United Nations; and, consequences much worse are bound to follow. For, what was available in terms of weapons of mass destruction in the 1930s are nothing compared to the weapons of mass destruction available now.

It is all very well for Shri Vijay Kumar Malhotra to link up terrorism with the issue over here, but the fact of the matter is that those who are upset with the United States and do not have the weapons to match their weapons, will, like Gandhi, choose weapons that do not match weapons. Gandhi chose the weapon of non-violence; the terrorists have chosen the weapon of violence.

It is Osama Bin Laden, whether you like him or not, who has said that he would die in the eagle's belly. The eagle to which he referred is the eagle, which is the symbol of the United States of America. But why would he want to die in its belly? In the attack on the World Trade Centre, it was not only American citizens who were killed but Indian citizens were also killed and so also would the destruction of the United States by world terrorism destroy all of us.

It is utterly irresponsible of Shri George W. Bush III – to give him his full title – to decide to wage war on our behalf without asking us. We do not want war. There is no *causus belli*. There is no cause for war. The belligerence is all on one side; the hurry is all on one side. There is no need whatsoever to deploy these armadas of ships and these fleets of aircraft in the Indian Ocean. When I was in the Foreign Service, we hoped the Indian Ocean would become a zone of peace but that sounds like a joke today. It is in that area that they are bristling and the Indian Ocean is named after our country. We have to save ourselves. We have the opportunity of saving ourselves. We have friends in Europe who will help us save the world but we have a Government which does not know its own mind.

SHRI RUPCHAND PAL (HOOGLY): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, we are at the crossroads. There are moments both in the life of the individual and the family and in the case of nations when the position has to be made clear. If we fail to do that and if we indulge in obfuscation, haziness, opportunism and changing positions according to domestic needs, it would spell disaster. It is the lesson of history. But I charge that this Government is indulging in the same sort of obfuscation and haziness. It has happened even yesterday. The hon. Prime Minister, while addressing the BJP MPs, said certain things and it had to be modified. It had to be changed.

The script of the American plan of action was written long back. Even as early as on the 12th September, 2001 itself, it was written. At that time, a very important functionary of the US Administration said, 'Let us not lose this opportunity; let us seize this opportunity.' The plan of action was to attack Iraq immediately, the day next to the attack on the World Trade Centre.

15.00 hrs.

There is a relationship between what is being shown as the audio tapes of Osama Bin Laden. No intelligent person world-over has accepted that. Osama Bin Laden has always been against Saddam Hussein. They have tried to manufacture evidence. They have indulged in falsehood. They have tried to prop up the dummies. They have tried coup seven times but still they have not been able to win the hearts of the people of Iraq. They have not been able to convince the world opinion that there is a case against Iraq. An official of the U.S. Administration has stated that we have met the Indian authorities and we have convinced them. Richard Hass of the U.S. Department – the Member of the National Security Council when the Gulf war had taken place -- had stated and I quote:

"U.S. would also ask India for cooperation for its military aggression on Iraq. India is a natural partner and ally. "

Has India protested? Has ever the Government of India publicly stated that it oppose this military action, It opposes these preparations of war against Iraq? India has never spelt out its position that we are opposed to war. What has been stated that principles and pragmatism will have to be made a judicious mixture. At this point of history principles matter.

Now, I would like to quote from the speech of the hon. President in the President's Address, which he delivered on February 17, 2003 in Parliament.

"We share the concern of the entire world on the unhappy situation"

This has not happened even at the time of Vietnam War. Out of twenty million people the world-over, only two million people assembled in Hyde Park, in the United Kingdom, in the United States, in the Asian countries, in the African countries, in the Latin American countries, etc. In such a situation, we share the concern of the entire world on the unhappy situation. Is it simply some unhappy situation that there are preparations of war and every preparation is being made to attack Iraq? What for? Is there any case for such an attack on Iraq? Is it because Saddam Hussein is a dictator? Is it because he does not believe in democracy? However, our neighbour, does he believe in democracy? There are so many dictators of the world who always sit in the lap of United States everyday. A number of dictators are their friends and they have picked up Saddam Hussein as a dictator. Is it because he is not complying with Resolution 1441? Who told you? You have prepared the dossiers. You have supplied the documents to the UN Inspectors and they have come back. What do they say? Till today there is no evidence of weapons of mass destruction in Iraq. Till today there is no proof of anything like nuclear programme. After 12 years of rigorous sanctions, you just imagine that it never happened in history. Millions and millions of people have to depend on this regime only for their food. Five million children have either lost their lives or they are subjugated to inhuman sufferings for want of medicines. During these 12 years, no less than 15 lakh of people have died.

There is an estimate prepared by the UN contingency planners that if this war takes place, another 10 million people will suffer. What is going to happen? What will remain of Iraq? Their infrastructure - power stations, electricity, oil fields and everything - has been destroyed, dismantled and about US \$ 200 billion worth of property already destroyed. What for? There is no case against Iraq and the USA are just advancing arguments which are not accepted even by their erstwhile allies - European Union, NATO partners. Even inside America, there is a strong opinion against all these things. Ever swelling number, millions and millions of people in different parts of the world are calling for peace. We, this Indian Parliament, have a duty at this important moment, critical moment to spell out clearly that we oppose this military preparation, the preparation to attack the sovereignty of Iraq to re-map the political geography of Western Asia, the Gulf region. This attack on Iraq is something isolated. For a new international order, it will cause paradigm shift in international laws, it will cause paradigm shift in the case of the existing international institutions. Will the United Nations become irrelevant? Can UN Security Council be allowed to be made irrelevant? The institutions which have been built up as a part of human civilisation brick by brick, on the heartrending experiences of the wars of the past, will be dismantled to subserve the interest of America only.

Mr. Colin Powell has stated on 23rd January publicly that so long as it serves their purpose, they will do whatever they consider to be appropriate without listening to any voice, public opinion, members of the United Nations' Security Council, European Union and the vast number of people of the other countries. They do not care about them. United States has a stockpile up weapons of mass destruction and they say that they will not hesitate even to use the nuclear weapons against the non-nuclear powers.

If this continues, in such a situation, do we not owe to our nation, does this Parliament not owe to the people of the world, to say that we have a glorious heritage of anti-imperialism which was the outcome of our freedom struggle? We have a foreign policy for decades based on national consensus which emphasises on peaceful solution of problems of the world. Between war and peace, there cannot be any such choice that at this point of time let us be pragmatic and surreptitiously support the war. There is a doubt that this Government is surreptitiously preparing itself to support the military operation, aggression on Iraq. The Government owes it to the nation to spell out clearly that we oppose it. Till today, they have not stated that they oppose the military aggression on Iraq, this proposed attack on the sovereignty of Iraq, this attempt of regime change. How can they do that? The sovereign power, the people of that country will determine the fate of that country.

Some new expressions are coming like 'material breach'. When Israel does not care for any of the United Nations' Resolutions, it does not matter. When friends of US, ignore them, the basic resolution of the United Nations does not matter. Take Resolution No. 1441. They say that they shall edit all the 12,000 pages. Who gave them the authority?

US shall supply information and their own agency should supply. But we find that what they have given is

ridiculous, what the UK Prime Minister had given to the inspectors as dossiers are ridiculous. Some old document was picked up from some articles. All these were arranged and re-arranged and put into the document.

In such a situation what should be the role of this Parliament? I earnestly plead with the Government. We have been doing this for the past few days, that in one voice, in conformity with our glorious heritage of anti-imperialism and anti-hegemonism, in conformity with the spirit of our freedom struggle and the NAM spirit, we should spell out clearly that this Parliament, this country, this nation is opposed to such military aggression on Iraq as is being tried by US-UK allies.

It is only for oil, hegemony is for oil. Military aggression will not end in Iraq only. The axis of evil is there. Afghanistan is within the grid. The puppet Government has been propped up; and another puppet Government or planted Government by putting some former criminals at the helm of affairs. What will happen? Saddam Hussain represents Arab nationalism after Nasser. He is the only person who has been able to keep Iraq united. USA has used Iraq against Iran and have encouraged them as they have done in the case of Afghanistan. Osama Bin Laden is their creation. Now, they say this in the name of fighting terrorism.

One VHP international leader Shri Praveen Togadia says that: "We shall support America in its military aggression over Iraq". Why? It is because it is an attack on a Muslim country. Let the Government spell out clearly that what has been stated by Shri Praveen Togadia is not the view of this Government.

What I want to say is that in a situation where a new international order is proposed to be set up, when the re-mapping of the political geography, when the total control over the oil resources of Iraq and surrounding region is being attempted, we should be careful in our statement. Iraq is a country which has historically been friend to us, it is not only that it is secular, it supports India on the issue of Kashmir, it has been by our side in the face of situations *vis-a-vis* Pakistan. They have supported us.

We have been dependent on oil imports and in the situation of world recession, after the military aggression, if it continues a little longer, what will happen to our economy and to our oil imports? We have good export market in Iraq. Nearly 3.5 million people are there in the Gulf region and foreign exchange is coming from there. What will happen to that now?

We have the experience of the Gulf war. The war was for a few days only and there was cession on petrol. We had the bitter experience of those days. What is the contingency plan of this Government? What is the role of the Government going to play when they are going to Kuala Lumpur? When it is proposed that let there be a unanimous Resolution adopted in Parliament, we are told that the hands of the External Affairs Minister should not be tied, let it remain flexible. There are certain basic principles, which form the basis of NAM. Why cannot you reiterate those principles that we are against military aggression; we are against hegemony; we are against the war designs of US and UK. The heavens are not going to fall if we adopt such a Resolution.

I think, the Parliamentary Affairs Minister has already consulted the hon. Prime Minister on this issue. Why are they backing out? Is it because of some hidden agenda? Is it that at one point of time, you will surreptitiously surrender to U.S. pressure when some carrots are dangled before you, as has happened in the case of some others? The Ruling Party, the Government, owes it to the nation that they have to spell out clearly what has happened when the representatives of the U.S. met the External Affairs Minister. What has transpired there? What did they say and what did we say? Did they say, "You are a natural ally; we hope to have your cooperation for the military aggression." Till today, we have not stated any such thing.

I would not elaborate much, but I would like to say that as a result of what is happening concerning Iraq, fundamentalism will grow not only in Arab countries, but also in Pakistan as a backlash, and we will have to bear the brunt. In the sub-continent --in Pakistan, Bangladesh, Maldives, Bhutan and in other places -- there are about 500 million Muslim people. In such a situation, when there is a deep conspiracy to divide the Indian society on communal lines, when people like Praveen Togadia say that since it is going to be an attack on an Islamic country, we should support America, what will happen to our relationships within the SAARC countries? What will be our position within NAM? This Government is lacking the strength to stand up and firmly say that this is our position. Instead we oppose war preparation of U.S. They are destroying the whole infrastructure of our foreign policy, which has been built up over these decades. It has always been built on a national consensus.

Anti-imperialism has been the key element in our foreign policy. Now, this Government is subjugating itself by making itself subordinate to the American desires and to the American plan of action. We are going to lose our friends in Asia, Africa, Europe and in other countries of the world. This is high time when we stand up and say that "we oppose the war designs, and we are not ready to subserve their narrow interests. The people, all over the world, have a right to live peacefully. If there is any problem, it should be resolved through diplomatic channels, and peaceful solutions should be found out through discussions." There are appropriate institutions for that, like the United Nations and the Security Council, and our Parliament should make its contribution.

I believe, we should pass a unanimous resolution distancing India from the moves of U.S.-U.K. alliance to attack Iraq to capture oil reserves, to control the Gulf region, to establish US hegemony and start a new world order, which will be done at the diktat of U.S. and its allies.

Sir, it was in 1941, during the Second World War, Gurudev Rabindranath Tagore, just before his death said something very important. He was agitated over the War that was going on then - those who have seen Satyajit Ray's documentary on Gurudev Rabindranath Tagore would know about it. He was otherwise calm and quiet but very agitated over developing war.

Walking from one end of the room to the other he said, "To lose faith in humanity is a sin. The mighty and the powerful may try but the course of history ultimately is determined by common man. . One should not lose faith on them. He was speaking on the crisis of civilisation." It was one of the remarkable pieces of writings of Tagore during the period of war. It is not a question of "crisis of civilisation" as has been made out by some theoreticians. In such a situation we should contribute to strengthening the human civilisation, to protect what has been built up globally - the rights under the UN Charter, the United Nations, the Security Council and all values associated with human civilization. At such times we should say 'no' to war. We should unanimously say 'no' to American designs. We should say to the world that Iraq should be protected today by another super power, a strong public opinion of the world. We should join that voice. Let the Indian Parliament join that voice for peace and against war.

DR. B.B. RAMAIAH (ELURU): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, today we are discussing the threat of war on Iraq. Attention of the whole world is now focussed on this particular issue. Hon. Prime Minister, Shri Vajpayee made it very clear that India opposes war because from the beginning we have followed the path of non-violence and because we are one of the founders of the Non-Aligned Movement.

As some hon. Members have mentioned, I am sure the Prime Minister will make it a point to explain our point of view very clearly at the forthcoming NAM Summit, to be held in Kuala Lumpur, and see that war is not encouraged. We all know what happened in 1990 when Saddam Hussain attacked Kuwait. They came and asked for support. At that time, the United Nations had probably given support thinking that they could not prevent aggression. Today the issue is entirely different.

What happened after the war, as Shri Rupchand Pal has put it, is that millions of people have suffered. Even today, many children are suffering for want of food and medicines. The after effects of sanctions are calamitous on Iraq that the lives of citizens are severely affected.

Today, there is a feeling that they have some weapons of mass destruction. The United Nations imposed a condition that Iraq should be inspected by the International Weapons Inspection Team for weapons of mass destruction. Saddam Hussain agreed to that. The UN Team of Weapons Inspectors made a thorough search. Yet they could not find any weapons of mass destruction in Iraq. They wanted some more information. Saddam Hussain gave permission to them to carry out further inspections. Therefore, I think that without the permission of the United Nations and the Security Council, any aggression on Iraq is uncalled for.

Our country is strongly opposed to war. The whole world is against it. There is a wave of public protests against war not only in the United States but all over the world. Under such serious circumstances, I am sure our Government will definitely take a positive step in the right direction.

We all know that a few days back the Chief Weapons Inspector Hans Blix said that they were not able to find any evidence so far of Iraq having weapons of mass destruction. They have been given unrestricted access to sites in Iraq now. They are able to go wherever they want to conduct their inspections. Under such circumstances, without the approval of the United Nations or the Security Council, any action by any country on Iraq is not desirable.

I am sure that our Parliament and the Government will definitely support any move to see that war on Iraq is avoided.

