

nt>

16.00 hrs.

DISCUSSION UNDER RULE 193

FOREIGN POLICY OF THE GOVERNMENT

Title: Discussion regarding foreign policy of the Government.

MADAM CHAIRMAN : Now discussion under Rule 193 about Foreign Policy of the Government. Shri Sudhakar Reddy.

SHRI SURAVARAM SUDHAKAR REDDY (NALGONDA): Thank you, Chairperson. I would like to draw the attention of the hon. Foreign Minister and the UPA Government to certain important policies. Since Independence, the Foreign Policy is an anti-imperialist Foreign Policy; it is an anti-colonialist Foreign Policy. Later on, it has come to be known as Non-aligned Foreign Policy. This independent Foreign Policy has been appreciated, and there was more or less a consensus on this throughout the country. It was the policy that was accepted by our people throughout the country. The then Prime Minister, Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, was the architect of this Foreign Policy. We had the historical background of supporting the national liberation movements throughout the world. We supported the struggle of the people for liberating their countries whether it is Vietnam, Laos, Cambodia, South Africa or Palestine, or wherever it was necessary. We continued this policy for the last five decades. Unfortunately, during the period of NDA - though there was no declaration of the change of the Foreign Policy - it was diluted very much. There are several other reasons also.

The Foreign Policy naturally needs our full political will, and also independent political economic policies. In the background of the globalisation, in the background of the Liberalisation Privatisation Globalisation (LPG), there were several pressures on India to change its economic policies, and that has resulted in NDA diluting the Foreign Policy also. For example, a country like India which always stood with the national liberation movements and the question of independence of different countries - the *Panchsheel*, non-interference in the internal affairs of the other countries - could not come out even with a statement when there was naked aggression by US imperialism on Afghanistan. We are not, in any way, supporters of Taliban. No tears for the downfall of the Talibans who are known as murderers of democracy! At the same time, neither US nor any other country has any business to interfere in the internal affairs of Afghanistan and to say who should rule Afghanistan. It is the Afghan people who should decide who should rule there.

Then came the attack on Iraq. Iraq was a friend of India. Maybe we had some differences of opinion in the way the internal policies were being pursued by President Saddam Hussain, but the Saddam Hussain regime was also a friend of India. Whenever there was trouble for India, Iraq stood with us. But there was an attack of USA, which declared itself as a world police interfering into the affairs of various other countries declaring some countries as 'rogue countries'. They decided that they will interfere in the internal affairs of several countries. Maybe day before yesterday, it was Afghanistan, yesterday it was Iraq, tomorrow it may be Iran and day after tomorrow, it may be India.

Our foreign policy needs that we should stand courageously to express boldly that we do not agree with this type of attacks. Unfortunately, the then Government had gone to the extent of thinking of sending troops to Iraq. They agreed to recruit mercenaries in India. It came out openly only when Indians were killed in Iraq. How is it possible that without the knowledge of the Indian Government mercenaries could be recruited here on Indian soil and Indians go and fight on behalf of US imperialism in Iraq?

One of the leaders had gone to the extent of saying arrogantly that the Opposition parties in India had given a *fatwa* against sending Army to Iraq, as if it was a holy decision that the NDA Government wanted to take but the Opposition parties were against it and the Indian people were against it. Very proudly they did a proper work.

There were demonstrations throughout the country in which lakhs and lakhs of people participated in solidarity with Iraq. After the attack on Iraq, almost one lakh people were killed. They were mostly civilians. Unfortunately, we did not take a stand on this issue. Now, the self-appointed world police wants to continue the same type of foreign policy, interfering in the internal affairs of various other countries. This should not be accepted. This is the 19th century policy of the white man's murder that they would decide the fate of the world, they would decide which country has to go which way.

16.07 hrs (Shri Arjun Sethi *in the Chair*)

Now, the new Government has come. The Congress party which was ruling this country for several decades and which is responsible for the Non-Aligned Foreign Policy is also wavering in recent times on some very important

issues. There was a lot of discussion in the Press that India might send observers for Iraq polls. Who is organising these polls? Is it a democracy? Is it a people's participation in the elections in Iraq?

Every day, several suicide bombers and suicide squads are killing several hundreds of people. In these circumstances, any type of involvement on the part of India by sending observers or officers to conduct elections would be accepting the US aggression and accepting the so-called democracy that is put on the Iraqi people without their acceptance. This should not be allowed. I would like to draw the attention of the hon. Minister of External Affairs to this.

