

[Shri Dharam Pal Singh Malik]

Minister, Rao Birendra Singh had said that he had not come across any such instance. But I can give instances of this type and such things take place in every *mandi* every day that the middlemen purchase wheat after getting it rejected by the F. C. I. and the following day they sell that wheat in the market in collusion with the F. C. I. employees. In this way, the profit which should have accrued to the farmer in the real sense, is taken away by the middlemen. The farmer is greatly disappointed and he loses faith in the Government. Government say that they have fixed the prices for procurement of wheat and rice. But the real benefit thereof does not reach the farmers. My submission is that proper arrangements should be made for procurement from the farmers all his commodities meant for marketing and inspectors and other honest officials should be deputed for checking so that the farmers are not exploited and they get full price of their produce.

Then, I would also like to submit that the prices of the agricultural implements should be reduced.

MR. SPEAKER : Now you may conclude.

SHRI DHARAM PAL SINGH MALIK : With these words, I support the Demands for Grants and conclude.

DR. G. S. RAJHANS (Jhanjharpur) : It is my misfortune that my turn always comes in the last.

MR. SPEAKER : If you roll the order paper, then first and last would be joined.

DR. G.S. RAJHANS : I wanted to say many things, but what to say now ?

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE : If you remain on your legs today, you will be on your legs till tomorrow.

MR. SPEAKER : Hear what the Members sitting near the door are saying.

DR. G. S RAJHANS : What I mean

is that you have written in the first paragraph of this Report that :

[English]

“The major thrust of the Government policy has continued to be on increased production and improvement in the management of supplies of various essential commodities. Accordingly several measures were taken to increase production, improve availability, strengthen supply management and keep in check the prices of essential commodities.”

[Translation]

I want to say that all this is incorrect. It is an irony that the prices given to the agriculturists in our country are not equal to the prices of even their inputs. When the consumer purchases those commodities he is badly affected by high prices.

Whatever you may say in your Report, the fact is that on the one hand the farmers are suffering because they are not getting cost price of their produce and on the other hand, consumers are being crushed due to spiralling prices. You have stated in this Report that it is a matter of great happiness that wholesale prices are coming down. May be wholesale prices are coming down, but are the prices paid by the consumers in the market are guided by the wholesale prices ? You say that the prices of the commodities have fallen, but when I go to the market I have to make purchases on higher prices. How can I say that the prices have come down? One should paint a realistic picture and should try to go deep in the matter.

16.00 hrs.

DISCUSSION RE : RECENT BOMBING OF TRIPOLI AND BENGHAZI BY US AIRCRAFT

[English]

MR. SPEAKER : Now we take up discussion under Rule 193.

Prof. Madhu Dandavate.
Before Professor Sahib starts, I would like to request that the House is unanimous in its opinion. We have to have two hours. So, keep within bounds so that we can finish within two hours.

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA : Are we going to have a resolution, Sir ?

MR. SPEAKER : As you like. If you can just prepare a common resolution, I shall be happy.....

(Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER : I am at your disposal, Sir, as your servant, your most obedient servant. No problem. Just discuss among yourselves. Whatever the House decides...

(Interruptions)

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE : Yes, we can adopt a resolution.

AN HON. MEMBER : All the time like this.

MR. SPEAKER : All the time like this. Never dissenting. Wavering mind is no mind. I never waver. What I decide, I decide.

PROF. MADHU DANAVATE : Can we go on to Libya, Sir ?

MR. SPEAKER : Yes, we can start, and let them also know about our stand...

(Interruptions)

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE : Dr. Krishi Ratna Speaker, Sir. I rise to raise the.....*(Interruptions)*

PROF. K. K. TEWARY : What did you say ?

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE : He has been given the Award 'Krishi Ratna' today. That is given not by me but by some well-known organisation.

PROF. K.K. TEWARY : Which organisation. ?

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE : Not by Tewery.

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE : Sir, I rise to initiate discussion on the statement made by the hon. Minister for External Affairs on the bombing on Libya by United States' Forces. There are occasions in the life of Parliament when the entire House in one voice voices the voice of the nation. I think this is that occasion. And permit me to say that the sentiments that I will express in the House today will not divide the House, they will unite the House and tell the Americans about the united voice of the nation through the sovereign Parliament of this country.

We are committed to the concept of non-alignment which is the accepted national goal of our country on the international plane. Permit me to say, at the very outset, that our concept of non-alignment is neither neutrality nor neutralism. It essentially means the freedom of our country to judge every international event on its merits and try to adopt an international posture and policy on the basis of our accepted principles of anti-imperialism, anti-colonialism, anti-racism, peace and freedom of nations. And if our House the other day condemned America's aggression on Libya, it is only in consonance with these accepted principles which have been accepted by the entire nation and, therefore, we have condemned United States' aggression on Libya.

This particular act of aggression is not to be conceived as an isolated act but that particular action has violated number of important concepts and institutions which occupy very important and pivotal position in the international affairs. It is not only a bomb that is dropped on Libya ; by bombing Libya, there have been a number of violations. The international law stands violated, the sanctity of United Nations' Charter stands violated, U.N. Constitution stands violated and the basic principle of non-alignment and non-intervention stands violated, Now, more important than even the physical attack on the country, the attack on this important, sacred principles, is a great violation

by the United States of America and that it why, no matter whatever be the ideologies of the nations concerned, there has been a world-wide condemnation of this particular act of aggression by the United States.

The other day our friend Shri Indrajit Gupta prepared a Memorandum that is to be sent to President Reagan through the United States Embassy in Delhi. When actually the Draft was prepared, he had used the word naked aggression. Some friends said : You drop the word naked. I concede. You drop the word naked. But even if you cloak the aggression, aggression continues to be an aggression. And therefore this particular act of aggression by United States of America is one of the most heinous steps that the United States has taken.

There is one more aspect which I would like to refer through you to the House. It is not only a small State that has committed an act of aggression, Sir, there are nations and nations. Unfortunately, there is an international caste system in the United Nations also. There are some countries which enjoy veto ; there are the so-called big powers and the small nations. There are some nations which are occupying a permanent membership of the Security Council. And United States is privileged to have that position of permanent membership of the Security Council. And even with that sense of responsibility, they acted in the most irresponsible manner. And therefore this aggression becomes all the more condemnable because a permanent member of the Security Council has indulged in this act of aggression.

The nature of the operations involved in the aggression has been very well brought about in the statement brought out by the Minister for External Affairs. Lot of aspects of this aggression are very important. In this aggression and bombing they have used two aircraft carriers; they have used sixteen warships; they have used couple of nuclear submarines; they have used Eighteen FB 111 Bombers from the US base in U.K.—that is most important—together with aircraft from the Naval Task Force.

At the same time let us take note of the fact that they had to have this round-about journey. Thank God, countries like France and Spain did not agree to give the overflight facility. And that is the reason why they had to take a circuitous route. This aggression is nothing else but an international political blackmail. But Americans, must be told that whatever is your capacity to blackmail small nations, so long as international public opinion stands by the side of Libya, even the nuclear bombs and atom bombs will not be able to destroy the sovereignty of Libya. That is the warning that is to be registered through the debate in this House,

Sir, international morality is at stake. There are so many ironies and so many contradictions. Sir, if you steal a small thing you are supposed to be a thief. If you try to indulge defiantly in capture of a big property you are supposed to be a robber. If you just try to send your army across the border you are supposed to be indulging in border skirmishes. If you drop a bomb on a small territory you are supposed to be an aggressor. If you go on bombing lands after lands like a lightning and capture those countries, you are supposed to be a world conqueror. If you send your army to other countries, mouthing radical slogans then you are supposed to be liberator. Now, these are unfortunately the ironies and contradictions of international morality and we have today witnessed one more illustration of this irony of this international morality. What is the *raison d'être* of this particular aggression by the Americans? What is their justification? Sir, we are told that this bombing is nothing but the retaliation to the acts of terrorism committed in connivance of those who are ruling Libya. That is what we are told. Sir, isolated terrorist acts, no matter howsoever despicable they are, are they to be replied to by international terrorism? That is the basic question that Americans will have to reply, and this question which is being posed to America, if they do not reply to this question in a rational way, probably they will meet the same fate, because their hands are not very clean, as far as acts of terrorism are concerned.

Sir, can the world forget the history of terrorism, the history of *coup d'etats*, the history of destabilisation of small countries, the history of political murders that are engineered through agencies like the CIA? And they might have forgotten them, but for our information, they themselves have put them on a record and the CIA's records are available to all concerned. Is it not a fact that in this game of destabilisation, there was a toppling of the regime of Dr. Mossedeq's in Iran in 1953? They might have forgotten, but we have not. And what about Salvador Allendes in Chile—1973? And, Sir, even in recent times Reagan has recently extended aid openly to bring about the fall of MPLA Government in Angola and again of the Frelimo Government in Mozambique. These are the recent occurrences. So, it does not sound well in their mouth to talk in terms of destabilisation and terrorism. They are the people who are at this game. They are not only at this game, but they are schools for terrorism and in the schools of terrorism they are given an international perspective to the acts of terrorism. People are trained, I do not know whether they are given post graduate degrees, but we are the recipients of such post-graduate degree-holders of terrorism in our own country, and we have seen what havoc that played. And those who are trained in the schools of terrorism across our border, whenever acts of terrorism in places like Punjab and elsewhere take place, some of them take a tall credit that they are the people who have been trained and they take responsibility for some of the heinous acts. Now, what is this if not terrorism? And is it not these forces, which are responsible for spreading this terrorism in the international plane? And therefore, if we cannot justify terrorism being replied with the help of arms, for instance, if our Government and our Prime Minister gets the information that some persons who have been trained in terrorism across the borders of Pakistan are indulging in terrorism in Punjab, will our country be justified in throwing bombs across the border on the land of Pakistan? Sir, I am glad that we have not resorted to those adventurous games. But if they could justify terrorism in some night clubs, where some Americans were there in Berlin, and that too at the night club at

Discotheque, if they are killed at the hands of the terrorists is it the right path to reply to terrorism with the help of bombing of the innocent people in that country? So, this is not at all justified. More than that, I would like, through you, to draw the attention of this House to the economic and political roots of this aggression. To my mind that analysis is more important than merely the physical fact that bombs were dropped and naval forces were used.

When there was a monarchical regime in Libya, U.S. had excellent relations with Libya, there was no problem. In these times the United States had a military base in Libya. The U.S. oil companies had extensive operations in the Libyan oil industry. When *coup d'etat* took place under Gadaffi on 1st of September, 1969, U.S. was ordered to evacuate the military bases. That was really the point where they were disturbed. When they were asked and when they were told that you must evacuate the military bases in Libya, they were disturbed. Libyan measures to increase the Libyan participation in the oil companies affected the American oil companies. So, when their financial interests, industrial interests and economic interests were disturbed. America was disturbed about this fact. Libyan leaders opposed the U.S.A. efforts for Arab-Israel agreement ignoring the Palestinian issue. U.S. was antagonised by the Soviet arms aid to Libya. They can give arms aid to anyone. But if anyone gives arms aid, any economic or financial assistance to others, then that is supposed to be a motivated act. Naturally, they are disturbed by the feeling of jealousy. Reagan has tightened economic sanctions against Libya and very often we forget this fact that as a part and parcel of the strategy of the United States to apply the economic sanctions to Libya, they tried to freeze her assets in the United States. This is the fact of history and U.S. offered arms aid to all those countries which are inimical to Libya and as a result of that, they tried to ensure the presence of naval forces in the Mediterranean and tried to disturb the entire atmosphere of Mediterranean. Just as we Indians want the Indian Ocean to remain an ocean of peace or zone of peace, in the context of the present existing tensions, it is extremely necessary that the

[Prof. Madhu Dandavate]

tension in the Mediterranean is totally defused and Mediterranean continues to be a zone of peace. But the interests of Americans were to see that the Mediterranean does not become a zone of peace, but becomes a zone of naval blackmail. Therefore, they have played a strategy in that direction.

Against the economic and political background, we must try to understand why the aggressive postures were taken. What was the attitude of various nations to the U.S. aggression and its design? A 21-member Arab League had announced as early as 13th April, 1986, support to Libya in the event of U.S. aggression. They had anticipated that the culmination of economic sanctions, the culmination of arms aid to the countries which are inimical to Libya will one day ultimately result into an open hot war against Libya and therefore; 21-member Arab League had already announced on 13th April, 1986 that in the event of aggression by the United States on Libya, they will stand by Libya. Syria and Iran had already pledged their support to Libya. Libya was trying to enlist—very interesting—Saudi Arabia to act as a mediator though they did not succeed. But they have made that effort. European allies of U.S. were also not very happy about the aggressive designs of the United States of America and they had already cautioned and a warning of restraint was given to the United States because every European country realises that if the zone of tension increases, it will increase at the cost of the national interest of all these countries of Europe.

Initially, even Margaret Thatcher, hard-boiled Conservative lady had refused U.S. airforce base. But later on, she went back from her original designs and already the Minister has admitted that in the present aggression, U.K. allowed the U.S. base in U.K. to be operated and to be utilised, to assist the aggression on Libya. West Berlin leaders had opposed the economic sanctions or military attack as antidote to international terrorism. They had also warned the U.S.

Sir, I welcome the Soviet proposal that

all naval forces be withdrawn from the Mediterranean sea so that tension is defused.

At the time when the world is talking in terms of disarmament, I think, this is the correct posture that the Soviet Union took that let us try to see that all these naval forces are withdrawn from the Mediterranean and that becomes the zone of peace. These are the backgrounds which are very important. That shows how isolated the United States stands today.