श्री राशिद अलवी (अमरोहा) : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, यह बहुत अहम् इश्यू है, जिस पर हम लोग बहस कर रहे हैं। न सिर्फ हमारा मुल्क बल्कि पूरी दुनिया इंतजार कर रही है और देख रही है कि इराक का इस मामले के अंदर क्या होगा। हिन्दुस्तान के पूरी दुनिया के अंदर बहुत से दोस्त हैं, लेकिन अगर पिछले 50 साल के अंदर हम देखें तो हिन्दुस्तान के जो सबसे करीबी दोस्त रहे हैं, इराक उनमें से एक है। अगर हिन्दुस्तान के साथ सबसे ज्यादा दोस्ती इंटरनेशनली किसी ने निभाई है तो वह इराक ने निभाई है। जब श्रीमती गांधी ने इमर्जेंसी लगाई थी और दुनिया के बहुत से मुमालिक अंगुली उठाने लगे थे, खास तौर से पाकिस्तान, तब भी इराक हिन्दुस्तान के साथ खड़ा था। आज इराक एक परेशानी के अंदर है लेकिन मैं सरकार से कहना चाहता हूँ, जितने मेम्बर्स ने कहा कि युनेनिमसली रेजोल्यूशन होना चाहिए, यकीनन युनेनिमस रेजोल्यूशन होना ही चाहिए। अमेरिका का एटीच्यूड क्या है, आज वह दुनिया की सबसे बड़ी ताकत है। रूस के बिखर जाने के बाद दुनिया की ताकत का तवाजुम बिखर गया। मैं बहुत अदब से कहना चाहता हूँ कि हिन्दुस्तान की पार्लियामेंट का कोई रेजोल्यूशन गवर्नमेंट आफ फ्रांस का एतजाज़, दुनिया के करोड़ों लोग, जो सड़कों पर निकल आए, जिन्होंने अमेरिका के खिलाफ आवाज बुलंद की, वह तमाम आवाजें अमेरिका को इराक पर हमला करने से बाज नहीं रखेंगी। यह हमारी मोरल जिम्मेदारी है कि हम इन हालात के अंदर दुनिया को बहुत सफाई के साथ बता दें कि हिन्दुस्तान इस माहौल और झगड़े के अंदर अपनी क्या राय

रखता है। हमें वाजेह तौर पर दुनिया से कहना चाहिए कि न सिर्फ इराक, बल्कि इस तरीके का वाक्या किसी भी मुल्क के साथ अगर कोई भी मुल्क करेगा तो हिन्दुस्तान उसका साथ नहीं देगा।

महोदय, आज अमेरिका इराक पर क्यों अटके करना चाहता है, कौन सी वजुहात है। क्या इराक के पास खतरनाक किस्म के हथियार हैं, अमेरिका के पास नहीं हैं। क्या दुनिया के दूसरे मुल्कों के पास नहीं हैं। वे कौन सी वजह है? युनाइटेड नेशंस का रेजोल्यूशन है कि इराक की तलाशी ली जाए। किसी भी कंट्री के लिए इससे ह्यूमिलिएशन नहीं हो सकता है, लेकिन वह एक कमजोर मुल्क है, वह यह भी बर्दाश्त करने को तैयार है। युनाइटेड नेशंस के इन्स्पेक्टर इराक के अंदर मौजूद हैं, वे एक-एक घर की तलाशी ले रहे हैं लेकिन आज तक कुछ नहीं निकला। दिग्विजय सिंह जी, आप और हम इराक गए थे, वहां हमने वह बंकर देखा। जब अमेरिका ने इराक पर हमला किया था तो उस बंकर के अंदर 500 औरतें और मासूम बच्चे थे। जिनके मर्द अमेरिका से लड़ाई लड़ रहे थे, उन्हें उन बंकरों में रखा गया था और अमेरिका ने जिन मिसाइल्स को छोड़ा था, उन बंकरों के चारों तरफ दीवारों पर हमने इंसानी गोश्त के निशानात देखे। हमने उन दीवारों पर वह चिपका हुआ गोश्त देखा। किस टेरेरिज्म की बात की जाती है, कौन सी कंट्री में टेरेरिज्म है, अमेरिका से बड़ा टेरेरिस्ट दुनिया के अंदर कोई दूसरा नहीं है। अगर इस दुनिया के अंदर सबसे ज्यादा टेरेरिज्म कोई पैदा कर रहा है तो वह अमेरिका कर रहा है और यह लड़ाई सिर्फ इज्जत की नहीं है बल्कि यह लड़ाई दुनिया के अंदर हुकूमत करने की है। कल ही किसी ने कहा कि जब मैं बुश की तरफ देखता हूं तो मुझे हिलर का चेहरा नज़र आता है, उसने यह बात बहुत सही कही। मैं कहना चाहता हूं कि आज पूरी दुनिया के अंदर 77 बैरल एक दिन के अंदर इस्तेमाल किया जाता है। इसके अन्दर ब्रिटिश पैट्रोलियम इनर्जी इन्फोर्मेशन एडमिनिस्ट्रेशन का कहना है कि अमेरिका 1.7 मिलियन बैरल सज्दी अरब से इम्पोर्ट करता है। नाइजीरिया से 8.84 लाख बैरल करता है, 1.5 मिलियन बैरल वेनेजुएला से करता है, 2.5 लाख बैरल कुवैत से इम्पोर्ट करता है, 2.78 लाख बैरल अल्जीरिया से करता है, 77 हजार पर डे कनाडा से करता है और खुद 7.95 लाख बैरल तेल पैदा करता है। यह तेल का अथाह स्टोर किसलिए किया जा रहा है। इराक के साथ वार होगी तो यह तेल पूरी दुनिया को महंगी कीमत पर अमेरिका बेचने का काम करेगा, दुनिया को तबाह करने का काम करेगा।

मैं सरकार को मशविरा देना चाहता हूं कि सफाई के साथ हमें आगे आना चाहिए। हमारे जबानी जमाखर्च से कोई नतीजा निकलने वाला नहीं है। हिन्दुस्तान को लॉग टर्म प्लानिंग सोचनी चाहिए। मैं आपसे सिर्फ एक एम.पी. की हैसियत से नहीं, हिन्दुस्तान के एक नागरिक की हैसियत से हाथ जोड़कर कहना चाहता हूं, बहुत सारे दोस्तों ने तो गड़िया और बहुत सारे लोगों को नाम लिए, मैं उनके नाम भी नहीं लेना चाहता। मैं तो अर्ज करना चाहता हूं कि इन जैसे लोगों को साइकैट्रिस्ट को दिखाना चाहिए, ये कमेण्ट करने के काबिल लोग नहीं हैं। लेकिन मैं आपसे कहना चाहता हूं कि हिन्दुस्तान के अन्दर चाहे हिन्दू कम्युनलिस्ट हो, चाहे मुस्लिम कम्युनलिस्ट हो, चाहे हिन्दुस्तान के अन्दर हिन्दू और मुसलमान के बीच में तनाव पैदा करने वाले लोग हैं, मेरा मशविरा है कि उनकी सिक्योरिटी विथड्रा कर लीजिए और उन्हें इजाजत दीजिए कि जो बोलना चाहें, बोलें। ब्लैक कैट के बीच खड़े होकर आप लोगों को गाली दे सकते हैं, लेकिन ब्लैक कैट को हटा दीजिए, जनता अपने आप समझ लेगी। वे तमाम लोग, जो इस मुल्क के अन्दर नफरतों की आंधी पैदा कर देना चाहते हैं, उनकी सिक्योरिटी आप विथड्रा कर लीजिए और उन्हें इजाजत दीजिए कि जो बोलना चाहें, आप बोल लीजिए। इस देश के अन्दर जो ताकतें कम्युनलिज्म पैदा करना चाहती हैं, उन्हें बन्द कीजिए और इस मुल्क को मजबूत करने का काम कीजिए। अमेरिका को अगर आप जवाब देना चाहते हैं तो सिर्फ एक रास्ता है।

आज पूरी दुनिया के अन्दर अमेरिका के मुकाबले पर कोई दूसरी ताकत नहीं है। रूस खत्म हो चुका है। हिन्दुस्तान के अन्दर वह ताकत है कि वह आज मेहनत करे। अगर आप मंदिर और मस्जिद के किस्से को बन्द कर दें, अगर छोटे-छोटे फायदे के लिए हिन्दू मुसलमान की लड़ाई लड़ाना बन्द कर दें तो अमेरिका के मुकाबले पर आप खड़े हो सकते हैं, दुनिया की कोई ताकत आपको नहीं रोक सकती। अमेरिका की बेहदगी का जवाब सिर्फ एक है कि आज पार्लियामेंट के अन्दर यूनानिमसली रेजोल्यूशन पास होना चाहिए और तय करना चाहिए कि इन तमाम बातों को खत्म करके हिन्दुस्तान को एक मजबूत मुल्क बनाएं। इतना मजबूत मुल्क कि अमेरिका का जवाब हम दे सकें।

आज यूनाइटेड नेशंस अमेरिका का खिलौना बना हुआ है। मैं आपसे कहना चाहता हूं कि इसकी भी यूनाइटेड नेशंस से इत्तला मंगानी चाहिए कि दुनिया के कितने मुल्कों के बारे में रेजोल्यूशन आपने पास किये, उन्हें किस मुल्क ने इम्प्लीमेंट किया, किस मुल्क ने इम्प्लीमेंट नहीं किया। यासेर अराफात को इस्राइल ने उसी के मुल्क में उसी के घर के अन्दर हाउस अरेस्ट कर दिया। यूनाइटेड नेशंस खामोश बैठा रहा, अमेरिका खामोश बैठा रहा। दुनिया के तमाम मुल्क जुबान नहीं खोलते थे। एक मुल्क के हैड ऑफ दि स्टेट को इस्राइल ने बन्द कर दिया, कोई बोलने वाला नहीं था। अफगानिस्तान के अन्दर बिन लादेन के नाम पर अमेरिका ने अफगानिस्तान को तबाह करने का काम किया। उसमें हमने भी मदद की, बदकिस्मती की बात है। हिन्दुस्तान ने कहा कि हमारी जमीन भी ले लो, हमारा आसमान भी ले लो। मैं दूसरे मुल्कों की या पाकिस्तान की बात नहीं करना चाहता, वे जो चाहे करें, लेकिन हमें अपने बारे में सोचना पड़ेगा और जो काम आज अमेरिका इराक के साथ कर रहा है, कल को वह किसी के साथ भी कर सकता है। इन तमाम बातों का सिर्फ एक हल है और वह हल है, जो मैंने बताया। मैं लम्बी बात नहीं करना चाहता, मैं अपनी बात खत्म कर रहा हूं। दुनिया के अंदर इराक के इस वाक्ये से हमें सबक लेना चाहिए क्योंकि अभी भी वक्त है। ये दुनिया कमजोर आदमी को जिंदा देखना नहीं चाहती। ये दुनिया कमजोर आदमी की, कमजोर मुल्क की इज्जत नहीं करती। ये दुनिया सिर्फ ताकत की जुबान जानती है। अगर हिन्दुस्तान ताकतवर होगा तो हम छोटे मुल्कों की इज्जत को बचा सकते हैं।

आज सारे अरब वर्ल्ड में बेइंतहा दौलत है। हिन्दुस्तान अगर अपनी फॉरेन पालिसी थोड़ी सी बदले तो उन तमाम कंट्रीज को दुनिया के अंदर लीड कर सकता है और एक बड़ी ताकत बन सकता है। आज सउदी अरेबिया अपनी तमाम जगह अमरीका को देने के लिए तैयार है। टर्की अपने अड्डे अमरीका को देने के लिए तैयार है। वह इसलिए देने को तैयार नहीं है कि वह अमरीका से मोहब्बत करता है बल्कि वह अमरीका से खोफज़दा है, अमरीका से डरता है। अगर हिन्दुस्तान के पास ताकत होगी तो आप उन सबको अपने साथ लेकर चल सकते हैं। इससे दुनिया के अंदर एक बड़ी ताकत पैदा होगी। अल्लाह मा इकबाल का एक शेर है:-

तक्रदीर के काज़ी का यह फतवा है अज़ल से।

है जुर्म ज़इफ़ी की सज़ा मर्गे मफाजात।।

यह फ़ैसला है खुदा का कि जो इंसान कमजोर होगा, जो मुल्क कमजोर होगा, जो कौम कमजोर होगी, मौत उसका मुकद्दर बन जायेगी। इसलिए इस दुनिया में इज्जत के साथ रहना है तो हमें ताकत हासिल करनी पड़ेगी। मेरा इस सरकार से आखिर में यही मशविरा है कि इराक के मामले में हमें एक रेजोल्यूशन पास करना चाहिए और अब तक जो कुछ होता चला जा रहा है, उसको खत्म करके इस मुल्क को ताकतवर बनाने की कोशिश करनी चाहिए।

प्रो. रासा सिंह रावत (अजमेर) : माननीय उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, हमारे देश के बारे में कहा गया है कि "अरुण यह मधुमय देश हमारा,

जहां पहुंच अनजान क्षितिज को

मिलता एक सहारा।

आज नहीं सदियों से हमारा देश विश्वशांति का हमेशा से उपासक रहा है। विश्व के कितने ही लोग, कितनी ही कौमों के लोग, कितनी ही विचारधारा के लोग इस देश के अंदर आये। जिसके बारे में कहा जाता है कि सारे जहां से अच्छा हिंदोस्तां हमारा, हम बुलबुले है इसके, ये गुलिस्तां हमारा। यूनान, मिस्र, रोमा सब मिट गये जहां से मगर अब भी बाकी है नामो-निशां हमारा।

जिस देश के बारे में ऐसा कहा जाता है, उस देश के संबंध में अगर कोई व्यक्ति, हमारे मणि शंकर अय्यर जैसी मानसिकता वाले व्यक्ति खड़े होकर हमें शांति पाठ की दुहाई देने की कोशिश करें और वह अपनी संकीर्ण मानसिकता का परिचय देते हुए प्रधान मंत्री जी के कमजोर घुटनों की बात कहकर कि इस सरकार के घुटने ही आपस में लड़ रहे हैं, इस प्रकार की ओछी बात कहकर उन्होंने जिस मानसिकता का परिचय दिया है, हम उसकी निंदा करते हैं।

मैं आपके माध्यम से कहना चाहता हूँ कि 50 साल के शासन के अंदर 45 साल तक कांग्रेस का शासन रहा। कांग्रेस के शासन के अंदर इतनी बुराइयाँ पैदा हुईं, इतनी कमजोरियाँ पैदा हुईं, देश को इतना खोखला और कमजोर कर दिया कि उन बुराइयों से मुक्ति पाने के लिए हमारी सरकार, एन.डी.ए. की सरकार ने पूरा प्रयास किया। **â€¦** (व्यवधान) हमारी राष्ट्रीय जनतांत्रिक गठबंधन की सरकार ने पूरा प्रयास किया। **â€¦** (व्यवधान) अब यह घुटनों के बल पर खड़े होकर पूरी ताकत के साथ दुनिया के सामने एक ताकत बनकर खड़ी है। **â€¦** (व्यवधान) हमने परमाणु परीक्षण करके और अमरीका की धौंस में न आकर दुनिया को बता दिया कि हिन्दुस्तान कभी किसी के पराधीन नहीं रह सकता। **â€¦** (व्यवधान) हमारे साम्यवादी मित्र हमें शांति पाठ पढ़ाने की कोशिश कर रहे हैं। हमें उनसे भी शांति का पाठ सीखने की आवश्यकता नहीं है क्योंकि ये वही लोग हैं जो पहले एक खेमे का हमेशा समर्थन करते थे। अगर रूस के अंदर **â€¦** (व्यवधान)

SHRI S. JAIPAL REDDY (MIRYALGUDA): This is a debate on Iraq. We do not want to get the House or the nation divided. We want to strengthen the hands of the Government. Therefore, let the Minister of the ruling Party control his Members....(Interruptions) Why is he trying to convert it into a debate on Party lines?

