

15.19 hrs.

DISCUSSION UNDER RULE 193

SITUATION IN IRAQ

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Now, the House shall take up Item No. 11 - Discussion on the situation in Iraq.

SHRI P.K. VASUDEVAN NAIR (THIRUVANANTHAPURAM): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, under Rule 193, I am raising a discussion on the situation in Iraq.

I think, it is a very welcome thing that our sovereign House, the House of the People, is discussing such an important subject which affects the whole humanity. The 13th Lok Sabha, I understand, had discussed this subject on many occasions. When the question of sending troops to Iraq came up, there was a decision by this House, rather a consensus in this House that India has no business to do such a thing, and that we should uphold the dignity of this country. We are pursuing that policy steadfastly, and we should.

At the very outset, I should like to say that nobody in this country, normally, should think of such things. This subject has got a special significance for countries like India. I think, this whole question of Iraq has exercised the minds of Indian people very much. It has touched their hearts because India was a slave country for decades and for centuries. We have undergone a period of time in our history; and we have paid so much for the liberation of this country. We fought against the British who were the mightiest imperialist power at that time. Now, colonialism has gone; and colonialism of that type has gone for ever. I do not think that it will return.

But imperialism and colonialism of a new type is raising challenges before humanity as a whole and before the Third World countries in particular. The main reason why we should be on guard is that after the collapse of the Soviet Union, the Socialist countries in Europe, the American rulers or the American imperialists are thinking that they are the masters of the world. Their whole strategy is to evolve a unipolar world where they can be the masters and they can be the only masters.

The developments all over the world during the last 10-15 years go to show that the American imperialism is out to capture countries by armed might, to invade countries as they like. The invasion of Iraq is one example where you can see that America has gone into that country without any rhyme or reason and under false pretext. It is already proved beyond doubt that all the talk about weapons of mass destruction was a hoax. The American rulers cannot justify their action on that basis in their own country. Under such false pretexts, they went into an independent country and a sovereign country, maybe a small country but a proud country, a country of proud people.

Can we concede that big countries can go into small countries as they like, that small countries are at the mercy of big countries or such countries with armed might? That is what has happened in Iraq. And the Indian people, as I said, were exercised over this because this is again an advent of colonialism or imperialism in a new form. We have suffered the agony of slavery and we have fought against this. So, naturally we feel sympathy for all such people, wherever they are, who fight for their freedom and sovereignty.

Now, it is not necessary at this point of time to go into all the details of the attack on Iraq by the United States. It is not necessary to go into the details of what happened after that. But one thing is clear. All the calculations of the American President and company have gone wrong. They were saying: "It is a devil of Saddam Hussein or a demon of Saddam Hussein. He is lording over the poor people, the innocent people of Iraq." We are not here to sit in judgement over Saddam Hussein, on whether he was a devil or whether his rule was good or not. It is for the people of Iraq to decide. That is a fundamental proposition which every country has to accept in this world. So, instead of doing that, with the help of the British, their closest ally, the Americans took upon themselves the responsibility of reforming, saving the people of Iraq from the tyranny of Saddam Hussein. That was their pretention. But even after capturing Saddam Hussein, everyday we are seeing as to what is happening in that country. Is there any doubt left in the minds of even the American ruling class, that the people of Iraq do not feel that they are liberated by America? They do not see Americans as

liberators of their country. Everyday, they are rising in revolt and, of course, you may say that this is terrorism. It is a fashion all over the world to stamp everything as terrorism. A freedom struggle can be stamped as terrorism. The people of Iraq may be blamed by somebody there that exploding bombs, or doing this and that is all terrorism. Bloodshed and everything is there. When people fight for sovereignty and freedom, they choose their own path. They choose their own weapons. Who are they to sit in judgement over that? The fact is that the people of Iraq do not see Americans as their liberators. They have foisted a so-called Government over the people of Iraq. They may say, "We have transferred the power even before the appointed date. The transfer of power is supposed to have taken place on 30th June, but we have entrusted them with power or Government even before two or three days." Such great democrats! But who are they? I am not sitting in judgement. But the whole world knows that it is all puppetry of the worst kind. Of course, I do not want to mention the name. I think he is called the self-appointed Prime Minister, the temporary Prime Minister or the interim Prime Minister because elections are supposed to come now.

We do not know when that would come. So, these people are called interim Prime Ministers. This Prime Minister was in the good books of the CIA. It is all well known. He does not deny it. The Americans do not deny it. So, they have selected a very proper person - a CIA-man as the interim Prime Minister. They are adding insult to injury, as far as the people of Iraq are concerned. They are foisting and bolstering up such people over a people, a valiant people and freedom-loving people. Such leaders are in the Government. The so-called Prime Ministers and other Ministers are all hiding themselves somewhere all the time. They cannot show their faces to their people. The people never want to see their faces. Such people are being foisted over a country. They say that this is democracy, this is freedom and the whole world has to accept it.

Then, they say that the United Nations has passed a Resolution. What can we say about the United Nations? America goes ahead and does what it wants. There are certain countries like Britain. Later, they try to pressurise some countries. They try to purchase some countries. They try to persuade people. All

these happen. Ultimately, a Resolution was passed in the United Nations. I do not deny that. Who can deny that they have passed a Resolution? But then the crux of the matter is that the American army will continue to remain there even after the transfer of power to this interim Government. That is the crux of the matter. Now, 1,40,000 American troops aided by some British troops are the main people who are operating there. They are the masters where they can do anything they like. They are doing everything they like.

In the 21st Century, can you imagine the kind of torture chambers that exist in Baghdad and Iraq? It is a shame for humanity. Actually Mr. Bush is in the dock in his own country. How are people being treated there? They are treated worse than animals. Perhaps, Bush is imitating Hitler for his gas chambers which are there. We remember how these gas chambers were used. This is nothing less than that.

What is going on there? Those who are fighting for their country are being treated like animals. One may stamp them as terrorists. It is easy to do that. In America itself, a movement is now growing. The name of that movement is "Boots Vigil." Nearly, 700 American soldiers have lost their lives in Iraq till now. Now, people are exhibiting empty boots in place after place of those who lost their lives in this war in Iraq. That is how they protest against their own President and their own Government. It is interesting to know that this "Boots Vigil" is moving from place to place. For the benefit of the House, I am reading a few sentences. The title is: "Eyes Wide Open. The Human Cost of War in Iraq." It says:

"Eyes Wide Open, the Human Cost of War in Iraq will travel to Boston, Madison, Indianapolis, Philadelphia etc. and to three cities in Ohio."

"It opened here the day after Bush delivered his 'stay the course' speech at the US Army War College."

One of the organisers of this movement Ms. Mary Ellen Mcnish says that the President's speech was mere platitudes and our hope is that these exhibits

will give the American people a picture of the true cost of the war that they will hold the politicians accountable.

Sir, it is very interesting to see several such anti-war movements taking place in their country in spite of the ruling class. Vietnam War was such an occasion when the students in the universities, the youth in the country rose up in their country against their Government. Such a thing is developing there. I hope it develops as fast as possible because the fate of Iraq will be decided by their people and the fate of the United States of America also should be decided by their people.

What happened to those leaders who supported the USA and how the people reacted in their respective countries? That is more important. In Europe, apart from Britain, Spain was an important country which went all ahead with America. What happened there? The Spanish troops were sent to Iraq. There was an election. In that election, what happened to Mr. Aznar, the Prime Minister who sent the troops to Iraq? He was defeated by the people of Spain and in his place a Socialist Prime Minister came to power. A new Government came to power there. It is a matter of fact that in Spain a new Government came to power due to this Iraq issue and the new Prime Minister has practically withdrawn every Spanish soldier from Iraq.

Sir, what happened to so many small countries like Honduras, Dominican Republic, Nicaragua, Kazakhstan, Bulgaria and South Korea? They were contributors of soldiers, along with America, to Iraq. Now, their Governments have asked their soldiers to come and stay in their camps. They said: "Do not go for any duty, come back and stay in your own camps". I hope they should be thanking their Governments. These poor soldiers should be thanking their Governments for allowing them to stay in their camps because, I hope, they will be safe in their camps. So, this is the kind of reaction in those countries.

What about the great British Prime Minister? Perhaps this Prime Minister was the most popular Prime Minister when he became Prime Minister. But now he is the most unpopular Prime Minister in Britain. Again, how they deal with their Prime Minister and Government is their business. But this is a fact and the main

reason is that this dirty war in Iraq was initiated by Bush and Blair. The British people, although at one time they colonised us, have a great sense of liberty and freedom and there are millions of people who really value these sentiments. So, they have risen up against their Government.

I do not want to say about many other instances where this kind of movement is going on. Actually, Europe is now divided. From the very beginning, as you know, countries like France, which is a member of the United Nations Security Council, Germany, Russia and China opposed the Iraq war. Apart from America and Britain, almost every other permanent member of the United Nations Security Council opposed this. They tried their best to prevent this war.

Even now they have got their reservations. Although, I agree that they supported the UN Security Council Resolution ultimately, they have their reservations. Even two days back the Russian Prime Minister openly said that there is no question of Russia sending troops to Iraq. No other country is thinking of doing that in spite of this Resolution. So, this Iraq invasion and the whole story is something which should make us think about the new world situation where a big danger of unipolarism, of imperialism is coming in new ways, in new forms; especially the Third World countries should be very vigilant against such happenings in any part of the world.

We sympathise with the people of Iraq. India had excellent relations with Iraq. Saddam Hussein, good or bad, was not the question. India had very good friendly relations with Iraq. We were getting our crude oil supplies from Iraq on very considerate terms. We had in our mind this kind of thought about our relations with Iraq. Everybody knows that U.S. eyes are on the oil of Iraq. Whatever you say about Saddam Hussein, his dictatorship and all that, actually what they want is this oil, this rich deposit of oil. Iraq is the second largest oil producing country in the world.

In spite of this Resolution being adopted by the UN Security Council, America has not divulged its plans about its ultimate withdrawal, its Army's withdrawal. That will continue. What are they going to do about their oil business, the oil money, which they alone are doing? They pretend that this will

be spent for the reconstruction of Iraq. Who decides all this? Who are they to decide all these things?

This great House had given its verdict in the Thirteenth Lok Sabha. I only want to reiterate that resolve of the House of the People, that consensus decision that India should have its independent approach on this question. I am sure this Government will stand firm against all kinds of pressures or intimidation by whoever it is, big or small. We have our independent positions and we stand with the people of Iraq, the bleeding people of Iraq. Actually, I cannot even think of their plight. It is so sad. But let us, at least, express our solidarity with the people who fight against the biggest of imperialism in the 21st Century.

THE MINISTER OF PETROLEUM & NATURAL GAS AND MINISTER OF PANCHAYATI RAJ (SHRI MANI SHANKAR AIYAR): Mr. Deputy-Speaker Sir, I think, in very large measure the Treasury Benches would share the sentiments and concerns expressed by Comrade Vasudevan Nair. We fought shoulder to shoulder from the Opposition Benches during the run-up to the Iraq War and in the immediate aftermath thereof. Therefore, as far as the past is concerned, I think Comrade Vasudevan Nair can rest assured that we were with him then and we are with him now.

But I think, the need today is not so much to look to the past as to look to the future for whatever happened in Iraq, however unfortunate it was, these are events that have happened, that have become part of an ineradicable history.

It is from the debris of this past that we have to ensure that phoenix-like Iraq rises again from the ashes. Sir, I think there is cause for some satisfaction. It is there I am finding it a little difficult to share Comrade Vasudevan's scepticism about the United Nations. At the end of the day, our world order depends upon an institution like the United Nations and upon the Charter of the United Nations. I think it will be fair to say that the Resolution passed last month constitutes the expression of a consensus point of view of the international community as a whole, and that although all Member States of the United Nations are by no means Members of the Security Council either in a temporary or in a permanent capacity, the general welcome that has been given by the Member-States of the United Nations to this latest Security Council Resolution demonstrates, I believe, the relief of the international community that the United Nations has once again been made relevant to the conduct of international affairs. Indeed, Comrade Vasudevan would recall that in order to arrive at this consensus Resolution, all the Permanent Members of the Security Council had to discuss these matters at very great length, with differences among them being part of the public discourse, and arrive at a compromise which would not have satisfied any one Member of the Security Council but which did constitute a consensual view of the Security Council as a whole, both the Permanent Members as well as the temporary members. In view of this, I think, the starting

point of our discussion today should be less the very unfortunate events of March-April, 2003, than the more welcome developments that date back a few weeks. When one looks at it in this perspective, I think, first, I would, as the Minister of Petroleum, tend to look upon what are the prospects in the oil sector.

Sir, I am happy to report to this House that my Ministry has offered to the Iraqis in the sector of the economy that matters most to the Iraqis, the oil sector, training facilities, where what our institutions are able to offer is substantially more than, perhaps, the institutions within Iraq, as they are today; are able to offer, and, I assure Comrade Vasudevan, exactly as good as, and probably superior to, any training they can receive anywhere in the world - OPEC countries, developed countries and other Asian countries, we are at the top; and, in an area that matters enormously to Iraq, and in matters where we have got special expertise, we have already made our offer. The Iraqi authorities are examining who are the candidates they wish to select to send to India for these important courses and, when we welcome them here, I hope our friends from the Left will agree to join me in talking to these engineers and, perhaps, discovering not only what is the situation in Iraq from the Iraqis themselves, but also seeing how, through them and with their assistance, their cooperation, their goodwill, we can move forward in this sector.

Sir, there is another very important matter, for us in the oil sector, which I think it would be my duty to share with the House. That is that we do have an offer from the Iraqi authorities to undertake exploration, and ultimately exploitation, to the benefit of India as well as to the benefit of Iraq, of certain oil reserves in the southern parts of the country near the Basra region. I mention Basra only because it is a very well - known town for us. It is fairly close to the Kuwait border. It appears to us from our preliminary investigations that this block is potentially a very remunerative block.

We are waiting for the law and order, the security situation in that area to improve a little before we can risk sending our people there and beginning this work. But it is, I think, a measure of continuity in the Iraqi administration, notwithstanding the traumatic events of the last few months, that such an

important bilateral matter between India and Iraq has remained unaffected by the developments of recent times.