Government and people are different things. I want to remind this House through you that on the question of Vietnam war, America stood on a criminal approach and attitude. But lakhs and lakhs of common men in United States of America demonstrated in the streets of Chicago, Washington and New York against the policy of United States of America regarding the Vietnam war. That spectacle we saw. Everywhere we saw the spectacle and even today, when Mrs. Thatcher is supporting these aggressive postures in the House of Commons, the Members of the Opposition party, the Members of the Labour Party and Members of other small groups, are stoutly opposing the posture that Mrs. Thatcher has taken. Why UK? Even in the land of America which indulged in aggression, even in the Congress itself, there is a split and there are sections which are opposing the aggressive designs that have been adopted by Reagan. That must be taken note of.

Today we are having a situation in which we can be on the brink of a nuclear holocaust. But I do not take the alarmist view that nuclear holocaust is going to take place. It is not because that America does not desire it or big powers do not desire it. You may recall on the occasion, while initiating a debate on non-alignment policy in this House, I had pointed out to the House that even on the question of nuclear weapons and disarmament, I have adopted altogether a different stand in the context of the proliferation of nuclear weapons. When actually the Belgrade Conference was held—that is the first non-aligned Summit—and recently

there have been new dimensions. There has been a considerable proliferation of nuclear weapons. Originally, there were only 5,000 nuclear weapons in the world and now when we have 15,000 nuclear weapons, qualitatively and quantitatively the entire picture has changed. Nuclear capability of big powers has changed and today the question is that out of such small wars and small aggressions, will the nuclear holocaust take place and is America going to destroy the world. There is only one deterrent. If America alone were to be the monopolist of war, and of all these nuclear weapons, probably the situation would have been different. But the nuclear capabilities of the two big powers, Soviet Russia and America, are matching nuclear capabilities and, as a result of that, Mr. Reagan knows it very well that in a push button civilisation, he can just push the button and bring the entire world on the brink of a nuclear war. But when the nuclear holocaust or nuclear war takes place, in the modern context, who wins and who loses is immaterial. The victors and those who are completely destroyed and the vanquished become irrelevant as far as civilisation is concerned, because the intensity of the nuclear war and its destructive potential and power will be so strong that who wins and who loses will be irrelevant. Those who win will also lose and those who are vanquished will also lose and the entire human civilisation will be on the brink of destruction and all the gains of the industrial civilisation will be destroyed even in the countries that win the nuclear war. That being the situation, Americans are today frightened that there is a matching capability. That is the problem before India and, therefore, in the strange atmosphere of today, United States stands totally isolated. And when it stands totally isolated, we are having discussion not only for the sake of satisfaction, not as a ritual that we have done our duty and we have expressed our sympathy for the people in Libya. We have met here and we have discussions here just 24 hours when the war has taken place, in order to tell the world that this sovereign country, India, is totally behind Libya and we are not going to tolerate the aggression by United States on a small country like Libya.

In doing this, we are only standing by

the heritage which we have preserved for years to come. This is the land of Gandhi where we have maintained some heritage and still we are maintaining that heritage.

Shall I end with one particular reference? This country under the dynamic leadership of Gandhi in 1942 gave a clarion call 'Quit India' to the British. Remember that clarion call "Quit India". Let this sovereign Parliament tell the Americans on the model of "Quit India" and the slogan of this Parliament to the Americans will be "Mr. Reagan, quit Libya." Let that be the slogan of this sovereign Parliament and that will ring in the ears of the world and that will assure that a country like India, Gandhi's India, India that has stood against every aggression, even to-day stands against the American aggression and true to our traditions and heritage we stand by the tiny country of Libya which is defending its freedom, and which is defending its sovereignty.

MR. SPEAKER : "Quit the Mediterranean", "Quit the Indian Ocean."

SHRI G. G. SWELL (Shillong) : On this occasion I feel my first duty is to congratulate the Prime Minister. Yesterday, soon after the events in Libya were known, even before the Foreign Minister came to the House with the statement, the Prime Minister had issued a statement in his capacity as Prime Minister, as Leader of this House and as Chairman of the Non-aligned Movement condemning American aggression on Libya in no uncertain terms.

We take this opportunity to fully support the stand taken by the Prime Minister and we are happy to note that the Co-ordination Bureau of the Non-aligned countries which coincidentally is in session in Delhi has also yesterday endorsed the statement made by the Prime Minister. Therefore, this country and this House have not failed in its duty in keeping with its best traditions.

One might argue whether after what the Prime Minister has said, there is any more need for us to say anything here.

[Shri G. G. Swell]

But, of course, I think there is a necessity to add to the voices around to the world condemning American aggression. It is necessary that the American administration, not the American people, should have a earful from us also. We condemn this blatant act of aggression by America on Libya which we consider a totally unreasonable, a totally indefensible, a totally condemnable...

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE :
Totally reprehensible.

SHRI G. G. SWELL : Totally reprehensible—I thank you—and may I add totally seatological act.

MR. SPEAKER : Any other adjective ?

SHRI G. G. SWELL : No other person than a fellow American, a scholar diplomat who was an Ambassador to this country, John Kenneth Galbraith, has, in one of his articles published in the *New York Times* described President Reagan as a man who has not yet got over his juvenile illusion and obsessions with the Stage. He still thinks that the world is a stage and he is an actor, swash-buckling horseman riding to the wild west to clobber the Indians.

AN HON. MEMBER : With a smoking gun.

PROF. G. G. SWELL : Yes, with a smoking gun.

Sir, What President Reagan has done to Libya is nothing new. It is new only in the sense that the act had taken place in a very sensitive and in a very crucial part of the world which can easily ignite a nuclear holocaust, as my hon. friend Prof. Dandavate said. He had done this in Grenada. The American troops had invaded Grenada. He is trying to do that by surrogate in Nicaragua to destabilise the elected Government of the people of Nicaragua through the rebels funded and armed by President Reagan. And

what he has done in Libya is in pursuit of this kind of act what they call 'New American Macho.' If President Reagan today tries to justify his action because certain terrorists have been in Libya or certain acts of terrorism have taken place somewhere in the world and in the mind of President Reagan these terrorists had been inspired by Col. Gaddafi, I would say, who are those terrorists who are being trained on American soil under the American Law. Whether it is Frank Camper school or any other terrorist school, what are those terrorist schools for ? They are to teach the people to go to other parts of the world and commit terrorism. And people from our country also have been trained in these schools, in order to come and commit aggression and to commit terrorism in India. There has been a demand in this House that these schools of terrorism in America should be declared illegal and banned. And the reply of the American Government is that under the law, they could not do it. Well, these are the dirty tricks of the Administration of America. There are certain things which the Government of America cannot do openly and overtly. It wants to do covertly and these terrorists have been trained there for the purpose of destabilising other countries. It was argued that because, certain terrorist acts had taken place in West Berlin and it has been alleged that it has been done under the inspiration of Col. Gaddafi, therefore, this aggression was launched. With the same argument, we might say that so many terrorists are being trained in America and the Americans have accepted it as legal, America should also be bombed. Col. Gaddafi at least has said that he has no terrorist school in his soil that he has nothing to do with the terrorists. But here the Americans agree that there are schools for terrorism and it is an open secret that the people of Grenada have been submerged; the people of Nicaragua are sought to be submerged. Many other such things have taken place in the world under the inspiration of America. The only difference here is that President Reagan seems to think that he has power to do things with impunity. He has horses today and a lot of horses: they are the F. 111, they are the aircraft carriers, they are the nuclear submarines. Because

Libya is a small, little country, that cannot fight for itself; although it is trying to fight very bravely, it cannot—against the superior armoury of the United States.

Sir, you must have read in the papers that the Americans have started saying that much of the damage that has taken place in Tripoli and Benghazi was on account of the missiles fired by the Libyans towards the American aircraft but which the Americans had jammed through their electronic gadgets and these missiles had fallen back into Benghazi and Tripoli. We do not know really what had happened. It is quite difficult to say. This is a new kind and technological warfare. Just because President Reagan has this kind of weapons, he can go around in the world and do everything that he wants.

It is good that at this moment the world is united in condemning the American action. America has never stood so totally isolated as it is standing today. As far as we can know, only two other countries have supported the action of the United States.

SHRI S. JAIPAL REDDY (Mahbubnagar) : Two other Governments.

SHRI G. G. SWELL : Yes, two other Governments—because yesterday in the House of Commons also there was a great opposition, a great protest, against Mrs. Margaret Thatcher.

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE : The Opposition is always sensible.

SHRI G.G. SWELL : Only two other Governments in the world—the Government of the United Kingdom and the Government of Canada—as far as we know. No other Government has supported the action of President Reagan. This itself should be a condemnation of President Reagan. And we in this country are not surprised. Where are the Indian terrorists being trained? We had a debate here last year about the danger to the life of our Prime Minister when he was to visit the United States because of the terrorists being trained in America. We know that most of the terrorists who are

from India or are of Indian origin have been given shelter and have been getting training in these countries. Today one of the main problems, one of the bones that we are picking up with the Government of the United Kingdom, is over its harbouring the terrorists, who are from India or are of Indian origin, in the United Kingdom, and, therefore, we are not surprised.

It is a pity that the American people have a man like President Reagan as the President of the United States. It is a pity that the world has a man like President Reagan as the President of the United States, one of the wealthiest and the strongest countries in the world because he is a limited man; his daily reading fare or rather his monthly reading fare does not go beyond the *Readers Digest*; he is a man who does not seem to know his own mind. There was nothing more revealing about the personality of this man than last year while he was air-borne from Washington to Geneva to meet the Secretary-General of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, Mr. Gorbachov. While he was actually air-borne, his Secretary of Defence leaked out a letter from him to the press warning President Reagan not to give way on strategic defence initiative or on strategic arms limitation. That sort of a thing is inconceivable. It is inconceivable in our country that, when the Prime Minister will be away to attend an important international conference, one of the Ministers will leak out a letter to the press warning the Prime Minister about certain things. Do you think that that is ever possible?

(Interruptions)

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE : He will then lose his job and head also.

SHRI G.G. SWELL : And yet when President Reagan was asked as to what he was going to do to Mr. Weinberger, the Defence Secretary, whether he was going to dismiss him, his answer was: "Hell; No".

MR. SPEAKER : Is it "Weinberger" or "War-berger" ?

SHRI S. JAIPAL REDDY : That keeps on changing.

SHRI G.G. SWELL : "Wine and burgher".

SHRI S. JAIPAL REDDY : I thought you are also referring to hamburger !

SHRI G.G. SWELL : Still going strong as one of the strong men of the American administration. Then Sir, while in Geneva his Major Domo, the Chief of Security Mr. Donald Reagan ridiculed all the women there including Mrs. Reagan herself and Mrs. Gorbachev saying that these women did not understand about all these talks of nuclear wars and nuclear weapons, they are throw-weights and the rest of it all. He said that and yet when he came back to the United States, Mr. Donald Reagan became a more powerful person and he saw to the departure of another Cabinet Minister in the United States of America. It is a pity.

What I would like to say through this House is, if it is possible to reach to the people of America, whether this is the kind of position in which they would like their country to be placed. By virtue of everything, by virtue of its wealth and other things America has been one of the leaders of the world. It is a permanent member of the Security Council. It is its duty to see that this kind of things do not happen anywhere. Here that country is behaving like a sulking teenager withdrawing from the UNESCO because it does not have its ways in the UNESCO; withdrawing from the ILO because it does not have its ways in the ILO, withdrawing from the International Court of Justice because it does not have its ways there and now trying to have its way in the United Nations by withdrawing 20% of its contribution and setting that international organisation in which the hopes of the world are pinned into a kind of a tailspin.

Is this the kind of picture that they would like to present themselves to the world? I think the time has come—our voice here may be only so many words—the world should stand up and when the whole world stands up, the American people will understand the folly of their

actions and may the time come when they all will overthrow a man like Mr. Reagan at the helm of their affairs.

MR. SPEAKER : Shri Ananda Gajapathi Raju. Please keep in mind the time factor.

SHRI ANANDA GAJAPATHI RAJU (Bobbili) : Mr. Speaker Sir, the attack of the American fleet on Libya is definitely a dastardly act to be condemned by all and we also join in this. The attack, in my opinion, is something more than just organised terrorism.

Today, the United States feels that they are isolated, isolated only because of their own action in threatening sovereign people of other nations and also in threatening the developing countries. We find that way back in 1971 when Bangladesh was formed, at that time the American 7th Fleet came down the Bay of Bengal to threaten the Indian Government.

What President Reagan has attempted now is also the same gun boat diplomacy which in our opinion and in the opinion of this House is outdated and something which is a relic of the past. The bombing of Tripoli and Benghazi is definitely an act of aggression. In this sense I would like to mention that the cold war has again started with the chillier atmosphere than perhaps what existed in the fifties. The action of the American President is totally unilateral and also infringes upon certain agreements which were to be arrived by the two super-powers, namely, SALT II. The strategic arms limitation talks have come to a standstill. America went ahead with a nuclear test before this and has brought out its contention to fight against the wind-mills and this is what they are doing today.

You find that they are trying to encircle the whole world. The Indian Ocean is being increasingly militarised. So also other parts of the world—the Pacific and the Atlantic. What is more they are trying to create an ultra-rightist movement in their favour which will bind the white world against the have-nots.

In this connection, I would also like to mention that these acts of aggression cannot go unnoticed, and these acts of

aggression will definitely mean a personal problem to the American nation. It is not the American people whom we are condemning but the American Government who has taken such an immature stand. Every time the Soviets are blamed for having militarised the area; for having provided arms but in a greater sense it is the United States which is escalating the arms movement and they are responsible for having increased tensions in different parts of the world. They are against any kind of democratic government. They are more for dictatorship.