प्रो. रासा सिंह रावत : उन्होंने जो बात कही, उसी का मैं जवाब दे रहा हूँ। **â€¦** (व्यवधान)

श्रीमती जयाबेन बी.ठक्कर (वडोदरा) : आपकी ओर से भी नियंत्रण होना चाहिए। **â€¦** (व्यवधान)

प्रो. रासा सिंह रावत : वह बात कभी भी शोभाजनक नहीं हो सकती। **â€¦** (व्यवधान)

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The debate has been continuing in a very harmonious way.

...(Interruptions)

प्रो. रासा सिंह रावत) : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, हम यह कहना चाहते हैं कि माननीय प्रधान मंत्री जी ने अनेक बार स्पष्ट कर दिया कि विश्व के अंदर कहीं भी लड़ाई नहीं होनी चाहिए। न अमरीका की इराक के साथ लड़ाई होनी चाहिए और न, उन्होंने तो यहां तक कहा कि भारत की पाकिस्तान के साथ भी लड़ाई नहीं होनी चाहिए। हम लोग ऐसी विश्व शान्ति के पोक रहे हैं। दुनिया में यू.एन.ओ. कमजोर नहीं होना चाहिए, संयुक्त राष्ट्र संघ शक्तिशाली बनना चाहिए, यह बात प्रधान मंत्री जी ने कई बार कही है और हमारे मित्र बार-बार कह रहे हैं कि **â€¦** (व्यवधान)

श्री रामदास आठवले (पंढरपुर) : ऐसी बात इधर से भी नहीं होनी चाहिए और उधर से भी नहीं होनी चाहिए। **â€¦** (व्यवधान)

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय : मैं आपको भी बोलने का चांस दे दूंगा।

...(व्यवधान)

प्रो. रासा सिंह रावत : इराक हमारा मित्र देश है। इराक के ऊपर अमरीका के हमले को कभी समर्थन देने का सवाल ही नहीं होता। हम कहना चाहते हैं कि एन.डी.ए. की सरकार न अमरीका परस्त है, न रूस परस्त है, एन.डी.ए. की सरकार भारत परस्त है और भारत के हितों को सर्वोपरि मान कर वह हमेशा विश्व के अंदर शान्ति स्थापित करने का पुरजोर प्रयास करेगी, इसमें किसी को तनिक मात्र भी संदेह नहीं होना चाहिए। हमारे साम्यवादी मित्रों ने बार-बार किसी व्यक्ति विशेष का नाम लेकर अपनी बात कही। व्यक्ति विशेष ने अपनी बात कही होगी लेकिन वे दूसरी बात क्यों भूल गए कि वे जिस विचारधारा के मानने वाले हैं, उसी विचारधारा के जनक राष्ट्रीय स्वयंसेवक संघ के लोगों ने कहा कि भारत को अमरीका की भर्त्सना करनी चाहिए, अमरीका का साथ किसी भी स्थिति में नहीं देना चाहिए, अमरीका इराक पर हमला नहीं करे, भारत को इस बात का प्रयास करना चाहिए। यह उन्हीं तोगड़िया जी की विचारधारा के राष्ट्रीय स्वयंसेवक संघ के लोगों ने कहा। इस बात को नहीं कहा गया और तोगड़िया जी की बात को बार-बार दोहरा रहे हैं कि उन्होंने यह कहा। यह व्यक्ति विशेष की बात हो सकती है, भारत सरकार की बात नहीं हो सकती। भारत सरकार हमेशा शान्तिपूर्ण सहअस्तित्व के सिद्धान्त को मानने वाली है, गुटनिर्पक्षता की नीति के अंदर विश्वास करने वाली है। एन.डी.ए. की सरकार उसी नीति के ऊपर चल रही है और उस नीति को हरगिज़ आंच नहीं आने देगी, इतना हम एन.डी.ए. की ओर से देश की जनता को विश्वास दिलाना चाहते हैं।

अमरीका दादागिरी करना चाहता है। ऐसा मालूम पड़ता है कि अमरीका युद्ध के उन्माद के अंदर अंधा हो गया है और वह इराक को धौंस पट्टी में लेकर कभी कहता है कि वहां रासायनिक हथियारों का निर्माण हो रहा है। उसने यू.एन.ओ. से प्रस्ताव पास करवा कर वहां जांच करने के लिए इंस्पेक्टर भेज दिये। उन्होंने देखा कि जांच की रिपोर्ट में कुछ न कुछ तो आएगा लेकिन जब जांच की रिपोर्ट हंस ब्लिक्स ने प्रस्तुत की तो उसके अंदर आया कि वहां इस प्रकार के रासायनिक या विध्वंसक हथियारों का निर्माण नहीं हो रहा है, हमें ऐसा कुछ नहीं मिला तो अमरीका एकदम क्या बहाना ढूँढे।

मुझे बचपन की **Wolf and Lamb** एक कहानी याद आ रही है। एक मेमना था जो पानी पी रहा था। नदी का पानी ऊपर से बह कर आ रहा था लेकिन एक भेड़िए के मन में आया कि उस मेमने का शिकार कैसे किया जाए। उसने कहा कि तुम पानी गंदा क्यों कर रहे हो। मेमने ने कहा महाराज, पानी तो ऊपर से आ रहा है, मैं पानी कहां गंदा कर रहा हूँ। उसने कहा कि नहीं, तुम्हारे पूर्वजों ने गंदा किया होगा, ऐसा कह कर उसने उस मेमने को मार डाला। मैं समझता हूँ कि आज अमरीका उसी भेड़िए की प्रवृत्ति का शिकार होकर इराक जैसे राष्ट्र को अपनी ताकत के बल पर दबाना चाहता है और सारे विश्व को युद्ध के अंदर झोंकना चाहता है। लेकिन अमरीका की जनता ने ही वहां के नगरों के अंदर लाखों की संख्या में प्रदर्शन करके, यूरोपियन मित्रों के देशों में भी यूरोपियन जनता ने लाखों की संख्या में लंदन में प्रदर्शन करके, रोम के अंदर प्रदर्शन करके या अनन्य नगरों में प्रदर्शन करके यह जता दिया कि **we want peace**, हम शान्ति चाहते हैं, हम युद्ध हरगिज़ नहीं चाहते। इसलिए भारत हमेशा इस बात के लिए प्रयत्नशील है कि मध्य पूर्व में किसी प्रकार का युद्ध नहीं छिड़े। वहां हथियारों के बारे में जो रिपोर्ट मिली है, रिपोर्ट देने वालों ने थोड़ा अधकचरा कह दिया कि वहां ऐसे अधूरे हथियारों का पता लगा है जिनके बारे में और जानकारी प्राप्त करने की आवश्यकता है अथवा यह कहा कि विशेष प्रकार की वौली गैस और ऐन्थ्रेक्स के बारे में भी हमको जानकारी प्राप्त करनी है। मैं समझता हूँ कि भारत को इस बात का प्रयत्न करना चाहिए कि वे एक बार पुनः हथियार निरीक्षकों को अवसर दे, यू.एन.ओ. के माध्यम से भेजे और वह वस्तुस्थिति की जानकारी करके वापिस विश्व को दे। लेकिन यह कोई बहाना नहीं होना चाहिए, युद्ध सरकार का अंतिम विकल्प होना चाहिए। हम युद्ध के पक्ष में नहीं हैं, विश्व में शान्ति होनी चाहिए। हम शान्ति के उपासक थे, हैं और रहेंगे। दुनिया के केवल तीन देश हैं जो अमरीका की हां में हां मिला रहे हैं - एक इंग्लैंड है जो हमेशा साम्राज्यवादी मनोवृत्ति का शिकार रहा, दूसरा बेल्जियम और तीसरा इटली है। इन तीन देशों ने साथ दिया। इसके अलावा बाकी जो देश हैं, चाहे फ्रांस हो या रूस हो या जर्मनी हो और चाहे चीन हो, जिनके पास भी वीटो पॉवर है, उन तीनों देशों ने भी अमेरिका को इस बात के लिए रोकने का पुरजोर प्रयास किया है और वे चाहते हैं कि अमेरिका इस बारे में पुनर्विचार करे और इराक के ऊपर हमला नहीं करे। हम

चाहते हैं कि संयुक्त राष्ट्र संघ शक्तिशाली बने और वह किसी दुनिया की ताकतों का खिलौना नहीं बने। अगर संयुक्त राष्ट्र संघ मिट गया तो दुनिया की जैसी भी पंचायत है और अगर वह पंचायत एक बार कमजोर हो गई तो दुनिया में फिर शांति स्थापित कराने के लिए बिचौलिए का काम, शांति स्थापित करने का काम फिर कौन करेगा? इसलिए भारत इस बात के लिए निरन्तर प्रयत्नशील है कि यूएनओ ताकतवर बने। जो भी कार्यवाही हो, यूएनओ के माध्यम से हो और शांति स्थापित करने की बात को प्रमुखता मिले और विश्व की सुरक्षा परिषद के अंदर जो वीटो पॉवर जिन लोगों के हाथ में है, वे शक्तियां इस बात का निरन्तर प्रयास करें कि अमेरिका को दादागिरी करने का और ईशक के ऊपर हमला करने का और वहां के कुंआं में पाये जाने वाले पेट्रोल को देखकर जो अमेरिका साम्राज्यवादी मनोवृत्ति का खेल खेलना चाहता है, उसे रोकने का निरन्तर प्रयास करें। मैं समझता हूँ कि हमारी सरकार हमेशा गुटनिरपेक्षता की नीति में विश्वास करती रही है और भारत के हितों को सर्वोपरि मानकर अपने मित्र राष्ट्र की रक्षा करने के लिए, मित्र राष्ट्र की जनता को शांति का संदेश देने के लिए निरन्तर प्रयत्नशील रहेगी।

एक और बात मैं कहना चाहूंगा कि जिस प्रकार से 1919 में लीग ऑफ नेशन्स की स्थापना हुई थी लेकिन जो कमजोर बनी और कमजोर बनने के बाद द्वितीय विश्व वयुद्ध हो गया और द्वितीय विश्वयुद्ध होने के बाद 24 अक्टूबर 1945 को संयुक्तराष्ट्र संघ की स्थापना हुई। आज उसका अस्तित्व एक प्रकार से खतरे में है। हालांकि कॉफी अन्नान साहब जो यूएनओ के महासचिव हैं, वह बहुत प्रयास कर रहे हैं और दुनिया की सारी ताकतों भी पूरा प्रयास कर रही हैं लेकिन अमेरिका कोई न कोई बहाना खोजकर हमला करने लग जाता है। अमेरिका ने अफगानिस्तान में आतंकवाद को मिटाने के नाम पर, तालीबानों से निपटने के नाम पर, वहां पर आतंकवादी ताकतों को नट करने के लिए और अफगानिस्तान की जनता को मुक्त करने के लिए जो भी प्रयास किए हों, उसमें हमने समर्थन किया था लेकिन ईशक के मामले में अमेरिका की इस प्रकार की दादागिरी की प्रवृत्ति का हम कभी भी समर्थन नहीं कर सकते हैं। इसलिए मैं समझता हूँ कि इस हाउस के अंदर बिनी किसी देश की निंदा किए हुए यह संदेश जाना चाहिए कि हम विश्व के अंदर शांति चाहते हैं। शांति संबंधी प्रस्ताव पारित होना चाहिए और यूएनओ सशक्त बने और सशक्त बनकर संयुक्त राष्ट्र संघ के माध्यम से इन शांति प्रयासों को और भी बढ़ावा मिले। जहां तक हथियारों की जांच का जो मामला है, दुबारा हथियारों का एक निरीक्षक दल मार्च में फिर से भेजा जाए जो और रिपोर्ट लेकर आ जाए। जब सद्दाम हुसैन ने घोषणा कर दी है कि हम दुनिया के लोगों को विश्वास दिलाते हैं कि आगे हम किसी भी प्रकार के आणविक या रासायनिक या विध्वंस हथियारों का निर्माण करने की नीति को त्यागते हैं और कभी नहीं बनाएंगे। जब ऐसा विश्वास दिलाया है तो हम समझते हैं कि उनकी बातों पर विश्व जनमत को भी विश्वास करना चाहिए। इन्हीं शब्दों के साथ जो 193 के अंदर जो बहस हो रही है, इस संदर्भ में मैं इतना ही कहना चाहूंगा कि हम हमेशा शांति के उपासक रहे हैं और हमारे मित्र राष्ट्र के लिए या दुनिया के अंदर कोई भी कितना भी शक्तिशाली राष्ट्र क्यों न हो, उसकी शक्ति उसके स्थान पर होगी। उसकी सही नीतियों का हम समर्थन करेंगे और गलत नीतियों का हम हमेशा विरोध करते रहेंगे और उसकी युद्धोन्माद वाली प्रवृत्ति को हम कभी भी समर्थन नहीं दे सकते। इन्हीं शब्दों के साथ आपने जो मुझे यहां बोलने का समय दिया, उसके लिए मैं आपको धन्यवाद देता हूँ।

SHRIMATI MARGARET ALVA (CANARA): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, one hears the term terrorism everywhere today. No debate, no discussion, nothing takes place anywhere without terrorism in one form or the other being dragged into it. You can turn anyone into a terrorist. You can condemn anybody you want and you can convert anything into a terrorist sponsored or a terrorist-friendly outfit. It is becoming a new *mantra*, if I may say so, in international relations. Someone spoke about the weaknesses of the Congress Government over the past 50 years.

SHRI P.H. PANDIAN (TIRUNELVELI): You should not say 'someone'. You should say one hon. Member.

SHRIMATI MARGARET ALVA : All right. One of the hon. Members said it. I get corrected by him.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, please tell him not to interrupt me.

Who understands the pangs of terrorism better than my own Party which has lost three leaders to the evil of terrorism? We have paid the price over the years. Please do not say the Congress Governments have been weak. We have faced the worst threat of the Seventh Fleet in the Indian waters during the Bangladesh war, but Shrimati Indira Gandhi refused to buckle and refused to give in. She was prepared to stand up to all the threats and fought to the finish until victory was ours. Therefore, I would like really not to get lessons, and as was said before, I do not want to divide the House into Government and Opposition on this crucial issue. I think we are all concerned with the world around on what is happening and would all like to find a peaceful solution to the challenges which we face not only in our neighbourhood, but which are growing all over the world.