Sir, with regard to the purchase of crude, ever since restrictions were placed on the export of crude from Iraq, few countries have suffered the consequences more than we have. Iraq has always been a very important source of our imports of crude and there was a time when, under an arrangement with the Soviet Union, we were purchasing the crude physically from Iraq but the payment for it was made in arrangement with the Soviet authorities because in principle under rupee trade we were purchasing it from the Soviet Union even though physically it was coming in from Iraq. So, in that very critical period that followed the decision of OPEC in 1973 to substantially increase the prices of crude, it was Iraq that came to our rescue and enabled us in this arrangement with the Soviet Union to purchase very large quantities of crude but paying for it in rupees to the Soviet Union. This was in addition to what we purchased directly from the Iraqis. It was my privilege, Sir, at that time, to serve as a diplomat in Iraq. I had two years two months and two days in that country and I really grew to love those people because there was such warmth in them, such sincerity of sentiment in their attitude towards India that one had to search deep into history and civilization to discover the roots of this warmth. Let us not forget that our relationship with Iraq goes back to Babylonian times to Sumerian times when there was trade between that part of West Asia and the area that generally we now refer to as the birthplace and the home of the Harappan culture. And it is that ancient relationship, the relationship between two very long old civilizations that has animated the relationship between today's people of India and today's people of Iraq. That is where the warmth lies. It is, therefore, for us to go back to that warmth. When I was posted as the Commercial Counsellor and Deputy Chief of Mission in Iraq about a quarter century ago, there were explicit orders given by the Iraq Government that, other things being equal, preference should be accorded to India in the import of goods as well as in the award of contracts. The consequence of that was that between about 1975 when we obtained our first contract till the war with Iran started, the number of our construction

contracts there exceeded 100 and we were talking not in terms of tens of crores of rupees, we were talking in terms of thousands of crores of rupees and co-operation with the country. It is evident to me from the experience of those days that when the reconstruction of Iraq begins in real earnest, there are going to be enormous opportunities for India to participate in the constructive activity of rebuilding Iraq to the glory which it had and which it deserves to have again.

Also, Sir, 25 years ago, in almost every single Iraqi Ministry of substance we had Indians invited by the Iraqis to work there as experts and to help them in building their country. We were there as traders, we were there as builders and we were there as experts. One instance that comes to my mind is Instrumentation Limited, a public sector organisation here going in to assist the Iraqi Cement Company, providing them with instrumentation, and their being so impressed with the work that we had done, that we built up, that the contract got extended to a large number of industrial units in Iraq who are using Indian instrumentation.

Sir, in the land of Mesopotamia, which means the land between the two rivers, the first company to sell ground water drilling rigs and discover water for them in this Mesopotamian region was Voltas. It was we who had the pride of doing that. We were involved in repairing and restoring their railway lines. We were involved in the construction and running of the steel mill too, near Basra, which is now, unfortunately, no more there because it got bombed. There were also some instances where we were not involved with very great distinction because in Basra once I complained about the quality of the air-conditioning and the hotel Manager said to me, "We are not at fault, it is an Indian company that put in the air-conditioning !"

So, the relationship was truly multifaceted, but I would say that in contemporary Iraq, what brought us very, very close to them was their deeply ingrained belief in secularism as we understand secularism. There was no distinction made in terms of discrimination between people of different communities. There was an attempt to ensure that Armenian Greek Orthodox Christians could have exactly the same rights as a Sunni Muslim in the country.

They were the ones who respected and really honoured a site in Baghdad where Guru Nanak is supposed to have sat when he was returning from Mecca and meditated. Till today they treated it with the utmost respect.

In places like Najaf and Karbala, it was one of the duties of the Indian Embassy to administer a fund that had been put in place by the Nawab of Rampur before Independence to provide financial assistance to Shias of Indian origin who, for reasons of religion, were living in Najaf and Karbala. One of the duties I had was to go there and distribute the money among those people.

So, when one looks at the depth of the relationship, the variety of this relationship, its economic dimension, its human dimension and its dimension in international relations where Iraq was one of the strongest voices in the Non-Aligned Movement, where, shoulder to shoulder, Iraq and we fought many a battle in the United Nations and in the Non-Aligned Movement, we look forward to the day when we can restore that relationship in the 21st century context, because, after all, some of the things that we fought and did together are no longer as relevant as they were once. New challenges have come before us, and in facing these new challenges, I do not think there can be any dispute between Comrade Vasudevan and ourselves that, in the preservation of the independence of countries, the prevention of colonialism and imperialism in any form, any garb, in co-operating to bring the developing countries to the fore, in giving sovereign nations sovereign rights over their natural resources, in co-operating in order to bring about an Asian resurgence - in all these, we are going to share with Iraq as we shared with Iraq in the past.

But during a transitional period, I do not think it would help us to be passing value judgements on personalities who might well be figures of significance in the Iraq of the future. So, we would prefer to work with those who are there within the framework of the Resolution of the United Nations. We see that there is a process of restoring sovereignty to the people of Iraq, that is underway. We believe that there are still steps to be taken in that direction, and that while a measure of sovereignty has been restored to the people of Iraq, full

sovereignty, which is the goal, must be one that is pursued with all deliberate speed.

16.00 hrs.

There is a roadmap relating to the dilution and eventual withdrawal of the external political authority and there is a less clear roadmap about the dilution and eventual withdrawal of the troops. But it is clear that the Iraqi people, sooner rather than later, perhaps as soon as the end of this year but more likely sometime during the course of the next year, would have an opportunity of exercising their democratic franchise to choose the next government. When they do that it is they who would decide how the remaining non-Iraqi troops are to conduct themselves or not have a role in the affairs of Iraq. So, I see an optimism in the situation in July, 2004 here in this House which was markedly absent when the Left and we together fought for this Resolution shoulder to shoulder. . (*Interruptions*)

SHRI VARKALA RADHAKRISHNAN (CHIRAYINKIL): Are you speaking as a Member of Parliament or as a Minister?

SHRI MANI SHANKAR AIYAR: I am intervening. I am not replying to the debate. . (*Interruptions*)

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of External Affairs is here. He would reply to the debate.

SHRI MANI SHANKAR AIYAR: The hon. Minister of External Affairs will reply to the debate but by becoming a Minister my right as a Member has not been extinguished. . (*Interruptions*)

SHRI VARKALA RADHAKRISHNAN : Shri Mani Shankar Aiyar, I know that but you have no *locus standi* to speak when the Minister of External Affairs would be speaking. . (*Interruptions*)

श्री इलियास आजमी (शाहाबाद) : कौन जालिम है, कौन इंसानी खून बहा रहा है, इन्होंने उसका उल्लेख नहीं किया है। .(व्यवधान)

श्री मणिशंकर अय्यर: मैं आपकी बात का जवाब दे रहा हूँ। .(व्यवधान) उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं माजरत चाहता हूँ। विषय हमारे सामने हैं - इराक की स्थिति - आज की परिस्थिति और भविष्य की परिस्थिति। इसमें यह नहीं कहा जा रहा है कि हम केवल भूत के बारे में बात करें। हमें छूट है कि आधुनिक परिस्थिति और भविष्य की परिस्थिति पर हमें जो कुछ कहना है, कहें। हमने साफ कहा है कि हम आजादी और सॉवर्नेटी के पक्ष में हैं। हम संयुक्त राष्ट्र पर विश्वास रखते हैं। संयुक्त राष्ट्र में सर्वसम्मति से जो रैजोल्यूशन पारित होते हैं, उनका उल्लंघन या उपेक्षा करना सही बात नहीं है। हम चाहते हैं कि इराक पुनः आजाद देश बने। .(व्यवधान)

SHRI M.P. VEERENDRA KUMAR (CALICUT): Sir, is he supporting the puppet Prime Minister of Iraq? . (Interruptions)

श्री मणिशंकर अय्यर: मैं सदन को बताना चाह रहा था कि जिस प्रकार से हमारे रिश्ते इराक के साथ बहुत गहरे थे, वैसे ही उसके साथ भविष्य में हमारे रिश्ते बहुत गहरे और करीब होने चाहिए। हम चाहते हैं कि आजाद मुमालिक की हैसियत से हम विश्व शांति और विश्व के विकास में अपना योगदान दें।

SHRI N.N. KRISHNADAS (PALGHAT): Sir, he has not made clear the stand of his party regarding the situation. It is a very diplomatic speech. . (*Interruptions*)

SHRI P.K. VASUDEVAN NAIR : Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, since Shri Mani Shankar Aiyar has also spoken in his capacity as a Minister of the Government and not in his individual capacity, can I get a clarification from him?

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: He has only intervened; the hon. Minister of External Affairs will reply later.

Now, Shri Varkala Radhakrishnan

SHRI VARKALA RADHAKRISHNAN : Sir, I support the views expressed by Shri P.K. Vasudevan Nair, the initiator of this debate.

First of all, I must thank the hon. Minister of External Affairs for having retracted his statement in the matter of sending troops to Iraq. He has saved the situation but let him not repeat things like this. . (*Interruptions*)

THE MINISTER OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS (SHRI K. NATWAR SINGH): I never said it.

SHRI VARKALA RADHAKRISHNAN : But it was reported in the newspapers.

SHRI K. NATWAR SINGH: A lot of things are reported in the newspapers. Why do you read fiction? . (*Interruptions*)

SHRI VARKALA RADHAKRISHNAN : I have gone through the newspapers. . (*Interruptions*) You have saved the situation but it was reported in the newspapers.

SHRI K. NATWAR SINGH: The very next day, I issued a statement in Washington. . (*Interruptions*)

SHRI VARKALA RADHAKRISHNAN : In America, it was reported in all the newspapers that you had agreed to send troops to Iraq.

SHRI K. NATWAR SINGH: I had not agreed.

SHRI VARKALA RADHAKRISHNAN : This matter was discussed in the previous House.

I remember it. There was a discussion in the House previously and I was present. We had a discussion and it was a unanimous decision not to send any

troop to Iraq on any account. That was the decision. The hon. Minister is quite aware of it. . (*Interruptions*)

SHRI K. NATWAR SINGH : I was among those who passed that resolution in the House. . (*Interruptions*)

SHRI VARKALA RADHAKRISHNAN : But how did it happen?

SHRI K. NATWAR SINGH: My friend, I did not say. . (*Interruptions*)

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS (SHRI E. AHAMED): He himself has denied. . (*Interruptions*)

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Please address the Chair.

. (*Interruptions*)

SHRI K. NATWAR SINGH: It is all right. I will reply to it later. . (*Interruptions*)

SHRI E. AHAMED: I am only contradicting you. . (*Interruptions*)

SHRI VARKALA RADHAKRISHNAN : But, anyway, I am not pressing on that point. Here the question is about the situation in Iraq. There is a Tribunal. Who appointed the Tribunal? It is appointed by a puppet Government. The legality of the proceedings also is in jeopardy as it is in an international dispute. Even foreign lawyers including Dr. Gaddafi and some 20 lawyers have expressed the view that the Tribunal is quite illegal. It is formed by a puppet Government; a Government which was installed in power by the occupying forces with no legal authority. We presumed that the United States Government have no authority to remain in Iraq. It was an independent nation and it was only in the capacity of an occupying force that they were continuing their presence in Iraq. It is because of the unipolar power of the United States at the mighty arms of the State, they could take possession of the independent nation Iraq. When they were in occupation, they had appointed a puppet Government, who was the agent of the CIA. Mr. Allawi is a Prime Minister known as an agent who worked for CIA for over 30 years. That man was put into power by his predecessor in office who was an opponent of Saddam Hussain. But he was removed because it was not convenient to the Americans keeping Allawi as an administrator. So, he was removed and this man was put in place.

Now, that Tribunal is questioning Saddam Hussein. I do not have any brief for Saddam Hussein. I do not argue for any clemency. But I would submit that there must be an independent Tribunal. There must be an application of independent law. The trial should be impartial. It should be free and fair.

Now, these fundamental things have been denied in Iraq. It is quite evident. That is why the dictator, as somebody may call him, at the outset, has proclaimed that this is only a farce, a theatre. He has questioned the legality. Now, not only that, there is an opinion prevailing in Iraq because they have done away with capital punishment.

Now, there is an attempt to revive capital punishment for being inflicted on this particular person who is in custody. There are about nine persons. There is a pre-determined declaration that he would be awarded death penalty. So, it is for the Tribunal to take a decision. Before that the authorities that were dealing with the situation have declared openly that he will be given capital punishment. Such is the situation there.

Now, we must examine the charges framed against him. You will have to think over it. The charges also are politically motivated. They are imperialist charges. We all know that there was a war between Iraq and Iran which lasted for eight years. Immediately after Ayatullah Khomeini took over, the Shah was removed from power, who was a puppet American imperialist, who was reigning for a long time. The people rose in revolt.

The Muslim fundamentalists captured power. I do agree. After capturing the power, the Iran Government was attacked by Saddam Hussein and the war lasted for eight years. No mention is made in the charge about the Iran-Iraq war because the Americans did not like Iran. They are in loggerheads with Iran. They are opposed to the policies of Iran. Since the American imperialists are opposed to Iran's policy, you will find that in the charges framed against Saddam Hussein there is no mention about this war which lasted for eight years. At the outset, it can be *prima facie* proved that it is politically motivated, to suit the convenience of the American imperialists that the charge is framed. Why is it so? We see that the attack on Kuwait lasted for only six months. Kuwait is an ally the American

imperialism. The ruler of Kuwait happened to be a stooge of the American imperialism.

I do not agree with the policy of Saddam Hussein for having attacked Kuwait; but the war lasted only six months and that is included because the Kuwaiti rulers were in honeymoon with the American imperialism. So, that charge is there. When the war with Iran lasted for eight years that is left out. What is impartial here? What is the crux of the issue? Are they really interested? If they are really interested to have a fair trial, all these things must be included. A war which lasted for eight years was left out and a war which lasted for six months was included. It is a major charge. . (*Interruptions*)

Who framed this charge? It was by the Americans. The Arab people do not agree. The Arab people look with suspicion towards this stooge Government or the puppet Government of U.S. imperialism ruled by Allawi. They do not agree. The Arab countries in the Middle East looked with suspicion the Government that is installed in Baghdad.

My humble submission is that India should try to make a trial which is fair and independent and according to agreed international law and not by a tribunal appointed by a puppet Government. It is against all the international justice and it is opposed to all international law. My humble submission to the hon. Minister of External Affairs is this. India is a country which can take a lead in these matters. We have not sent troops to Iraq. We have an independent policy. We are in close friendship with the Arab countries. We want to be in friendship with the Arab countries. We have a very very good and definite relationship with Iraq.