At this juncture, I would like to mention that before Eisenhower left the Presidency in 1960 he spoke about the emergence of a military industrial complex, and this military industrial complex is what is ruling the roost in the United States. They are not interested in the development of the third world. The World Bank is going to be shortly staffed by a former Congressman, who is conservative in his outlook. Other organisations, like UNESCO and UNICEF, which help the developing world, have been denied American participation. The replenishment of IDA is also something which they are not very happy about. The increase in international liquidity that we asked for was also denied. So there is an all round confrontation between the developed countries and the developing countries. The developed countries go to the extent of saying that it is not their responsibility to feed the rest of the developing world. That is something where they must change their stand because we are not asking them to feed us. We are asking them to give us equal opportunity. So there is need for a change in the attitude of American Government and if it does not come to that level, then definitely, the NAM—its relevance—will come to the forefront and all that Libya was asking for is: "Don't enter a bay which was formed by us." They had drawn a line and said "don't enter this, otherwise, it would be an act of aggression". But the Americans themselves, who had fixed the 250-mile Economic Zone on the Eastern and Western coasts of their country unilaterally way back in 1974-75, drew a line and said "it is our Economic Zone". When they could draw a line, why can't the Libyans

draw a line, saying that this is also an area which we consider as vulnerable and which should not be militarised. So, it is my humble submission to the House perhaps without any preparation, but because of the mood of the House and because of the mood of the people of this country, we go all out in condemning such an action, a unilateral action taken by the United States of America, as a permanent Member of the Security Council, in attacking a developing country, which also has a lot to do with the Third World.

16.51 hrs.

[MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER *in the chair*]

In this connection, let me add just one more point, namely, about Oil. Today, the Western World is deriving a lot of benefit due to reduction in the price of oil. Though they say that they want to prop up the price a little bit through some measure, they are probably interested in keeping it low for geo-political reasons and, therefore, it is in my opinion an attack on the Third World. It is an attack on what the Third World stands for; it is an attack on the Conference at Belgrade; it is an attack on the Non Aligned Movement; it is an attack on independent thinking of the Third World countries and, therefore, we, in our humble right, are ready to face any might because we stand for certain cherished principles that have been propagated by Mahatma Gandhi and when we stand on such solid ground, there is nothing that anybody can do to destabilise us.

SHRI R. S. SPARROW (Jullundur): Mr Deputy-Speaker, Sir, America attacks Libya. Globally speaking, this is the most dangerous situation that everybody has been put into and whatever may be the consequences, we all may have to face and fight. I will bring before you, Sir, and the House four factors cogent to this particular incident. The first factor pertains to the overloading of weapons of all types the world over. Mr. Dandavate had mentioned slightly about this. But this is something which is very serious. Everybody has started playing so very fondly with the modern weapons of war which are a very very dangerous type and

[Shri R. S. Sparrow]

some people started handling with restrained power and some simply can't do so. This is where America stands condemned today. We understand what power they hold, and what the world has all types of nuclear weapons, ICBMs, medium range MXs and so many others with different people commanding, controlling, establishing them for deployment in the types of war they expect may come. The people have gone a little more further in this particular factor—laser ray, bacteriological, chemical weaponry and all types of weapons galore. Is somebody going to start a tinder box into some kind of a mess? This is one way which Ronald Reagan has done today. He has no business to go that far. As one of my colleague has quite rightly pointed out, America is the Member of the Security Council of the United Nations Organisation. Push button nuclear warfare is not going to help anybody. If one studies that subject in depth, one can easily understand that. I do not want to elaborate on that. But this is one of the factors which one has to watch. What can be the effect of the holocaust if it comes to that? Therefore, this is one premise which all of us have to understand.

My next factor comes to the American role and this needs a little explaining. It has two faces. The first one is that America accuses Mohammad Gaddafi that he is promoting, boosting, aiding and abetting terrorists. May I remind the House as also the American administration what has been the role of American administration in particular in promoting this particular cult? Nicaragua, Grenada, Guetemela, El-Salvador, Honduras, stretching from Central American States down to South American States upto Chile, everywhere it is the same performance with bagfuls of money and weapons. Who does not know that? Is this the way to treat the world and put Monroe doctrine upside down? Is this what the American people want? I doubt it. The administration is not handling itself correctly. It is not good trying to be a cowboy of a type, which does not apply today. The steel muscles are entirely different from horse muscles.

Everybody knows Jack Camper's school of training terrorists; it is an open secret. Everybody knows about it. It has ramifications and its tentacles have started working all round, close to us also, Kahuta and other places. Everybody knows it. What is their contribution? And they accuse somebody else for terrorists activities. This is not correct. The boot is in the wrong foot.

The second aspect is about their performance as a country, particularly the administration. Time and again, they have let the people of America down, let the world down on various counts. It is not the first time, American Administration's dealings with her one time friends do not go in consonance with the general American peoples basic character. American people are free born, free speaking, proud, brash, vigorous and are formed from out of practically all adventuresome races on earth. These are American people at large. But how does the administration behave? When a friendly country is in difficulty, without any reason, they jilt and leave it high and dry; it may be North Korea, South Korea, Vietnam, Vietcong, Cambodia, Congo, Katanga, Nigeria, Biafra, Uganda, Ethopia, Iran for that matter, Afghanistan for that matter and any other country for that matter. What is the philosophy of your foreign affairs? Are you working for the

17 hours.

progress of the world at large? Is this the way to behave? Is this the way to show your muscles around? This is down-right wrong from any point of view.

Now I give you my third factor. There is a resplendent show of one beautiful thing; which is like a silver lining amidst the dark clouds obtaining globally at the moment as the situation so reflects. What is that? Our hon. Prime Minister and the Foreign Minister and our Government and this House, have condemned without any reservation the action of America vis-a-vis Mummar Gaddafi. This is something about which one should be very proud. The Prime Minister has taken initiative and the Prime Minister and the

Foreign Minister have condemned the American action not only in this House but in the NAM's Ministerial Level Meeting as well. Without any reservation, we have condemned the action of America. A right thing is a right thing and we have to face it in that manner down to earth. Why should we be frightened of anybody? We stand on our two solid legs. And we are self-reliant. The initiative taken by our hon. Prime Minister is really beautifully shining and it reminds of something...

[Translation]

If you listen to it, perhaps you would like it.

*Kohetoo Ka Jalva har bar nahin hota,
Har roj hasion Ka deedar Nahin hota.*

[English]

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE :
We did not follow it. But it is beautiful!

SHRI R. S. SPARROW : It is only on very rare occasions such type of beautiful action is taken by somebody. Here is our Prime Minister. Here is this House. With absolutely single-minded attention, we have made up our minds in one direction. I am very glad to say that today the Prime Minister has given the right direction to move and we are all moving together in that direction. And this is something fantastic.

My last factor pertains to something which we must take as a lesson. This is nearer home. I am going to talk about South Asia. Mostly it concerns us because these bigwigs always keep their battle fields and war arenas away from themselves. So you watch your front also very carefully. In that context, I want to refer to South Asia. Why should the South Asian comity of countries work like surrogates to others? This is my humble opinion and I am passing it on. Nepal, Bhutan, India, Pakistan, Burma, Bangla Desh, Srilanka, Afghanistan--we all have suffered at the hands of alien powers. Have not we? We all have our common heritage and ethnically and historically we are a

very close-knit people. We have amongst us sufficient know-how and ability in all respects to promote our commerce, our economy and our mutual all-round progress. We can ensure each other's independence as equal partners of the South Asian bloc. If there are any differences among us, we can also sort them out mutually, through good will on a bilateral basis.

There is no reason as to why the South Asian countries cannot form a common Defence Plan in respect of this geo-strategically important region. This action is bound to contribute considerably to bring about peace, amity and stability in the comity of World Nations. This way South Asian Bloc will act as a big-time deterrent against any militantly aggressive bloc. If there could be NATO, SEATO, CENTO and so on why can't there be South Asiato. So we have to work together and this is also one way of thinking within the periphery of this type of conglomeration of nuclear war. Thank you very much for giving me this time and I thank the House for that. I fully endorse and I am with you Mr. Dandavate in what you have moved. Every word of what the Prime Minister and what you have said as also other spokesmen, we all have to work together and prove to the world that this is one nation which stands firm on to hind-quarters and fight anything that is on.

SHRI SAIFUDDIN CHOWDHARY (Katwa) : Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, this discussion is very appropriate & it reflects the feelings of the people of our country. I appreciate the way in which the NAM Ministerial Meeting was held to discuss this. They also reacted to this situation. I appreciate the Prime Minister for his reaction to this situation. All the political parties are one in condemning this aggression & yesterday many people had demonstrated before the U.S. Embassy to express our feelings about this dastardly act. Today also, we all together are going to tell Mr. Reagan that Indian people are totally opposed to the kind of act that they had committed, not only Sir, we progressive people & those who are anti-imperialistic, but we see even their allies, they are also

[Shri Saifuddin Chowdhary]

opposing. This aggression was committed not only by defying public opinion world wide, but also ignoring their supporters viz European Economic Community. We had seen that as has been mentioned earlier that their planes are taking a detour of 2800 miles because France, Spain & Portugal did not allow them to fly over their territory. These are very good signs. May be for that French embassy in Tripoli was also hit. But, I must say that the role of Mrs. Thatcher is very deplorable. We saw two days ago in paper that U.K. is not going to allow its bases to be used to attack Libya. Sir Hypocrisy is there. From these basis, originated U. S. war planes those attacked Libya.

Mrs. Thatcher, is known as the iron lady. But, Sir, we also know the iron melts but it requires appropriate temperature. And that temper has to be built through world public opinion. They think that they cannot molest public opinion like this. This kind of arrogance may lead to very serious consequences world wide.

Now, the way the attack has been done to take revenge or what they call terrorism, they attacked the Presidential Palace injuring two sons of President Gaddafi killing one adopted daughter. Mr. Reagan has no experience what it means when a son is injured or the daughter is killed. Never in history was American land bombed; nor was the White House. They think that it is in their power; they can have wars elsewhere, and not in their own country.

We hear so much about the Libyan Suicide Squads, and terrorism aided by Libya, But what happened to it? In retaliation against the U. S. action in Libya, we have no report that their suicide squads have gone to the White House. to bomb it. These are all ill-founded.

U.S.A. is talking about tackling terrorism. Why can't they bomb Khalistan's presidential palace which is there in their own land? What about Contras? We all know about this; I am not going into it. What are they doing with the Unita leader in Angola? They are patronising

Samviba, the counter-revolutionary leader. They are bringing him to their country, giving him reception. And what does this man do, with his organization? They are trying to destabilize the popular, legal Government of Angola. Everywhere, this is the picture.

I must say that at the root of terrorism, U. S. A. is there. When they try to pin down Gaddafi with charges of terrorism, we have to look at the cases closely. We have seen the Malta incident, when one Egyptian plane was hijacked. It is a mystery that the hijackers did not make any political demand. They demanded re-fuelling; and what happened to that? The Commandos were sent to destroy the plane, to kill the passengers. Everything was destroyed; and the information is that three U.S. officials were also there in the plane that was carrying the Commandos. The report came later on. The charge USA had made was that in the Grand Hotel at Tripoli, in room No. 401, this conspiracy to hijack this plane was hatched. But what was found? It was found that room was long occupied by the President of the African Lawyers Association, who went there to attend a meeting against Apartheid.

Now about Rome and Vienna. Nobody has been able to give any proof of Libya's involvement on the airport attack. The spokesmen of the Italian and Australian governments said that they could not blame Libya. We know that four days before the attack, the spokesman of USA's State Department, Charles Redman threatened to take action against Libya. When the journalist asked: "When are you going to attack Libya, he did not mention any date, so this is a long-planned act not an immediate reaction. Terrorism is an *arbiti*. Even about the West Berlin incident, the West German Government said that they could not say that there was the hand of Libya. There is no proof. For argument's sake if we take it that there was the hand of Libya, then where should the issue be taken? There is the United Nations; and USA is the member of the Security Council. Even if it is true that Libya has a hand, what right does

USA have to attack & molest that country? They do not have any right. Otherwise, they may charge any country of giving some kind of aid to terrorism, and they may then attack that country, which will be an attack on its sovereignty.

Now about the Gulf of Sidra. It is nowhere near the coast of USA. It is situated thousands of miles away from USA. It is contiguous to Libya. What is the role of USA? USA has not ratified the Sea Convention. If they say that it is an international waterway, they should have taken the case to the World Court. How can USA itself decide things? They are violating every rule. I am not going into the details of how they are really at the root of terrorism.

We have to understand the savage Israeli attack on the headquarters of PLO. If that happens and as a reaction some people take to terrorism, I do not support that. But then we have the duty to see, this organised state terrorism against the countries and the people. When we condemn terrorism, that are also restrained, they are also curbed. But after the attack on PLO headquarters, Egyptian plane was hijacked. In reaction to that, what USA did? They forcefully landed one Egyptian airliner which was carrying surrendered hijackers. This is the kind of flexing of muscles going on. I am not going backward more. But the root can be traced again in the denial of homeland to Palestinians. What is the history? The USA is trying to inflame regionalism in that area, to have the domination on that area. They want to keep alive the conflict in that area, in the Middle East; and that is their long-drawn policy; this is the policy of global gangsterism, I must say.

Now, we have been told, Mr. Gaddafi has told so many times, that Libya has no hand in terrorism. But he categorically says that Libya is a centre of international resistance against imperialism, colonialism, reaction and racism in all its forms; and he is right and legitimate to say that; and that is the heart-burning of USA. Then what is the USA policy? A former US Secretary of State says. "There

is a good cause to describe Middle East region as an operating laboratory for military political experiments". That is what they do. Then Brezinski—one time aide of Carter described it—arc of instability comprising 19 countries of Asia and Africa. Now, we can see they tried different ways to have their stooge government, to have different kind of cooperation, council, who will act as the stooge of USA imperialism. But when they are being failed, they are trying to prop up the conflict in this area.

One Damascus Paper—*Tishrin*—says, "The desire of Washington and Tel Aviv is to prevent at all costs the Arabs from joining forces and taking counter measures against increased American penetration in the region." The attack on Libya is not an isolated incident. Sovereign countries are in danger, more particularly the whole Arab world is in danger.