For decades we from India spoke about the danger of international terrorism. At every international meeting India was drawing the attention of the world community to the threat of terrorism. But we were told 'oh, go slow; these are battles for self-determination; these are battles of independence; talk to people; negotiate; find a solution; after all, you must find a solution to the problem.' But one attack in New York in which not only Americans died, but people of all nationalities died in that attack, and suddenly it becomes a world war against terrorism! Is it because the thousands who died in other parts of the world, including India, over so many years were not as important? Is it because of the colour of the skin of those who died earlier, which was not white perhaps? Nobody took notice of that. But, three thousand people died from different countries, and the heartland of a particular country had been attacked and then it declared a war on terrorism and the world was told 'you are either with us or you are against us; you join the coalition, otherwise you are against the war on terrorism'.

What followed after that? You and I have been witnesses to the invasion, I would call it, of Afghanistan with bombings, occupation and overthrowing of the regime. I am not defending any regime. Please do not misunderstand me. I am not holding any brief for any repressive regime anywhere. But the way in which they walked into a country, bombed the people in which thousands of civilians died, thousands have fled or have been carried away to camps in Cuba and other parts of the world like animals caged and taken. We have seen pictures shown all over the world. Is this the meaning of democracy or the meaning of international law? Or I would ask, is this the meaning of a world in which justice can ever be expected or given to people who are weaker than those who have all the arms and all the power? Injustice breeds violence and unless there is justice in international relations the world will never see

peace again. I want to say this today without any hesitation.

In the United States, after the 11th September incident, we have seen what has been happening. Asians have been targeted; minorities have been targeted; all sorts of repressive laws, systems are coming into place and everyone who belongs to particular communities, particular countries are being deported or are being marked as terrorist suspects or having links with terrorists. The type of fear psychosis, the type of – if I may say – the new world order of suspicion, of setting one against the other all over the United States and in other parts of the world today is creating more and more tensions. And yet, after all that they have done, Al-Qaida still survives in many parts of the world. Bin Laden is still supposed to be alive and sending his messages. Other leaders whom they wanted to bomb out of existence have managed to get out. And what have they achieved except turning Afghanistan and other areas around it into rubble and innocent people being forced out of their homes? And now, having done that, they turn their eyes on Saddam Hussein. Well, we are finished with Afghanistan, they are not.

Let us be very clear on this point. The American troops are engaged in ground battles all over Afghanistan even today. The Russians tried subjugating the tribes of Afghanistan, they paid a price and withdrew. It is said that Shrimati Indira Gandhi had advised the Soviet President, when he came to India, not to get involved with Afghanistan because even the British and nobody down the centuries have been able to subjugate the Afghan tribes. The Americans have gone in now. Let us see what happens. We thought that they have learnt the lesson after the Vietnam war but it looks like they still have lessons to learn in Asia and in this part of the world. And now, it is Saddam Hussein. They think, "We could not get Bin Laden, we will get Saddam Hussein and so, you must attack Saddam Hussein. You must attack Iraq, you must bomb Iraq, you must occupy Iraq, you must control Iraq and you must give a regime which suits you, which will be friendly to you and which will help you to control the oil resources of the Middle East." That is the whole game plan. Let us look at it simply and honestly.

As has been said, it does not matter what they destroy. "The American eagle must swoop and get its prey". That is the battle cry. The UN Security Council has refused to endorse the war game. The Arms Inspector Team has asked for more time and it has said it very clearly in its recent report. I have it here and I would like to quote from it to show that they have not found anything of mass destruction there. This is the report and I would quote from it.

"While the United States and UK had hoped to use Blix's second report to push through a second resolution authorising war, the outcome was just the opposite. The Guardian reports, "The French and Russian foreign ministers were given rare applause in the council chamber yesterday (Friday) when they demanded more time for inspections, in striking contrast to the stony silence that greeted hoarse and irritable insistence that time had run out from Colin Powell, the US Secretary of State.

"In a crucial report to the United Nations, chief inspector Hans Blix gave Iraq a mixed review – though today's assessment was far less scathing than the one in January. He again raised questions about Iraq's stocks of anthrax and nerve agent VX and its long-range missiles, but also took a swipe at the two satellite images presented by Colin Powell to the Security Council. Powell argued that the images showed Iraqis moving arms out of certain sites to evade inspectors. He said, 'The reported movement of munitions at the site could just as easily have been a routine activity as a movement of proscribed munitions in anticipation of an imminent inspection.'"

The Report of the US Inspector has not confirmed the many wild reports which the US and UK were trying to sell to the world. And now, they are faced with this. But what does Mr. George Bush say? I quote his statement.

"If you want to keep the peace, you've got to have the authorisation to use force," said Mr. Bush, adding, "If the United Nations Security Council won't deal with the problem, the United States and some of our friends will."

16.00 hrs.

In other words, it is a challenge to the United Nations. We want you to do what we say. If you do not do it, we will do it any way. Is this the international law or the rule of law. Is this what we expect from the so-called most powerful nation in the world which they claim to be? It is said that out of 6,000 inspections carried out over 91 months, there have been only 100 cases where the inspectors and the Iraqis have differed. It is out of 6000 inspections. Yet we are being told that there have been blatant violations of the commitments made for the inspection. Sixty per cent of Iraq has been declared by these two countries, not by resolutions of the United Nations, as 'no fly zones'. No Iraqi plane can fly. Nobody can overfly. Only the US and the British bombers and U-2 planes can fly for surveillance. It is closed to everybody else. These are some of the facts which we are faced with.

Of course, the British Prime Minister, in response to the US persuasion and perhaps to the slogan 'you are either with us or you are against us, so join the coalition', like the little poodle, jumped on to the President's laps and dances to his master's tunes. Israel has been violating all the Resolutions of the UN and carrying on its aggressive acts against the Palestinians, but nobody says anything! The Arabs look for a peaceful way out, but they have their limitations. Fortunately, for the world, the European Parliament and the European Union has rung the warning bell. France has very firmly and clearly refused to go along and Germany quietly has said enough about its reservations.

But with all the diplomatic balancing that Shri Jaswant Singh has done over the past so many years after Government's balancing efforts, its periods of meditation and *mauna* from time to time, its accusations and proof of complicity against Pakistan, Pakistan has not been condemned. Though words have been heard from time to time from the US against Pakistan, still they admit publicly that they are their strategic partners in the war against terrorism. So, they survive; they have their nuclear installations; and they have their camps. They do everything they want, but the United States will not touch them in any way nor will they touch North Korea. Why am I saying this? Because, for them it is only Saddam and it is only Iraq which is the cause of terrorism today after Afghanistan. I would like to ask as to where do we stand. Why have we scuttled SAARC? Why have we debunked the Non-Aligned Movement? Why have we been repeatedly silent at the United Nations? There was a time when India's voice was heard with respect, and was looked forward to by those who had to take a stand. They wanted to know what India had to say so that they could also follow it alike. But today we are afraid to let our voice be heard.

In fact, the Government speaks in so many different voices. Somebody quoted some one. I do not give so much importance to people who just talk through their hats. But someone says, 'support the war', somebody else says, 'do not support the war', someone says, 'we have no stand on the war' and someone says, 'our interests are more important than Iraq'. Why are there so many differing voices coming from our Government? I think the country and Parliament has the right to know what is their stand and what they intend doing. Iraq has been a friend of India at most crucial times. We have had - as it has already been explained, I am not saying that again - a long relationship of friendship between the Iraqi people and India. I am not defending a regime. There might be limitations in the running of that State. There might be aberrations. I am not condoning them. My point is this. Does another power have the right to change a Government because it does not suit that power? I would like to pose this question. Who decides it? Can the international community keep quiet? Can India really be a silent spectator?

The other day I was at the Airport. I got introduced to an American Professor who had come to India for a Seminar on Indo-Israel-U.S. cooperation in security arrangements to fight terrorism. So, I looked at him. I asked him as to what he is doing in a Seminar like this. He said: "Now, we have to save the world from terrorism." I said "the Americans have no business telling us about fighting terrorism". I further told him that they are responsible for most of the terrorist acts in the world either themselves or because of their actions. I asked of him: "What are you trying to teach us?" So, he got quite upset. He said: "You forget that we liberated Asia from the Japanese. We liberated Europe from the Nazis. We liberated the Afghanistan from the Talibans and so on and so forth." He went on saying this. He further said that they liberated Kuwait from the Iraqis and so on and so forth. Then, I looked at him and said: "When do you think that you have to liberate Pakistan and you have to liberate Kashmir from India? Is that also on your agenda? You want to liberate the world. You are teaching the world what is good for it." I further told him that they should first search their conscience and see why the world is in the condition in which it is today. As I said before, injustice, which has been perpetuated in various parts of the world, will never ever lie without reaction from the people. They may be small countries. Since they cannot fight openly, they will take to acts of terrorism and sacrifice their lives so that they could get even with others.

The recent statement of the President of Pakistan is also very telling. President Musharraf, who is supposed to be their strategic partner, says very openly. "It is quite possible that we will be the next victims after Saddam." For the President of Pakistan to admit that, I think, is saying quite a lot.

There have been protest marches all over the world. Thousands, nay, millions have marched in London, Paris, Madrid, Rome, New York and California. Name the countries and name the cities they are marching in their millions saying "no" to war and "no" to the attack on Iraq. In fact, bus-loads of volunteers have gone to Iraq from Europe as shields to protect the Iraqi people from their own forces. They say: "We will die before you touch the Iraqi people." This is the kind of emotion that is felt around the world. Perhaps, the most interesting banner which was widely published in India on the front pages. It says: "We have an empty warhead in the White House." I think that is saying a lot. This is not I who am saying it, but the American people in their march towards the United Nations said this. I would just like to say that this is not the clash of civilisations or this is not a religious war. It is a battle for oil and the desire to control the Middle-Eastern oil fields by the country which we know.

Here, I would like to read what appeared in the *Observer* in the U.K. It says and I quote:

"The U.S. plans to withdraw all its troops and bases from the country - Germany - and pull the plug on decades of military and industrial cooperation between the two countries. "

It is so because they have opposed the war in Iraq. It further says and I quote:

"The plan – discussed by Pentagon officials and military chiefs last week on the orders of Defence Secretary Donald Rumsfeld – is designed 'to harm' the German economy to make an example of the country for what U.S. hawks see as Chancellor Gerhard Schroder's 'treachery'."

So, if you do not fall in line, you pay the price. This is the latest blackmail. Wars are also meant to rekindle the military and economic complex of the West. If there are no wars, there is no economic development in that country and there is an interest, therefore, in provoking wars and keeping them going.

I would appeal to the House on behalf of all of us that, I think, there is a need for us to, in no uncertain terms, come out with a Resolution on behalf of the people of India and say in very clear terms from this House that we are the representatives of the people of India and the voice of the people of India is: "no war on Iraq".

16.11 hrs. (Shri Devendra Prasad Yadav *in the Chair*)

I think, at this time we need to stand up, be heard and counted as those who had the courage in a time of crisis like this to tell the world that India has a stand that this Parliament will not support aggression on Iraq or on anybody else, because what happens to someone else today could happen to us tomorrow.

So, I appeal to the Government and its good sense that before the Prime Minister goes to the Non-Aligned Summit, he should carry a unanimous Resolution of the House saying that this is what we feel, this is what we want and this is what we have to tell to the world.

डॉ. रघुवंश प्रसाद सिंह (वैशाली) : सभापति महोदय, आज इराक के सवाल पर दुनिया भर की नजरें लगी हुई हैं और देखा जा रहा है कि वहां अमरीका अपनी दादागिरी कर रहा है और यू.एन.ओ. को नीचा दिखाने की कोशिश की जा रही है। ऐसा माना जाता था कि अमरीका डेमोक्रेटिक कंट्री है, विश्व के देशों की पब्लिक ओपीनियन का ख्याल रखेगा और उसे रखना भी चाहिये। लेकिन हम इसका उलटा देख रहे हैं कि आज दुनिया भर में सवाल इस बात का है और पब्लिक ओपीनियन उभर कर सामने आ रही है कि अमरीका इराक पर हमला करने के लिये किस कदर बहाना निकालना चाह रहा है। इस बात का विरोध न केवल हिन्दुस्तान में बल्कि विश्व के कई देशों में हुआ है। जब आतंकवाद हुआ, उसके खिलाफ दुनिया के लोगों की ओपीनियन तैयार हुई थी। अमरीका आतंकवाद से पीड़ित हुआ तो उसे लगा कि आतंकवाद क्या चीज है। जब अमरीका आतंकवाद के खिलाफ खड़ा हुआ तो दुनिया के लोगों का जनमत तैयार हुआ कि आतंकवाद समाप्त किया जाना चाहिये, यह न केवल मानवता के लिये बल्कि सभ्य समाज के लिये कलंक है। आज देखा जा रहा है कि अमरीका उस जन-समर्थन का दुरुपयोग करना चाहता है। उस जन-समर्थन से उसे लगा कि उसे हर जायज-नाजायज बात पर समर्थन मिलेगा। लेकिन, ऐसा नहीं है। अभी-अभी अमरीका का बयान आया कि दुनिया का जन समर्थन उसका साथ दे या न दे, वह अपनी हठधर्मिता पर अड़ा हुआ है- क्या ऐसी दादागिरी चलेगी?