There are several things which the Government of India should clarify. In the recent past, the US President was arrogant enough to tell the Palestinian people that Chairman Yasser Arafat should be removed from the Presidentship of Palestine and then only there would be a solution to the Palestinian issue. Now, the great leader has died but the Israeli attacks at Gaza and other places are still continuing and Palestine is being harassed.

The Palestine Liberation Organisation was always a friend of India. Is it not our responsibility to stand with Palestine and declare openly that we disapprove the US policy of aggression? Of course, on the platform of the United Nations and on certain other occasions, we did express very clearly that we would stand with the Palestine people. But there is a necessity for more clarity and to tell more openly the United States of America that we are not going to approve this type of support to Israel which is never a friend of India and which is always fighting against the interests of the Indian people.

Then, the question comes of economic blockade of U.S. on Cuba. We are supporting the Cuban people. As far as Cuba is concerned, there was clarity. But the trade relations and the political relations are, more or less, nominal with a country like Cuba. It is necessary that we should come out more openly on this question and extend our total support to the Cuban people in fighting against this unashamed attack of US imperialism.

Now, the re-election of Mr. George Bush for the second term as the President of the United States of America is not a very good sign for the democratic countries in the world. Anyway, it is for the people of the United States of America to decide who will preside over their destiny. But George Bush Junior's foreign policy and the aggressive nature are a danger to India also and we should be more vigilant on these various policies. If the same type of policy is going to continue, it will be naturally dangerous to our interests.

After the second re-election, there was an announcement that they are going to increase the strength of the CIA; the recruitment into the CIA will be doubled in the next few months. CIA is an organisation which is mainly working to sabotage the interests of the people of the Third World countries. We have to take all precautions because the United States of America, in the last few decades, never stood at the time of the test with India. It was always against our interests. They were trying to encircle with military pacts around India, whether it is the Indian Ocean or Pakistan or some other countries. ...(*Interruptions*)

SHRI KHARABELA SWAIN (BALASORE): Shri Reddy, Are we talking about the Indian foreign policy or American foreign policy? ...(*Interruptions*)

SHRI SURAVARAM SUDHAKAR REDDY : I understand, you get very much hurt when we criticize the United States of America. I am sorry. ...(*Interruptions*). We understand your inconvenience. But, I think, the Indian foreign policy includes the question of the relationship with the United States of America, the question of the defence of India against the most dangerous aggressive country which has decided to take up as the world police to discipline the entire world. I hope you will not object on this point.

Then, the most important question comes of relationship with the United States. Recently, the Assistant Secretary of State visited India.

There were reports in the Press that there was a discussion about the next steps towards the strategic partnership. This strategic partnership naturally is expected about U.S. missile defence cooperation. The U.S. missile defence cooperation is a very controversial issue. There is a danger that it will once again bring arms race in the world. It is intended to establish U.S. global hegemony. I would like to know from the hon. Minister of External Affairs whether any commitment is made on behalf of the Government of India that we will join this type of defence system or not. This thing must be clarified by the hon. Minister of External Affairs.

There is a lot of discussion going on about the membership of India in the Security Council. Certainly we deserve the membership of the Security Council and certainly with a veto right. President Putin's announcement that Russia will stand with India and support this is definitely a big encouragement for us. But here, I would like to emphasise that we need the support of various other countries. We can get the support of various other countries not by bowing before imperialist powers but by standing courageously to carry on the policy of Panchsheel. We should be accepted as a leader.

Some people, in the last few years, were going on with the campaign that India should become a superpower. India should become an acceptable leader in the international arena by its dynamic work, by its dynamic leadership in the international policies; not as a superpower we will get this type of membership.

I congratulate the hon. Prime Minister and the hon. Minister of External Affairs for the initiative taken to break the ice in Indo-Pak relations. The discussions by the hon. Prime Minister, Dr. Manmohan Singh, with the President of Pakistan in the USA are definitely an important step. There need not be any pessimism. Five decade-long hatred should be broken, in spite of Pakistan's attitude towards Kashmir.

There are many other areas where there can be cooperation. There should be better Indo-Chinese relationship. We have clarity as to who are our friends in the world, who are our enemies, who stood with us in the last six decades on various issues. Unfortunately, the relations between India and China were very bad after the Chinese attack on India in 1962. But in the last few years, the relationship improved and this should be improved further. By having this type of relationship with all the friendly countries, India should play a major role.