Now, what has been disclosed about Syria? Heritage Foundation, which feeds Mr. Reagan with ideology, they have said; that "Washington has few carrots it can extend to ASSADS Syria. It must rely on sticks." That is the kind of policy that they are taking.

Ahmed Dearhan of Syrian Baath party said, "Threats against Libya are part of a wider imperialist design. We could also be made the target for one thing, because the US and Israel fear that efforts towards peace in Lebanon could lay the ground work for the creation of an anti-imperialist front in the eastern mediterranean." Now, that is the position. They want to have this conflict there in order to intervene in this area, permanent conflict; and the theory that they are giving is that if you do not disturb the European Zone, then you can have conflict elsewhere; that won't lead to nuclear conflict. That is a very wrong theory and that is a dangerous theory. Any conflict anywhere of this nature can lead to nuclear conflict and can bring the world to disaster. With this, I want to refer to two things which are closely connected with one happenings in Libya. Despite world wide protest and despite unilateral moratorium of USSR, USA conducted their nuclear test and through

[Shri Saifuddin Chowdhary]

that they have pushed the world to the brink of disaster. Some days ago, the U.S. Warships violated the waters of USSR in Crimea. All these are done according to design, they are testing, experimenting. These are fraught with dangerous consequences. Let us see what kind of provocations the USA is giving. Calling the name of President, Mr. Reagan, President of that country, big country, where they have a big heritage of democratic struggle, what did he say about Gaddafi? He said, 'He is a **from the Middle-East. [Interruptions] That is unbecoming.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : That will not go on record.

SHRI SAIFUDDIN CHOWDHARY : Gaddafi replied, 'He is a third rate actor'.

SHRI S. JAIPAL REDDY : He is only quoting.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : He may have said it. He would have said it. But we do not want it to go into our record.

SHRI S. JAIPAL REDDY : He is only quoting.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : I cannot decide like that. I cannot allow it.

PROF. K. K. TEWARY : This is what Mr. Reagan has said.

(Interruptions)

Mr. Deputy-Speaker, I am on a point of order. The Head of State has used a certain expression. The hon. Member is using that expression within quotation. I do not find what is the objection to the use of the expression used by the President of U.S.A.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : Today, a Head of State, somebody has quoted and

again this kind of thing somebody may say. It is unparliamentary. We cannot allow it. Somebody may quote that some people had used it.

(Interruptions)

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : When the word is unparliamentary, how can you allow this kind of thing to go into the record ?

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE : Let it go on record. Or, you can say.**

(Interruptions)

SHRI SAIFUDDIN CHOWDHARY
He is suggesting.**

Anyway, I am not going into the first rate or second rate...(Interruptions)

I want to quote another thing that appeared in the *Times of India* yesterday; President Reagan's Budget Director, David Stockman said which appeared in his book :

"The triumph of policies—why the Reagan Revolution failed."

He said, "The President might be getting a little...**" Mr Reagan, the President of such a super power getting.**

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE : He is only quoting. Quotation should be retained, Sir.

SHRI SAIFUDDIN CHOWDHARY : I quote :

About the White House team, he said :

"No serious legislative experience or wisdom. Most of them had no comprehension of the numbers. Moving down the political resistance was the sole purpose of the Reagan Revolution."

This is what he has said. (*Interruptions*) And we have now to—from this House—we may appeal to the Arab countries. First of all, they have to close their ranks. They should not waste their energy infightings, and they should unitedly fight this challenge. This challenge, it cannot be minimised by saying Libyan leaders aided terrorism. That is nothing but a design.

Secondly, I want to mention that the NAM has reacted quickly and promptly but it has a duty also. The USA had imposed economic sanctions against Libya. (*Interruptions*) But, ideally, if all the countries in the world come together and they also declare a kind of economic sanctions, against the U.S.A., where will they go? In Latin America this kind of feeling has come. I believe, if we pursue this, and close our ranks we will be able to stop these people from doing this kind of incidents which may endanger our country also some day.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : Prof. Tewary. You may also keep in mind the time factor.

PROF. K. K. TEWARY : Time factor is important.

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA : How many people have spoken in one and a half hours? Only four of five have spoken.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : The initiator is given more time. The others can take five minutes or so.

PROF. K. K. TEWARY (Buxar) : We are proud of our Prime Minister and the Government and this House that in conformity with our glorious tradition of fighting and resisting imperialistic aggression and racial arrogance, this country has again risen as one man in exposing imperialist blackmail, naked aggression against Libya by the United States of America. What this act of brigandry, this act of state terrorism brings to our mind is the question of peace and international security. It is not a

matter that we can dismiss out of hand by quoting a few examples of American excesses here and there. We have to take into account the total perspective, the role of imperialism which is fast de—generating into predatory fascism. I would like to speak a few words about the President of the United States of America. How Mr. Reagan, about whom so much has been said by my friends, is described by his own countrymen and the awesome enormous power that a person of his mental state wields and the threat that he poses to the survival of humanity. This is what has been said about Mr. Reagan :

“He only works three to four hours a day. He does not do his home work. He does not read his briefing papers.”

The last sentence is most significant.

“It is sinful that this man is the President of the United States.”

This statement has been made by no less a person than the Speaker of the House of Representatives, Mr. P. O. Neill Jr. The activities of Mr. Reagan all over the world reveal the mind of the man. To me he is a**

SHRI S. JAIPAL REDDY ; This should not go on record.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER ; It will not go on record.

SHRI S. JAIPAL REDDY : Mr. Tewary is capable of importing an element of controversy into an issue on which there is no controversy,

PROF. K. K. TEWARY : If you want to defend Mr. Reagan you can do it. But I am not importing any element of controversy in this debate.

**Not recorded.

[Prof. K. K. Tewary]

Therefore, what has happened in Libya is utterly outrageous. We have shown this tremendous unity in the House in condemning it. But we should also take into account other things which are happening. This is just a symptom of a whole imperialist system going amok. What Mr. Reagan and his friends are doing in the White House is to re-affirm the policy of imperialism. After the success of NAM and the long struggle of countries which were held in chain over centuries by colonial powers, they have realised that the powers to shape the world according to their dreams, strategies and system, are crumbling. Therefore, a new strategy, a new doctrine is being propagated and that doctrine is the doctrine of intervention. The U.S. and the Western allies of U.S. have been planning it. And I can tell the House that out of about 78 interventions since 1947, United States of America has intervened about 60 times in different parts of the world. In this manner, what we see today is that a super power, armed to the teeth with lethal weapons of destruction, of catastrophe, is on a warpath. The reasons have been mentioned why Libya was attacked. Libya was being harassed since 1981. Attempts were made by CIA to assassinate Gaddafi to bring about internal destabilisation so that America gets a friendly regime in Libya. And when we look at this incident, we should also try to understand the global significance, the global importance of controlling the Mediterranean. Reference has been made to the act of terrorism. America has retaliated because they suspect that Gaddafi and his regime have been propping up terrorists all over the world against Americans and their Western allies, but this act itself constitutes the most indefensible act of State terrorism and America has been responsible for growing terrorism all over the world. In Israel, the Zionists' terror, the State terrorism unleashed by Zionist regime in Israel against the helpless patriots of Palestine and other Arabs, the regime of apartheid in South Africa, that racial outlaw that rules over South Africa and the way people are being butchered, being subjected to genocidal terror there, we cannot forget

the role of America in these areas.

We have been recipients, as it has been said, of the growing American threat to the stability of the Third World because Mr. Reagan and his Advisers are not prepared to accept, as they call, 'Third World trade unionism', that is, Third World countries are organising themselves into trade unions against the so-called globally vital interests of America and America's allies. Therefore, when we look at the entire picture, we have to condemn this in strongest terms. And we cannot forget, as a country how can we forget in America that Hardgrave? This again is something very revealing and which has been repeated in this House. I have been repeating almost in every speech. The Americans who profess to love democracy and who are so much bothered and agitated about terrorism, their State Department organised that study. That Hardgrave Report was prepared at the instance of the State Department of America about the likely picture of India in case Madam Gandhi was assassinated. This was done by American Government. At the behest of American Government it was done. Can't we draw our own conclusions that Americans wanted India to be destabilised, Americans wanted India to be dismembered, Americans wanted India to lose its freedom and independence and, therefore, a plan was underway, a conspiracy was hatched to remove Madam Gandhi from the scene? After that we have had reports of conspiracies being hatched in United States of America, in Canada, in Britain against our Prime Minister when he was visiting United States of America. A number of people were arrested. Even now almost every day reports are appearing that conspiracies are being hatched there; and terrorists are being trained there. And whenever we bring this to the notice of this House or whenever Government of India takes up this matter with these countries the stock argument given is that their laws do not empower the Government to close down such schools and to bring to book such persons who are operating against different countries from their soil. London and Washington have become the centres of such terrorist activities and terrorism is being exported on a large scale from these

two centres. Therefore, if we start arguing like this, or any country for that matter—not only India—starts arguing like this, saying, from your soil a threat is emanating and we are entitled to take such measures as aggression or attack, then they say, international laws will be violated. And in this case, Sir, I can say—and I am sure you will agree with me—that America poses a serious threat. The President of America, Mr. Reagan, is not the person who respects international law. He is not the person who respects international morality. American authorities have been doing their best not only to subdue countries which do not fall in line, which do not subscribe to their world view. They have also been trying their best to subvert all international organisations and institutions which have held the world together and which have so far guaranteed peace in the world and security of mankind. In this situation, we must remember the role of Imperialism and the role especially of American power. American power is out to destabilise the international system and their plans of de-stabilisation and intervention simultaneously has been prepared through their network of bases all over the world. Today it is Libya. Tomorrow it may be any other country; it may be India. We cannot forget that only recently the Sixth Fleet of America had come up to Karachi. It was there in our neighbourhood. We cannot also forget that at the time of Bangladesh war, Nixon went to the extent of contemplating nuclear attack on India. We cannot forget that. So this interventionistic syndrome is symptomatic of growing imperialist aggression which is growing space and we have to take notice of it.

Sir, it is a good and welcome sign that people all over the world who respect sanity in international relations, who respect international law, who respect international institutions, have condemned this naked aggression of America. I am sure that public opinion at large in the world will be mobilised to isolate American aggression and the design of America and ultimately the ugly plans which are being hatched by Americans and America's allies like Britain and Canada will be exposed.

These 3 countries constitute the greatest danger to the developing world because, in all the 3 countries, terrorists are being trained and we have been the victims of this. Mr. Deputy Speaker, you have warned me by ringing the bell, that I must take my seat.

Therefore, Sir, in conclusion I can say that this attack on Libya is just the beginning of aggression by America and this aggression is going to affect all peace-loving and all developing countries of the world. Therefore, the time has come when our country should take the leadership, as we have taken in this House, to call upon developing countries and the Third World, and the progressive people of the world to come together and launch a world-wide campaign for isolating America and to stop or to nip in the bud the tendencies which are growing and which will ultimately threaten the very existence of humanity and the world.

With these words, Sir, I support the notice and every word that Prof. Dandavate has said. At least for once I find myself in agreement with Prof. Dandavate.

(Interruptions)

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : He may do it many times.

SHRI S. JAIPAL REDDY : Prof. Dandavate is not feeling comfortable.

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE : I am feeling comfortable. Let there be many such occasions, not aggression.

PROF. K. K. TEWARY : Therefore, this whole House expresses its concern and its solidarity with the people of Libya and all those countries which today feel threatened by American imperialism and its allies.

SHRI P. KOLANDAIVELU (Gobichettipalayam) : Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, first of all, I have to congratulate the

[Shri P. Kolandaivelu]

the honourable Prime Minister and the Foreign Affairs Minister for having readily made a statement condemning the U.S. military attack on Libya. And I am also very thankful to the honourable Opposition Leaders, for they have spoken at length with regard to the military attack on Libya.

Sir, on behalf of All India Anna DMK, I condemn the attack made by the U.S. on Libya. Actually, the history of the last two decades shows that the State terrorism does not curb but breeds greater terrorism. The U.S. military attack on Libya is an outrageous act of International illegality and Reagan is taking the part of a belligerent confrontationist. Actually Reagan seems to possess Rampo spirit, but we have to remind Mr. Reagan that the world is not a Hollywood fantasy because Mr. Reagan says that Col. Gaddafi is on the wrong path. But supposing Col Gaddafi is guilty of any offence, he can take this matter to the United Nations and he can expose him and isolate him before the United Nations. But actually Reagan is following the role of the jungle. What he says is, 'might is right'. But this is not the world where Reagan can say like this and follow the rule of the jungle. And this incident shows that there is a prolonged acrimony between Libya and the United States. The chronology of major incidents show that from 1979 up to this date, so many incidents happend between Libya and the United States. So, I condemn the aggression committed by the United States and I also condemn the terrorist acts by United States against Libya. Actually the United States want to be a dictator of the world. But I can say boldly that when our young honourable Prime Minister is here to curb all terrorism, they cannot be a dictator. This country is not at all for the terrorist activities. I strongly condemn the military action taken by the United States against Libya.

SHRI EDUARDO FALEIRO (Mormugao) : Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, the aggression of United States against Libya has evoked absolute and calculated condemnation of all peace loving people of

the world and has very serious and grave implications not merely for Libya but for all the small developing countries of the world, for their peace and for their security.

Last month, the attack was a naval attack and the ground was that Libya had encroached on the international water in the Gulf of Sidri. The Gulf of Sidri water has been claimed as its territorial water by Libya as early as 1973. The United States of America, a permanent member of the Security Council, without having recourse to Security Council or any other institution of the United Nations, without having recourse to the International Court of justices, in utter disregard of all norms of international law, took to attack the Libyan forces in the Gulf of Sidri, last March. They did not succeed. Because they did not succeed, yesterday they did their air attack on Tripoli and Bengvzi and some other areas. I say here that this attack was timed in a pre-meditated manner just on the eye of the Non-Aligned Summit to show deliberate contempt of the Non-Aligned Movement, to show disregard for all our countries, to show that they care nothing for our opinion, for our deliberations. It is because, at this meet of the Ministerial meeting of the Non-Aligned Foreign Ministers, both the questions—the questions of international terrorism of which the United States accused Libya, as well as the Libyan question itself—were to be discussed. It was therefore, the attack was so timed in such a manner as a contempt would be shown for the Non-Aligned countries, for their deliberations and for their opinion at large.