सभापति महोदय, दुनिया के देशों में जमीन के हिसाब से हम 2.4 प्रतिशत हैं लेकिन आबादी के हिसाब से 16 प्रतिशत हैं और हम छठा मुल्क हैं। आज हिन्दुस्तान को अपनी विल पॉवर दिखानी चाहिये कि हम दुनिया का छठा देश हैं और हमारी विरासत के अनुसार भगवान बुद्ध ने शान्ति की दीक्षा दी थी, भगवान महावीर, महात्मा गांधी और पं. जवाहर लाल नेहरू ने अहिंसा का संदेश दुनिया को दिया था। इसे मद्देनजर रखते हुये, हिन्दुस्तान को ऐसा वातावरण बनाना चाहिये था, उसका नेतृत्व करना चाहिये था, एक ऐसी विल पॉवर दिखानी चाहिये थी लेकिन हम सरकार का व्यवहार अमरीकी पिटू की तरह देख रहे हैं।

यदि दुनिया में कुछ गलत होगा तो हिन्दुस्तान को आगे आकर उसके खिलाफ खड़ा होना चाहिए। इसके लिए डिप्लोमेसी की जरूरत है। इसमें कूटनीतिक तरकीब के हिसाब से जनमत बनाया जाना चाहिए और दुनिया भर में जो शक्तियां हैं, उन शक्तियों की विचारधारा को मोबीलाइज करने के लिए हिन्दुस्तान को अपनी कूटनीति प्रयोग करनी चाहिए ताकि किसी भी हिसाब से अमरीका की दादागिरी न चले या दुनिया में कहीं भी जोर-जुल्म हो तो हिन्दुस्तान को उसके खिलाफ आगे आना चाहिए।

सभापति महोदय, अन्नान साहब, यू.एन.ओ. के महासचिव हैं। वह प्रयत्न करते रहे हैं। इराक में जांच-पड़ताल के लिए इंसपेक्टर भेजे गये हैं। लेकिन अमरीका अपने पास सबसे ज्यादा अणुबम और घातक हथियार रखे हुए हैं और वह इराक में इंसपेक्टर भेज रहे हैं कि इराक अपने यहां क्या-क्या रखे हुए है। उन्हें इराक में कुछ नहीं मिला, फिर भी इराक पर हमला करने की साजिश हो रही है, हमला करने का बहाना बनाया जा रहा है। फिर संवाद भी दिया जा रहा है कि यदि सद्दाम हुसैन हट जाएं तो हम हमला नहीं करेंगे। दुनिया के किसी भी मुल्क को दूसरे मुल्क के अंदरूनी मामलों में हस्तक्षेप करने का अधिकार नहीं है। वहां की जनता जिसे चाहेगी, उसे चुनेगी। हर देश अपने देश के प्रधान को चुनने के लिए आजाद है। यहां से खबर होती है और संवाद दिया जाता है कि सद्दाम हुसैन हट जाएं तो हम हमला नहीं करेंगे। हम चाहते हैं कि इसका हल यू.एन.ओ. में बातचीत के द्वारा होना चाहिए। हम लोग उससे अलग नहीं रह सकते। हिन्दुस्तान के लोग दुनिया भर में फैले हुए हैं। किसी देश पर कोई देश हमला करेगा तो उससे हिन्दुस्तान भी प्रभावित होगा। अमरीका अब आतंकवादी लादेन को नहीं खोज रहा है। लोग कहते हैं कि लादेन पाकिस्तान में डेरा डाले हुए है। पाकिस्तान आतंकवादियों को सहारा दे रहा है, मदद कर रहा है, पनाह दे रहा है। इस मामले में उसका दोहरा मापदंड है। एक तरफ वह दुनिया को बतायें कि हम आतंकवाद के खिलाफ लड़ रहे हैं, इसलिए सब लोग हमारा समर्थन करिये, उसी जगह अमरीका दोहरा मापदंड अख्तियार कर रहा है और पाकिस्तान को हमसे ज्यादा मदद दे रहा है। इसलिए दुनिया में उसका भंडाफोड़ करने की जरूरत है। सरकार को इसके लिए आगे आना चाहिए। इसलिए यह सर्वोच्च सदन, जो दुनिया के छठे हिस्से की प्रतिनिधि संस्था है, यहां से एकमत से संदेश जाना चाहिए कि किसी भी हालत में जो भी विवाद है, वह बातचीत के द्वारा हल किया जाए। यू.एन.ओ. को अंडरमाइन न किया जाए बल्कि यू.एन.ओ. के साथ बातचीत करके सारे मामले को हल किया जाना चाहिए। यदि फिर भी अमरीका उस पर हमला करे तो हम लोग उसके खिलाफ हैं। हिन्दुस्तान को उसका नेतृत्व करना चाहिए।

सभापति महोदय : आप संक्षेप में अपनी बात समाप्त करें।

डॉ. रघुवंश प्रसाद सिंह : मैं संक्षेप में ही समाप्त कर रहा हूं। यहां विदेश मंत्री नहीं हैं, राज्य मंत्री हैं। (व्यवधान)

एक माननीय सदस्य : वह भी बिहार से हैं।

डॉ. रघुवंश प्रसाद सिंह : बिना बिहार के सदन नहीं चल सकता। अंतर्राष्ट्रीय राजनीति में भी बिहार की जरूरत पड़ेगी। बिहार के बिना कोई काम नहीं चल सकता।

सभापति महोदय : अब आप समाप्त करिये। बृह्मानंद मंडल जी, आप बोलना शुरू करिये।

डॉ. रघुवंश प्रसाद सिंह : बिहार में ही भगवान बुद्ध को ज्ञान हासिल हुआ था। यहां भी बिहार से वक्ता हैं और आसन पर भी बिहार से ही सभापति जी आसीन हैं। बिहार मूकदर्शन नहीं रह सकता। बिहार में भगवान महावीर का जन्म हुआ और भगवान महावीर ने सत्य और अहिंसा का संदेश दिया। मोहनदास करमचंद गांधी ने बिहार आंदोलन किया। इस सबका गौरव बिहार को प्राप्त है।

सभापति महोदय : बृह्मानंद मंडल जी, आप शुरू करिये।

डॉ. रघुवंश प्रसाद सिंह : इसलिए हम भारत सरकार को सलाह देते हैं, यहां माननीय मंत्री जी बैठे हुए हैं, वह अपनी तरकीब का प्रयोग करें और एक रिजोल्यूशन के द्वारा यहां से संदेश जाना चाहिए कि अमरीका किसी भी हालत में इराक पर हमला न करे। बातचीत के द्वारा मसले का हल किया जाए। यू.एन.ओ. की अवमानना न हो और अमरीका की दादागिरी बंद हो। अमरीका के दोहरे मापदंड का पर्दाफाश हो।

सभापति महोदय : आपकी कोई बात रिकार्ड पर नहीं जायेगी। *

डॉ. रघुवंश प्रसाद सिंह : इन्हीं शब्दों के साथ मैं अपनी बात समाप्त करता हूं।

* Not Recorded

श्री ब्रह्मानन्द मंडल (मुंगेर) : अध्यक्ष महोदय, नियम 193 के अधीन होने वाली चर्चा में आपने मुझे अपनी बात कहने का समय दिया, इसके लिए मैं आपको धन्यवाद देता हूँ। आज इराक पर अमेरिकी हमले की जो तैयारी हुई है, उससे संबंधित विषय पर हम लोग चर्चा कर रहे हैं।

हम जानते हैं कि पूरी दुनिया के अधिकतर देश, दो-तीन देशों को छोड़कर, इस युद्ध के खिलाफ हैं। हम यह भी जानते हैं कि दुनिया के 600 से अधिक शहरों में 60 लाख से अधिक लोगों ने सड़कों पर आकर इस बात का इज़हार किया है कि युद्ध नहीं होना चाहिए, इराक पर हमला नहीं होना चाहिए। शांतिपूर्ण तरीके से जो भी हथियार संबंधी इराक के खिलाफ आरोप लगाये जाते हैं, उनका हल होना चाहिए। हम यह भी जानते हैं कि संयुक्त राष्ट्र संघ के हथियार निरीक्षकों ने इराक में जाकर जितने भी दस्तावेज और जहां कहीं भी हथियार के ज़खीरे हैं, उनकी जांच करने का काम किया है, लेकिन न तो उन्हें कोई साक्ष्य मिला, न कोई प्रमाण मिला, न आपत्तिजनक बातें पाई गई हैं। इसके बावजूद भी अमेरिका का कहना है कि इराक एक ऐसी जगह है जहां से आतंकवाद पैदा होता है। अमेरिका को इससे खतरा है और इसलिए सद्दाम हुसैन को वहां से हट जाना चाहिए, इराक छोड़कर चले जाना चाहिए, सत्ता में नहीं रहना चाहिए और अगर रहता है तो हमला किया जाएगा।

कहा जाता है कि अमेरिका दुनिया का सबसे बड़ा जनतांत्रिक देश है लेकिन वही अमेरिका आज दुनिया के तमाम देशों की सरकारों की आवाज़ को क्यों नहीं सुन रहा है? इसलिए अमेरिका अपना हित जिस चीज़ में देखता है, उसमें वह कोई समझौता नहीं करता है। इतिहास गवाह है कि जहां भी, जिस भी जगह दुनिया के जिस भी कोने में अमेरिकी हित रहा है, अमेरिका ने वहां अपना बल प्रयोग किया। आतंकवाद का केन्द्र पैदा करने का काम दुनिया के हर कोने में अगर किसी एक देश ने किया है तो अमेरिका ने किया है। जब उससे भी काम नहीं चलता, तब वह सीधे अपनी ताकत का इस्तेमाल करता है।

सभापति महोदय, भारत सरकार और भारत के माननीय प्रधान मंत्री जी ने, अमरीका इराक पर हमले की जो तैयारी कर रहा है, उसका विरोध किया है, लेकिन इतने से ही काम नहीं चलेगा। हम लोग जानते हैं कि आज दुनिया मंदी के दौर से गुजर रही है। इसलिए हमें यह भी देखना चाहिए कि कहीं ऐसा तो नहीं है कि अमरीकी अर्थ-व्यवस्था में जो मंदी है उसे दूर करने के लिए सारी चालें चलने के बावजूद वह सफल नहीं हो रहा है, इसीलिए युद्ध करना चाहता है। तेल के दाम आसमान छू रहे हैं। दुनिया में सबसे अधिक तेल बेचने वाला अमरीका है और दुनिया के हर देश को तेल का इस्तेमाल करना पड़ता है। तेल के दाम अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय स्तर पर बढ़ रहे हैं। इससे दुनिया के हर देश को परेशानी हो रही है। तेल का अधिकांश धन अमरीका को ही मिल रहा है।

सभापति महोदय : माननीय सदस्य, ब्रह्मानन्द मंडल जी, कृपया अब समाप्त कीजिए। इस विषय पर बहस का समय केवल चार बजे तक था और माननीय सदस्यों को भी अपनी बात कहनी है, इसलिए इसका समय बढ़ा दिया गया है। मेरा निवेदन है कि आप कृपया दो मिनट में अपनी बात समाप्त करें।

श्री ब्रह्मानन्द मंडल : सभापति जी, अभी तो मैंने शुरू ही किया है। मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि अमरीका संयुक्त राष्ट्र संघ को भी धमकी दे रहा है और बता रहा है कि

संयुक्त राष्ट्र संघ को किस प्रकार से काम करना चाहिए। अमरीकी राष्ट्रपति जिस प्रकार से कहेगा, उसे उसी के अनुसार काम करना है। संयुक्त राष्ट्र संघ के जो भी सदस्य देश हैं, उनकी उसे कोई परवाह नहीं है। सुरक्षा परिषद् को कैसे चलना है, कैसे काम करना है, यह भी अमरीकी राष्ट्रपति बताएंगे और जैसा वे कहेंगे, उसके अनुसार ही उसे चलना है। आज पूरे विश्व में ऐसी स्थिति हो गई है कि अमरीका अपनी ताकत के बल पर हर समस्या को हल करना चाहता है। ताकत के नशे में वह पागल है। हम लोग अच्छी तरह से जानते हैं कि अपने देश में पागल का क्या मतलब होता है और वह कब क्या कर देगा, यह कहना मुश्किल है।

महोदय, भारत का हित किस में है, यह तो अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय स्तर की बात है। गुटनिरपेक्ष देशों की चर्चा की गई है। आज 114 गुटनिरपेक्ष देश हैं जिनमें से लगभग 66 देश इस्लामिक हैं। ये देश इस्लाम में विश्वास करने वाले देश हैं। इस्लाम में विश्वास करने वाले 66 देशों की आबादी बहुत है। उनके पास तेल के बहुत बड़े संसाधन हैं, लेकिन वहां पिछड़ापन है, गरीबी है, भुखमरी है। इसलिए ये राष्ट्र कमजोर हैं। हम गुटनिरपेक्ष आन्दोलन के जन्मदाता हैं। आज इन कमजोर राष्ट्रों का नेतृत्व कौन करेगा, इस पर विचार करना चाहिए। इन कमजोर 66 इस्लामिक देशों का नेतृत्व भारत को करना चाहिए कि नहीं, अगर भारत इनका नेतृत्व करता है, तो वह भारत के हित में है या नहीं, इस पर विचार होना चाहिए या नहीं, इस तरह की नीति बननी चाहिए या नहीं, ये सब विचारणीय विषय हैं। मैं राष्ट्रीय हित एवं अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय दृष्टिकोण से कहना चाहता हूँ कि हमें अमरीका द्वारा इराक से युद्ध करने का न सिर्फ विरोध करना चाहिए बल्कि हमें कूटनीति इस तरह से चलानी चाहिए जिससे सारे गुटनिरपेक्ष देशों को एक करके अमरीका को बाध्य किया जा सके कि वह किसी भी कीमत पर युद्ध नहीं करे। दूसरी बात आर्थिक है। हमारे देश का आर्थिक हित इसके साथ जुड़ा हुआ है। इराक के साथ जुड़ा हुआ है और पूरे मध्य पूर्व में जुड़ा हुआ है।

महोदय, अभी हमारे सीपीएम के एक बंधु कह रहे थे कि 200 मिलियन डालर धन की बर्बादी होगी। मैं उनसे कुछ कहना चाहूँगा कि आपने जहां से भी आंकड़े इकट्ठे किए हैं, गलत अंदाज लगाया है, वह गलत है। उससे हमारी अर्थव्यवस्था की हालत बहुत खराब हो जाएगी, हमारी जनता परेशान होगी। इस दृष्टिकोण से भी हमें इस युद्ध का सिर्फ विरोध ही नहीं करना चाहिए, बल्कि पूरी दुनिया के अंदर इस ओर राष्ट्रों को संगठित करना चाहिए कि अमेरिका अगर सारे नियम और कायदे तोड़ कर हमले की तैयारी कर रहा है तो उसे रोकने का काम करना चाहिए। (व्यवधान)

16.31 hrs. (Mr. Speaker in the Chair)

अध्यक्ष महोदय : मंडल जी, अब आप समाप्त करिए।

श्री ब्रह्मानन्द मंडल : अध्यक्ष महोदय, मुझे दो मिनट बोलने का समय और दिया जाए।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : हम आपको दो मिनट का समय और नहीं दे सकते। आपका समय समाप्त हो गया है, अब आप बैठ जाइए। मैं आपको दूसरे रेजोल्यूशन पर बोलने के लिए समय दूंगा।

श्री ब्रह्मानन्द मंडल : अध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं अपना भाग समाप्त करता हूँ, लेकिन मैं इतना कहना चाहता हूँ कि इस समय जो पूरी दुनिया की स्थिति है, दुनिया की राजनीति में हमें बहुत बड़ी भूमिका अदा करनी चाहिए। इससे भारत की स्थिति पूरी दुनिया में मजबूत होगी। दुनिया एक ध्रुवीय हो गई है। अमरीका अपने अनुसार दुनिया बनाने जा रहा है। अगर यह बन गया तो सबसे ज्यादा भारत को नुकसान होगा। मैं यही कहना चाहता था। इन्हीं शब्दों के साथ मैं अपना भाग समाप्त करता हूँ।

SHRI S.S. PALANIMANICKAM (THANJAVUR): Thank you, Sir.