So, in these circumstances, it is only just and proper that we must have a lead in the matter. We must make an earnest effort to see that there is no hate trial by the tribunal that is trying these offences, these war offences. There should be no hate trial. The trial in Baghdad should be within the purview of the Iraq administration.

All over, it has been stated that the custody of the accused is dual custody. It is unheard of in judicial jurisprudence. Where is the dual custody? If there is sovereignty in Iraq, there can be no question of dual custody. The legal

custody is with the puppet Government and the physical custody is with the military power. It is quite unfair, unjust and ridiculous. When we deal with an accused, the authority which is dealing with the case must have the supreme power. Here is a case that the so-called puppet Government is given legal authority which is nominal. He has not been given the physical custody but only the legal custody. The tribunal will have only legal custody; but the physical custody is with the American forces who are still in Iraq.

They are not one or two in number; there are more than 1.5 lakh of American troops as well as other troops stationed in Baghdad and they are controlling the power. The sovereignty is with the occupying forces even today. How can we say that the power is with the puppet Government? By any stretch of imagination, can we assume that the power is vested with the puppet Government? No. The power is still with the United States, the occupying force. They are still occupying the country. So long as they are occupying the country, how can it be claimed that it is a fair trial? They are the people who are physically in possession of Saddam Hussein and his associates.

Not only that, it is said that prisoners are being tortured. We have read it in newspapers. The things which happened in Iraq are unheard of in human history. Prisoners were taken into custody. They were put into jails. Even women prisoners were asked to supply tea and food naked to the American people. That is the culture they boast of, the American imperialists boast of. There has taken place inhuman torture within the jails. This is not my allegation; this is a claim made by the Amnesty International. They have made it clear that all human and humanitarian feelings were thrown to the wind, and barbarous, uncivilised and inhuman treatment was meted out to human beings who were styled as prisoners. They are not prisoners; they are the citizens of that country.

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय : राधाकृष्णन जी, आप एक मिनट के लिए बैठिये। मुझे एक ज़रूरी अनाउंसमेंट करनी है। उसके बाद आप बोल लीजिए।

Hon. Members, I have an urgent meeting with the delegation which has come from Vietnam. Since no one from the Panel of Chairmen is present in the

House, if the hon. Members agree, I would request Shri Hannan Mollah to come in the Chair.

SEVERAL HON. MEMBERS: Yes.

मोहम्मद शाहिद (मेरठ) : जो हमारे माननीय सदस्य ने कहा है, मंत्री जी पहले उस बात का जवाब तो दे दें। . (*Interruptions*)

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: He is a senior Member.

. (*Interruptions*)

16.18 hrs. (Shri Hannan Mollah *in the Chair*)

MR. CHAIRMAN : Shri Radhkrishnan, please continue.

SHRI VARKALA RADHAKRISHNAN : Sir, I was submitting about the treatment awarded to the prisoners in Iraq jails controlled by American imperialists. They were kept under inhuman conditions. They were not even given food. They were tortured day and night. They were not even allowed to answer the call of nature. These are the reports appearing in *Washington Post* and not in any foreign Press. They have given pictures of human torture inside Baghdad prisons controlled by American soldiers. It is said that even rapes were committed inside the prison. Women were raped. That also was treated as a cultural treatment awarded by the civilised West. That is their claim. They claim that they are the most civilised people in the whole world and they are governing the whole world. That is the claim of the American imperialists. They say that they are the champions of democracy, they are the champions of individual freedom and they advocate for their citizenship rights, human rights.

These Americans were doing such inhuman atrocities inside the prison. The Americans in Iraq were putting men in cuffs and torturing them, and they claim that their civilization is the most powerful, and the most modern. The Americans make all these fantastic claims. The Americans -- when they were in occupation of Iraq -- gave a very very graphic picture to the international press, including the American press. The American press is free, so they had the freedom to report all these matters, and that is how we could know how the Iraqi people were being treated.

Sir, you can imagine 18 year - 19 year old muslim girls from Iraq, who for having fought for their independence were put inside the prison and tortured, and these Americans claim that they are good. I would request our hon. Minister of External Affairs to bear these things in mind when dealing with the issue of Iraq. Please do not have any agreement, or any good feeling about these Americans, especially in the matter of dealing with the Iraq issue. They have treated the Iraqi people like brutes in Iraq. So, I would request you to be very very vigilant whenever you go to America, and do not be very very friendly to these people. You should be very vigilant while dealing with such a situation. Such behaviour and ill treatment from an occupying force is unheard of in human history. We

have not heard about such atrocities even in the Greek history or the Roman history. But in the 21st century we hear that such inhuman atrocities are being committed in Iraq.

Saddam Hussein may be a brute man; he might have killed thousands of people; he might have -- for argument sake -- invaded Iran; he might have attacked Kuwait; sometimes he might have killed his own relations, all these things are there, but this is not a solution. There is no justification on the part of the Americans for committing these atrocities in Iraq. It was done for the simple reason that Saddam Hussein had attacked Kuwait. That is no justification.

MR. CHAIRMAN : Shri Varkala Radhakrishnan, please conclude.

SHRI VARKALA RADHAKRISHNAN : It was also reported that Saddam Hussein is having weapons of mass destruction. It was a fantastic thing done by the Americans to justify their actions. But even after one or two years of occupation in Iraq they could not find an iota of truth regarding this false allegation of piling-up of weapons of mass destruction by Saddam Hussein in Iraq. Nothing was detected or found. So, all those allegations were untruths.

I would say that the Americans would go to any extent. They are far far ahead than Goebbels. They have even surpassed Goebbels in the matter of making false allegations and propagating untruths.

MR. CHAIRMAN : Please conclude.

SHRI VARKALA RADHAKRISHNAN : Sir, I would again request our hon. Minister of External Affairs -- who is well experienced -- to please see that we do not have any kind heart towards America when dealing with matters like the Iraq situation.

Sir, with these words I conclude.

प्रो. राम गोपाल यादव (सम्भल) : सभापति महोदय, धन्यवाद। श्रीमन्, इराक पर जब चर्चा हो और अमेरिका का जिक्र न हो तो बेमानी होगी। इस टोपिक पर चर्चा करते समय मैं तीन बिन्दुओं पर अपनी बात रखना चाहता हूँ - पहले यह कि जब हम किसी दूसरे देश से अपने संबंध रखते हैं

तो हमारी मूल नीतियां क्या थीं और क्या हम उनके आधार पर, उसके साथ चल रहे हैं। दूसरे, अमेरिका का दूसरे देशों के साथ संबंधों का पिछला इतिहास क्या रहा है, और तीसरे इराक पर अमेरिका का जो आक्रमण हुआ, क्या उसका कोई औचित्य था? अगर नहीं था तो हमारी अब क्या भूमिका होनी चाहिए, हमारा क्या रोल होना चाहिए? जहां तक हमारी विदेश नीति का सवाल है, हम सब जानते हैं कि जब दो ध्रुव थे तो हमने दोनों से समान दूरी बनाए रखते हुए गुटनिरपेक्षता को अंगीकार किया था। उस समय पंडित नेहरू ने स्पष्ट कहा था कि गुटनिरपेक्षता और तटस्थता एक चीज नहीं हैं, अगर कहीं किसी के हितों पर आक्रमण होता है, कुठाराघात होता है तो गुटनिरपेक्षता उसमें इण्टरवीन कर सकती है, तटस्थता की नीति नहीं करेगी। हमारी नीति सक्रियता वाली है, गुटनिरपेक्षता वाली है, तटस्थता वाली नहीं है। उसका यह मूल आधार रहा, भले ही सोवियत यूनियन के डिसइंटीग्रेशन के बाद एक ध्रुप खत्म हो गया हो, अमेरिका की दादागिरी रह गई हो, लेकिन हम अभी भी अपने को गुटनिरपेक्ष कहते हैं और जब गुटनिरपेक्ष कहते हैं तो हमें यह विचार करना पड़ेगा कि कहीं अगर अन्याय हो रहा है तो हमारी भूमिका क्या हो।

इतनी ज्यादातियां इराकियों के ऊपर हुईं, माननीय मणिशंकर अय्यर साहब ने बहुत अच्छी बात कही कि हमारे इराक के साथ पुराने कैसे रिश्ते रहे हैं। जिस इराक से इतने अच्छे रिश्ते रहे हों, जो कभी-कभी संकट में रैस्क्यू के लिए हमारे लिए आगे आया हो, उस पर आक्रमण हो और उसकी निन्दा करने के लिए, कण्डैम शब्द का प्रयोग किया जाये या न किया जाये, इस पर संसद कई दिनों तक यहां स्टाल बनी रहे, काम न कर सके और फिर यह समझौता किया जाये कि हिन्दी में निन्दा और अंग्रेजी में डिप्लोर कर दिया जाये तो यह एक चिन्ता की बात है। पूरे देश के लोग क्या सोचते हैं और यहां बैठे हुए लोग किस तरह से काम करते हैं, इसमें यह फर्क है। जहां तक अमेरिका का सवाल है, माननीय मंत्री जी बैठे हुए हैं, जो बहुत ही विद्वान हैं। मुनरो डाक्ट्रिन

से लेकर अब तक अमेरिका की एक ही नीति रही है, जहां उसको लगे कि उसके व्यापारिक हित को नुकसान हो रहा है, इन दि लॉग रन उसके निजी हितों पर कहीं नुकसान आ सकता है तो वह कहेगा कि यह अमेरिका के हितों पर आक्रमण है और हम इसको रिटेलिएट करेंगे, इसका प्रतिकार करेंगे। 1956 में जब प्रेसीडेंट नासिर ने स्वेज नहर का राष्ट्रीयकरण किया, आप जानते हैं कि फ्रांस और ब्रिटेन दोनों जो सिक्वोरिटी कौंसिल के परमानेंट मैम्बर हैं, उन्होंने उस पर हमला किया। बाद में उन्हें वहां से जाना पड़ा तो यह कहा गया कि वैक्यूम क्रिएट हो गया है।

श्री के. नटवर सिंह : इसाइल से मिलकर किया था।

प्रो. राम गोपाल यादव : इसाइल के साथ ही किया था और कहा कि वैक्यूम क्रिएट हो गया है। जब वैक्यूम क्रिएट हो गया तो अमेरिका को वहां जाने का अधिकार मिल गया। इसे आइजनहॉवर डाक्ट्रिन के नाम से जानिए। ईरान के साथ जब मामला आया, जब ईरान ने अमेरिकी दूतावास के कुछ लोगों को कैद कर लिया, आप जानते हैं कि आर.डी.एफ. वगैरह का एम्पलायमेंट जब गल्फ में हुआ, तब भी प्रेसीडेंट कार्टर ने कहा कि यदि गल्फ में कोई बाहरी हस्तक्षेप होता है तो वह अमेरिका के हितों पर आक्रमण माना जायेगा और अमेरिका उसका प्रतिकार करेगा, चाहे इसके लिए सशस्त्र सेनाओं का प्रयोग ही क्यों न करना पड़े।

श्री मोहन सिंह (देवरिया) : उसी पर कार्टर हार गये।

प्रो. राम गोपाल यादव : हार गये और ये भी हार जाएंगे, बुश और ब्लेयर दोनों ही हार जाएंगे, जो आज की स्थिति है। मैं यह कहना चाहता हूं कि अमेरिका का कार्य करने का तरीका ही यह रहा है और आप जानते हैं कि सैकिण्ड वर्ल्ड वार जब खत्म हुआ था, सैकिंड वर्ल्ड वार खत्म होने के समझौते की स्याही सूखी नहीं थी, यूनाइटेड नेशंस के चार्टर पर दस्तखत नहीं हो पाये थे, यूनाइटेड नेशंस के रेजोल्यूशन के ऑवर में ही उत्तर कोरिया पर हमला कर दिया गया। आप जो यूनाइटेड नेशंस की बात कर रहे हैं, यह सही है कि यह एक ऐसी संस्था है कि जब झगड़ा होता हो

तो कम से कम यह एक प्लेटफार्म है, भले ही इफेक्टिव न हो, लेकिन वहां बात होती है तो उसमें से कुछ न कुछ रास्ता निकलता है, लेकिन हमें यह स्वीकार करना होगा कि यूनाइटेड नेशंस की जो भूमिका होनी चाहिए, वह निष्पक्ष भूमिका नहीं रही है। लगता है कि अब अमेरिका के प्रभाव में वहां भी फैसला होने लगा है - यह स्थिति है। इस परिस्थिति में जो अमेरिका काम कर रहा है, शुरू से करता रहा है और उसके बाद जब अब सब सामने आ गया है, स्वयं अमेरिकन एजेंसीज, एमनेस्टी इंटरनेशनल ने स्वीकार किया है, कि 11 सितम्बर की घटना की जानकारी सद्दाम हुसैन को नहीं थी। मॉस डैस्ट्रक्शन के वैपन्स भी वहां नहीं हैं। ये दो कारण हो सकते हैं। इन्हीं दो कारणों की वजह से इराक पर हमला हुआ। प्रैजिडेंट बुश भी जानते थे कि ये बातें सत्य नहीं हैं। जानबूझकर किसी सप्रभु देश पर कोई देश हमला करे, इसको सिर्फ दादागिरी के अलावा अंतर्राष्ट्रीय राजनीति में कोई दूसरी संज्ञा नहीं दी जा सकती।

उसके बाद कितना अनाचार हुआ, कितना अत्याचार हुआ। अभी यूनाइटेड नैशंस में जो रेजोलूशन आठ जून को पास हुआ, उस रेजोलूशन के तहत इंटरिम गवर्नमेंट की बात की गयी और प्रधान मंत्री भी ऐप्वाइंट कर दिया गया। यह चर्चा अमेरिकी सर्कल में है, अमेरिकी प्रैस में भी है कि जो व्यक्ति इराक का प्रधान मंत्री मनोनीत किया गया है, वह सीआईए की पैरोल पर रहा है। अमेरिका में बहुत जबरदस्त लॉबिंग हुई। करोड़ों डालर इस प्रचार पर खर्च हुए कि किस तरह से अमेरिका के हितों को सर्व करने के लिए इस पार्टिकुलर व्यक्ति को वहां का प्राइम मिनिस्टर नामीनेट कर दिया जाये और वह कर दिया गया। एमनेस्टी इंटरनैशनल ने जो तमाम बातें कहीं, उसने यह भी कहा कि तमाम देशों में जो मीटिंग हुई, जैसे चिली, स्पेन आदि कुछ देश हैं, जिन्होंने यह कहा कि उस मीटिंग में अमेरिका से मांग की गयी कि अमेरिका के सैनिक इराक के लोगों के साथ अत्याचार या अमानवीय बर्ताव न करें लेकिन अमेरिका ने इस पर सहमति नहीं दी।