Here, in this foreign policy framework, as earlier stated, the independent academic policy plays a very important role. The policy of globalisation in the last few years is affecting the foreign policy also. According to the U.N. Development Report, 2004, the world's wealth has been increased in the ten years from 1991 to 2000 by about two-and-a-half times or 250 per cent.

But according to its own report, 85 per cent of the wealth is concentrated in the top 20 per cent of the population, and the last 20 per cent of the population is getting only Rs. 1.40 for every Rs. 100 produced throughout the world. It is also not equally distributed. The wealth is concentrated in the United States of America, European countries, G-8 countries, etc. Asia, Africa, and Latin America are getting poorer in the period of globalisation. Naturally, in the coming decades, there will be bigger fights on the economic front as well. We need the support of countries in Asia, Africa, and Latin America to fight in WTO, United Nations Organisation (UNO), etc. for defending the interest of the Third world countries.

Panchsheel policy, which was framed five decades back, is still valid. I would like to request the framers of the foreign policy, and our hon. Foreign Minister to keep up courageously the foreign policy of India. There is no question of waiver. The issue of waiver will destroy the image of India, and we will become more isolated. We need a courageous and dynamic foreign policy. Our foreign policy should be based on the *Panchsheel* policy, and based on the Nehruvian foreign policy.

I believe, that the UPA Government, which has announced the Common Minimum Programme (CMP), will abide by its announcement of not allowing unilateralism, and defending a multipolar world. In order to achieve it, we need more clarity in our foreign policy stand. Thank you very much, Sir.

डॉ. लक्ष्मी नारायण पाण्डेय (मंदसौर) : सभापति महोदय, हम अपने देश की वैदेशिक नीति पर चर्चा कर रहे हैं। हमारी वैदेशिक नीति की कुछ आधारभूत मान्यताएँ हैं, आधारभूत संरचनाएँ हैं। भारत एक सम्प्रभुता सम्पन्न देश है। हम वैश्विक सौहार्द चाहते हैं। हम गुट निरपेक्ष हैं। विश्व के देशों की भारत से यह अपेक्षा है कि भारत वैश्विक शांति प्रक्रिया में अगुवाई करे, वह आगे आए और हमारा मार्गदर्शन करे। इस दृष्टि से भारत कितना खरा उतरा है, उसकी नीतियों के आधार स्तम्भों पर वह कितना आगे बढ़ रहा है, हमें इस पर विचार करने की आवश्यकता है।

पिछली सरकार की विदेश नीति और आज की सरकार की विदेश नीति दोनों को हम देखें, यद्यपि इस संग्रह सरकार ने भी उसी नीति का अनुसरण करने की बात कही है, जिस पर पिछली सरकार चल रही थी। मैं इस बात का स्वागत करता हूँ और आपको धन्यवाद देता हूँ। विदेश नीति के मामले में कहीं हम इधर-उधर नहीं होते हैं। लेकिन विदेश नीति में जो उतार-चढ़ाव आते हैं, उनके बारे में बिल्कुल निपक्षता और गम्भीरता से हमें चिंतन करना चाहिए और विचार करना चाहिए।

हम इस बात की चिंता न करें कि दूसरे देश हमारे बारे में या हमारी विदेश नीति के बारे में क्या कहते हैं। लेकिन भारत की सम्प्रभुता को खतरा तो नहीं है। भारत वैश्विक शांति के लिए जो कार्य कर रहा है, उसके मार्ग में कोई रुकावट तो नहीं है। इस बारे में हम विचार करेंगे तो हमें कुछ चिंतन इस पर करना पड़ेगा।

मैं निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि वैदेशिक नीति का क्षेत्र इतना व्यापक है कि हम आसियान के बारे में, सार्क के बारे में चर्चा करें या संयुक्त राष्ट्र संघ के बारे में चर्चा

करें या चीन के संदर्भ में चर्चा करें या फिर पड़ोसी देशों के बारे में चर्चा करें। इस समय सदन में हो रही वैदेशिक नीति पर चर्चा के समय हमें कुछ सीमित क्षेत्रों तक रहना पड़ेगा। उसी ओर मैं अपनी चर्चा को ले जाना चाहता हूँ।