No national interest is above the interest of the people. People even from America and England are against the war but the President of the United States and the British Prime Minister are eager to go for a war against Iraq.

The US wants to have a war with the approval of the UN but now it is clear that it would go ahead even without UN approval. Anything related to America is a matter of world concern for them but anything not related to America is of least concern.

Ours was the first country to condemn the September 11, 2001 attack on the United States and support the stand of the US. Now, ours must be the first country to oppose the American move against Iraq.

Our Parliament, the highest symbol of our democracy was attacked by terrorists. Even after that, we did not declare a war against Pakistan. That is our greatness and that shows our Gandhian way of rule. Peace-loving countries like India should now allow big powers like America to attack Iraq.

Iraq is very much co-operating with the UN inspectors. I would like to know whether the United States would allow the inspectors to check their arms in the same way.

On behalf of my party, the DMK, I would like to say that as our leader Dr. Kalaignar has said, the issue must be solved on the basis of the guidelines issued by the UN Council.

I whole-heartedly support the Resolution to be unanimously passed by our Parliament against war to restore peace in the world.

SHRI MANI SHANKAR AIYAR : Sir, they have not allowed a Resolution. Everything you said is right. Come and join us. They have not allowed a Resolution.

MR. SPEAKER: Shri P.H. Pandian. I am giving you three minutes.

...(Interruptions)

SHRI P.H. PANDIAN : Sir, is it only three minutes? We need ten minutes even for local issues. ...(Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER: The speaker before you took only two minutes.

...(Interruptions)

SHRI P.H. PANDIAN : Sir, I thank you very much for giving me this opportunity to participate in the discussion regarding threat to international peace due to tension between USA and Iraq.

Sir, India has the highest stakes in the oil in that area. Over 60 per cent of India's crude oil imports are sourced from the Gulf. I need not apprise anybody about it. India's exports to the Gulf countries in 2001-02 were valued at \$ 3.7 billion.

Sir, I would say that there are differences among dictators. I view Musharaff in a different way and I view Saddam Hussein in a different way. Saddam Hussein's administration is different from General Musharaff's. He has a secular idea. Secularism is there. He gives free education in that country. There is subsidised food. So, I view Musharaff and Saddam Hussein differently. Then, health is also free. This fact cannot be shut off. There is a good democratic administration. Though Saddam Hussein used to be a dictator yet his way of administering that country is different. The first democracy in the world is United States, but it has declared war.

Sir, after the September incident in America, Mr. Bush had said that it was going to hang down Osama Bin Laden. But he has not done it. So, these are all empty words.

As far as we are concerned, we are civilised. We believe in negotiation; we believe in discussion and we believe in participating in U.N. That is why, the U.N. Resolution is adopted in both the Houses of Parliament in the United States and also in Iraq. Even though we are not discussing that Resolution, yet we are discussing the contents of the matter here in Parliament. There should be a consensus on this issue because it is a global issue. There is no global Government, there is no global Parliament; and there is no global control except the United Nations. So, we have to strengthen the hands of the United Nations. They have submitted a Report after an inspection. We have to take into consideration all the circumstances of the matter connected therewith. The Government and the Opposition should take a unified one view. There cannot be divergent views on this matter. There is no unipolar world. We have different entities, different Governments, different States and different countries. Each country is electing its own leader. No country can ask the other country to elect a different leader. America cannot say that you elect this man as a Prime Minister. It is a democratic right of each and every country. ...(Interruptions) Saddam Hussein's invasion of Kuwait is bad. Everybody has agreed about it. There are shortcomings on both the sides. ...(Interruptions) Please listen to me. ...(Interruptions) We are in the Centre of this Parliament. You belong to Congress. They belong to BJP. You are an alternative to BJP and they are an alternative to you. We are in between. ...(Interruptions) But we cannot compromise on principles. India has its own principles, the policy of non-violence or non-declaration of war. We have not declared even a war against Pakistan, though General Musharaff's diabolical attitude demanded a war. His behaviour on the negotiating table at the diplomatic level has not yielded any result. When we have spared Pakistan and when we have not waged a war against Pakistan, why should we support the U.S. to wage a war against Iraq? We should have declared a war immediately after the incident on the attack of our Parliament building. But war is an uncivilised way and it will destabilise the whole world.

But there are some countries which are against US declaring a war. There were large protests from Washington to San Francisco, Japan to Paris, Beirut to Buenos Aires and London to Moscow and to Damascus. So, there were worldwide protests, but there is a conflict of behaviour between President George Bush and Saddam Hussein.

Sir, I should say that it is high time that the UN resolutions should be adhered to, UN resolutions should be respected. Though the USA was not a member of the United Nations all these years – though the United Nations' building was situated in New York, but they have not cared to become a member of the United Nations – now their big brother attitude spoils the whole peaceful atmosphere.

We are for peace; we are against war, but circumstances demand that a war should be declared only against Pakistan and not against Iraq.

MR. SPEAKER: Now, Shri Bhartruhari Mahtab will speak. You have only three minutes. So, you start quickly.

SHRI P.H. PANDIAN : This is a big issue. For local issues, we debate for two hours or three hours.

MR. SPEAKER: I know. We have some other constraints also.

SHRI BHARTRUHARI MAHTAB (CUTTACK): Mr. Speaker, Sir, with war clouds gathering thick and fast over Iraq, India's foreign policy options in the new, more complex, world are being defined by circumstances as much as by its own volition.

Non-alignment ceased being an influence in the world long ago and although the movement is technically still in existence, its fate can be judged by the travails of two of its founder members. Yugoslavia has disintegrated and

has now even lost its name and Egypt lives on some US \$ 2 billion in American military and economic assistance every year. West Asia remains divided and beholden to the Western powers, particularly the USA, for protection.

At this juncture, I would like to quote hon. President's Speech. Just two days ago, he has stated in para 71 :

"We share the concern of the entire world on the unhappy situation relating to Iraq. We have deep interest in peace, stability and security in that region. We hope that the wisdom of the international community, expressed through the UN Security Council, will result in a peaceful resolution of this matter in a manner, which would benefit humanity. "

At this juncture, I would like to deal with two or three aspects of the situation that has arisen today. Indeed, the world of 9/11, as it is very often quoted, is an inhospitable place for many States in the Arab world. America's horrendous experience of the terrorist attacks in September, 2001 has been grasped by a neo-conservative Republican administration to try to shape a new world order.

Americans cannot forget the fact that the overwhelming majority of the hijackers used passenger planes as missiles to hit the World Trade Centre and the Pentagon. They belonged to Saudi Arabia. Almost overnight, the cosy relationship the USA maintained with Saudi rulers over the decades, had been called into question. If the proclaimed goal of the new American policy is to democratise the region, it is unrealistic, if not hypocritical.

The truth is that West Asia today is volatile and unstable. The poison of the Israeli-Palestinian confrontation, with a built-in American pro-Israeli bias, is spreading like cancer. India has general and specific interests in West Asia, particularly in Persian Gulf. In broad terms, New Delhi must controvert the American thesis of its right to act against a nation-State pre-emptively.

MR. SPEAKER: Please conclude.

SHRI BHARTRUHARI MAHTAB : I would suggest today that if an American intervention were to be the beginning of a period of instability in the region, New Delhi's problems would multiply. Flexibility must remain the watchword in promoting Indian foreign policy in a changing world.

Recently, we have also seen how the Chinese, Russians and the French have made it clear after General Powell's recent passionate performance in the United Nations that despite Mr. Saddam Hussein's alleged offences against the U.N. Security Council's Resolution 1441, they most emphatically did not want war. It is an open secret today that invading Iraq would invite disaster. As the Malaysian Prime Minister Dr. Mahathir Mohammad and others have warned, it could kindle the fires of international *jihad*.

The cry for revenge will resonate from Xinjiang to the Philippines with more Chechen and Palestine, more Bali and Mombassa bombings.

MR. SPEAKER: Now, I call Shri Ajoy Chakraborty.

SHRI BHARTRUHARI MAHTAB : Sir, I would conclude. In the American scheme of things, NATO is being assigned 'peace-building' chores and ideally the United Nations should not make policy, but stand ready to undertake following duties after American power prevails....(*Interruptions*)

MR. SPEAKER: Shri Mahtab, please cooperate with the Chair.

SHRI BHARTRUHARI MAHTAB: Sir, I would conclude with one sentence. India's options are infinitely more limited, but it can seek to emulate Washington in choosing different partners for different occasions.

SHRI AJAY CHAKRABORTY (BASIRHAT): Hon. Speaker, Sir, through you, I urge upon all the hon. Members, cutting across party lines, to adopt a unanimous resolution against the war-monger and also against the aggressive attitude adopted by the America and Britain towards Iraq. This Indian Parliament should also adopt a unanimous resolution against war and in favour of peace all over the world. That message should go to the entire world.

Since Independence, I wish to remind the hon. Members that India was the leader of the peace movement in the world. Our the then Prime Minister Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru took the initiative of uniting all the countries of the Third World in favour of peace. He was one of the founding fathers of the Non-Aligned Movement.

When I was a student in the school, in my boyhood, I recollect from my memory that England and France jointly attacked Egypt. At that time, under the leadership of Pandit Nehru, our entire country was united against Britain and France. He had initiated a dialogue with the then Soviet Union leader Nikita Krushchev so that Soviet Union could come forward to save Egypt.

I am sorry to say that this Government has refrained itself from taking a stand on adopting a unanimous resolution. In the other House, the hon. Parliamentary Affairs Minister told the Members that they were not in favour of the Parliament adopting a unanimous resolution. Our country was the leader of the peace movement in the world, our country was the leader of the Non-Aligned Movement, but I am sorry to say that this present Government is very much reluctant to take a bold stand against America.

I urge upon the Government to keep in mind the sentiments of our countrymen and follow our age-old tradition of peace. The Government should raise a loud and strong voice and condemn the war-mongering attitude of America as well as Britain, which is destroying the mankind and the world.

You may recall that on the 15th of this month, peace marches in protest of war have been taken out at different places in the world. The entire world marched in the streets in favour of peace and against war. In the country of Tony Blair, who was the greatest sycophant of George W. Bush, in London city, two million people assembled on the streets and took a march in favour of peace and against war.

Spain supported America in the Security Council. However, in the capital city of Spain, in the city of Madrid, three million people assembled on the streets and marched against war and in favour of peace. Not only in London and Madrid, in New York, in Rome and everywhere in the world including our country, thousands and lakhs of people assembled and conducted peace rallies and protested against war. Taking all this into account, our Government should maintain bold attitude against America.

Mr. George W. Bush said, 'I will unarm Saddam Hussain.' Who is Mr. Bush to unarm Saddam Hussain? The greatest number of weapons of mass destruction are lying in America. For the sake of peace in the world, who should be unarmed first? I believe that as long as America has these weapons of mass destruction, peace cannot be maintained in the world. Mr. George W. Bush said that he would remove Mr. Saddam Hussain from power. People of Iraq will decide as to who would be the leader of Iraq. Israel cannot remove Mr. Yasser Arafat. The people of Palestine will decide who would be the leader of Palestine. Ignoring the public sentiments and the UN Security Council, America is unilaterally trying to take a decision to attack Iraq. I hope and believe that if they attack Iraq, the same thing will happen to America what hapapened in Vietnam. I urge upon the Government to take initiative and adopt a resolution for peace and against war which would send a message to the world.

Lastly, I say, 'Hands off the people of Iraq; hands off Iraq,' against the warmongers of America and Britain.

SHRIMATI KRISHNA BOSE (JADAVPUR): Sir, I am usually brief, but it is difficult to be brief on a subject like this. However, I will try my best.

The discussion on Iraq is taking place today at a very critical moment when the whole world is poised uncertainly between war and peace.

Sir, I happened to be present at the Security Council in November, when the Iraq Resolution was passed. It is now famous as SCR 1441. I saw fifteen hands go up and a gong, and our fate was sealed then and there. It was a peculiar feeling. There was no dissenting voice that day. Though the Resolution was interpreted by different countries in different ways, we heard all the speeches that followed. US and UK spoke in one voice. France was totally interpreting it in a very different manner. In a way, we all had a sense of relief that at least the US had been brought to the U.N. and they were not doing anything unilateral. That was the concession for which we were thankful on that day.

However, Iraq was told that that was their final opportunity to disarm and if they did not, they faced serious consequences.

The history after that, we all know. The inspections have been going on, reports are being placed every day, and the Chief Weapons Inspector as also the representative of the Atomic Energy Commission have said that they have not found any weapons of mass destruction yet.

The UN is now again in Session. It is heartening to hear a voice of sanity coming from France. The other European countries, including Germany and Russia, have come out very strongly against war. It is very heartening to see that. But it was much more heartening to see the people marching in the streets of London, New York and the other cities for peace and against war. That brings back our faith in mankind that everything is not lost yet.

Sir, I happen to meet in my Standing Committee on External Affairs many delegations that come from abroad, and I was pleasantly surprised to see that most of them were strongly against war even though the Government of their country unilaterally was for war. For example, recently we had an interaction with the Labour Party MPs here. I was quite surprised to find that all the Labour Party MPs were for peace and against war, and they did not support their own Prime Minister, Tony Blair's view. It was a pleasant surprise for me talking to them. They were much more strident in their views than we Indians were at that point of time.

Sir, I would agree with Shri Mani Shankar Aiyar that the Non-Aligned Summit has suddenly become very important, which is taking place so soon. When the Non-Aligned Movement was there, it was a bipolar world. But India was one of the path finders. We had a moral command over other nations as it were at that time. But then came the unipolar world, and there was only one superpower – the US.

Now, India must look at its own self-interest which we did, and we were carrying on constructive dialogue with the US. Our former Foreign Minister is here. He was carrying on a dialogue with the US. I do not see anything wrong in that. We must not have an unthinking anti-Americanism in our mind, as some of my colleagues seem to have on the other side. But at the same time, we have to be clear that we will not uncritically support any short-sighted view or any terrible decision that the United States wishes to take. We cannot do that. On the one hand there should be no unthinking anti-Americanism and on the other hand, there should be no uncritical support to their actions.

Sir, Shri Mani Shankar Aiyar had mentioned about the Non-Aligned Movement. It has weakened, no doubt. People are asking: 'movement aligned with whom or against whom?' Sir, I think, we should give it a new name. It may be 'a movement for multilateralism.' That is the word which is now coming into real importance. It should be a movement for multilateralism now. There are 114 countries there. Our Prime Minister is going there. If we also get the support of the old European countries which are against the war, it is going to be a very strong support indeed.

Multilateral approach to all international crises, to all international issues should be India's stand now.

Sir, India has, I think, a unique role to play now, and the Non-Aligned Summit may give us an opportunity to get back the moral command that we once had over the other nations of the world. I do not know why the opposition members are casting doubt on our hon. Prime Minister as to whether he would be able to rise to the occasion. I am sure, he will rise to the occasion.