इंटरनैशनल लॉ यह कहता है कि जब युद्ध खत्म हो जाये, सॉवरैनिटी किसी देश की वापिस मिल जाये तो जो प्रिजनर्स ऑफ वार हैं, उनको रिहा कर दिया जाना चाहिए। इराक की कैद में जो लोग हैं जिनको अमेरिका ने कैद में रखा है, इन्कलूडिंग सद्दाम हुसैन, उनके ट्रायल का हक अमेरिका या अमेरिका द्वारा गाइडेड व्यक्तियों को नहीं है--अंतर्राष्ट्रीय कानून यह भी कहता है। लेकिन उन्हें रिहा नहीं किया गया। दूसरी सरकार जब जनता द्वारा चुनकर आयी है तो सद्दाम हुसैन के साथ क्या ट्रीटमेंट हो, यह वह सरकार तय करे लेकिन ट्रायल अभी से अमेरिका की कठपुतली सरकार के द्वारा हो रहा है। हमें इसका विरोध करना चाहिए।

जितने लोग वहां बंद हैं, उन सबको ऐमनेस्टी इंटरनैशनल और उसकी कवर में जो कोरी माफी दी जाती है, जब कोई देश जो युद्ध के बाद काबिज है, वह अपने को अलग कर लेता है तो सबको रिहा कर देना चाहिए, माफी देनी चाहिए, यह भी इंटरनैशनल लॉ, रैडक्रास के रूल्स में है, लेकिन वह भी नहीं हो रहा है। सारी दुनिया के लोग चुप हैं। मेरा मानना है कि सोवियत यूनियन की डिसइंटीग्रिटी इस दुनिया के लिए बहुत नुकसानदायक साबित हो रही है। अगर एक और बड़ी ताकत पैरलल बनी रहती तो इस तरह का व्यवहार अमेरिका का नहीं होता। अब तो कहीं भी किसी भी देश पर कोई बहाना लेकर कहीं भी आक्रमण किया जा सकता है और ऐसा लगता है कि दुनिया भर के देश अब इस चीज से दहशत में भी हैं और कई बार ठीक तरीके से और सही बात को कहने की हिम्मत नहीं जुटा पाते।

अटल जी ने पहले कहा था कि यू.एन. रेजोलूशन हो जाये, तो हम अपनी सेनाएं भेज देंगे। हालांकि हमारे विदेश मंत्री महोदय ने बाद में खण्डन किया जिससे ऐसा लगे कि अमेरिका में उन्होंने जो कहा था, वह यही था। टेलीविजन पर जो लोगों ने सुना, उसमें माननीय नटवर सिंह जी ने यही कहा था कि अगर रेजोलूशन हो जाए, तो सेनाएं भेजी जा सकती हैं। इस पाप में भागीदार हिन्दुस्तान न बने। हमारे जो रिश्ते इराक से रहे हैं, उसकी कद्र होनी चाहिए। उसने हमें जो सहयोग दिया, जिस तरह से हमें तेल कन्सेशनल रेट पर दिया, उसका कुछ तो हम रेसीप्रोकेट करे केवल रिश्तों की तारीफ करते रहें और इराक पिटता रहे और हम मुंह न खोलें, यह उचित नहीं लगता है। मंत्री जी और प्रधान मंत्री जी न कहें लेकिन हम भी आपके सहयोगी दल हैं। ये सब सहयोगी दल ही बैठे हुए हैं। विरोधी दल सब बाहर हैं। यहां बैठे हुए एमपीज़ अगर बोलते हैं और अमरीका का नाम लेने से भी हिचकें, तो मुझे लगता है कि हमारी सरकार भी अमरीका का नाम लेने में डर रही है। इसलिए हमारे कामरेड ने बीच में इंटरवीन किया था, जब मणि शंकर अय्यर साहब बोल रहे थे। उनका पूरा भाषण हो गया, लेकिन कहीं एक शब्द नहीं। इराक पर चर्चा हो तो क्या अमरीका का नाम नहीं लिया जा सकता है? जिस देश की जनता आन्दोलन कर सकती है कि यह गलत हो रहा है, बैरेक्स के अंदर, सैल्स के अंदर क्या-क्या हुआ, किस तरह लोगों को टॉर्चर किया गया, इनह्यूमन अत्याचार हुआ, उसे लेकर अमरीका में प्रैज़ीडेंट बुश की पॉपुलैरिटी गिर गई है। ओपीनियन पोल कह रहा है कि अगर आज चुनाव हो जाएं तो प्रैज़ीडेंट बुश चुनाव हार जाएंगे। श्री ब्लेयर की पॉपुलैरिटी खत्म हो चुकी है। अगर चुनाव हों तो उनकी सरकार दुबारा सत्ता में नहीं आ सकती। उन देशों की जनता इतनी सैनसिटिव है, लेकिन हम जो मित्र देश रहे हैं और इराक के मित्र देश होने का दावा करते हैं, वे मुंह खोल कर वास्तविकता भी नहीं कह सकें तो फिर क्या फायदा है। आखिर आदमी के अंदर कोई कान्शस, कोई अन्तरात्मा होती है या नहीं। क्या अमरीका के सहयोग के बिना हम जिन्दा नहीं रह सकते?

हम जानते हैं कि विदेश नीति का सबसे महत्वपूर्ण अंग राष्ट्रीय इंटरस्ट होता है। नेशनल इंटरस्ट पहली चीज है, वह बेस है। उसके बाद बहुत सारी चीजें होती हैं। लेकिन सारी दुनिया में उदाहरण हैं। चीन आइसोलेट होकर भी दुनिया की सबसे बड़ी ताकत में से एक बन गया है। जो कभी राष्ट्रसंघ का सदस्य नहीं रहा। उसे संयुक्त राष्ट्र संघ का मैम्बर भी नहीं बनाया गया। फिर हाथ जोड़कर मैम्बर बनाना पड़ा। शक्ति की पूजा होती है। अगर आप भारत को शक्तिशाली बना लेंगे तो जो चाहे कहिए, आधे लोग आपकी तारीफ करेंगे। फिर कोई आपके ऊपर दबाव नहीं डालेगा। वरना श्री क्लिंटन की तरह कह देंगे कि सेना मेरी वजह से वापिस आ गई। आपके लोगों ने बहादुरी नहीं की थी।

इसलिए मैं इस सदन के माध्यम से, आपके माध्यम से मंत्री जी से कहना चाहता हूँ कि अभी सद्दाम हुसैन का जो ट्रॉयल हो रहा है, उस ट्रॉयल का विरोध होना चाहिए। जब जनता द्वारा चुनी गई सप्रभु सरकार आए, वह जो फैसला करे, वही होना चाहिए। क्योंकि अभी यही तय नहीं है कि वहां जो सेनाएं हैं, उन सेनाओं का आदेश सॉवरेन सरकार मानेगी या सॉवरेन सरकार का आदेश भी सेना मानेगी। इस वक्त इराक के जो प्रधान मंत्री हैं, क्या अमरीका की सेनाएं उनके आदेश को मानने को बाध्य हैं? क्या अमरीका ने क्लैरिफिकेशन दिया है? नहीं तो वहां कैसी सप्रभु सरकार है। वहां एक लाख चालीस हजार के आस-पास अमरीकन सेनाएं हैं, एक लाख से कुछ ज्यादा सेनाएं ब्रिटेन की हैं, थोड़ी सी और हैं। सबने मना कर दिया। अमरीका की कमांड रहेगी। क्या अमरीका की कमांड में आप अपनी सेना भेजने को तैयार हैं? अमरीका की सेनाओं की कमांड है, उसके निर्देश पर सारी सेनाएं काम करेंगी। फ्रांस ने मना कर दिया, रूस ने मना कर दिया, कनाडा ने मना कर दिया, जर्मनी ने मना कर दिया। Is India ready to send its troops under American command? हम चाहते हैं कि ये सारी चीजें स्पष्ट होनी चाहिए। देश की जनता, देश का जनमानस इराक वाले मसले पर अमरीका के सख्त खिलाफ है क्योंकि पुनर्निर्माण

की बात अफगानिस्तान ने भी कही थी। इतने हमले हुए, कितना पुनर्निर्माण कर दिया, कितनी मदद की। ऐसे ही छोड़ दिया गया। ऐसे ही इराक को छोड़ देंगे। उसकी तेल पर निगाह है, तब तक बने रहना चाहता है। जब तक इराक के तेल का मैक्सिमम एक्सप्लॉयटेशन होता रहे, तब तक यह होता रहेगा।

मैं लम्बी बात नहीं कहना चाहता। अध्यक्ष जी, मैं आपके माध्यम से मंत्री जी से कहना चाहता हूँ कि इस मसले पर देश के लोगों की भावनाओं की कद्र करते हुए अपना पक्ष स्पष्ट रखिएगा। अमरीकी सेना के कमांड के अंतर्गत कभी अपनी सेना वहां मत भेजिए। सद्दाम हुसैन के ट्रॉयल को अभी रोकिए। अगर नई सरकार ट्रॉयल करना चाहे तो करे। मुझे ऐसा लगता है कि सद्दाम हुसैन ने जो कहा "I am the President of Iraq. Bush is the real culprit." जब देश सप्रभु हो गया तो कौन तय करेगा कि सद्दाम हुसैन राष्ट्रपति नहीं हैं। क्या इसे अमरीका तय करेगा? उन्हें लीगली तो हटाया नहीं गया। जो आए उन्होंने कहा हम विद्वान कर रहे हैं। विद्वान कर रहे हैं तो स्टेटस को होना चाहिए। कम से कम इस वक्त ये ट्रॉयल नहीं होना चाहिए। ऐसे बाद की बातें हैं। यह तमाम लोगों पर आरोप लगे। लोगों ने बहुत ज्यादातियां दुनिया में की हैं, वे सत्ता में आये और सत्ता से गये, लेकिन क्या उनमें से किसी का भी ट्रॉयल हुआ। इसलिए भारत सरकार का इस मामले में स्पष्ट रुख होना चाहिए। हम इराक की जनता के प्रति केवल यहां संसद में बोलकर हमदर्दी करें, ऐसा नहीं होना चाहिए। वहां पर रिकंस्ट्रक्शन के बारे में मदद की जो बात हम कर रहे हैं वह तो होनी ही चाहिए लेकिन इसके साथ ही साथ अमरीका की निंदा भी होनी चाहिए और अमरीका के सैनिक जल्द से जल्द वापिस होने चाहिए। इराक को अपनी नयी सरकार चुनने का अधिकार होना चाहिए। जो नयी सरकार बने उसकी आप जो भी मदद कर सकें, उसका स्वागत है।

SHRI MADHUSUDAN MISTRY (SABARKANTHA): Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I am standing here to express a few concerns of mine regarding the situation in Iraq. I would just list them.

I think, we should derive some lessons especially on the situation that is prevailing in that country. It was an unjustified and highly deplorable invasion by the US under the pretext that Iraq had weapons of mass destruction and that it should be disarmed, which the US Intelligence has so far failed to establish, despite its own efforts.

Today's newspaper reports that there was varying influence of persons of Pentagon, which was in touch with one of the Institutes which was solely - I would not say an 'agent' - responsible for influencing the people at the higher echelon in Pentagon, that Iraq had weapons of mass destruction. The analysis was highly subjective and as a result, it had led the US to invade Iraq. This is the question - in case of a failure of Intelligence, if any country commits such an act of ignoring the entire international opinion and invading a country, what could be our response? This House, of course, had passed a Resolution in the 13th Lok Sabha unanimously, not to send troops to Iraq, and we were all party to it.

But nonetheless, the facts remain that because of failure of Intelligence, a blunder was deliberately done by some countries. What could then be done to revamp our own Intelligence whereby you get the correct information, a complete and a true information? Are there any mechanisms to check the information that we get from our own Intelligence agency from different parts of the world?

The second concern is the ignorance of a role of UN, and that is quite a concern, in the sense that the US and its allies, in the world opinion, had ignored the UN, and blatantly went to invade Iraq. That forces us to think about the world order, how the UN can be made much more effective, whether UN can be armed with some kind of an international law to punish those countries which do not obey its Resolution or which do not obey its mandate, and whether the UN should be given a kind of a mandate to take action on such erring countries, so that such a situation does not arise in future.

It looks as if the countries of the world are very much in a helpless situation and that one cannot do anything because US has money, US has

technology, US has troops, and it can dictate many countries of the world simply because it has the entire monetary power, trade and other things. It can get away with any kind of scene that it does. In that context, when every member of the UN feels that it has equal status, what could be done to make the UN a much more effective instrument to establish or to maintain peace in the entire world? In reaching to that situation, what could be the role of India and how could that be achieved in future?

My third concern is that incidents of violation of even the basic human rights, which have come to notice, are shocking. They are the soldiers and not the criminals. I wonder whether the soldiers of any country have basic human rights. I remember very well, particularly in this respect, US has double tongue. When its soldiers are captured by any of the country it talks about the Geneva Convention but when it captures the soldiers of other countries it does not want to follow such Conventions. Again, here comes the role of UN as well as the universal Human Rights, the Civil and Political Rights, which most of the countries of the world have ratified. If these universal civil and political rights, even of the soldiers, are violated by any country blatantly, the mechanism to rectify it by an international body has to be thought of when we are thinking of a new order for governance for the entire world.

My fourth concern is, a number of incidents have been reported in the newspapers where Indian people are recruited under some pretext to serve in certain countries of the world. There are two or three such incidents which have been reported where labourers were recruited to work either in Jordan or Kuwait but immediately were bundled to work in various camps in Iraq. I would like the Government to investigate such incidents as reported in the Press. What exactly is the situation? All those agencies which are recruiting persons to serve the American soldiers in the camps should be black-listed, banned and their licences should be cancelled. All those people who are victims of cheating by certain agencies operating in this country and who wish to come back to our country should be given full facilities by our Embassies in the respective countries.