मान्यवर, मैं अमरीका, यूरोपीय संघ या आसियान के बारे में चर्चा करने के लिए यहां उपस्थित नहीं हुआ हूँ क्योंकि इन पर चर्चा करने के लिए बड़े लम्बे समय की आवश्यकता होगी। हमारा संबंध पड़ोसी देशों के साथ जैसा होना चाहिए, उसी तक सीमित रहते हुए मैं अपनी बात कहना चाहूंगा। पड़ोसी देशों के साथ हमारे सौहार्द्रपूर्ण संबंध बनने चाहिए और हम उसके पक्षधर हैं। लेकिन आज उन संबंधों में जो तनाव दिखाई देता है, थोड़ा सा अंतराल दिखाई देता है, उसके बारे में निश्चित रूप से सरकार को सावधान करना चाहिए। माननीय वाजपेयी जी की सरकार ने 6 जनवरी को मुशरफ साहब से भारत पाक संबंधों पर चर्चा की थी, उससे एक शांति प्रक्रिया बहाल हुई थी और हम शांति बहाल करने की ओर आगे बढ़े थे। आज अंतर यह पड़ गया है कि एक दिन पाकिस्तान के प्रधान मंत्री एक बात कहते हैं और दूसरे दिन दूसरी बात कहते हैं और हम भी उनके स्वर में स्वर मिलाकर वही बात कहने लगते हैं। इस बात को जनता गंभीरता से देखती है, विश्व भी गंभीरता से देखता है। हमें अपनी बात पर सुदृढ़ रहना चाहिए। आज हमें अपनी बात पर सुदृढ़ता से जमे रहने की आवश्यकता है। हमने यह साफ शब्दों में कहा है कि भारत किसी तीसरे देश की मध्यस्थता स्वीकार नहीं करेगा। लेकिन आज जो स्वर सुनाई दे रहे हैं कि अगर अमरीका या ब्रिटेन कोई दबाव लाता है तो मध्यस्थता भी स्वीकार की जा सकती है। समाचार पत्रों में ऐसी खबरें हैं। हमें ऐसी बातों से सावधान रहना चाहिए और सदन में भी यह बात कई बार कही गयी है कि हम पाकिस्तान के साथ शांति बहाल की प्रक्रिया को जारी रखना चाहते हैं लेकिन किसी तीसरे देश की मध्यस्थता हमें स्वीकार नहीं होगी।

अभी कुछ दिन पहले हुर्रियत नेता यहां आये थे। उन्होंने पाकिस्तान के प्रधान मंत्री से चर्चा की लेकिन हमारे प्रधान मंत्री जी से चर्चा करने की इच्छा पता नहीं क्यों जाहिर नहीं की। एक तरफ वे हमारे साथ शांति प्रक्रिया में हिस्सा लेना चाहते हैं और दूसरी तरफ चर्चा भी करना नहीं चाहते और कहते हैं कि तीसरे पक्ष को सम्मिलित करना चाहिए। मैं निश्चित तौर पर भारत सरकार से कहना चाहता हूँ कि हमें इस पर गंभीरता से विचार करना चाहिए और हम अपनी उस बात से पीछे नहीं हटें, जो हमने यहां भी कई बार कही है कि हमें किसी तीसरे की मध्यस्थता स्वीकार नहीं होगी। चाहे अमरीका कहे या ब्रिटेन कहे, हमारी नीति स्पष्ट है कि हम द्विपक्षीय आधार पर ही किसी समझौते या शांति-प्रक्रिया के लिए आगे बढ़ेंगे। जब शांति प्रक्रिया की बातें की जाती हैं तो अमरीका का पाकिस्तान के बारे में रुख क्या है? अमरीका कहता है कि पाकिस्तान आतंकवाद की लड़ाई में मदद कर रहा है और दूसरी तरफ अमरीका पाकिस्तान को एफ-16 विमान देने की बात करता है या ऐसा हथियार देता है जो हमारे लिए खतरनाक हो सकते हैं या हमारी रक्षा-पंक्ति को नुकसान पहुंचा सकते हैं, हमारी संप्रभुता को नुकसान पहुंचा सकते हैं, तब हमें निश्चित तौर पर विचार करना पड़ेगा कि अमरीका के साथ हमारे संबंध कैसे हों? मैं माननीय विदेश मंत्री जी से निवेदन करना चाहूंगा कि इस दिशा में हमें गंभीरता के साथ विचार करने की आवश्यकता है।