As has been said here, it is claimed now on this attack that Col. Gadaffi was indulging in terrorism. I hold no brief for Col. Gadaffi and most of these Members hold no brief for Col. Gadaffi. But the United States Administration has definitely miscalculated, if they thought that because Col. Gadaffi was not one of the most popular leaders in the world, the public opinion would not shift against them. The public opinion of the world, including that of the United States, excluding that of Britain—about

which I have a word or two to say—has condemned this action and, therefore, today the United States Government of Mr Reagan stands in that notorious club of South Africa, and Israel as one of the countries for State terrorism. It is because what is it that United States has done—It has terrorised the people of Libya a people with 5 millions population. One of the small countries in the world is being terrorised by a most powerful nation on the face of the earth. The reason is simple. The United States, the Reagan Administration has now considered the whole earth to be their fiefdom and the ocean just to be their private place. This is the position.

When we condemn the United States, let us not forget and I beg this House that you should also condemn the British Government of Mrs. Thatcher, the Conservative Government of Mrs. Thatcher which, Sir, was the predecessor of Mr. Reagan in the imperialistic doctrine. The whole situation created today in the Middle East is the result of the imperialist practices, of the imperialist theories of divide and rule brought about by the British colonial times. It is not only in the question of Palestine, it is not only in the question of the middle East but the divide and rule philosophy has been throughout including in this subcontinent, and the results are now in the action of Col. Gaddafi and now in the action of Mr. Reagan. This is part of a wider doctrine, which is now known as the Reagan doctrine. It is not now very complex; it is rather simplistic, I should say. It is as simple as Reagan himself and having the potency of evil and danger and the doctrine makes it out that today we are in the brink of a situation, much more than ever been since the last world war. We find that the doctrine, as defined, is containment plus meaning thereby that whilst in the 50s in the post-war period the theory was that Communism must be contained and, therefore, we must intervene, now the Reagan theoreticians have gone a step further and they say that it is not enough to contain Communism. We must actively intervene to see and I quote here a Reagan law, to see that ideologically congenial regimes are established all over the world because only

ideologically congenial regimes assure American security. It means that if a particular Government—and this is point—if a particular Government in any part of the world and particularly in a developed world does not toe the line, then Americans will interfere. The purpose of the rapid deployment force under the Central Command which is in the Indian Ocean is not to confront the States. The purpose of the rapid deployment force is to put a threat, a military threat, to all the regimes in Indian Ocean itself that they will not abide, will not subserve, the American designs.

This is, as I said, just the beginning of a situation which is created. About 2,500 tanks of Israel are at this moment massed on the Golan Heights and it will be nobody's surprise if this attack on Libya is just a green signal for Israel to attack Syria. Today Libya, tomorrow Syria, the two major opponents of the Reagan Administration and American imperialistic designs in that area.

So, this is the position and we will not be surprised if soon Israel attacks Syria through the Golan Heights. The incursions on Lebanon are in the meanwhile continuing.

We have to be careful of the situation that is created. This is a situation, in whatever language it is clothed; it is the same situation, is the same attitude, which we have seen being followed and put forward by the Western powers in the 16th century, is the doctrine of world domination. What Americans are doing today is imperialism in its most cruel form, in all disregard of the so called human rights about which we talk so much of individuals and peoples of the developing countries and of the so called third world.

Now, in this context, there is really not much that we can do against the State terrorism—may I repeat it?—because the attack on Tripoli, for instance, was not against military installations alone. Civilian installations were attacked. Diplomatic Enclave was attacked. The French Embassy was hit. The Iranian Embassy was hit. Family members of Col. Gaddafi

[Shri Eduardo Faleiro]

were killed and, therefore, if this is not terrorism, then what it is.

All we can do in this context is to build opinion. We are talking about a resolution to be brought in this House. Let us talk as Members of Parliament to the Members of the American Senate. Let us talk to the Members of the House of Representatives because they are the representatives of the people of America and let us bring to their notice our feelings. Let us bring to their notice that there is another picture, which is a picture which is not presented by Mr. Reagan and his accoyids. Let us communicate with them in the interests of world peace and security.

It is also important that we must express moral support to the people in the Middle East to the Arab World. We have been saying here again and again that what is important today for the solution of the problems in that area is the question of Arab unity. The difficulty is that Arabs are disunited. And that is the belief of Mr. Reagan. The belief is precisely this that the Arabs are not supporting Col. Gaddafi and, therefore, he will have easy time in building opinion in that area. One good side of this reckless action has been that the entire Arab World alone and the other countries of the world have united themselves in unequivocally condemning the United States aggression. We must lend our moral support to the people of Libya and Syria and to those who are fighting this imperialism and to those who want to decide things for themselves and who do not want to be dominated by anybody, much less by those with imperialist, clear-cut designs, as the present Reagan Administration. There is an unfortunate side, a tragic side to this entire affair. That is the reports that are coming that Libya was made a testing ground of the latest weapons by the United States. F111 attacked Libya and F111 is one of the latest aircraft just next to the strategic bomber. It is an aircraft which is fully automated with electronic devices, with nuclear capabilities and which can hit even during the night any target without any

than 5 metres. These were used for the first time in Libya. Just for testing and Libya was a testing ground for their weapons and also to see what is the reaction of the Soviet Surface-to-air missiles SA-5. This is the way we are going.

All that one can say at this stage is that the regional understanding among the countries of the Third world must grow and movements such as SAARC must be strengthened. We must settle our differences and this is the only way in which all the countries of this region, all the countries of the third world will grow. Let us say so that we will not allow imperialism to prevail. The imperialists will not pass. The people of the world, the peace-loving people of the world, the people of developing countries will join together to remember their sufferings and will say that the domination and the oppression through which they went through will never repeat again. We will see to it.

SHRI BALWANT SINGH RAMOO-WALIA (Sangrur) : This august House is discussing a serious issue; that is the attack by US imperialists on the peace-loving people of Libya. My Party and myself express solidarity with all the members of the House and the views expressed yesterday by the hon. Prime Minister and the hon. Foreign Minister on the issue.

My Party derives light through the teachings of the great Guru, Guru Nanak Devji who taught us the philosophy of Live and Let Live. That is the philosophy of co-existence. This threat, this attack, these inhuman activities by the US is a serious threat to the ideology of co-existence and the philosophy of Live and Let Live. So I strongly condemn the attack by the US on Libya.

This aggression is the reflection of the policies of imperialism. Though imperialism is dying, though imperialism has been defeated throughout the world by the brave fighting forces of civil liberties, by the forces of independence and by the forces of liberation throughout the world, the United States yet want to dictate its

terms to the peace-loving people of the world at gun-point. It should not be allowed. Not a single person who has got some self-respect will allow such policies to go.

I am utterly surprised when the US says 'I have been compelled to adopt this measure because Libya is supporting terrorists. Libya is helping terrorists and Libya has sent certain terrorists to Berlin and certain solid proof is there.' But through you can I ask these people, can I ask the US, "Has it got any moral authority to speak?"

18.00 hrs.

Is not that country herself instigating terrorists to destabilise my country and my province? I fail to understand how America says that though every-day we have to defend in this way or that way because we have to defend the attack when it is made against a total community. I want to put my request before the House that let us be one in isolating the bad people. Let us isolate those who indulge in such bad activities. Now the U.S. says "We justify it to teach a lesson to those who instigate the terrorists indirectly." The U.S. is not only giving direct support in her country to the terrorists but also supporting and giving training to the terrorists. Tomorrow, if there is a strong voice in this country that let this country teach a lesson to that neighbouring country who is supporting the terrorists, then what will be the reaction of the U.S? It is a very serious matter. I strongly stand with the people of India, the hon. Members of this House in condemning the evil designs of the U.S.

SHRI BIPIN PAL DAS (Tezpur) :
Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, at the outset I congratulate the Prime Minister and the Government of India for the very bold stand they have taken on this issue. What the Americans have done undoubtedly is most outrageous, heinous and unpardonable crime. It is a naked aggression of the worst type that we have seen, not only an attack on Libya alone. Let us not misunderstand it. Let us not minimise it. It is not an attack on Libya alone. It is

an attack on the entire third world. It is an attack on the entire non-aligned movement. It is an attack on the U.N. system itself. It is an attack on international morality. Therefore, it is not a question that the American committed the aggression on Libya alone. We have to take a total picture of it, and the global designs of America. It is most shameful for a Super-power and a Member of the Security Council to attack such a small nation like Libya. And why? I shall come to that the U.S. has forgotten. They have to be reminded. They have forgotten the discomfiture and humiliation suffered in Vietnam, Cuba, Angola, Nicaragua and so on. Everywhere they have been humiliated. They will be humiliated again? Because of What? It is not the atom bomb or the nuclear bomb which ultimately triumphs or wins. It is the people's will to fight for freedom which exists in all honourable human beings, that alone wins the war. And that is why we have seen some shining examples in the recent history of the world. They should learn from their own experience that this determination of the people, the urge for freedom, however small the country may be, is much more powerful than all the weapons that the U.S. or any other country may possess. They have no excuse to justify this action that they have committed. Now, the question is what is the motivation? Why have they done it? In my opinion, we can think of three motivations. Firstly, they want to teach a lesson to Libya because Libya pushed them out financially and their capital. That insult they could not swallow, and they want to teach a lesson to Libya. The second one is, they want, by this kind of action, to intimidate, terrorise and brow-beat the entire third world, the Non-Aligned Movement, into submission, a meek submission. This is a very major cause and this must be taken note of very seriously. This is not a singular action, or an isolated action. By this action they give notice to everybody in the world, to all small nations, the entire third world and the Non-Aligned Movement: "Look, my dear boys; if you misbehave, we shall bomb your palace and buildings and also the civilian population". And that is what they have done. Thirdly, they want to re-establish the dominant position in

[Shri Bipin Pal Das]

the Mediterranean region. In that region, Col. Gaddafi happens to be a thorn in the flesh and, therefore, this man must be thrown out. The Americans have proved to be not only the leader of international terrorism but they have also proved to be the leader of international gangsterism....

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE :
The Reagan Administration.

SHRI BIPIN PAL DAS : By that I mean 'Reagan Administration'. When I say 'Americans', I mean the American Government, the American Administration; I do not mean the people.

They have said that they have done it because Libya became a seat of international terrorism. But who has appointed them as the international policemen? If there is any body to combat international terrorism, that is the UNO, the Security Council. Nobody has appointed America as the international policemen to deal with international terrorism in any part of the world. Who are they to talk about terrorism? As some hon. Members have said, when they have Schools recognised by law where terrorists are trained and these terrorists go all over the world, including this country, and create conditions of destabilisation, who are they to talk about terrorism on the part of Libya? They have absolutely no moral ground to talk about it. The UNO must take up this matter immediately and take the USA to task. In any case, it is the duty of the UNO to see that such aggressive actions are not repeated. If the UNO is to survive, they must assert here and now, by all means, whatever means possible, at their command.

The Non-Aligned Movement cannot sit idle. We are proud, we are very happy, that the Chairman of the Non-Aligned Movement has taken a very bold step and given a guide to the entire Movement. But that is not enough. It is for the entire Movement now, all the members of the Non-Aligned Movement, to see that nobody can go scotfree by attacking one of their members in this manner. Public opinion has to be created throughout the

world, including America, particularly in non-aligned countries and also in other countries, so that by force of public opinion such actions can be prevented.

I now come to the last point. We in India cannot take this incident as an isolated, distant incident. We must take a serious notice of this. Apart from theoretical considerations or analytical considerations, we have not forgotten what happened in 1971.

I know some details; but I have no time to tell the House or I can disclose anything. But everybody knows what happened when the 7th Fleet was advancing towards Chittagong. Today I remember Smt. Indira Gandhi, a great leader—not only a political leader, I call her a military leader also. Everybody was nervous. Mr. Somnath Chatterjee, I don't know whether you were here or not.

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE :
Yes, Yes.

SHRI BIPIN PAL DAS : Everybody was nervous and shaking in the Central Hall. I do not name them. All leaders, Congress, Opposition, everybody was nervous, when the 7th Fleet was advancing. But one person was sitting in this Parliament House, firm and determined knowing her mind quite well and that was Smt. Indira Gandhi.

May I refer to the proceedings of this House? I was not a Member here. When Members were shouting saying, what shall we do, what is the Government's policy, the 7th Fleet is coming, the world war is coming, what shall we do...

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE: Nobody was nervous.

SHRI BIPIN PAL DAS : Yes, I will turn out the proceedings of the Lok Sabha and I will show you what happened and what Mr. Raj Bahadur, the then Parliamentary affairs Minister had to say. Anyway, apart from that, it was the guidance...

SHRI S. JAIPAL REDDY : Concern is not the same as fear.

SHRI BIPIN PAL DAS : Why don't you accept a fact as a fact? I am not bringing politics here. I am speaking only facts.

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE : In your anxiety to describe someone as courageous, you need not consider the entire House as coward. That is all that I want to tell you.

SHRI BIPIN PAL DAS : I did not say coward. The entire House was worried. Everybody was worried about what was going to happen. I was worried, my party was worried.

I have now evidence at my disposal to show that she was the only person who was not worried. She did what she wanted to do on 16th December 1971 when Dhaka was captured and the 7th Fleet had to go back before reaching Chittagong. That is what happened.