My fifth concern is what Shri Radhakrishnan has also raised. How can we assure that the trial which is being conducted in Iraq remains fair, free and impartial? Whether it should be conducted outside Iraq or it should go to international tribunal, tried under the international law or whether it should go to the court of the Hague; all these questions have to be answered. What could be the role of India to influence or to even lobby or to see that all these trials are conducted under the principle of natural justice and principle of fair inquiry under the legal instrument? Apparently, it is true that the way the tribunal has been constituted and the way the trials are going on in Iraq raises a very serious question. It certainly looks far end that Mr. Saddam would be punished with a kind of death penalty.

Looking at the relationship and the history that we have with Iraq, as Shri Mani Shankar Aiyar has just now described, we can mobilise world opinion, Arab opinion. I agree with him that the people of Iraq have every right to try if there are any war crimes.

I think it should not certainly be under the influence, guidance, and dictate of the United States. I feel it is going to affect us economically and it would also affect our commercial ties with Iraq. I feel we have a greater role to play to see that the people in Iraq get justice. I express my solidarity with the people of Iraq. I think we should not only express our solidarity but our acts should also aspire to fulfil the feelings of that country. We should play a greater role and not just a passive role to look what has been happening. I am sure that this Government through the hon. Foreign Minister will play a lead role. India used to play a lead role at one time in Non-Aligned Movement and other world fora. We should also now begin to play a very important role in shaping the world order besides mobilising the world and especially the Asian opinion in the light of situation in Iraq.

श्री आलोक कुमार मेहता (समस्तीपुर) : सभापति महोदय, आज हम यहां इराक की परिस्थिति पर चर्चा करने के लिए बैठे हैं। मैं इराक की परिस्थिति के बारे में बाद में बताऊंगा। पहले मैं यह बताना चाहता हूं कि आज से दस वर्ष पहले देखा जाता था कि जगह-जगह और घरों में सद्दाम हुसैन के बड़े-बड़े चित्र लगाए जाते थे, उनकी बहादुरी को ग्लोरिफाई किया जाता था और उनकी मिसाल देकर कहा जाता था कि सद्दाम हुसैन के नेतृत्व में इराक ने अमेरिका जैसे बड़े देश को पछाड़ने का काम किया। उनके नाम पर कई व्यक्तियों एवं जगहों के नाम भी पड़ गए थे। जब इराक की अमेरिका से दूसरी लड़ाई हुई तो वैसे लोग उन्हें दबी जुबान दूसरी बात कहने लग गए थे और उन लोगों ने अमेरिका द्वारा उसे चूहा कहे जाने पर तालियां भी बजायी थीं। इसका पत्र पत्रिकाओं में उल्लेख भी किया गया था। यह बहुत शर्मनाक परिस्थिति है। हम ऐसे अवसरवादी नहीं हो सकते। देश के जो सिद्धान्त, आदर्श और राजनीतिक मूल्य हैं उनके आधार पर हमारे इराक के साथ लॉग टर्म रिलेशन्स थे। इसके आधार पर हमारे व्यवहार और सिद्धान्तों में स्थिरता होनी चाहिए थी। आज इराक में मानवाधिकार का उल्लंघन हो रहा है। पत्र-पत्रिकाओं के माध्यम से पता लग रहा है कि वहां युद्धबंदियों और कैदियों के साथ कैसा सलूक किया जा रहा है। यूएनओ जैसी ऑर्गेनाइजेशन के मना करने पर भी जैविक हथियारों का बहाना बना कर इराक पर हमला करने का जो दुस्साहस अमेरिका ने किया, उस पर हमारे जैसे देशों को एकजुट होकर विरोध करना चाहिए था। अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय फोरम में आज भी इसका कड़ा विरोध होना चाहिए वरना यह बीमारी दूसरे एशियाई देशों में फैल जाएगी। हमें ऐसी बू आ रही है। आज इराक की आम जनता, जो दहशत में है, यह कहने को मजबूर है कि अमेरिका के राष्ट्रपति जॉर्ज बुश उसके हितैषी हैं। हम उनके साथ खड़े होकर अपनी नीतियों, बातों और संसद के माध्यम से उन्हें हिम्मत प्रदान करके कहें कि वे उठ कर खड़े हों और अत्याचारों का प्रतिकार करें। मैं आपके माध्यम से माननीय मंत्री जी से कहना चाहूंगा कि उन परिस्थितियों से निपटने के लिये हम लोग कुछ

सावधानियां बरतें। सब से पहली बात यह है कि हम वहां पीस कीपिंग फोर्स भेजने की गलती न करें। दूसरे, हमारे देश की जो आइडियोलौजी है उस पर आधारित निर्णयों में सौलिडैरिटी होनी चाहिये, यह एक अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय मामला है और अंतर्राष्ट्रीय संबंधों का खयाल रखते हुये हमें सैद्धान्तिक तौर पर उस पर मज़बूती से अड़े रहना चाहिये। हमें अमरीका के किसी भी अरेंजमेंट पर बिलकुल सहमत नहीं होना चाहिये।

सभापति जी, मैं एक बात और कहना चाहूंगा कि अंतर्राष्ट्रीय फोरम में यह बात उठनी चाहिये कि जो हमने एक नारा दिया था - 'सदाम एक बहाना था, तेल पर निशाना था' - यह बात सचमुच में सार्थक नहीं होनी चाहिये, उनके नापाक इराके कामयाब न हों, हमें इस बात का प्रयास करना चाहिये। हमारी सरकार को अंतर्राष्ट्रीय मंचों पर इस बात को मज़बूती के साथ रखना चाहिये।

सभापति जी, अमरीका ने रैस्ट ऑफ एशियन कंट्रीज में अपने सैनिक रख छोड़े हैं और उसकी फौजें ओमान और कुवैत में पहरेदारी कर रही हैं। यदि कल किसी भी तरह उन देशों की आजादी की बात होगी, तो फिर जैविक हथियारों का बहाना ढूँढा जायेगा और उन देशों पर आक्रमण करके उन्हें उपनिवेश का मूर्त रूप देने की कोशिश की जायेगी। इसलिये हम इसका घोर प्रतिकार करते हैं। हम यह भी कहना चाहते हैं कि सदन की इस मामले में सौलिडैरिटी होनी चाहिये और एक नीति तैयार करनी चाहिये ताकि इस खास विषय के समाधान का मार्ग प्रशस्त हो सके और अमरीका की दादागीरी पर अंकुश लग सके।

श्री इलियास आजमी (शाहाबाद) : सभापति महोदय, श्री वासुदेवन नायर साहब ने जो कुछ कहा है, मैं उसका समर्थन करता हूँ। मैं ईराक की बहादुर जनता को अपनी संसद के जरिये सलाम पेश करना चाहता हूँ जिसने यह साबित कर दिया है कि दुनिया में बड़ी से बड़ी शैतानी ताकतें इनसानी अज़म और उसके इरादे को डिगा नहीं सकती। जहां तक अमरीका का सवाल है, शायद श्री मणि शंकर अय्यर जैसे लोग उसका इरादा नहीं समझ सके और संसद में आकर श्री वासुदेवन नायर की तकरीर पर शायरी करने लगे जिसका न कोई मतलब है और न कोई मायने हैं। मैं मानता हूँ कि हमारे देश के ईराक के साथ हज़ारों साल पुराने ताल्लुकात हैं लेकिन आप ताल्लुकात किस तरह से निभा रहे हैं? हमारी पिछली सरकार वहां अपनी सेना भेजना चाहती थी लेकिन इस संसद के जरिये वह नाकामयाब हुई लेकिन हमारी मौजूदा सरकार ने अमरीका को खुश करने के लिये अमरीका में बयान दे दिया कि हम वहां सेना भेजने पर विचार कर रहे हैं और हम विचार करेंगे लेकिन जब यहां जनता का मूड देखा तो उसका खंडन कर दिया कि हमने यह बात नहीं कही है।* इन्होंने अमरीका में क्या कहा था लेकिन बाद में उसका खंडन कर दिया। मैं इस बारे में कुछ न कहकर सिर्फ इतना कहूंगा कि ईराक में जो कुछ हो रहा है, उसके पहले कोरिया में और बाद में वियतनाम में हो चुका है। कहां तक गिनाया जाये? हमारे साथी ने दर्जनों नाम गिनाये हैं। ऐसा अफगानिस्तान में हुआ है। * उस समय की हमारी सरकार उनके सामने हाथ जोड़े खड़ी हो गई और कहा कि हुज़ूर हमारे हवाई अड्डे ले लीजिये, हमारी सेना ले लीजिये ,परन्तु अमरीका ने कहा * हमें आपसे छोटे मुल्क पाकिस्तान की जरूरत है जो उसका पड़ोसी देश है।

17.00 hrs.

अफसोस की बात यह है कि आज पूरी दुनिया की सरकारें खुले तौर पर या घुमा-फिराकर छिपे तौर पर शैतान की हिमायती हैं। लेकिन उसी के साथ खुशी का मुकाम यह है कि सारी दुनिया की जनता अमरीका और ब्रतानिया समेत शैतान के खिलाफ हैं, शैतानी जा रहियत, उसका

वहशियानापन, उसके जुल्म, उसकी धांधली का विरोध सारी दुनिया कर रही है, यहां तक कि अमरीका और ब्रतानिया की जनता भी कर रही है। लेकिन जहां तक सरकारों का ताल्लुक है, सारी सरकारें उसके आगे हाथ बांधे खड़ी हैं। उसमें किसी न किसी हद तक हमारी पिछली सरकार भी शामिल रही थी और मुझे यकीन है कि मौजूदा सरकार भी हो सकता है कि हाथ बांधकर खड़े होने वालों में शामिल रहे।

* Expunged as ordered by the Chair.

17.01 hrs.

(Mr. Deputy Speaker in the Chair)

लेकिन उपाध्यक्ष महोदय मामला सिर्फ इराक का नहीं है, मैं बहुत सफाई के साथ बता दूँ कि मैंने पूरी लाइफ में कभी भी सद्दाम हुसैन की हिमायत नहीं की, मैं हमेशा सद्दाम हुसैन का विरोधी रहा, लेकिन उसका यह मतलब नहीं, आज सद्दाम हुसैन नहीं, आज इराक की जनता पर . * अमरीका का कब्जा है और इराक की जनता उसे भुगत रही है। सद्दाम हुसैन ने जो गलतियाँ की थीं, उसकी सजा देने का हक इराक की जनता को था, अमरीका या बुश को नहीं था। आज अजीब-ओ-गरीब हालत दुनिया में फैली हुई है, आज पूरी दुनिया खतरे में हैं और जिससे खतरे में है, उसी की घुमा-फिराकर हिमायत कर रही है और अगर हिमायत न भी कर रही हो तो श्री मणिशंकर अय्यर जिस शायरी के जरिये उसके जुर्म को कम करने की कोशिश कर रहे हैं, सारी दुनिया की हुकूमतें कर रही हैं। लेकिन हमारे मुल्क की अवाम समेत पूरी दुनिया की अवाम मुबारकवाद की मुस्तहिक हैं कि जिस खतरे को सरकारें नहीं भांप रही हैं, उस खतरे को सारी दुनिया की आम जनता भांप रही है और भांपकर अमरीका के जुल्म के खिलाफ खड़ी हो गई है। मुझे कहने की इजाजत दीजिए और मैं यह कहना अपना फर्ज समझता हूँ कि आज दुनिया की कोई सरकार अमरीका के खिलाफ नहीं लड़ रही है। एक आदमी है जो अरबों-खरबों में खेलने वाला था, पहाड़ों की खोह में छुपकर अकेला एक आदमी . * और अमरीका चिल्ला रहा है कि वह दहशतगर्द है और हम भी पीछे-पीछे ताली बजा रहे हैं कि अमरीका का दुश्मन दहशतगर्द है। हम भी उसको दहशतगर्द और आतंकवादी कह रहे हैं। मैं ऐसे बहादुर आदमी को सलाम करता हूँ, जो एक अकेला पहाड़ों की खोह में बैठकर उस शैतानी ताकत को ललकार रहा है और मुकाबला कर रहा है।

हक की फतह हमेशा हुई है, वह सच्चाई पर है। एक न एक दिन उसकी जीत होगी मेरी दुआ है, मेरी उम्र ज्यादा हो चुकी है, लेकिन मेरे मरने के पहले मैं उसकी फतह को अपनी आंखों से देख सकूँ, . * मैं उसकी हिम्मत, उसकी बहादुरी को सलाम करता हूँ और अमरीका को और बुश को इंतबाह देता हूँ - जुल्म की चक्की कभी फलती नहीं, नाव कागज की सदा चलती नहीं, जुल्म फिर

जुल्म है, बढ़ता है तो मिट जाता है, खून फिर खून है, टपकेगा तो जम जायेगा, खाके बिस्मिल पर जमे या कफे कातिल पर जमे। उसका रिजल्ट जल्द ही अमरीका की जनता दे देगी, अमरीका में चुनाव होने वाला है और अमरीका की जनता साबित कर देगी कि कहीं की भी जनता जुल्म नहीं सहती। ब्रतानिया का जिक्र, ब्लेअर का जिक्र श्री वासुदेवन नायर साहब ने किया था। ब्रतानिया के बारे में फारसी का एक मकूल काफी है, फारसी में कहावत है - .*

* Expunged as ordered by the Chair.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: This is unparliamentary language and I expunge it.

SHRI MADHUSUDAN MISTRY : It is derogatory to women.

श्री मोहन सिंह (देवरिया) : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, मेरा व्यवस्था का प्रश्न है।

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Shri Mohan Singh, you please sit down.

श्री मोहन सिंह : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, मेरा एक व्यवस्था का प्रश्न है। जो हमारी नियमावलि है, उसके अनुसार ऐसा भाषण जिससे हमारे देश के रिश्ते दूसरे देशों से खराब हों, हम नहीं कर सकते हैं। हम माननीय सदस्य की भावनाओं की कद्र करते हैं, लेकिन किसी पूरे देश को इस तरह से कहना, मैं समझता हूँ कि अपनी नियमावलि के अनुकूल नहीं है।

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय : जो भी अनपार्लियामेंटी होगा, वह एक्सपंज कर दिया जाएगा।

आज़मी जी, आप अपनी बात खत्म करने की कोशिश करें।

SHRI MADHUSUDAN MISTRY : Sir, what about the unparliamentary statement in his speech?