आज आतंकवादी घटनाएं घट रही हैं और सीमा पर भी घुसपैठ बढ़ रही है। हमारे प्रधान मंत्री माननीय मनमोहन सिंह जी जब जम्मू-कश्मीर के दौरे पर थे तो उसी दिन आतंकवाद की घटना वहां हुई। क्या इसे ही आतंकवाद की घटनाओं में कमी होना कहा जा सकता है। जिस दिन माननीय प्रधान मंत्री जी वहां हों और उसी दिन आतंकवाद की घटनाएं घटें और माननीय मुशरफ साहब यह कहें कि आतंकवादी घटनाओं को रोकने के लिए हम तो बहुत ज्यादा कोशिश कर रहे हैं और अमरीका उनकी पीठ थपथपाए, तो यह गंभीरता के साथ विचार करने की बात है। आज घाटी की स्थिति और खराब हुई है। मैं यह भी कहना चाहूंगा कि हुर्रियत नेता जब यहां आये तो उन नेताओं की यहां क्या बातचीत हुई, यह भी हमारी जानकारी में नहीं है। हमारी भूमि पर आकर जो लोग भारत को विघटित करना चाहते हैं, उनसे मिलें, यह चिंता की बात है। यहां आने से पहले हमें हुर्रियत नेताओं को चेतावनी देनी चाहिए थी कि जो हमारे देश के हितों के विरुद्ध हों, ऐसी कोई बात नहीं होनी चाहिए। नहीं तो आने वाले समय में हमारे लिए कठिनाई उत्पन्न हो जाएगी। अच्छा तो यह होता कि वे यहां आते ही नहीं। माननीय वाजपेयी जी की सरकार ने सिद्ध कर दिया था कि भारत कोई कमजोर देश नहीं है। परमाणु परीक्षण करके सिद्ध कर दिया कि भारत भी एक ताकतवर देश है, परमाणु शक्ति सम्पन्न देश है। विभिन्न देशों ने जिन में बड़े-बड़े देश थे, शक्तिशाली देश थे, सम्पन्न देश थे, हमारे ऊपर आर्थिक सँक्शान्स लगा दिए थे। अमेरिका और कुछ दूसरे देशों ने लगा दिए थे। लेकिन हमने इन सब से निपट करके सिद्ध कर दिया था कि भारत इतना सक्षम है और उसमें इतनी क्षमता है, भारत की जनता में इतनी क्षमता है कि वह किसी भी स्थिति का मुकाबला करने के लिए तैयार है, हमने उस स्थिति का मुकाबला किया और आगे बढ़े। आज जो स्थितियां बनी हैं, जिस प्रकार से हमें घेरा जा रहा है, यदि अलकायदा से निपटना है तो अमेरिका को चिन्ता लग जाती है, अफगानिस्तान में कोई बात है तो अमेरिका को चिन्ता लग जाती है, इराक पर आक्रमण करना है तो अमेरिका को चिन्ता लग जाती है क्योंकि जब आतंकवाद उसे प्रभावित करता है तो वह सीख देता है। भारत उससे कहता है कि हम आतंकवाद से प्रभावित हैं, इसे रोकने के लिए हम भी कदम बढ़ा रहे हैं। उन कदमों में चाहे आप सहायता न करें, उन कदमों को रोकने का प्रयत्न न करें लेकिन दूसरे देशों को सहायता देकर, हमारे उन पड़ोसियों को सहायता देकर जो अभी भी आतंकवाद के प्रशिक्षण केन्द्र चला रहे हैं, उन्हें रोकने में हमारी मदद करें। आज भी पाकिस्तान में आतंकवाद के प्रशिक्षण केन्द्र चल रहे हैं। हम रेल मार्ग खोलना चाहते हैं पाकिस्तान तैयार नहीं है। हमारी इस संबंध में कैसी नीति होनी चाहिए, इस बारे में निश्चित रूप से विचार करने की आवश्यकता है। हमने सीमा से फौजें कम करके बता दिया है कि हम शान्ति चाहते हैं।