Therefore, this incident is there for us as practical experience. What is happening in Libya today may happen to any other country tomorrow. Therefore, we cannot sit idle and be complacent.

Lastly, we are living in a dangerous world. We have to learn to live dangerously in a dangerous world. There is a saying that in a dangerous world you must learn to live dangerously. We cannot take any chance and we will have to prepare ourselves accordingly.

SHRI DINESH GOSWAMI (Guwahati) : Mr. Deputy Speaker Sir : While initiating this debate Mr. Dandavate pointed out that there are very rare occasions when this House, in spite of its differences in perceptions on various national and international situations, speaks in one voice as has been done today to condemn the dastardly attack on Libya.

I believe that there is another aspect and that is that this House has always been very careful while making observations against another Administration. We have been always cautious, we have been careful and we have always been restraint in expressing the collective views. But

never before have I come across such strong views being expressed by all sections of this House and by all the Members, as has been done today in this case. This adequately expresses the feeling of this House. Even though strongest words have been expressed, we feel that we have not expressed our views adequately because we are short of words.

We strongly condemn this aggression because, as has been pointed by a number of speakers earlier, the attack on Libya is not only an attack on the territorial integrity of Libya; but it is an attack on the non-aligned movement and it is a challenge to the peace loving people of the world. At a time when the world is virtually on a brink of precipice and at a time when the nuclear catastrophe may appear a reality on the horizon at any point of time this attack on Libya can be compared only to the act of a lunatic who plays with fire in thatched houses in a dusty and windy day.

And what are the pretexts? Earlier also the American administration intervened in number of countries but some sort of pretexts were made. What type of pretext has been advanced this time. It is that Libya has harboured or Col. Gaddafi has been instrumental in some terrorist activities in West Berlin and so forth. Even that is not shared by the allies of America. West Germany has doubted that statement. Dutch Government has not accepted this statement. So also France. They have not permitted the United States to use their territory for fuelling purpose or other purposes.

Sir, if this pretext is allowed to be a ground for attacking another country, then no country in this world will be safe, because any country can be attacked on this pretext; I mean that that country is harbouring terrorists or is instrumental to terrorist activities. As has been pointed out by Shri Ramoowalia, it is America which has been instrumental in aiding and abetting the terrorists across our borders. Of course, it is true that America has never been short of pretexts right from Vietnam to Chile, now Nicaragua & also in their aggression on front-line States of Africa. On one pretext or another

[Shri Dinesh Goswami]

the American administration is flouting the world opinion. Three grounds have been stated by the previous speaker for the aggression. May be there is the fourth ground also, namely, Presidential elections in America. Mr. Reagan himself may like to project himself to the American people as the cow boy hero in the type in which he acted during his filmy days. One can imagine the danger inherent in such a situation where one attacks another country to fulfil his own domestic political ends of winning an election in the presidential election which is only a few months away.

Sir, we strongly condemn Mrs. Thatcher for giving her support when France and other countries decided not to give their support. May we point out to Mrs. Thatcher that world public opinion and international public opinion be capable of throwing away mightiest leaders. When the bomb was thrown at Egypt Anthony Eden had to go because of international public opinion and today the situation that we see in Libya and Mediterranean is worse than the situation when the Egypt crisis was there.

Everybody in this House has condemned Reagan. No words can probably describe him. I am sure that if I am adequately to describe him then you will not permit those words to go into the record. But I do not think that it is only the individuality of Reagan that counts. It is the American administrations approach to the international problems in the last few decades has been in one particular direction. They do not want third world countries to grow and assert their independence and play their role in the international affairs. I believe in this context it is important that the third world countries, the non-aligned countries stand together as one. It is important today, Sir, when America is trying to weaken United Nations that we should see that all our efforts get directed to the need that United Nations is strengthened further to play its rightful role in the manner that we want. In fact, a point was made last time that

United States is talking of cutting down its contribution to United Nations. I think the Non-Aligned Nations should stand up and say today that if the United States of America cut their own contribution to the United Nations or to its different Bodies, then the Non-Aligned Nations of the Third World will make up that loss by their own contribution for the cause of the world peace. They should say "we will suffer in our domestic economy if necessity so arises."

Sir, the Ministerial Conference of the Non-Aligned Bureau has taken place at this crucial juncture and I am sure that the deliberations will help in easing the situation. As has been pointed out to us, in America, today, there is a very strong public opinion against the mad arms race. The Six-Nation gave a call for moratorium. The Soviet Union responded. The United States of America, unfortunately, did not respond. But they have virtually frustrated all the efforts of disarmament. If the voting pattern of the United Nations is of any indication, whenever the universal public opinion brought resolution for edisarmament, for doing away the mad arms race or stock piling of nuclear weapons or nuclear proliferation, it is the United State of America's vote which has gone against the universal public opinion. I believe that it is high time that this House must appeal to the people of America, which has the greatest democratic tradition, to divorce themselves from the decision, the policy decision, that has been taken by the Reagan Administration and raise their own voices against this diabolic and dastardly aggression of Administration, which may ultimately lead to the annihilation of the whole mankind and the world. I am sure that this call from our Parliament will have response from other Parliaments and peace-loving people, and in spite of the mighty power of the Reagan Administration, the Administration will perhaps collapse in the hands of the world public opinion. The mighty Reagan Administration shall have to bow down to the peace efforts of the people of the world.

SHRI SHARAD DIGHE (Bombay North Central) : Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, first of all, I congratulate the hon.

Members, Prof. Madhu Dandavate and Mr. Indrajit Gupta for having raised this discussion on the External Affairs Minister for statement regarding the bombing of Tripoli and Benghazi. I also heartily welcome the statement that was made by the External Affairs Minister on 15th April 1986, in which he has unequivocally condemned the aggression against the sovereignty and territorial integrity of Libya. He has also urged that no precipitative action should be taken. Further, he has stated that immediate steps should be taken to defuse the situation for international world peace. What is further significant is that, as far as the statement made by the Prime Minister as the Chairman of the Non-Aligned Movement, is concerned, a very significant addition has been made in the last sentence, that is, "The Non-Aligned Movement extends its firm support and solidarity to Libya at this critical hour". Now, this firm support and solidarity to Libya is also necessary at this critical hour.

Now, as I was saying, this attack is more serious because the bombing has been done of the Palace, the residential quarters also in which one of the members of Col. Gaddafi's family has been reported to have died. So, if I say that the real attempt in this bombing was also to murder Col. Gaddafi, then it may not be an exaggeration. I would also like to condemn the Great Britain equally as the United States of America because the Great Britain had not kept up its promise which was given by the Prime Minister of that country that they would not allow to use their airbase. If that promise had been kept and if no cooperation was extended to the United States, perhaps this bombing could have been avoided. Not only they cooperated, but it has also been fully justified by the Prime Minister of United Kingdom by saying that it was within their inherent right of self-defence. In this situation, even the United Kingdom also deserves to be condemned as far as this incident is concerned.

The Reagan administration has also become so arrogant that while justifying this bombing President Reagan has said "We have done, we had to do, and if necessary, we will do it again." This is

the arrogant statement made by the President of the United State. This is very serious.

This attack was made, according to President Reagan, because there had been direct, precise and irrefutable evidence of Libyan involvement in the recent bombing of the West Berlin night club. If that is so, it is the duty of President Reagan to share with the world as to what is the irrefutable evidence which is in their possession, otherwise these allegations had already been denied by the Libyan Government. They had declared that they had "no relationship with the claims" made by US linking it to recent terrorist attack. Not only that, the Libya's Foreign Ministry had also said that all terrorist operations, hijacking aeroplanes and murder of innocents had nothing to do with Libya. In view of these facts, if there was any positive evidence with the President of the United States, he should share that information with the world. Only then he could say that because of this this bombing had been done.

Secondly, even assuming that he had got any evidence, that would not justify the bombing of the country only because he feels that terrorists have been trained there. That point has been fully developed by other speakers and I would not go into that question within the short time.

According to me, the real purpose, as has been stated by some of the earlier speakers, is to attack the small countries, really speaking the countries which are in the non-aligned movement. It was specially so, because Col. Gaddafi was extending his solidarity and lion-hearted support to the national liberation movement of South Africa, Namibia, Palestine and to the regimes of Afghanistan, Kampuchea etc. Because of this political stand, they wanted to punish him. That was the real purpose behind this according to me.

This is not the first instance. On 25th March three vessels of the US Sixth Fleet crossed Col. Gaddafi's 'Line of death' off the Gulf of Sidra and fired on four Libyan boats. At that time also, the Washington Post, their popular newspaper, had specifically stated that President Reagan wanted to harass Gaddafi and destabilise his

[Shri Sharad Dighe]

regime and, therefore, that attack was made. Therefore, it is very clear as to the real purpose of these attacks.

I would like only to put before this House two or three main points which arise out of this attack. Firstly, that it is not only a menace to the security of the small countries, but it has also demonstrated the real purpose in establishing military outposts. Upto now, USA was justifying military outposts here on other grounds. And they were posing that it was not a threat to other countries. But now it is specifically demonstrated that they use the other outposts only for attacking the small countries. This is one point that has been demonstrated by them now. The second point is this. Upto now, US preferred covert action against those countries which were not in their camp. Now in this case, they did not merely attempt to destabilise or dislodge a government by other means which they used to do in other countries. But now they have directly attacked and left that covert policy which they were following upto now. These are very serious things which have come up on the surface now. As far as this question is concerned, serious note has to be taken by the small countries, especially the developing countries and the non-aligned countries. And solidarity must be shown, as has been shown by the statement of the NAM, to Gaddafi and Libya from this point of view. With these words, I again welcome the statement of the Government and the Statement of the Chairman of the Non-aligned Movement also.

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA (Basirhat) :
Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, the intentions and designs of the United States Administration have been so devastatingly exposed through this flagrant aggression that has been committed against Libya that at least in my living memory, I do not think this House has ever spoken with such a common united voice before, on any issue. I am very proud of the fact that the Indian Parliament is able today to stand up before the world and declare in absolutely unequivocal terms its indignation, its condemnation and its resolve to see that in future the resistance by all the third world

countries and all freedom loving peoples throughout the world to these expansionist and aggressive designs is going to be redoubled.

I must say one thing Sir. This is, of course, a coincidence or a quirk of history that this aggression has taken place just at the time when the Bureau of the Non-Aligned Movement happened to be meeting not very far from this building itself. Those representatives who have come there as our honoured guests at the moment in this country are seized of this problem. They have spoken out yesterday. Before their Session concludes, I am sure they will take some further decisions in this matter. And it is good that just at the time when they are here, present on our soil as our guests, they should also be satisfied that the representatives of the Indian people express the will of the people of India. We are talking continuously about small countries and all that, but we are not a small country, we are a very big country, but we are also part of that community of nations, non-aligned nations and developing nations, whom they represent and in fact we are the Chairman of NAM at the moment, and they should be reassured by the voice of this Parliament that we are representing the unanimous will of the people of this country.

I would request Sir that whatever Resolution we adopt—I think we are going to adopt a Resolution, & if it is moved by the Chair, it will be more appropriate—that Resolution may kindly be forwarded with an appropriate covering letter to the United States Congress so that from one Parliament to another we can make known our views. We know that there are forces, not dominant but still quite strong forces within the United States Congress forces within the United States Congress who are also in their own way trying to put up some resistance to the mad designs of the Reagan Administration, as we have seen recently in their refusal to vote the huge amount of funds which he was demanding openly in order to arm and equip the Contras in Nicaragua. So they are also trying to struggle in their own way, but I must say that this struggle is going to be

a very difficult struggle. I would not like to under-estimate the impact of kind of jingoistic propaganda which unfortunately is still quite strong in some of these countries. If you read the next—the full text—of President Reagan's broadcast, which he made just when the attack was launched, broadcast address to the American people—you can see how he is trying to arouse the jingoistic sentiments and passions among his own people, not only by attacking Gaddafi as the arch villain of the peace, but by assuring them every single man, woman & child—whenever anywhere in the whole world any evil force or evil person lays a single finger on anyone of you, I am here—Ronald Reagan to look after you and rest assured that we will come down with heavy hand. I know Margaret Thatcher at the time of the Falkland war, was successful in raising jingoistic sentiments among the British public and it paid off dividends to her in the subsequent election very much. So don't let us under-estimate.

18.36 hrs.

[MR. SPEAKER *in the chair*]

My friend Prof. Swell was very hopeful that the day is not far off perhaps when the American people realise that they are in the grip of Mr. Reagan and they will see to it that he is removed from the scene but it is not so easy. It is not a question of an individual as it has been stated here, you see in the days of President Nixon or in the days of Lyndon Johnson, we know what the Americans were doing in Vietnam. It is a policy of a certain imperialist force and it does not change very much, the nuances may change, the style of functioning may change with individual Presidents and their personalities, but the basic line does not change. And Lyndon Johnson, we know under the filmiest of pretexts ordered the American Air forces to bomb Laos, which was not engaged in that War at all, because, he said that Vietnamese forces were operating through Laos and they were finding sanctuary in the territory of Laos. And many years later it was proved that the whole thing was a complete hoax. But a poor, weak, defenceless country like Laos was bombed mercilessly by the Americans at that time. Later on a story

was concocted that the Vietnamese had attacked U.S. vessels in the Gulf of Tonkin—a very famous incident which was made an excuse for another big offensive by the Americans. And many years later, it was found out that it is a totally concocted story. There was no truth in it at all. And similar thing is sought to be concocted now on the basis of alleged complicity of the Libian regime with these terrorists who are operating. Of course we are against terrorism. We must be against terrorism always, whoever is responsible for it, whether it is a individual or whether it is a State. But you cannot get away like that without any proof or evidence or anything just saying that the two incidents have taken place or three incidents have taken place in Europe. Therefore Gaddafi must be held responsible. Therefore this huge armada of nuclear sub-marines and aircraft carriers and everything is moved into the mediterranean just to launch a terrific attack on this country.