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: That has been expunged.

श्री इलियास आज़मी : मैं जब पिछली लोक सभा में था तो एक डैलिगेशन में जा रहा था। हमें ट्रेनिंग दी गई थी कि यूरोप में जहां जाएंगे, वहां आपसे ह्यूमन राइट्स पर सवाल किया जाएगा कि हमारे मुल्क में ह्यूमन राइट्स का वायलेशन हो रहा है। यानी, अमेरिका, ब्रितानिया और पश्चिमी देश ह्यूमन राइट्स का वायलेशन नहीं कर रहे हैं, हमारे देश में हो रहा है। डिप्टी स्पीकर

साहब उस डैलिंगेशन के लीडर थे। वहीं मैंने कह दिया था कि ह्यूमन राइट्स का सवाल आए तो जवाब देने के लिए मुझे अधिकृत कर दें। ऐसा ही हुआ। ब्रुसेल्स में यूरोपियन पार्लियामेंट के सदस्यों के साथ चर्चा में ह्यूमन राइट्स का सवाल आया कि आपके यहां ह्यूमन राइट्स का वायलेशन बहुत होता है। मैंने जो जवाब दिया, मुझे यकीन था कि आईन्दा जितनी भी बैठकें होंगी, उनमें ह्यूमन राइट्स का सवाल नहीं उठेगा।

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय : इराक के संबंध में जो बात हो, वह कहें।

श्री इलियास आजमी : आप कह रहे हैं कि ह्यूमन राइट्स का सबक अमेरिका पूरी दुनिया को पढ़ाता है। उसको हम सबक दें तो शायद हमारी आवाज़ वहां तक पहुंच जाए। उस भाषा पर हमारे भाई को कुछ एतराज़ है तो मुझे अफसोस है कि अगर ये लोग शराफ़त की भाषा समझते तो वे दुनिया के मुल्कों पर कब्ज़ा करके इस ज़माने में 17वीं सदी के यूरोप को उजागर करने की कोशिश न करते, वह उस भाषा को नकारते। वह इसी भाषा को समझेंगे जिस भाषा का इस्तेमाल मैंने किया है।

आखिर मैं मैं यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि अगर अमेरिका का वियतनाम पर हमला जायज़ था, काबुल पर हमला जायज़ था, अगर बगदाद पर हमला जायज़ था तो 11 सितम्बर को न्यूयार्क पर जिन लोगों ने भी हमला किया, वह भी बिल्कुल जायज़ था। इन बातों के साथ मैं अपनी बात समाप्त करता हूँ।

SHRI OMAR ABDULLAH (SRINAGAR): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, I thank you for giving me this opportunity to speak on this subject. I rise to take part in the Discussion under Rule 193 initiated by my colleague Shri P.K. Vasudevan Nair.

At the outset, I would like to, for the record, mention that I do recall seeing the hon. External Affairs Minister on television outside the State Department building. I do not, however, recall him committing troops to Iraq. I recall him mentioning there that the situation in Iraq has changed after the Resolution in the United Nations. But I also recall him saying that before he could say Ayes or Noes to sending troops to Iraq, he would have to consult his senior Government colleagues, his Prime Minister and his coalition partners and only then could he answer. Perhaps, in this, he was amazed inasmuch as he forgot to mention that Parliament had passed a unanimous Resolution not authorising the Indian Government to send troops to Iraq. Perhaps if this had been added to his answer, some of my colleagues here in the Parliament would not have been under this mistaken impression that he had re-drawn the Indian Foreign Policy on the steps of the State Department building.

But that having been said, I listened with great interest to the speech delivered by Shri Mani Shankar Aiyar. He intervened perhaps in his personal capacity. But I think he had also spoken as the Petroleum Minister when he talked about some other things that India and Iraq are going to be doing. He very wisely gave us advice to look towards the future rather than towards the past and spent most of his entire speech talking about what had been between India and Iraq rather than what is going to be between our two countries. I do not dispute the fact that we had great relations with Iraq. Even today, on a people to people level, there is great warmth between the Indian people and the Iraqi people. But that does not necessarily translate into a bright future.

Shri Mani Shankar Aiyar tried to divert or to focus our attention on the economic future between India and Iraq. Unfortunately, Shri Aiyar is not here. Otherwise, I would have liked certain clarifications from him. Two things I recall him mentioning. One was that we are going to be training the petroleum people, the people involved in the oil trade in Iraq. They would come back to India and get training here.

That is all very well. I am glad that we are offering some sort of a humanitarian service there. But what is the point of training Iraqi personnel just to operate American equipment? He talked about an economic future. I would have liked to have known from Shri Mani Shankar Aiyar how many millions of dollars of direct contracts - I do not mean secondary contracts or sub-contracting - have been signed between Indian companies and Iraqi companies. Maybe now that allegedly or supposedly Iraq is a sovereign nation with its own Government, perhaps we will see that some of this goodwill that exists between Iraq and India will translate into some direct contracts being signed between Indian companies and Iraqi companies. But until then I would not be liked to be lectured by Shri Mani Shankar Aiyar about what a glorious economic future we have, because we do not have anything now. The economic reconstruction work in Iraq is going to be sewn up by US companies, by UK companies and Indian companies will sit on the sidelines and watch the fun. That is all that we are going to be used there for.

Sir, is the situation in Iraq still a matter of concern? Yes; it is. The security situation remains a matter of concern, the law and order situation remains a matter of concern and even the governance situation remains a matter of concern. We are told that Iraq is a sovereign country now. Yet, Iraq is a sovereign country without any control over its own troops, over the security forces that operate in that country. I doubt very much whether those American forces will take even a single order from the Iraqi leadership that has been put in place there. If Iraq is a sovereign country, may I ask the US then as to what is the need to have an Embassy of more than 1,000 people in a sovereign country? The largest US Embassy is in Iraq. Now, if this is a sign of a sovereign country,

then, I do not think that any other country would care to have a sovereignty like the sovereignty that Iraq is welcome to now.

Sir, governance is talked about. Yet, the Iraqi people have no say in who governs them. I dare say that today the Prime Minister or the President of Iraq, is, perhaps, better as the Prime Minister or the President of the green zone of Baghdad, pretty much as the President of Afghanistan is the President of Kabul. Their writ does not run beyond certain designated security zones. Today, we are in a situation where the US would like to see more troops from other countries in Iraq. Fair enough. I think the logic behind this is very sound.

Having said that, I do not recall India's opinion being sought when the United States went to invade Iraq. India's opinion then was not important. I do not recall anybody from the US coming and telling us: ' look, this is the situation in Iraq, this is the position as we see it, we are going to go ahead and invade Iraq and what are your views on this subject?' Forget about India's views; the views of the United Nations did not matter to the United States of America. They presented bogus evidence to the United Nations Security Council. They went ahead with a massive Power Point presentation. I still recall seeing that on CNN where Colin Powell, the Secretary of State of US made the slides available about weapons of mass destruction that Saddam Hussein had developed. Lo and behold! All this time after the invasion of Iraq, I do not recall a single weapon of mass destruction having been found there. Even the capability of manufacturing those weapons of mass destruction seems to have curiously vanished. So, our opinion was not important in the invasion of Iraq. Fine. Why are our troops important now? It is quite simple really. The Americans are fed up seeing dead American soldiers. The Americans would like to see dead Indian soldiers. The Americans would like to see any other country's soldiers dead than American soldiers. Why? It is because this is an election year and George W. Bush is going in for an election as an ?

incumbent President. Every body bag that comes back to America containing an American soldier costs George W. Bush his support in an election that he wants

to win. But if the situation in Iraq remains the same, he will not win and, therefore, what better way to reduce American casualties than to bring in other countries to take on this burden?

So, this is precisely that he wants that his own country's body bags are replaced by another country and in this case, he wants them to be replaced by ours, Pakistani and Bangladeshi body bags or, perhaps, of any other country that would do him this favour.

Sir, is it just the fear of casualties that should keep us out of Iraq? I do not believe so. There are a number of other questions and some of them have been raised by my colleagues. The foremost question in my mind is the question of command and control. Who will control Indian troops should we take this, what I believe would be, incorrect or wrong decision to send our troops to Iraq? Will they be under Indian control? Will the Minister of External Affairs or his colleague, the Minister of Defence or our Supreme Commander, the President have any control over the troops once we have sent them into Iraq?

Will the Iraqi leadership have any control over Indian troops that we are sending into Iraq? What would be the objective of those Indian troops operating in Iraq? Would they be operating with a security objective? Would they be operating with a humanitarian objective? I think, this is another factor that is not clear and perhaps foremost that the Indian troops will alienate the Iraqi people.

Today the Americans are carrying out a campaign to stamp out what they call terrorism. In this, I have just a word of caution for some of my colleagues in the House. I listened with great interest to some of the speeches made, which perhaps suggested that what was happening in Iraq was a struggle for freedom, what was happening in Afghanistan was a struggle for freedom, they were rising to overthrow the oppression of a force that they did not agree upon, which is fine. I will not argue with justification if that is what you want to give, but there is a saying in English, 'What is a source for goose has to be a source for gander'. You cannot choose one rule in one situation and another in another.

We have always maintained that what is happening in Jammu & Kashmir is terrorism and not a battle for freedom. But if we are now going to justify what

is happening in Iraq as a battle for freedom, if we are going to justify what is happening in Afghanistan as a battle for freedom, if tomorrow somebody asks my colleagues that what is happening in Jammu & Kashmir, is that also not a battle for freedom, we perhaps might find ourselves without an answer to give. Before we start justifying situations, let us first look closer to home. If we want to justify tomorrow what is happening in Jammu & Kashmir as a battle for freedom then you are welcome to do that. But you cannot pick and choose how you want to identify a situation just to suit an audience that you want to appeal to. If what is happening in Iraq is a battle against terrorism and we put Indian troops in there, we will lose goodwill amongst the Iraqi people. There is no good way to fight what is happening in Iraq. If we put Indian troops under American command and control, we will lose whatever goodwill we have with the Iraqi people and if not today, tomorrow the Iraqi people will elect their own leadership. They will have the Government of their own choosing. Let us maintain the goodwill that we have with the people of Iraq so that tomorrow when they have their own leadership, we will have a strong foundation upon which to base a strong relationship, which perhaps does not exist today.

Sending troops to Iraq, alienating our friends there will have another spill off effect. It will alienate what is already a strained relationship with our friends in the Arab world. Make no mistake about it. India's relations with their traditionally very close and warm allies, the Arab world, are not what they used to be. Perhaps our proximity to Israel, perhaps the growing relationship that India and Israel share has accounted for the suspicion and the mistrust that now clouds over India's relations with the Arab world, who were traditionally our closest friends, our closest allies. If we do become more involved in a military situation in Iraq, I have no doubt that this will even further alienate ourselves and upset our friends in the Arab world.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, it was a resolution of Parliament that guided our relationship militarily and otherwise with Iraq. While the External Affairs Minister would like to believe that the Resolution by the United Nations has changed a lot, I believe, it has changed very little. All it has done in some way seems to justify

what is in the minds and hearts of most people, an unjustifiable occupation. All it has done is to put a rubber stamp on actions that have already been taken. America invaded Iraq and then the United Nations justified it. America sought to put in an alternative Government, then the United Nations got in and awarded it sovereignty and recognised it.

I think, in keeping with the policy that we have adopted so far, militarily we have no business being in Iraq. With regard to the developments in Iraq politically, I think, we should be far more cautious. We should adopt a wait and watch approach. More than supporting the American occupation of Iraq, we should support the Iraqi people because these are the people who are suffering enormously. They are suffering from an occupation that they had no desire to see.

As I have said, this is an occupation that may have got the stamp of approval from the United Nations but it has got absolutely no approval in the hearts and the minds of the Iraqi people and that is the fact that we should keep foremost in our mind when we decide the future of our relations with Iraq.

With this, Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, thank you very much for allowing me to intervene.

SHRI M.P. VEERENDRA KUMAR (CALICUT): Hon. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, I have one or two points to make. I heard with rapt attention the hon. Minister Shri Mani Shankar Aiyar's intervention. As my colleague now said, he was picturing the past. How glorious it was. He said we had wonderful relations with Iraq during seventies. Then, who was the President of Iraq? Saddam Hussein. Now where is Saddam Hussein? What has happened to him? He is brought before a Government created by America and handed over illegally. He was produced before a puppet court in chains. Saddam Hussein was the ruler and President of Iraq. He is before a puppet Government in chains! Have we ever condemned this? At least you would have said Saddam Hussein had wonderful relations with us. His Government had relations with us. Shri Mani Shankar has also said he did not use to talk in terms of 10 or 20 crores but thousands of crores. If that was the relation Iraq and Saddam Hussein had with us - and he also qualified by just saying relationship was secular - how come now we never had one word of condemnation of what America had done to him?

Secondly, he said that after the United Nations Resolution, situation has changed. What is the changed situation in Iraq now? Just now Shri Omar Abdullah has said United Nations just stamped the occupation of America in Iraq. That is all. What they have done? They have endorsed it. The American President Bush is facing an election there because of that he is doing diplomatic manoeuvring in Europe and is succeeding in bringing NATO Forces also to Iraq. This was compounded. Then the United Nations justified and stamped American's occupation. After that, the NATO also is going to come to Baghdad. Moreover, 150 thousand troops of United States and some other countries are there. They are not under the present Government. They are controlled by United States and not by the present regime in Iraq. The Government does not have a control over the security or the Army. What type of Government is that? How can we say that the situation has far changed after United Nations' Resolution? The situation has become worse.

Sir, we say we are going to train people to exploit oil in Basra or somewhere else- that is what Shri Mani Shankar Aiyar has said. After Kuwait's

occupation by Iraq Government. America waged a war against Saddam. Earlier, America had wonderful relations with Saddam Hussein. Dick Cheney was the Vice-President of the oil company, Haly Burton. Now he is the Vice-President of the United States of America. He was doing oil business. He did maximum business with Iraq after Kuwait's occupation, after Kuwait war. How come there was a strained relation? After Iran, now the charges are made against Saddam Hussein. He waged war of eight years with Iran. Iran is not listed in the war against Saddam. After the Iran war, US Secretary termed Saddam Hussein as the saviour of Middle East. He never condemned Saddam Hussein. Who instigated war against Iran? Now they talk of Saddam Hussein engineering the killing of Kurdish in Fallujah. It has been conclusively stated by the American intelligence agencies that it was done by Iran.