Sir, war will bring untold suffering and turmoil in this region. So, from our Parliament today, instead of saying anything against each other, one voice should go that we are all for peace and against war. Let this message strongly go to the world from us today. Mr. Speaker, I have done.

17.00 hrs.

SHRI G.M. BANATWALLA (PONNANI): Mr. Speaker, Sir, the two reports of the United Nations Weapon Inspectors and the International Atomic Energy Agency, presented to the United Nations Security Council on the 27th January, 2003, present irrefutable conclusion and evidence that there is no cause whatsoever for war against Iraq. These reports make it very clear that there is a definite and more co-operative attitude from Iraq. They have also made it very clear that there is no evidence of Weapons of Mass Destruction in Iraq. At the same time, Iraq repeatedly assures its continued co-operation with Inspection Commissions and assures that full explanations would be given, whenever called for.

Iraq has also enacted a law banning Weapons of Mass Destruction. The entire world, Mr. Speaker, Sir, is thankful to France, Russia, Germany and majority of the countries of the United Nations Security Council for their unequivocal stand in support of the work of the inspectors and in their clear 'no' to the war.

Sir, it is most unfortunate and highly condemnable that the United States has declared that it is prepared to go for war against Iraq even without the support or the approval of the United Nations.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, the United States' strategy bears the mark of double standard. Look at the United States' attitude - an attitude of full support to Israel which has violated more than 500 UN resolutions, and certainly has amassed Weapons of Mass Destruction. On the other hand, the United States demonstrates impatience with Iraq even to the extent of flouting the world opinion. We know that there are protests throughout the world against war. There are protests even in the United States of America.

Interestingly, there are protests not only in the United States of America, but there are doubts even within United States' Intelligence Agency with respect to the justification of the White House to go to war.

Sir, I may point out that *The Guardian* in its issue, dated 9th October, 2002 carried a report under the caption: "White House exaggerating Iraqi threat: Bush's televised address attacked by United States' Intelligence".

Again, Sir, *The Philadelphia Inquirer* in its issue dated 8th October, 2002 carried a report under the caption: "Officials' Private Doubts on Iraq War".

Sir, it must be understood that the United States' objectives are neither to counter terrorism nor to destroy the alleged piles of Weapons of Mass Destruction.

The US' strategy is clearly to promote its own interests; its greedy eyes are fixed on the oil wells. The US' strategy is to boost its sagging economy. The US' strategy is to keep the Arabs and the Third World divided and weak in the interest of the US' supremacy. The US seeks to assert that it is the super power which has the right to go ahead and destroy military capability of any country that does not endorse its interests. The US desires, by flouting the world opinion, to assert that it is the super power that has the right to remove Governments in other countries and to remove even leaders in other countries, whom the US considers as a threat to its own interests.

Recently the US even wanted Mr. Yassar Arafat to step down. It is clear that there is no State that is a terrorist State greater than the USA. Iraq has suffered a lot. When it has demonstrated a definite will to cooperate, and cooperate more, the time is to consider even lifting of the sanctions against Iraq. Its people have suffered a lot; children in large numbers have suffered a lot because even the life-saving drugs were not available.

India has rightly emphasised that there should be a peaceful solution. But I regret that the main issues have not been addressed by India. Let it be made very clear that there can be no support for a war; there is no cause for war. Let India's voice resound: 'No war' and let there be a resolution to that effect from this House.

SHRI LAKSHMAN SINGH (RAJGARH): Please give me a minute.

MR. SPEAKER: You can give your speech in writing; it will be taken on record.

SHRI MANI SHANKAR AIYAR : Sir, I would like to raise a point of order with reference to section 43, entry 16 of the Handbook for Parliamentarians, relating to Parliamentary Etiquette, which says that after an hon. Member has made a speech, he should remain in the House.

For the last five years, I find that every time, hon. Dr. Vijay Kumar Malhotra makes a speech in the House, immediately he quits and goes. I have been waiting for five years for him to obey the instructions of the hon. Speaker. I request you to kindly reprimand him for this lack of Parliamentary Etiquette and request him to be here. When he can be here when the Minister speaks, there is no reason why he should not be here when other hon. Members are responding to the points that he made. Thank you.

डॉ.विजय कुमार मल्होत्रा : महोदय, आप जानते हैं, इनसे कहीं ज्यादा समय मैं सदन में बैठता हूँ। सुबह से यहाँ बैठा हुआ हूँ। इसके अलावा चीफ व्हिप के तौर पर किसी माननीय सदस्य को बुलाने के लिए गया होऊँगा। पता नहीं आज यह बात क्यों उठाई जा रही है। इराक के मामले में इस तरह से बात को उठाना ठीक नहीं है। (व्यवधान)

SHRI ADHIR CHOWDHARY : Sir I want to make only a few points. Will you give me a minute please?

MR. SPEAKER: You can give your speech in writing; it will be taken on record. Now, the hon. Minister.

...(Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER: Shri Ramdas Athawale, you can go to his chamber; he is a nice Minister.

...(Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER: Now, Mr. Minister, you can start please.

...(Interruptions)

श्री रामदास आठवले : अध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं कहना चाहता हूँ। (व्यवधान)

* **श्री जोवाकिम बखला (अलीपुरद्वारस):** अध्यक्ष महोदय, अमेरिका के द्वारा इराक पर आक्रमण करने की वकालत की मैं निन्दा करता हूँ। बुश के नेतृत्व में अमेरिका इराक पर आक्रमण करके यह साबित करना चाहता है कि वह एक ध्रुवीय विश्व में अपना दबदबा बढ़ाना नहीं चाहता है बल्कि सद्दाम के जनविनाश के हथियारों को नट करके विश्व में शांति एवं स्थिरता लाना चाहता है। लेकिन मैं यह दलील नहीं मानता - दुनिया के विभिन्न देशों से इसका विरोध हो रहा है।

मेरे विचार से ऐसा लगता है कि अमेरिका सैन्य व्यवहार द्वारा अमेरिकी साम्राज्य की पुनर्चना करना चाहता है। 19वीं सदी के ब्रिटिश साम्राज्य की तर्ज पर अपने साम्राज्य का विस्तार करना चाहता है जो विश्व के लिए विशेष करके छोटे छोटे देशों के लिए खतरनाक साबित होगा। 1991 के खाड़ी युद्ध के नुकसान को देखते हुए मुझे लगता है इस युद्ध का विरोध करना चाहिए अन्यथा हमारे देश को एक बहुत बड़े संकट के सम्मुख होना पड़ेगा। हमें युद्ध नहीं शांति चाहिए।

* Speech was laid on the Table of the House.

***श्री लक्ष्मण सिंह (राजगढ़):** माननीय अध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं कोई विदेश नीति का विशेषज्ञ नहीं हूँ अथवा आपसे एवं माननीय सदस्यों से आग्रह करूंगा कि मेरे भाषण में कोई त्रुटियाँ हों तो उन्हें क्षमा करें।

सदन जब शुरू हुआ तो समस्त राजनीतिक दलों की बैठक में मुख्यतः तीन मुद्दे चर्चा के लिए सामने आये।

1. सूखे के कारण उत्पन्न स्थिति पर चर्चा।
2. अयोध्या में राम मन्दिर निर्माण पर चर्चा।
3. अमेरिका अथवा ईराक के संभावित युद्ध पर चर्चा।

प्राथमिकता के आधार पर अमेरिका अथवा ईराक के युद्ध पर चर्चा पहले स्वीकार की गई।

माननीय अध्यक्ष महोदय, सबसे पहले ईराक और यू.एस.ए. का युद्ध आज से 12 वर्ष पूर्व 1991 में शुरू हुआ। जनवरी 16, 1991 अथवा 1 मार्च, 1991 के बीच यू.एस.ए. द्वारा 88 हजार 500 टन बमों की वार्ड ईराक पर की गई, जो हीरोशिमा में गिराये गये बमों की तुलना में साढ़े सात गुना अधिक थे। यू.एस.ए. ने वहाँ की जनता पर पेयजल स्त्रोतों पर, गैस-पाईप लाईन पर, अस्पतालों पर, स्कूलों पर और लगभग 9 हजार मकानों पर बमबारी करी। जिसमें लगभग 2 लाख से ऊपर आम जनता मारी गई। जब उस समय के यू.एस.ए. के जनरल कॉलिन पॉवल से पूछा गया कि ईराक में कितने लोग मारे गये तो उनका उत्तर था कि मुझे मरने वालों की संख्या में कोई रूचि नहीं है। उनका यह कथन न्यूयार्क टाइम्स की मार्च, 23 के समाचार पत्र में छपा।

इस युद्ध में यू.एस.ए. के केवल 157 लोग मारे गये। मैं आपके माध्यम से सरकार से पूछना चाहूंगा कि क्या यह युद्ध दो समान ताकतों का था ? हमारे शास्त्रों में लिखा है अथवा चूंकि मैं एक क्षत्रिय हूँ और क्षत्रिय धर्म कहता है कि जो अपने से कमजोर हो उस पर वार नहीं करना चाहिए। अब आप ही बताइये कि हमें इस युद्ध का विरोध करना चाहिये या नहीं।

आज विश्व में स्थिति यह है कि यू.एस.ए. अथवा यू.के. को छोड़कर कोई भी देश युद्ध नहीं चाहता है। यू.एस.ए. अथवा यू.के. ऐसे देश हैं और इस बात का इतिहास गवाह है कि इन्होंने भारत की कभी राजनीतिक सहायता नहीं की। हमें वो दिन याद करना चाहिए जब स्वर्गीय इन्दिरा गांधी प्रधान मंत्री थीं और यू.एस.ए. ने भारत पर हमला करने हेतु समुद्र मार्ग द्वारा सातवां बेड़ा भेजा था। किन्हीं कारणों से युद्ध टल गया नहीं तो भारत भी अमेरिका से युद्ध करने में पीछे नहीं रहता। दूसरा देश जो युद्ध का समर्थन कर रहा है वह है यू.के.। यह वो देश है जिसने हमारे देश को अढ़ाई सौ वर्ष तक गुलामी की जंजीरों में बांध कर रखा और देश को आजाद कराने में हमारे नेताओं अथवा असंख्य देश में गरीबी है उसका दो यू.के. को जाता है। मैं समझता हूँ कि अगर हम युद्ध का समर्थन करते हैं तो इससे बड़ी भूल और कोई नहीं होगी।

अभी हाल ही में यू.एस.ए. कोई हार्लन वॉट्सन 29 अप्रैल, 2002 को भारत आये थे। अखबारों के माध्यम से पता चला कि वो "क्लाइमेट चेंज नैगोशियेटर" हैं। चूंकि उनकी इस यात्रा को ज्यादा उजागर नहीं किया गया, मन में कई शंकाएँ उत्पन्न होती हैं। कहीं ऐसा तो नहीं कि यू.एस.ए. के दबाव में हम क्योटो प्रोटोकॉल के खिलाफ जायेंगे, उसे दस्तावेज के खिलाफ जिस पर हम दस्तखत कर चुके हैं। युद्ध जब होता है तो इसका विपरीत असर पर्यावरण पर भी पड़ता है और इसलिए हमें इस बात का भी ध्यान रखना चाहिए।

अंत में मैं मणी शंकर अय्यर के साथ अपने आप को संबद्ध कर प्रधान मंत्री जी से कहना चाहूंगा कि आप नॉन एलाइड देशों की बैठक में भाग लेने जा रहे हैं, हम आशा करते हैं कि आप वहाँ भारत का मजबूत पक्ष रखेंगे और युद्ध न हो इसका पक्ष करेंगे, क्योंकि यू.एस.ए. वो देश है, जिसने चुपचाप काश्मीर में आतंकवादियों की मदद की है और हम आशा करते हैं कि आप उस देश का पक्ष कभी नहीं करेंगे, जो काश्मीर में आतंकवाद को बढ़ावा देता है। आप NAM की बैठक में जाएं तो कविता की इन पंक्तियों को सार्थक करें -

विजयी विश्व तिरंगा प्यारा ,

झंडा उंचा रहे हमारा ।

* Speech was laid on the Table of the House.

अध्यक्ष महोदय: आठवले जी, आप अच्छे आदमी हैं। प्लीज बैठिए।

â€¦ (व्यवधान)

MR. SPEAKER: Whatever Shri Ramdas Athawale is saying will not go on record.

*(Interruptions) **

श्री रामदास आठवले : मैं एक कविता पढ़ता हूँ।

" जब ओसामा बिन लादेन बन गया धूर्त,
तब अमेरिका को याद आ गया हमारा बुद्ध
अगर अमेरिका करेगा इराक के साथ युद्ध
तो सारी दुनिया हो जाएगी क्रुद्ध
और अमेरिका के साथ करेगी युद्ध। "

मैं इतना ही निवेदन करूंगा कि भारत को इस वक्त अमेरिका के साथ नहीं रहना चाहिए। उसे इराक के साथ रहना चाहिए।

अध्यक्ष महोदय: भाषण रिकॉर्ड में न जाए लेकिन कविता रिकॉर्ड में जा सकती है।

* Not Recorded.

THE MINISTER OF FINANCE AND COMPANY AFFAIRS (SHRI JASWANT SINGH): Mr. Speaker, Sir, I am grateful to all the hon. Members, a number of them, who have participated in this discussion. No doubt the Government will consider the views expressed by them seriously. My distinguished colleague, the Minister of External Affairs, who unfortunately is not here, will be fully briefed on this account. I do wish to express my gratitude to all the hon. Members.

One hon. Member, who initiated the discussion, chose to rather personalise his observations against me. I know that this is a recognised syndrome and inability to stop talking, therefore, I chose to ignore what he said. I must make explicit the Government of India's position in this regard.

It was made quite clear. It has repeatedly from time to time been made clear. In the last Session there was a full-fledged discussion on this very subject in the other House. But let me reiterate the sanction of the Government of India's position in this regard.

The Government has been maintaining active diplomatic engagement with the international community on the evolving situation with regard to Iraq. The Government's position is guided by its belief in maintaining the relevance of the United Nations in matters relating to international peace and security; the need to ensure fulfilment of the unanimously adopted UNSC Resolution 1441; the need to avoid a war and avert a humanitarian crisis in Iraq; the importance of maintaining international and regional stability; and India's vital political, economic and security interests in the region, including the security and welfare of the large Indian Diaspora in the Gulf area, and the traditionally strong economic ties with Iraq, which have weakened over the past decade as a result of UN sanctions against that country.

After the UN Security Council unanimously adopted the Resolution 1441 on 8th November, 2002, the Government had publicly stated that it recognises the validity of this unanimous decision of the United Nations Security Council.