महोदय, हमारा जो दूसरा पड़ोसी देश है, वह बंगला देश है। उसके बारे में हमारी चिन्ता स्वाभाविक है और इसके बारे में चिन्ता करने की आवश्यकता है। अभी हाल ही में अखबारों में सुर्खियों से यह प्रकाशित हो रहा है कि क्रिकेट खिलाड़ी वहां खेलने के लिए नहीं जा सकेंगे क्योंकि उनके उम्र आक्रमण होने की संभावना है। अभी हमारा दल इसे देखने के लिए वहां गया है कि हमारी सुरक्षा की स्थिति कैसी है? भारत में बंगला देश से घुसपैठ करके जो लोग आ रहे हैं और पूर्वोत्तर भारत की स्थिति उन्होंने जिस प्रकार से खराब की है, जिस प्रकार कमजोरी खड़ी की है, वहां आतंकवाद से प्रभावित जो लोग हैं, उसके बारे में आज के राष्ट्रीय सहारा के अन्दर सम्पादकीय आया है। मैं उसकी कुछ पंक्तियां पढ़ कर सुनाना चाहूंगा। "बंगला देश सरकार ने खिलाड़ियों की पूर्ण सुरक्षा का भरोसा भारत को दिया है लेकिन वहां कानून व्यवस्था के जो हालात हैं, उसे देखकर वहां की सरकार पर भरोसा नहीं किया जा सकता है। बंगला देश में भारत विरोधी आतंकवादी गतिविधियों का एक प्रत्यक्ष नमूना है जिसे बंगला देश अभी तक नकारता आया है। सच्चाई यह है कि पाकिस्तान की तरह बंगला देश में भी अघोषित सरकारी नीति के तहत क्रमिक रूप से भारत विरोधी आतंकवाद को बढ़ावा दिया गया है। बंगला देश के एक महत्वपूर्ण मंत्री पर अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय आतंकवाद से जुड़े होने का आरोप लग चुका है। खास करके खालिदा की सरकार का रवैया भारत के खिलाफ काफी मुखर है। लाख प्रयासों के बावजूद केन्द्र सरकार इस मामले में बंगला देश को समझाने में नाकाम रही है। आम तौर पर पड़ोसी देशों के साथ अच्छे संबंधों की वकालत करने वाले वामदलों ने भी मुखर तरीके से बांग्लादेश में सक्रिय भारत विरोधी आतंकवादी गुटों की मौजूदगी की बात उठायी है और बंगला देश ने इससे इंकार किया है। कहने का मतलब यह है कि अपने खिलाड़ियों की सुरक्षा के मामले में हम बंगला देश सरकार पर भरोसा नहीं कर सकते, न तो कानून व्यवस्था के मामले में और न ही उसके राजनीतिज्ञों के वादों पर।" जागृत मुस्लिम जनता बांग्ला देश या बांग्ला भाई संगठन क्या भारत के खिलाफ कार्य नहीं कर रहा है ?

उन्होंने जिस प्रकार हमारी सीमाओं पर आक्रमण किया था, फौज पर जिस प्रकार आक्रमण किया था, लाखों की संख्या में जिस प्रकार घुसपैठ करके देश की आर्थिक स्थिति को खराब कर रहे हैं उसके बारे में सबक लेने की और चिन्ता करने की आवश्यकता है। अति आधुनिक हथियारों का जखीरा बंगला देश में पकड़ा जाए, एक नहीं दो-दो जहाज वहां पर आएँ और वह जहाज भी बंगला देश के एक मंत्री के जहाज हों और पकड़े जाएँ और उनमें शस्त्र पकड़े जाएँ, फिर वह हमें कैसे भरोसा दिलाते हैं कि हम आपके साथ मैत्रीपूर्ण संबंध बनाए रखना चाहते हैं। मैं चाहूंगा कि आप इसके बारे में निश्चित रूप से चिन्ता करें। पिछली बार जलवाहक पोत जब जब्त हुए थे तो उसमें बंगला देश के संसदीय कार्य मंत्री का भी नाम था। क्या हम उस बांग्लादेश पर भरोसा करें? हमारी जो पॉलिसी है मित्रता की हम उस पर कायम हैं लेकिन चाहे वह बंगला देश या पाकिस्तान के बारे में हो, उनके बारे में हमें चिन्ता करने की आवश्यकता है। हमने बांग्ला देश को वहां चल रहे आतंकवादी शि वरों की सूची भी दी किन्तु उन्होने कुछ नहीं किया।

नेपाल के साथ हमारे बहुत मैत्रीपूर्ण संबंध हैं। हम उसके साथ मैत्रीपूर्ण संबंध निभाते आ रहे हैं। वहां जब-जब कठिनाइयां खड़ी हुई हैं, हमने उन्हें हल करने में उनकी