MR. SPEAKER : Find a net where the noose can be fitted.

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA : Anyway we have to demand also. I hope the Non-aligned Meeting will demand that this huge armada of ships and aircraft carriers and nuclear sub-marines who are off the Coast of Libya, are they to remain there ? What is to happen ? They want to turn the Mediterranean into an American lake. The Soviets had proposed that all the Navies should be withdrawn from the Mediterranean. They don't agree to that and they moved in this huge fleet. They are armed with such lethal types of weapons, but now they may not immediately attack Libya again in a day or two, I do not know, anything may happen. But what will happen ? Will this fleet remain there—off the coast—intimidating everybody ? And the irony of it is that on the Northern shore of the Mediterranean where all the United States bases are—in Portugal, in Spain, in France, in Italy, in Greece—where it is so easy to come across the Mediterranean within striking distance of Libya, he could not find a single place from which those Governments would allow those bases to be used. The Air force had to come all the

[Shri Indrajit Gupta]

way from the United Kingdom, flying for thousands of miles around, making a big detour to reach the targets in Libya.

Somebody said here that Margaret Thatcher is known as the Iron Lady. But iron sometimes melts. Unfortunately, we could not melt her very much during the Commonwealth Conference in The Bahamas, on the South African question. She did not melt there. She remained, showing her mettle as the iron lady very much. But the Opposition leader in the House of Commons has said that when Mr. Reagan asks her to jump, her reply is: "All right; but how many feet do you want me to jump?" This is how iron is melting there. And she has said only two days ago that the bases in the United Kingdom would not be used for such purposes. We are also her colleagues in the Commonwealth. (*Interruption*)

So, I will say one thing here: this statement which was made here on behalf of the Government yesterday by the Minister of External Affairs summed up three reasons for our condemning the aggression: firstly, it is in total disregard of international law; secondly, it is a clear act of aggression against the sovereignty and territorial integrity of Libya, and thirdly, it places the regional security and international peace in grave jeopardy. These are all very unexceptionable—the grounds which have been given. To these should be added, the fact that it represents a grave danger to the non-aligned movement, a challenge to the conscience of the non-aligned movement—this attack that has taken place. It is a challenge, of course, to the United Nations also. It is a slap in the face, as one Minister in Holland has said, for the European Community also. But we are more bothered about the fact that it is a direct challenge to the non-aligned movement and, therefore, I would say this. I do not want now to repeat all the things that have been said here. I will just finish by saying 1 or 2 points only; The NAM and its Chairman have spoken up loud and clear; and they should continue to speak loud and clear, because they should have the confidence

that all patriotic and anti-imperialist people throughout the world will support that. I say this because, as it has been pointed out here, this attack against Libya has been planned and prepared for, for a long, long time. It is not something which has suddenly developed. My one complaint is—you can call it a complaint or anything! I do not know what to say—that these incidents are showing that if you take a very mild stand from the beginning, you are perhaps not able to correctly assess the potential danger of it. Then, by taking a very mild kind of stand in the beginning, these hawks who are sitting in the Pentagon only become more aggressive and more encouraged.

What was going on earlier? In 1980, the U.S. expelled all Libyan diplomats from the United States. In 1982, an embargo was placed on the purchases of Libyan oil. In 1983, of course, Libya itself nationalized about 70% of its oil industry, thereby hitting the interests of Western oil companies. Then in 1983, two Libyan planes were shot down off the coasts of Libya. They were patrolling along the coast. They were shot down. In 1985, Libyan officials who work at the U.N. headquarters were refused entry by the U.S. authorities; they were not allowed to function from the U.N. headquarters. There was a total severance of economic relations with Libya. All the bank accounts in the U.S. were frozen, i.e. of Libyans. One thousand U.S. citizens working in Libya were asked to come home. Most of them refused to do so, of course. Then in March 1986, U.S. Fleet deliberately, cold-bloodedly crossed what Gaddafi has called the Line of Death in the Gulf of Sidra, and then for five days, 200 sorties or more were flown by U.S. bombers destroying many installations, ships, small boats and vessels off the Libyan coast.

I am saying that throughout this period, if the non-aligned movement had spoken up, or reacted a little more strongly, then perhaps...because you see, the sovereign right of non-aligned countries to determine their own policies, domestic policies and international policies, is being challenged; challenged with bombs, challenged with guns. Therefore, we must assess

reality of the situation today. About terrorism, I do not want to say anything because most members here have spoken about it. The arch terrorist is described others as terrorists. You see this is the whole point Coming to Israel, the creation of the United States Government, I do not know, how many incidents of terrorism can be brought against Israel which they have been doing for years together. But about them, President Reagan has no word to say.

We are supporters of the PLO and SWAPO because they are fighting still for independence. They do carry out armed activity. But do we put those armed activities on the same par as that of terrorism? Can we do it? We cannot do it; and certainly they do not justify by the counter measures by Israel or by the South Africans, as they are doing in the southern part of Africa. And now chickens come home to roost; now we find Jayewardene in the name of fighting terrorism is bringing the same Israel agency, British agency and other agencies there into his country. So, I think I know about it very well. Recently, the American movie industry and the American television industry has been projecting a figure called 'Rambo'. I don't know if you have had the fortune to see him. I have read about him. Rambo, tough American hero, who is shooting from the hill and finishing off all coloured people, Negroes and others—what do they call him,—who tried to challenge the United States' might; and nobody can stand in front of him; he is an expert with all weapons; and he knows Karate and he can kill anybody and finish off everybody. So, Rambo—Reagan have appeared on the scene now with all their aircraft carriers and missiles and all that. This is the embodiment of the threat that we are facing. I would only say that since now we have at least awakened up to the reality of the situation, I would respectfully advise the Prime Minister, if I may have the presumption to do so, that in the light of these revelations that are going on now at least let us be a little more careful in reviewing our relations with the United States of America. I do not say, cut off relations with them. Obviously, you cannot do that. We are also a big

country; we are not so weak; nevertheless, in all these economic things, in all these high technology areas, even arms aid and all that, that we are now very hopeful of getting from them, please be a little more careful, be cautious about these chaps.

THE PRIME MINISTER (SHRI RAJIV GANDHI) : I have clarified that myself; and the Minister of State for Defence has also clarified it a number of times.

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA : There are certain spheres in which they are trying to push you in. If you resist that; I will be very happy. They are trying to sell us some arms.

SHRI RAJIV GANDHI : We will be also happy.

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE : He only says that we should be at an 'arm's length.

MR. SPEAKER : We will keep them away.

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA : There is a big propaganda barrage being launched with the help of millions of dollars to make black look like white. This is going on throughout the world. American propaganda machine is very very powerful and it tries to influence the Press of other countries also; and we should be extremely vigilant and careful. And therefore I will say that we should not be at all surprised to see that the stand of the United States was completely negated on the question of this moratorium on nuclear test which was proposed and which is still being proposed by six Nations headed by our Chairman of the NAM here. The response was totally negative and they started again having their nuclear tests and it is nothing surprising; we are not surprised that they do not respond to the appeal of the Six Nations; we are not surprised about the attitude they take towards the whole Indian ocean question and go on obstructing any attempt to have that Conference on the Indian Zone question. So, they are consistent; I don't see any inconsistency in their stand at all; inconsistency has only occurred sometime in the

[Shri Indrajit Gupta]

attitude of other countries who can be pressurised or get themselves fooled for some time by their sweet talk and may be by their dollars.

I have nothing more to say. We are, of course, one, the entire Parliament and the country and everybody is one on this question. Let us speak with one voice to the people in our own country also. And let us rouse and mobilise people outside this House. It is not enough if only a few elected Members do it. You see, here also, how many people are present? Then, I saw many people went out to the American Embassy, Yesterday.

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE : They have gone to mobilise people.

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA : Let us mobilise the people outside also. Let there be some big rallies and demonstration in the country, so that the Americans understand the sentiments of the Indian people, and they are forced to withdraw, vacate this kind of aggression which they have committed so blatantly.

MR. SPEAKER : Shri Brajamohan Mohanty.

SHRI BRAJAMOHAN MOHANTY (Puri) : Mr, Speaker, Sir. at the outset, I have to place before this House that the motives of the United States of America are well known. This type of episode is not new. During the last fifty years of this century, at least two hundred coups have taken place and out of them seventy have been engineered by the C.I.A. So, this is not new. And, I have not been surprised at what has been done by the United States of America. The policy is very straight. Their policy is to gain bargaining power, with strength and for negotiating from the point of strength.

So far as this is concerned, it is not the exercise of their right over the international waters, or that Libya is involved in terrorism. That is not the real issue. The real issue is, Gaddafi was not following the policies of the United States of America in West Asia. It is a straight thing. So, somehow or other

they have to bring a nation to follow them, and not only follow them, they want to make it survive.

One thing, I want to tell you. So far as Libya is concerned, no doubt, we condemn terrorism either national or international. No doubt, we do not accept and approve the stand of Libya in international waters. But that does not provoke, that does not justify the United States of America for armed intervention on that massive scale. That is very important.

On thing, I want to remind the House is that what has happened, or I want to ask, is the United States of America, really against terrorism? I am afraid; they are not. Our Prime Minister, when he was the General Secretary of the All India Congress Committee, he had categorically stated that behind the extremists in Punjab, behind is terrorism, here in Punjab, the U.S.A.'s hand is there. It is not there? When the American Ambassador ...
(*Interruption.*)

SHRI RAJIV GANDHI : I had also pointed this out when I was in the U.S.A. talking with the U.S. Government.

SHRI BRAJAMOHAN MOHANTY : Initially you said it when you were the General Secretary, and subsequently you said it in the U.S.A.

When Mr. Chauhan, carried on this extremist activity in the United States of America, Mr. Bernes, the Ambassador of U.S.A. in India, justified his activity. And he justified it on the ground that it is like Puerto Rico, this is a national liberation movement. He said, "similarly, Khalistan movement is like that." That is quite surprising.

My submission is, in the United Kingdom now also under Police protection the Khalistan flag is being unfurled. They are under Police Protection. The extremists in U.K. have been given Police protection. Khalistan house is functioning there helped and aided by the Government of the United Kingdom.

AN HON. MEMBER : United States.

SHRI BRAJAMOHAN MOHANTY :
In spite of our protest no serious action has been taken by the United Kingdom against these activities. In reply to a question, the hon. Minister of External Affairs said that we were unhappy that no serious action had been taken by the Government of U.K. against extremism. Once upon a time certain political parties, when it was alleged that Pakistan was assisting, helping the extremists in Punjab, did not agree with us. They said that Mrs. Indira Gandhi was raising the bogey of Pakistan for political reasons. Today, Mr. Barnala repeatedly says that terrorists are infiltrating into Punjab from Pakistan and they are working as extremists and terrorists in Punjab. It is very clear that what is being done in Punjab has the tacit support of the United States of America, if not directly through CIA. At the same time, it is heartening that all the political parties and the people of India are united to condemn the naked aggression of the United States of America. But all the same, we should not forget that on different occasions we have seriously disagreed. There was the allegation that our Non-Aligned Movement was tilting—sometimes this side and sometimes that side. But we have exhibited our differences. Certain political leaders had gone to Pakistan to negotiate with the head of the military regime in Pakistan, Mr. Zia-ul-Haq. This is our experience. The nation is in crisis. At least for the unity and integrity of this country let all of us be united. I would remind the friends here how the forces are working to destabilise us, how some countries of the world are conspiring to divide us. We must be very careful about that.

About Non-Alignment Movement, efforts should be made to keep all the non-aligned countries united. May I know the names of those countries which are associated with NAM but are being assisted by dangerous weapons and given economic and financial aid by the United States of America? How will they go with you? Whenever there is a crisis, I am afraid they will not be within the NAM. Rather they will be used as instruments in the destabilising game in different parts of the world by the United States of America. There are some such countries;

I do not want to mention their names. We must be very very careful of them.

So far as our hon. Prime Minister is concerned, he has depicted the foreign policy of India in one sentence only and that is that India has neither any hegemony over any state nor any individual, neither on nature nor on God. This is the essence of the Indian foreign policy and essence of Indian Constitution depicted in one sentence. This is very nicely expressed by our Prime Minister. Let the political parties and the people of India stand by it. We must defend the unity and integrity of this country. We must stand for peace. And we must resist all forces which are working to de-stabilise and disrupt the peace of the world.

19.00 hrs.

MR. SPEAKER : Now we have got an important engagement for the Foreign Minister himself. He has to host a dinner in honour of the Foreign Ministers and we have got still about.....

(Interruptions)

SHRI ABDUL RASHID KABULI :
Sir, my party has not been called.

MR. SPEAKER : The question is only that the Foreign Minister has to go and attend to that. But still National Conference is there. Mr. Banatwala is there. Enough has been said

(Interruptions)

SHRI ABDUL RASHID KABULI :
Only five minutes, Sir.....

(Interruptions)

There will be misunderstanding amongst our people also. They will think that we have not taken any part.

MR. SPEAKER : What can I do about it? I cannot create time.....

(Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER : Well, I can give you one minute. You can say that you associated with this.

SHRI ABDUL RASHID KABULI :
Give me five minutes, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER : Not five minutes, I can give you two minutes,

[*Translation*]

SHRI ABDUL RASHID KABULI :

Mr. Speaker, Sir, the President of America Shri Regan has said in the last :

[*English*]

Today we have done what we had to do. If necessary, we will do it again.