This Resolution is under Chapter VII of the UN Charter, also that Iraq had accepted the terms of the Resolution. The Government had further stated that Iraq had to faithfully comply with the provisions of this Resolution; that if Iraq did not comply with UNSCR 1441, the Security Council should decide on the action to be taken; and, if Iraq complied fully with the provisions of the Resolution, then sanctions against Iraq should be lifted. The Government had also expressed its belief that in the interest of all humanity, the issue should be resolved peacefully through the United Nations.

The Government has been closely following the developments – as I said in my introductory observation – in the UN Security Council on the issue, including the different interpretations of the reports presented by weapons inspectors to the Security Council as also the facts, and evidence presented by the United States to the Security Council on 5 February, 2003. The heads of UNMOVIC and IAEA have informed the Council in carefully-worded, concise, and thorough briefings on 27 January and 14 February. Their reports constitute the essential basis on which the Council would require to take decision on a matter of international peace and security.

The Government's position remains that a war should be avoided and, for this purpose, all concerned parties should fully cooperate in finding a peaceful Resolution to the issue. Iraq has to faithfully comply with the provisions of UN Security Council Resolutions. At the same time, on a matter of grave international importance, further action should be based on the broadest possible international consensus and it should be the Security Council that should decide on what further action needs to be taken.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, we sense, and the world senses, that the Security Council is coming close to making a decision between war and peace. We know that before it makes a final determination on the question, it would seriously consider the numerous complex ramifications that surround any step taken by it. These include issues such as the dangers posed by the development of weapons of mass destruction, risks of their diversion to non-State actors; the significance and credibility of enforcement action under Chapter VII of the Charter, also the important question of compliance with its Resolutions; the rationale and effectiveness of weapons inspections; and the continuing pressure of sanctions. Apart from the immediate consequences of military action in a region that is already volatile, the Council will need to take into account the impact of its actions, its larger implications for peace, stability and security in the region, as well as the dangers of radicalisation of public opinion around the world. Yet another set of issues of a different order of magnitude concern the potential massive internal displacement of people and possible refugee flows, the disruption of oil supplies, and other such immediate economic and social repercussions of a possible outbreak of conflict.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, these are questions that do not have simple answers. But they are questions that cannot be evaded. As the multilateral organ of the UN, charged with safeguarding of international peace and security, the Security Council must give a careful thought to these questions and issues before it makes an irrevocable move.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, India has also consistently maintained three other essentials:

1. That wars and conflicts are always the last option – never the first;
2. That the inspectors must have a full and completely unfettered opportunity to complete their onerous task, but equally that the UNSC cannot be expected to wait indefinitely to secure, what Resolution 1441 had itself said, immediate, active and unconditional co-operation;

SHRI MANI SHANKAR AIYAR : Sir, this is a distortion. It says that the UN Security Council shall be seized of the matter. That is the final decision and not that any kind of ultimatum or deadline can be unilaterally given by the United States to Iraq. But this is what is happening.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: I would prefer really to carefully state the Government's position. I did say that this is a well-recognised syndrome and I do not wish to keep on reacting to it...*(Interruptions)*

India has always maintained the primacy of the multilateral route in addressing the issue of Iraq. Indeed, the hon. Prime Minister had in the UN General Assembly last year stated that the world needed multilateralism.

The third point is that India has been and remains deeply concerned about the humanitarian situation in Iraq. The Iraqi people have suffered grievously. Ten million people – men, women and children -- are dependent on the UN Oil for Food programme -- for their food. It is a part of India's overall concern and that is why, Mr. Speaker, Sir, I had said that these are questions that do not have simple answers but they are questions that cannot be evaded. I am very glad that we have an opportunity to address these questions in the form of this discussion.

Thank you.

SHRI RUPCHAND PAL : Sir, the Government's position on this issue has not been spelt out. We would like to know whether the Government is opposing military action or not. What is the position of the Government?
...*(Interruptions)*

कुंवर अखिलेश सिंह : सरकार की तरफ से इस सवाल पर लीपापोती की गई है। अमरीका द्वारा सीमा पार से आतंकवाद को प्रायोजित करने वाले पाकिस्तान को खुला संरक्षण प्रदान किया जा रहा है। ऐसे समय में इस सवाल पर लीपापोती देश हित में नहीं है।*(व्यवधान)*

MR. SPEAKER: Now, the House would take up Legislative Business – Further Consideration of the following motion moved by Shri Arun Jaitley on the 18th February, 2003, namely:-

"That the Bill further to amend the Representation of the People Act, 1951 and the Indian Penal Code, be taken into consideration."

Shri Janardhan Reddy.

Dr. Raghuvans Pd. Singh

...(Interruptions)

SHRI AJOY CHAKRABORTY : What is the position of the Government?â€¦ (Interruptions)

SHRI TARIT BARAN TOPDAR : Sir, please allow one or two clarifications on this...(Interruptions)

कुंवर अखिलेश सिंह : इराक ने कश्मीर के सवाल पर भारत का खुलकर साथ दिया है।â€¦ (व्यवधान)

MR.SPEAKER: I have already taken up the next item.

...(Interruptions)

SHRI RUPCHAND PAL: Sir, we had requested for a unanimous Resolution on this issue...(Interruptions) Sir, nobody is above lawâ€¦ (Interruptions) This is an aberration from the well-accepted foreign policy of Non-Alignment as practised by this country...(Interruptions)

SHRI MANI SHANKAR AIYAR : The Minister has walked out amidst the discussions!

कुंवर अखिलेश सिंह : मान्यवर, मंत्री जी जवाब देकर सदन से बाहर चले गए जबकि यह इतना गंभीर सवाल है। â€¦ (व्यवधान)

अध्यक्ष महोदय : आप जानते हैं कि मैंने अगला आइटम शुरू किया है, इसलिए मंत्री जी गए हैं।

MR. SPEAKER: I have already gone to the next item.

...(Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER: Friends, you are aware that the question as to whether a resolution is to be adopted unanimously was discussed in the Business Advisory Committee.

डॉ.विजय कुमार मल्होत्रा : अध्यक्ष महोदय, इराक को लेकर राजनीति न की जाए तो अच्छा है। â€¦ (व्यवधान)

MR. SPEAKER: Malhotraji, I am talking to him. The discussion had taken place in a nice manner in the House. As for the resolution, there was no unanimity on whether a resolution should be taken or not and therefore it was decided that there will be a discussion. And the discussion has taken place already. So, there is no question of a resolution in this regard. I have gone to the next item; Dr. Raghuvansh Prasad Singh to speak.

...(Interruptions)

SHRI TARIT BARAN TOPDAR : It shows the arrogant attitude of the Government.

SHRI MANI SHANKAR AIYAR : Why is it that the Minister refrained from informing the country through the House of what he has told you privately in the Chamber?

MR. SPEAKER: Not privately. I will make it clear to you. This issue was discussed in the Business Advisory Committee. There was no unanimity there. Therefore finally the discussion took place and now the discussion has been concluded.

SHRI MANI SHANKAR AIYAR : I accept that. But, when on the floor of the House, a demand has been made for a resolution so that the Government can tell us its stand, the Minister had no business to scuttle what was raised in the Parliament and this would not do in a democracy. Then he comes here and reads out a written statement. He does not take into account what has been stated here. Over and above that, he has insulted me saying that Mr. Aiyar always talks too much. Is this the way the Minister is expected to behave? ...(Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER: The discussion is over. Dr. Raghuvansh Prasad Singh, if you want to speak, you speak now.

...(Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER: If you do not start speaking now, I will announce the next name.

कुंवर अखिलेश सिंह : अमेरिका सारी दुनिया पर अपना साम्राज्य कायम करना चाहता है। â€¦ (व्यवधान)

SHRI TARIT BARAN TOPDAR : In the face of all this, the Indian Parliament should adopt a unanimous resolution against the aggressive attitude of the UK and USA. Does the Ruling Party agree to it?

SHRI SUNIL KHAN (DURGAPUR): We should adopt a resolution unanimously that we are against the war.

MR. SPEAKER: Shri Sunil Khan, please go back to your seat.

...(Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER: Let one Member speak; I am prepared to hear. What do you want to say exactly? Why do you shout unnecessarily? I do not want Members to shout like this in the House. If one Member has to make any point, he can stand up, I will permit him to speak. If you want to make a point, let others sit.

...(Interruptions)

श्री प्रकाश परांजपे (ठाणे) : हमारे देश में इतनी गंभीर समस्याएं हैं, उनको छोड़कर ये इराक पर बात करना चाहते हैं। **â€œ** (व्यवधान)

MR. SPEAKER: Shri Paranjpe, please sit down now.

SHRI MANI SHANKAR AIYAR : We were informed by the principal speaker on the Treasury Benches that in his opinion there was unanimity in the House as to what should be stated on this occasion.

MR. SPEAKER: Shri Paranjpe, please sit down. I have permitted Shri Aiyar to speak. Let there be discipline in the House. Please sit down and do not talk like this in the House. I have permitted Shri Aiyar. Let him make his point clear. What is this going on?

SHRI MANI SHANKAR AIYAR : The principal spokesman on the Treasury Benches said, even before we had opened our mouths, that there was unanimity in the House, on the question of threat that the US is making to Iraq, in the context of the rising and mounting international tensions between two countries. On the basis of his opinion that there is unanimity in the House, we laid down the elements of that unanimity. I specifically, on behalf of my Party, said that whatever had been stated by the permanent representative of India in New York in October, 2002 contained the elements on the basis of which Parliament's opinion could be unanimously expressed with the expressed desire of strengthening the Prime Minister's hands when he goes to Kuala Lumpur so that he can speak on behalf of the whole of India and not just the Government of India.

I awaited a response from the Minister who is doubling as the Minister for External Affairs – this goes from the past – expecting that he would give us reasons as to why the Government of India did not desire a unanimous resolution from a House which, according to the Treasury Benches themselves, is unanimous on this issue. Therefore, if we could have either been given the reasons as to why not adopt a resolution or given an opportunity, I would be very grateful. **â€œ**...(Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER: I am not going to permit every Member to speak. I am sorry. Is there anybody to respond to this point from the Government?

डॉ.विजय कुमार मल्होत्रा : अध्यक्ष जी, मुझे इस बात का बड़ा दुख है कि कल जब आपके चैम्बर में बात हुई, वहां बात हुई कि हाउस में इराक के मामले में डिफरेंस आफ ओपीनियन है, यह बात बाहर नहीं जाएगी। यहां दो-तीन बातें बिल्कुल बेसिक, फंडामेंटल हुईं कि हिन्दुस्तान चाहता है कि लड़ाई न हो, हिन्दुस्तान चाहता है कि सिक्योरिटी काउंसिल के माध्यम से ही काम हो और सभी देश मिल कर कंसेंस बनाएं। हमारा देश चाहता है कि इराक के अंदर अगर कहीं, कोई हथियार हैं, तो सिक्योरिटी काउंसिल के माध्यम से उसको डिस-आर्म किया जाए और इस समय बजाय इसके कि एक तरफ लड़ाई हो, अमरीका को कोशिश करनी चाहिए कि सिक्योरिटी काउंसिल के माध्यम से इस समस्या का समाधान हो। ये बातें बेसिक तौर पर कांग्रेस पार्टी ने भी रखीं और बाकियों ने भी रखीं। अब उस बात पर यूनेनिमिटी हो रही है। मुझे आश्चर्य है कि सी.पी.एम. के लोगों ने लगता है कि यह तय कर रखा है कि कभी यूनेनिमिटी होने ही नहीं देनी है, यानी यहां पर कोई बात चलने ही नहीं देनी है। **â€œ** (व्यवधान)

MR. SPEAKER: Shri Pal, you have to listen to him now.

SHRI RUPCHAND PAL : Sir, I have not got a reply to my question. **â€œ**...(Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER: Shri Pal, please listen to what he has to say.

...(Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER: On behalf of the Government, Shrimati Sushma Swaraj would make the stand clear on the issue.

...(Interruptions)

SHRI RUPCHAND PAL : Sir, I had asked a specific question. **â€œ** (Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER: Please sit down. I have not permitted you. She is not replying to the questions asked by you.

स्वास्थ्य और परिवार कल्याण मंत्री तथा संसदीय कार्य मंत्री (श्रीमती सुमा स्वराज) : अध्यक्ष जी, माननीय सांसद मणिशंकर अय्यर जी ने एक बहुत ही पाइंटेड सवाल रखा है। उन्होंने यह सवाल किया है कि जब हाउस में यूनेनिमिटी है, तो गवर्नमेंट हाउस से एक यूनेनिमस रिजोल्यूशन पास क्यों नहीं कराती है। यह एक पाइंटेड सवाल है। मैं इसका जवाब देना चाहूंगी।

अध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं आपके माध्यम से सदन को अवगत कराना चाहूंगी कि हमने बी.ए.सी. में एक कार्यक्रम तय किया था। उसमें यह तय हुआ था कि रिजोल्यूशन नहीं, बल्कि डिसकशन हो, लेकिन क्यों ? बात सीधी है और इसका सरल जवाब यह है कि डिसकशन में भाव प्रकट होते हैं, लेकिन रिजोल्यूशन में शब्द भी तय किए जाते

हैं। जब भारत सरकार के प्रतिनिधि अंतर्राष्ट्रीय मंच पर जाएं, तो उनसे यह अपेक्षा तो जरूर होनी चाहिए कि सदन में देश की जो भावनाएं और भाव प्रकट हुए हैं, वे उस स्पिरिट को लेकर जाएं और वह स्पिरिट वहां रखें, लेकिन **â€**! (व्यवधान)

श्री रूपचन्द पाल : लेकिन वह स्पिरिट नहीं ली गई। **â€**! (व्यवधान)

श्रीमती सुमा स्वराज : लेकिन वह किन शब्दों में रखें, इसकी थोड़ी-बहुत गुंजाइश अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय मंच पर जाते समय रहनी चाहिए। क्योंकि जब रिजोल्यूशन हो जाता है, तो सदन का एक मॅडेट हो जाता है। फिर कौमा या फुल स्टाप का अन्तर करने की गुंजाइश भी बचती नहीं है। अब नैम में अगर कोई प्रस्ताव पारित हो जिसके शब्द हमारे सदन के प्रस्ताव से थोड़े से भिन्न हों, तो भी यह होगा कि सदन का मॅडेट आपने समाप्त कर दिया। इसलिए मैं मणि शंकर जी से कहना चाहूंगी कि कोई एतराज नहीं था। केवल मात्र इतनी चीज थी कि

थोड़ी गुंजाइश शब्दों के फेर-बदल की दे दी जाए। भाव आपके ही हैं और उन्हीं भावनाओं के अनुरूप सरकार जाएगी, आपकी बात रखेगी। **â€**! (व्यवधान)

MR. SPEAKER: The issue is over now.

...(Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER: Nothing should go on record now.

(Interruptions) *

MR. SPEAKER: Nothing will go on record now.

(Interruptions) *

MR. SPEAKER: I am sorry, this is not the way to conduct the House.

...(Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER: Now, the House will take up item no. 7

* Not Recorded.