Then, it was said that Iran had mustard gas and all that. Iraq never had it. Apart from all that, if he is to be tried on the crimes he has done against Kurdish, against *Shias* or against anybody, why Iran is not a party? When he attacked Iran, he was in the good books of the United States. The occupation is for what. What they have done is the human rights violation. The occupation is in the interest of the United States.

Now, when we go to explore oil in Basra, are we working for Haly Burton Company? Sir, I read the report about Abu Ghraib jail, where all these atrocious things have happened. When the Americans wanted to destroy that jail, the present American-created Government did not give them the nod. Why? The moment it is destroyed, some American multinational company will re-build it. The money goes to them. Now, they are talking of re-construction of Iraq. From the American Congress, how many billions of dollars George W. Bush got for the re-construction of Iraq? Not even 2 % per cent is spent for that purpose. The entire money for re-construction of Iraq has to come from their own resources, Iraqi's bread. What is the great thing that the United States is talking about? They had given three reasons for occupying Iraq. They wanted to convince the world. All the three reasons for occupying Iraq are now proved to be incorrect.

One is about weapons of mass destruction right from the Blicks time, who was the United Nations observer. He made an exhaustive report. It has come as a book now and it is in the market. Then, tenet who resigned has given a report. All these have proved that there are no weapons of mass destruction. That was the one reason given to attack Iran.

The second reason was about 9/11 issue. Mr. Saddam Hussein had some links with the destruction of the World Trade Centre. Now, the American Intelligence has said that it is not right or some Senate Committee has said that it is not right. Then, they said that he had connections with *Al Qaeda*. Now, it is so conclusively proved that not only Iraq had no relations with *Al Qaeda* but Saddam Hussein had anything to do with *Al Qaeda* in these nine years. That is what happened in Iraq.

Now, the entire occupation by the United States is for their interest, the interest of the multinationals. Now, the Army has fought with the Iraqis. The *Shias* and *Sunnis* are united on one thing. They want to fight out these occupation forces. Now, the Iraqi people will never tolerate the American troops. Why should we be a party to whitewash what the United States is doing? What the United States is doing is against humanity. Tomorrow they can do it to any other country. Do they have any right just to put a man, who was the President of the country, in chain? Tomorrow they can put anybody in chain. We had no business to whitewash what the America has done. Of course, we must condemn what the America has done. It is imperialism nakedly coming to the fore.

SHRI RUPCHAND PAL (HOOGHLY): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, I will be very brief.

Sir, after the NDA Government has been removed from power by the people of this country, the UPA Government has been entrusted with the

responsibility of correcting the situation in many areas, be it in the areas of toxification through communalism of the educational system, institutions and others, and simultaneously to demarcate from the wrong policies pursued by the NDA Government earlier. Sir, it is our tradition, convention from the days of freedom struggle that our foreign policy is based on a national consensus. The nation wants to know as to what are the corrective measures this new UPA Government is trying to proceed with.

The first issue is, how it responds to the Iraq situation. Iraq has all along been a very trusted friend of ours, be it in the case of commerce, in making oil available to us or be it in the case of extending unconditional support on the issue of Kashmir even though Iraq is a Muslim country. Of course, it is a very modern and secular country. Now, how is this Government going to demarcate it?

We have had a Resolution passed in this Parliament after a lot of discussion. There was opposition about the nomenclature, about the text whether we should use condemnation in English or deplore in Hindi. Now, the world over the situation has changed. Even within America, there is strong criticism. Sir, you must be aware of a recent documentary by Michael Moore. Be it in respect of Afghanistan or be it on other issue, he has exposed the hypocrisy of the Bush administration. It is a very, very popular documentary in the world. That is the critical situation growing on the eve of elections in America.

What position do we propose? About the story of fake sovereignty and handing over of sovereignty, whose sovereignty is it? Who are they to give back sovereignty to the Iraqi people? They had occupation forces, the military forces numbering more than 3.5 lakhs. They have their handpicked people who have been restrained by the CIA and they have all along been advocating the cause of America against the interest of Iraq. They have picked them up and formed the Government. They say sovereignty is being handed over surreptitiously. We should boldly stand up and say we do not accept it. It is totally unacceptable to our country. An ugly story, a story of possession of nuclear weapons, proliferation and all this had been totally exposed by the Americans themselves,

American scientists themselves and by the people who have been entrusted with the job.

Then, again about the Al Qaeda connection, even after the latest report available, there is no trace of any connection between Al Qaeda and Saddam regime. Such a person who still continues to be the President of Iraq, sovereign President of Iraq, is humiliated in the most uncivilised manner by the new empire, by George Bush and his associates that one can never witness in the 21st century. We must forthwith condemn this position and say that this conspiracy to kill, to assassinate Saddam Hussein should not be allowed.

The people of the world are looking to us as we have all along been championing the cause of the free world, championing the cause of the independence struggle and we have been the champion of the Non-Aligned Movement. Now, in the CMP, in the manifesto of the major ruling alliance, that is, the Congress Party, and also in the President's Address, it has been emphasised that we want to follow that glorious path of non-alignment and independent foreign policy, independent not in words but in action. Iraq is going to be the acid test because day after day it is going to be the story of another Vietnam. The governments will go. In America, the public opinion is growing every day.

India has to take a position and this should be in conformity with the unanimous Resolution of this Parliament that the US forces should unconditionally withdraw. The occupying forces must leave and the Iraqi people should be left to determine their own fate. That is independence. Otherwise telling some sweet words, diplomatic language would not do. For a country like India, very bold utterance is expected from the world. In this debate, when the hon. Minister is replying, we believe that such a demarcation from the UPA Government should be emphasised by the Minister and this Government.

SHRI ASADUDDIN OWAISI (HYDERABAD): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, I thank you for giving me the opportunity.

The occupation of Iraq by America and its allies is a gross violation of the United Nations' Charter. It contravenes article 51 of the United Nations' Charter, that is, of self-defence. It is a slur on the international law.

The talk of the United States that Iraq had weapons of mass destruction has been continuing even after many months and years have passed but not a single iota of evidence has been produced by the Allied occupational forces, by America, Britain, Italy and other countries which are occupying Iraq; and the verdict has been given by the people at large. When Iraq was being occupied, Germany had elections and the present Chancellor of Germany was opposing the war on Iraq. He had made it an election issue and won the elections though there may have been various factors for his winning the elections. They had elections in Spain at that time. The present Government in Spain said that if they came back to power they would bring back their forces. They won the elections. Our previous NDA Government was playing the role of Tony Blair. They were dancing to the tunes of America. If America said, 'Today is Sunday', they would say, 'Yes, it is Sunday'. What has been their fate now? There may have been many factors in their defeat but one of the factors was abdicating our foreign policy and in fact mortgaging it to the American interests.

I find it very unfortunate that in the Resolution which was passed, a word could not be added to say 'condemnation' of American occupation but the fact is that even the American people were against their own country's occupation of Iraq. They were against their own country's gross violation of human rights. The biggest example is of the events at the Abu Ghraib prison. What happened in Abu Ghraib prison shows clearly that the American forces are characterless. They do not believe in the Geneva Convention. They do not believe in any United Nations' Resolution. I can say very clearly that there are two countries which very grossly violate the United Nations' Charter and Resolutions. One is America and the other is Israel. They do not want to follow the United Nations' Resolutions. Whenever it suits them, they take a stand. The latest Resolution that has been

passed is not a partial victory for America. In fact, it is a setback for America. We cannot say that things have changed because of the latest Resolution. Things have not changed. It is a partial setback for America. America is slowly realising the fallacy of its occupation.

The hon. Minister of Petroleum and Natural Gas talked about the glorious past and how he lived in Iraq 25 years ago. He is not here but I would like to point out to this august House through you that Mr. Paul Bremer, the Administrator appointed by the United States, could not travel in a car to the Baghdad airport and so he had to leave by helicopter. This shows what is happening there. We cannot describe here what has been happening in the Abu Ghraib prison because it would be unparliamentary. We have seen American women soldiers laughing at naked bodies of Iraqi prisoners. We have seen how people have been killed there.

The recent report of the inquiry commission which went into the 9/11 attacks has clearly stated that the 9/11 attacks and Saddam Hussein had no relation whatsoever. I do not hold a brief for Saddam Hussein. It is a fact that Saddam Hussein was a tyrant. Saddam Hussein did kill Kurdish people; Saddam Hussein did kill the Shias; and Saddam Hussein grossly violated human rights. But again two wrongs do not make a right. If Saddam Hussein has to be tried, it is my opinion and the opinion of my Party that a trial on the lines of the Nuremberg Trials should be held. Let the International Court of Justice be seized of this matter as it is happening in the case of Milosevic of Yugoslavia. That can be done. Moreover, I would request the hon. Minister of External Affairs, through you, that the need of the hour is to revive the Non-Aligned Movement. We can have world peace only through Non-Aligned Movement. . (*Interruptions*)

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Please conclude.

SHRI ASADUDDIN OWASI : Sir, I am concluding with a few words.

Even in the NATO Conference, countries did not agree that command control should be given to America. I request the hon. Minister of External Affairs that in our Common Minimum Programme, which our Party is supporting, there is an urgent need, once again, for Non-Aligned Movement for world peace.

Lastly, I would like the hon. Minister for External Affairs to give a categorical assurance that we will not send our forces to Iraq. That is a puppet regime. We do not recognise that regime. I would like our country's stand to be very clear that India does not recognise a puppet regime that has been imposed by America.

श्री तरित बरण तोपदार (बैरकपुर): महोदय, इस प्रश्न का भी जवाब बाद में दे दीजिए। सब कुछ करने के बाद भी अस्त्र नहीं मिले। कुल मिलाकर कन्डैमनेशन के बारे में सरकार का स्टैंड क्या है?

THE MINISTER OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS (SHRI K. NATWAR SINGH): Sir, I have listened with very great respect and very great interest the discussion initiated by Shri P.K. Vasudevan Nair.

The Seventh Non-Aligned Summit was held in Delhi in March, 1983. Shrimati Indira Gandhi was the Chairperson and it was my honour to be the Secretary-General of the Seventh Non-Aligned Summit. So, I am aware of the Non-Aligned Movement, what it stood for, what it stands for and what it needs in the 21st Century. But we are not discussing the Non-Aligned Movement, we are discussing Iraq.

First, in the Resolution that was passed by the Security Council on the 8th of June, there were five permanent members. America, China, Russia, France and Britain, these five permanent members voted for it. The non-permanent members who voted for it are Germany, Pakistan, Spain, Angola, Chilly, Algeria, Romania, Philippines, Brazil and Benin. These countries represent a cross section of world opinion. The Resolution was welcomed by the international community and by us for the simple reason that the United States and the United Kingdom, who for all these months and years had been bypassing the United States Security Council and going unilaterally into Iraq, have come back to multilateralism. It is not an insignificant event. We have been successful in canvassing them. Although we are not in the Security Council, still our PR there has been emphasising along with our friends that the only course to go into Iraq is through the United States Security Council and that is now happening.

Now, a number of issues were raised. First I would like to say something about my young colleague Shri Omar Abdullah for whom I have very great affection and very great regard because, I think, he has a great future. One day, probably, he will end up doing the job I am doing now.

The Iraqi national oil companies own all the Iraqi assets. Our training is meant to increase this skill. Contracts for Block No. 8 near the most productive Romalia field was signed when Shri Omar Abdullah was in Government as a Minister of State. We intend to pursue this because energy security for us is paramount.

The other thing was the contract. We are not getting contracts for the simple reason that we are not supplying troops. Now, I have been hauled over the coals for what I am supposed to have said in Washington.

Now, Sir, you must have that much confidence in me that I have spent 51 years dealing with international affairs, that I understand the sources of the inspiration for India's foreign policy and the framework put through by Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, not in 1947, not even at the Haripura Congress in 1938 but in 1927 when he went to the Brussels Conference to represent the AICC there and from then he thought what would India's foreign policy be. So, I am brought up in that tradition. To expect me to make any compromise is to be grossly unjust to me and for the services that I have rendered to this country in good faith. The question of India sending the troops to Iraq does not arise.

How was the resolution of Parliament in the last Parliament passed? We did our best to have it passed in the Monsoon Session; with their dilly-dallying tactics, eventually we were able to pass it. I was spearheading the move for having a unanimous resolution condemning the war in Iraq and not sending any troops.

Now, here is the history of what happened. On May 27, 2003, the Indian Ambassador in Washington was called by Under Secretary of Defence Douglas Feith and asked for contribution of troops to the Stabilization Force in Iraq under US command. On May 28, 2003, the Defence Advisor to the Indian Mission in Washington was informed by the Office of US Joint Chief of Staff that Northern Sector in Iraq could be the responsibility of India. On May 28, 2003, the US Embassy in Delhi tells the Ministry of External Affairs (JS-USC) that CENTCOM was sending a delegation to four or five countries immediately (end of May) and could visit India to discuss the operational details of a possible Indian

contribution. The visit to India did not take place, as we could not give a response immediately. On June 3, 2003 Defence Secretary Ronald Rumsfeld writes to Raksha Mantri asking for a division size force.

Now what happened? On June 5, 2003 Shrimati Sonia Gandhi wrote to the hon. Prime Minister, Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee that 'we hear that your Government is considering sending troops to Iraq; this cannot be done unless all parties are consulted and unless there is a national consensus and that these troops will be under the U.N. flag'. It was then and then alone that a decision was taken to tell the Americans. When was it? On July 14, 2003 the Cabinet Committee on Security meeting decides that were there to be an explicit UN mandate for the purpose, the Government of India could consider the deployment of troops in Iraq.

This is the history of it. After this, we passed the unanimous resolution in both Houses of Parliament. The Congress Party can take a lot of credit and all of you can take a lot of credit that the resolution was passed in spite of the reluctance of the Government to do so. That is the background.

Let me come to what is happening now in Iraq. It has been mentioned several times about the trial of former President Saddam Hussein. Now, in the trial, at present the charges are being framed under the Iraqi criminal law dating from the days of the former President Saddam Hussein's regime. The trial judge was appointed under former President Saddam Hussein's regime. I am using the words 'former President' and I am not derogating him. I am taking his name. He is the former President.