[*Translation*]

Then in the communique released by the White House, he has said that -

[*English*]

This is an effort on our part to prevent colonel Gaddafi from making future attacks on us. This is a self-defence move.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Speaker, Sir, I want to say that this posture of America has hurt the feelings of the entire world. Today, in this Parliament, a united stand has been taken by the Hon. Prime Minister, the Government and the opposition and it is the correct expression of our feelings. Today, there is a great danger to the entire world and this is so because the USA is exhibiting her power by sending her Sixth and Seventh Fleets sometime in Gulf of Sidra and sometime in the Bay of Bengal or Indian Ocean and is threatening small nations, particularly non-aligned nations. I also want to say that today the world is facing danger and the way the atomic weapons have been stock-piled, no one is in a position to combat them. But the voice of India is quite powerful. We are living in a very big country and our Prime Minister should lay emphasis on our policies. We should awaken the opinion of the people of the world so that we are able to face the manoeuvres of the big powers.

Mr. Gaddafi has been charged with helping and aiding terrorism. So far as Gaddafi is concerned, the Prime Minister has supported him and he has said in appropriate words that we do not support terrorism. Mr. Gaddafi has, in particular, made his position very clear about the

explosion occurred recently in a night club in West Germany.

At present, the root cause of tension and struggle is Palestine. Because of this, the entire world is caught in the whirlpool of war. Lakhs of Palestinians are wandering about from one place to another and they are not getting any shelter in Syria, Egypt, Jordan etc., and those living in Lebanon have been attacked by Israel and their refugee camps in Chhatila and Savra have been destroyed, though Lebanon too has been involved in a civil war with the result that lakhs of people are heading towards destruction. That country is burning. It is the right of the Palestinians to struggle for their freedom, to get their country back, because the way America, a big power, is assisting Israel, it looks that a programme has been chalked out to annihilate the Palestinians. I am of the view that unless this Palestine problem is solved, this fight will continue and it becomes the moral duty of all of us, be it Gaddafi, Syria, Jordan or India, to help them. The type of terrorism the Palestinians are indulging in, is their reply. To achieve freedom for their country and to liberate themselves from Israel, it is their right to use whatever means or arms they want to use. Otherwise, America should agree that the people there should be resettled in that country.

I would also like to submit that the United Nations Organisation is facing a grave danger. If this process continues, if America continues her highhandedness, you can very well imagine the results. The United Nations Organisation is situated in America itself, but the way she is adopting policies, the way she has attacked Gaddafi and has killed innocent people in Tripoli and other cities, I think these are going to be fatal blows to the existence of the United Nations. It is going to end.

MR. SPEAKER : You must have heard the saying which means that we shall not sink alone, we shall take you along.

SHRI ABDUL RASHID KABULI : That is right, Sir. That is why I am submitting that if this process continues, if it

is not resisted, then there is danger to the very existence of the United Nations, which is our last ray of hope. But I would also like to tell that the way NATO countries, like Spain, France, etc., have told America in clear words that their land cannot be used for raids shows that there are differences among the countries in the American camp. Our policy is an independent policy which aims at saving the entire world. It is a very hopeful sign.

[English]

SHRI G. M. BANATWALLA (Ponnani) : Mr. Speaker, Sir, I respect the constraints of time and I will not take much time.

Sir, when I was participating in the Debate on the Demands for Grants of the Ministry of External Affairs, I had opened my remarks with a reference to the tension in the Mediterranean and the evil designs of the United States of America against Libya. Here now we have this blatant aggression.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, no words are adequate to denounce this act of the United States. No words are adequate to condemn fully the act of aggression—and the blatant aggression—of the United States against Libya. It appears as if the United States acts like a 'aw unto itself. It accuses Libya of complicity in terrorism and then it itself sits to judge the issue and acts to punish on the basis of its judgment.

[Translation]

MR. SPEAKER : It is said that they are mindful of the sins of others whereas they are oblivious of their own.

[English]

SHRI G. M. BANATWALLA : Mr. Speaker, Sir, this blatant aggression by the U. S. represents a flagrant violation of all norms of civilised behaviour and international conduct. Even the allies of the U.S. should take a lesson from the way in which the U.S. is behaving. They had also advised the U.S. not to take any military action. But as has been correctly pointed out, this aggression is a slap in the face of the allies of the United States. It is high time that the allies of the U.S. should realise the contemptuous manner

in which their own advice to the United States has been held by the Reagan Administration.

Sir, I will not take much time. I will conclude by saying that the entire world must rise to pronounce the United States guilty. We must not rest content by merely asking U.S. not to undertake any such military action in the future and to desist from such activities in the future. We cannot rest content with that alone. I must emphasise that we must call upon the U.S. to atone for its sins by giving due compensation to Libya for the damages that have been inflicted upon it against all norms of international behaviour and conduct.

Sir, the statement that has been made by the Minister for External Affairs and our Prime Minister—every word of that statement reflects the sentiments of the Indian people. Every word of that statement echoes the voice of the Indian people.

Let us march forward with our solidarity with Libya in its defence of its territorial integrity and sovereignty.

SHRI PIYUS TIRAKY (Alipurduars) : Mr. Speaker, Sir, I will take only one minute.

I join this august House in the condemnation of this brutal attack by the U.S.A. Government headed by Mr. Reagan as President, on Libya. Sir, America is a Super Power, the world knows. But it does not mean all the countries which are small or the poor countries should be used as bonous of America. So, the world opinion is against this American attack on Libya, and the Indian people specially are very much peace-loving people and as the Parliament has joined now to condemn this brutal attack, no word is sufficient enough to express this brutal act of American Government headed by Mr. Reagan. At the same time, as the Parliament is speaking with one voice, let us have one voice all over the country and the world also to mobilise the opinion that Americans should be taught a lesson that the status of Super Power and money is

[Shri Piyus Tiraky]

not the only thing that can dictate the world.

MR. SPEAKER : Now, the Minister.

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE : You can take full time, at dinner I can represent you !

MR. SPEAKER : He can go on speaking and you can represent him there !

THE MINISTER OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS (SHRI B. R. BHAGAT) : You can go, of course. Yes, you are welcome.

(Interruptions)

Mr. Speaker, Sir, it is really a unique and momentous experience when we see the united strength of Indian democracy raising its voice, quiet but a strong voice, against aggression. The house with one voice has not only condemned the aggression against Libya, but also has expressed its solidarity with the people and the Government of the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya. This is in the glorious tradition of this Parliament because of our Constitution itself enshrines in the Directive Principles—promotion of international peace and security, respect for international law, just and honourable relations between nations and settlement of international disputes through arbitration. These are the principles which our Constitution enjoins upon us and the house has followed that tradition repeatedly. If I may quote the famous statement of our leader, the first Prime Minister, Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, when he addressed the United Nations in the early Fifties for the first time, he said :

“India will not be neutral when peace is threatened and freedom is in peril.”

These are the words he said and the House witnessed, and some of us who were in this House since the Fifties have known that when Korea crisis began, when Korea was threatened, here the House unitedly under the leadership of Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru expressed against aggression in Korea. Then, when Suez Canal was

attacked by the joint forces of France and England and Nasser was attacked, Prime Minister Nehru said that he must oppose, the world must oppose, the Parliament must oppose. And he opposed what he called, the gun-boat diplomacy. And then, later on, more than once the House expressed solidarity with the great and heroic people of Vietnam and condemned aggression on the people of Vietnam by the imperialist forces.

Coming again, I can give instances after instances. But the finest hour of this House was the Bangladesh crisis because that was an aggression on us. I have given an example of aggression committed by other countries. But this was an aggression on us. India was threatened by major powers : they had said, they will intervene in this country. The 7th Fleet was on the Bay of Bengal and at the moment the leadership of the Prime Minister, Shrimati Indira Gandhi was unique, bold and courageous. And the House gave her the name, Durga. This house itself gave, the Opposition gave her that name. And no less a person than the great formidable adversary, Dr. Henry Kissinger writes in his memoirs acknowledging the courageous leadership provided by Shrimati Indira Gandhi, at that moment, when our own country was threatened. And there was this danger of intervention from outside power.

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE: And also our Defence Minister, at that time.

SHRI B.R. BHAGAT : Recently, the House had debated the other day on Nicaragua. We united with one voice against intervention, against aggression and against destabilising and trying to subvert an independent country.

We are now on the statement. The House has debated today this evening the statement of the Prime Minister, Shri Rajiv Gandhi the Chairman of the Non-Aligned Movement. This statement is in that same tradition, glorious tradition of the leadership of this country. If Panditji would have been today, he would have spoken the same words. If Indiraji would have been today, she would have spoken

the same words. We are fortunate we are lucky that we belong to the same traditions, the glorious traditions of the Indian Parliament and the united strength of the Indian democracy. Such a voice cannot be muted. Such a voice will have its effect in the world as a whole where even though, the voice is mute and which is ranged against the brute force of power and nuclear power. But the political will, the voice of the people, the millions and millions of people, not only in this country but in the world as a whole—this cannot be silenced and this cannot be defeated. This is what we saw in the emergency meeting of the Ministerial meeting of the coordinating bureau of the Non-Aligned countries yesterday where they welcomed and they praised the statement of the Chairman, NAM and Prime Minister of India. And they said that it had given a timely, bold and correct lead and has spoken against aggression and expressed solidarity for the people and the Government of Libya.

Since the last three months when this crisis has been building up, we have been saying always at all moments since January in our statements on 13th January and then again on 26th March and later on on the 14th April we spoke against the moves, the military confrontation posed by the actions of the United States vis-a-vis Libya and called for restraint. The NAM Coordinating Bureau Meeting in New York, of which India is the Chairman, under our chairmanship issued some statements on 6th February and then again on 26th March and we condemned US actions and demanded an immediate cessation of military operations by the United States.

Recently, the latest development since yesterday when I made the statement, as I said the Non-aligned Coordinating Bureau had an emergency session and it strongly condemned the US action and it demanded that the United States put an immediate halt to its military operations and also demanded that full and prompt compensation be paid to Libya. In addition, it called on the Security Council to take urgent action to condemn this act of aggression and to prevent the repetition of such acts. It also affirmed its full

support to and solidarity with Libya. United Nations Security Council is already in session at this moment and our representative there has made a statement on the lines of the Prime Minister's statement here and of my statement in this House.

According to latest reports, the United States bombing raid lasted only 11 to 12 minutes. During the raid, as is known, Col. Gaddafi's residence was hit, his baby daughter was killed and two sons were injured. President Gaddafi himself is safe. Five targets in Libya were hit. These included Al-Azzizyah barracks, Tripoli airport, Al-Jammahriya barracks, Benina airport and Sidi Balal.

There are very interesting developments in the world. There have been popular and violent demonstrations against US action in United Kingdom and West Germany. Prime Minister Mrs. Thatcher has come in for severe opposition for having permitted US aircraft to have taken off from British basis for use against Libya in the House of Commons,

Very interestingly, the House is aware that earlier, there was a call for imposing economic sanctions against Libya by the United States Government. This was not followed by any of the European countries, not even United Kingdom which is the only country which is supporting US action in Libya. But the European Economic Committee which met on April 14 issued a statement which said in the last final paragraph :

“Finally, in order to enable the achievement of a political solution avoiding further escalation of military tension in the region with all the inherent dangers, the 12—the 12 Members of the EEC—underlined the need for restraint on all sides”

One of the signatories to this is the UK Foreign Secretary Sir Geoffrey Howe and now British is allowing the bases. So, this, if I may say so, is for British consistency and sincerity.

PROF. N. G. RANGA : General Assembly should be convened.

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA : There was a report from some foreign news agency in Tripoli that there had been a further attack. Have you any information about it ?

SHRI B. R. BHAGAT : There is apparently no truth in the report that there was a second US attack on Libya.

PROF. N. G. RANGA : They themselves corrected it to have one more attack.

SHRI B. R. BHAGAT : This is the report I have.

THE PRIME MINISTER[?](SHRI RAJIV GANDHI): I had a report which said that there was no further attack but there was some firing by anti-aircraft guns. Nobody really knows why. But they believe that it was at some reconnaissance plane which might have been fairly high up.

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE : What about the Indian Embassy ? Any news ?

SHRI B. R. BHAGAT : With regard to the Indian Embassy we are in contact with them. The Indian Embassy and our personnel are safe and luckily the Indian citizens living there are not affected.

PROF. N. G. RANGA : Is it not possible for us to take the move and also to persuade the present conference which is going on to demand an emergency meeting of the United Nations General Assembly ? Certainly we have got majority there. We have no say at all in the Security Council.

SHRI B. R. BHAGAT : Six European countries like FRG, Spain, France, Greece and Netherlands have condemned the attack. Spain and France refused to allow the US aircraft to use their airspace for their flights from US to Libya. The only countries which have supported US bombing raids are Britain, Israel and Canada, while the Australian Government counselled restraint by both sides. The Organisation of African Unity and the Organisation of Islamic Countries have also condemned this attack.

The united voice expressed in this House condemning the aggression against Libya will go a long way in creating the political will in the country, because the escalation of conflicts can lead to a serious situation and it should be our effort to prevent that. The Prime Minister has already appealed for restraint by the United States and all others concerned in this region. In the Non-aligned Bureau meeting of the Foreign Ministers we are discussing this question and the suggestion that has come from the hon. Member—we are viewing it how to pursue this, whether in the Security Council which is already in session or in the General Assembly or in some other manner. But the important point is that further escalation should be prevented so that it should not develop into a major conflict involving other powers and this will be a very serious crisis and we should direct our attention to this. But certainly again I say that I am grateful to all the hon. Members for the support they have given and the lead they have given. This will not only enhance the prestige of this Parliament but actually the world expects the Indian Parliament to give a lead of this kind on a critical matter like this.

RESOLUTION RE : RECENT BOMBING OF TRIPOLI AND BENGHAZI BY US AIRCRAFT

[English]

PROF. N. G. RANGA : I thought that there was going to be some resolution...

MR. SPEAKER : It is coming pronto.

PROF. N. G. RANGA : And then kindly convey the sentiments of this House.

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE : You being non-aligned in this House, it is better that you move it.

MR. SPEAKER : It is coming Professor Saheb, pronto.

PROF. N. G. RANGA : You kindly convey the unanimous sentiments of this House to the leaders of the Delegations