The tribunal is yet to be formed and will be guided by international humanitarian law practiced in Iraqi national law with defence authorities involved. We will continue to monitor this development and keep the House informed.

Now, let me come to the substantial part of it. What does the resolution say? It was passed on the 8th of June. The roadmap for political transition in Iraq, as envisaged under the United Nations Security Council Resolution 1546, which I told you has been approved by five permanent members and 10 non-permanent members including Pakistan and Algeria, is as under. First, assumption of full responsibility/authority by the Interim Government of Iraq by 30th June, 2004. This happened on 28th of June. Two, end of occupation by June 30, 2004. It actually took place on June 28, 2004. Three, convening of National Conference expected to take place in July-August, 2004. Four, holding of direct democratic elections and formation of transitional National Assembly by 31st December, 2004 and in no case, later than 31st January, 2005. Fifth, formation of transitional Government. Sixth, drafting of permanent Constitution. Seventh, referendum and endorsement of the Constitution. Eighth, election for a Government under the Constitution by 31st December next year. This is the factual position. I have a copy of the resolution with me. It runs into several pages and goes into very great details about what is to happen.

Now, I want to place before the House that, as I said, nobody has asked us for troops. If asked too, the answer will be : India will not send troops. That should be made clear in black and white right here. It was never the intention. I was in America when I saw this whole thing on internet. The reaction to what I said battered me. So, I rang up Comrade Surjeet. At least, he must have that much confidence in me. I have been doing this for the last 50 years.

Now, there is a resolution of the Security Council for which we have been asking. We have been asking that the United States and the United Kingdom should not act unilaterally and should go through the multilateral route. This is happening and this is the first step. So, where does the question of our sending troops arise? There are today in the world 1.3 billion Muslims and 56 Muslim countries exist in United Nations. India has a record of having friendly relations with all these Islamic countries. We cannot, in any way, under-estimate the feelings of the Islamic world. I have served in Pakistan. So, I know something of it. I know something about the history of this movement. The psyche of the

Islamic world has been hurt from Mauritania to Medan in Indonesia. The world has to come to terms with it.

A reference was made here to the disintegration of the Soviet Union. It is a political earthquake, the consequences of which have yet not been fully analysed. The world has not come to terms with the absence of Soviet Union because with the disappearance of the Soviet Union, an alternative point of view from the world has disappeared and no replacement has taken place. It is a role that India, China, Russia and other friends can play and should play. This is the endeavour. This is what we have said in our Common Minimum Programme. This is what our policy is going to be.

Sir, to assume that any compromise will be made on an issue like sending troops to Iraq, to me, is inconceivable. If Members should have any doubt that this would be done, this is what distresses me. We are dealing with a very complicated situation. I am a member of a coalition Government. Whatever decision we have to take, we have to take our coalition partners with us, we have to take you with us, we have to take both Houses with us, we have to take the nation with us. This is the pride of India's Foreign policy, the framework for which was laid down by Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, which stands today.

The international agenda has changed. The problems 30 years ago were imperialism, apartheid and colonialism. Today, they are AIDS, terrorism, poverty, health, population control and financial matters. The international agenda has changed. So, we do not run a static or sterile Foreign Policy. We run a Foreign Policy which is responsive to the requirements, demands and aspirations of the people of the 21st Century.

Therefore, to say that the Non-Aligned Movement has become irrelevant is not true. Do not mix up Non-Aligned Movement with non-aligned. India was non-aligned from 1947 to 1961, when the Non-Aligned Movement was founded. So, when you say that we are departing, we are not departing from this. We are being realistic. As asked the other day, in Jakarta on my talks with Kasuri Saheb, whether you are optimistic or pessimistic, I said : "I do not talk in terms of pessimism or optimism." We have to be realistic about these things. We live in a complicated world, and this is a complicated situation. We are living in a situation where one super-power is the most powerful, but that super-power today has decided to go through the United Nations Security Council with unanimous support.

Now, Sir I will -- with the permission of the Chair -- read out a statement that I have prepared. I thought that it was my duty to answer the questions raised by the hon. Members. They are fully entitled to it. आपके जज्बात को मैं समझता हूँ, मगर हमारे हिंदुस्तान के वजीरे-खारेजा अगर सिर्फ जज्बात पर चलें तो चल ही नहीं सकता, क्योंकि मैं उस कुर्सी पर बैठा हूँ, जहां जवाहर लाल नेहरू बैठे थे। पता नहीं मैंने क्या अच्छा काम किया जो मैं यहाँ हूँ। Do not for a moment think that I will compromise on any issue relating to India.

The situation in Iraq has been evolving rapidly, and the last one month alone witnessed such significant developments as the formation of interim Government, the passage of Resolution 1546 by the UN Security Council, and the transfer of authority and sovereignty to the interim Government by the Coalition Provisional Authority (CPA). This was in accordance with Resolution 1546 and the dissolution of the CPA. The new Government of Iraq under an interim President, Prime Minister and the Council of Ministers took oath of office a week ago.

Now, we already have an Ambassador in Iraq. We have had an Ambassador in Iraq for the last two years, and other Embassies are being opened there and other countries are also going there.

The UN Secretary-General played a central role in the formation of this Government. A year and a half ago the UN Security Council was totally ignored, and they had to go back. Mr. Kofi Annan played a central role for the UN to have a role there. His Special Advisor Mr. Lakhdar Brahimi of Algeria was also a key player. Mr. Lakhdar was able to have a Conference on Afghanistan in Bonn and made it possible for the transition to take place. So, Mr. Lakhdar Brahimi, who comes from Algeria, was also deeply and daily involved in the process of the Resolution being adopted unanimously.

Resolution 1546 provides a timetable for the political process that will culminate in the establishment of a constitutionally elected Government by December, 2005. The United States and the United Kingdom are also signatories to this Resolution. There is no going back.

Resolution 1546 was passed unanimously by all the members -- permanent and non-permanent -- of Security Council endorsing the interim Government as a sovereign body and Iraqi people's right to freely determine their own political future and to exercise full authority and control over their financial and natural resources. The Resolution also provided for a Multinational Force in Iraq at the request of the interim Government. The mandate of the force will end up on the completion of the political process by December 31, 2005. Its mandate could end earlier if so requested by the Government of Iraq.

The unanimous Resolution passed by the two Houses of the Indian Parliament on April 8, 2003 continues to provide direction to our policy towards Iraq.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : Mr. Minister, please wait for a moment. If the House agrees I will extend the time of the House till the hon. Minister finishes his reply.

SEVERAL HON. MEMBERS : Yes, Sir.

SHRI K. NATWAR SINGH : Thank you, Sir.

18.00 hrs.

Within the framework of this Resolution, we always emphasised the need for an early restoration of sovereignty to the Iraqi people, the right of Iraqi people to freely determine their political future and control their natural resources and a vital role for UN in the transitional process and political and economic reconstruction of the country. It is in this spirit that we welcome the Security Council's Resolution 1546 as a first step towards transfer of authority to the Iraqi people. This is not an ordinary achievement considering the fact of what the world reality today is.

India is vitally interested in the peace and prosperity of the Gulf region. Lakhs and lakhs of Indians live in that part of the world. They are doing a great job and they are earning us a great name. विदेशी पूँजी हमारे यहाँ भेज रहे हैं। केरल की सारी इकोनॉमी उन पर निर्भर है। मैं 9-10 तारीख को केरल जा रहा हूँ। वहाँ कुछ परेशानी हो रही है। हमारा स्टैक इतना वाइडल है कि 24 घंटे इस पर तवज्जह दी जाती है।

A stable and peaceful Iraq is essential for the larger stability of the region and the world. India has close and friendly relations with the people of Iraq and is firmly committed to assist the people of Iraq in their humanitarian and reconstruction efforts. In my letter of 2nd June to Foreign Minister Hoshiyar Zibari of Iraq, I have reiterated our basic policy of assisting Iraqi people and our deep commitment to support efforts in this regard. That is the policy of this Government.

We have committed US 20 million dollars for assistance to the Iraqi people. As part of this assistance, we have arranged for distribution of milk powder to Iraqi children through the World Food Programme. We ran training courses in India for Iraqi diplomats at our Foreign Service Institute and Iraqi officials in information technology at the National Institute of Information Technology. We will be training Iraqi Oil Ministry officials in upstream and downstream units in India and nominations from Iraq are awaited. We have conveyed our interest to Iraq in fully rehabilitating a hospital and providing

specialised medical facilities at the holy city of Najaf, should the security situation permit. We have offered our support and experience to the political process in the development of the Constitution, electoral process, census and vote registration because nobody has the kind of experience that the Election Commission of India has in running elections on this vast scale -- there is no parallel in history -- for a democracy of one billion people. We are breaking new ground and we would like to share our experience with the people of Iraq. We have offered assistance in human resource development in priority areas of power, transport and communications, pharmaceuticals, education, water and sanitation, information technology and development of small and medium enterprises. The offer was made at the International Donor Conference in Abu Dhabi in February this year and reiterated in Doha Conference in May. Iraq has appreciated the gesture and has already availed of our facilities in information technology for training of their officials. With Iraqi Ministries becoming totally free of control of the Coalition Provincial Authority on 28th June, we anticipate a higher level of interactions in this regard. We intend to pursue the matter in accordance with Iraqi requirements. In response to Iraq's request, we have resumed provision of 30 annual scholarships for Iraqi nominees in higher education and doctoral degrees and the ITEC Programme of the Ministry of External Affairs is open to the Iraqi trainees.

We participated in the International Donors Conference on Iraq held in Madrid in October 2003 and pledged an amount of US 10 million dollars to the two Iraqi Trust Funds set up by the UN Development Group and the World Bank respectively for reconstruction of Iraq. As members of the Iraq Donors Committee, we have participated actively in its meetings in Abu Dhabi and Doha. India is the only non-oil developing country to become a member of Iraqi Donor Committee which is expected to help in supervising Iraq's economic reconstruction.

I would like to reiterate that the question of sending Indian troops to Iraq does not arise. The unanimous resolution of this august House passed on 8th April, 2003 continues to guide the position of the Government. We took into

account a number of relevant factors such as ground realities, development of political process, role of the UN, public perception in Iraq and of Iraq's neighbours, national sentiment in India and capacity to spare our troops for Iraq. Accordingly, we have decided not to consider any troop deployment in Iraq. This will continue. I must clarify that India has not been approached recently for deployment of troops in Iraq.

The Government also share the concern expressed at Indians working in Iraq. There are: in Baghdad 580, in Basra 98, in Falluja 190, in Tikrit 533, in Najaf 88, in Karbala 76, in Al Hilla 166, in Al-Quds 100, in Baquba 140, in Al Nasiriya 67, in Mosul 353, in Balad 51. Some Indian ex-servicemen recruited by private agents went to Iraq reportedly for work on static watch and ward duties. In addition, a number of Indians have been misled by unscrupulous recruiting agents and found their way unwittingly into Iraq for employment. Our enquiries indicate that none of them are in the direct employment of the Coalition Forces. As per our information, all of them are employed in non-combat and civilian jobs. They are employed by private contractors who have been hired by the US Government for rendering various support services such as maintenance of buildings, laundry, kitchen and dining facilities and watch and ward civilian duties at their bases in Iraq. We have given clear instructions to our Missions in the Gulf countries, and particularly in Iraq and its neighbours, to extend all possible assistance to them to return to India. Emigration clearance for Iraq is now suspended. This will continue. The suspension of emigration clearance applies to ex-servicemen also not only in respect of Iraq but also for Iraq's neighbouring countries Kuwait, Jordan and UAE in order to prevent misuse of emigration clearance to these countries for entering Iraq.

I would like to refer to the Press reports about the 18 Indians recruited - Dr. Karunanidhi wrote to me about this and I have replied to him, and I will just share this within the House - by a private firm ostensibly for employment in Jordan, but diverted to Iraq and placed at a US facility near Falluja from where they wanted to return to India. Ten of them left Iraq on 2nd July and the remaining eight left Iraq yesterday. We are advised by our Embassy in Baghdad

that all the 18 Indians stranded in Falluja have left Iraq. I would like to clarify that Indians working in Iraq are spread through the length and breadth of the country. Given the prevailing situation, it may not be possible for them to reach out to our Embassy in Baghdad for assistance. The Embassy in Baghdad has been instructed to establish contacts to the maximum extent possible with the Indians located in various parts of Iraq so that other cases of Indians wanting to return to India are handled expeditiously. Our Missions in Iraq's neighbouring countries have been asked to establish contact with the employers who may have sent their Indian workers to Iraq on service contract with a view to ensure their safety and well being and return to India.

We are extremely concerned at the violation of the sanctity of religious places in Iraq that are revered by millions and millions of people all over the world including India. We emphasised the imperative need to respect the sanctity of places and for all concerned to refrain from any activity that would cause damage or desecrate the places of worship.

We share also the concern at the abuse of Iraqi prisoners by elements in the Coalition Forces particularly the inmates of the Abu Ghraib Jail. There can be no condoning of such heinous acts. The US Senate Armed Forces Committee has condemned the brutalities and indecent acts perpetrated by the US soldiers. Like the rest of the world, the Government considers the ill treatment or abuse of Iraqi prisoners abhorrent. We have noted the regret expressed at the highest level by the USA and UK and the intentions of their Governments to take corrective and punitive steps through their military, administrative and legal system to prevent recurrence of such inexcusable practices. These violate human rights and humane behaviour.

In concluding I would like to reiterate that the relations between the peoples of India and Iraq have been historical and close. We look forward to their assuming full and real sovereignty over their destiny as early as possible. We hope that it will inform the evolution of the political process underway so as to meet the aspirations of the Iraqi people as a whole. We have conveyed our good wishes to the Interim Government of Iraq in its task of addressing the urgent

issues of security and stability so that relief and reconstruction can proceed apace with the political timetable. India will continue to extend the fullest assistance to the economic and political reconstruction of Iraq.

I appreciate and value this timely discussion and debate today in this House and I thank all the hon. Members.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Thank you.

Now, the House stands adjourned to meet again tomorrow at 11.00 a.m.

18.11 hrs.

*The Lok Sabha then adjourned till Eleven of the Clock
on Wednesday, July 7, 2004/Asadha 16, 1926 (Saka).*