मदद की है। माओवादियों से नेपाल परेशान है। हमने इस कठिनाई में नेपाल की मदद के लिए भरपूर सहायता देने का वचन दिया है और हमने सहायता दी भी है। लेकिन क्या माओवादी हमारे देश में दिखायी नहीं दे रहे हैं? उनसे निपटने में नेपाल असमर्थ रहा है। उन्हें रोकने में हमारे क्या कोशिश होगी? क्या हम नेपाल को बाध्य करें? हमारे देश की सीमा से लगे जो गांव हैं, वहां आकर माओवादी आक्रमण करते हैं। यह विसंगति है। वह एक प्रकार से पैरल सरकार चला रहे हैं। इसके बारे में चिन्ता करने की आवश्यकता है। मैंने आपसे निवेदन किया कि पूरी समग्र वैदेशिक नीति और समग्र उन संगठनों के बारे में चाहे वैश्विक संगठन हों - चाहे सार्क हो, एशियान हो, जी-8 हो - में इनके बारे में चर्चा इसलिए नहीं कर रहा हूँ कि आज वास्तव में हमें चिन्ता पड़ोसी देशों की है।

उन पड़ोसी देशों के बारे में चिन्ता ले लेंगे तो निश्चित रूप से इस पर वैदेशिक नीति की सफलता निर्भर करेगी। मेरा ऐसा मानना है कि आज सरकार असमंजस की स्थिति में है, वह किर्करतव्यविमूढ़ है कि क्या करे और क्या न करे। हमें अमरीका से संबंध रखने चाहिये तो किस तरह से रखें और दूसरे देशों के साथ संबंध कैसे रखें? ईराक में सेना भेजनी चाहिये या नहीं, इस पर भी सरकार किर्करतव्यविमूढ़ होकर सोच रही है। सरकार किसी निर्णय पर न जाकर असमंजस की स्थिति में बैठी हुई है।

सभापति महोदय, आपने घंटी बजाई है। इसलिये मैं अधिक समय न लेकर अपनी बात जल्दी ही समाप्त करना चाहूंगा क्योंकि अभी मेरे दो साथियों को भी बोलना है। इसलिये अपने पड़ोसी देशों के बारे में निश्चित रूप से हमारी चिन्ता आवश्यक है। अभी चीन ने पाकिस्तान को मानव-रहित टोही विमान दिये हैं जिसने भारत के चित्र लेने प्रारम्भ कर दिये हैं- क्या यह हमारे लिये चिन्ता का विषय नहीं है? हम चीन के साथ सीमा-विवाद समाप्त कर दोस्ती करना चाहते हैं लेकिन शायद चीन दुश्मनी के रास्ते अपनाकर पाकिस्तान को जहाज दे रहा है। इससे हमारी सीमा पर खतरा बना हुआ है। क्या इससे सीमा विवाद सुलझ गया- नहीं सुलझा है।

सभापति महोदय, मैं संक्षेप में बताना चाहूंगा कि हमारी वैदेशिक नीति में दृढ़ता हो और उसका दृढ़ता से ही पालन हो। केवल कहने भर से दृढ़ता नहीं आ जाती। मेरा ऐसा मानना है कि भारत सरकार की कुछ मजबूरियां हो सकती हैं और कुछ व्यवस्था हो सकती है परन्तु रा्ट्र की सुरक्षा, उसकी सार्वभौमिकता सर्वोपरि है। अगर ऐसा नहीं होगा तो उसके परिणाम सरकार को भुगतने होंगे। हमारी वैदेशिक नीति दुलमुल तरीके से नहीं चल सकती। हमारी दृढ़ वैदेशिक नीति से पाकिस्तान भी समझेगा कि हमारे साथ ठीक उसी प्रकार का व्यवहार किया जाना चाहिये, जो व्यवहार अपेक्षित है। हमारे कहने और करने में अंतर नहीं हो। इस विदेश नीति से पाकिस्तान चेतें बंगलादेश सरकार भी चेतें, चीन भी सावधान रहे कि यदि भारत के साथ गलत व्यवहार किया, तो भारत उसका उत्तर देने में सक्षम है। यदि यह दृढ़ता अपनाई गई तो निश्चित रूप से हमारी विदेश नीति सफल होगी अन्यथा इस सरकार की मजबूरियों के चलते मुझे पूरा विश्वास नहीं होता कि यह सफल होगी।

SHRI K.S. RAO (ELURU): Mr. Chairman, Sir, thank you very much for giving me an opportunity to speak on the foreign policy. During the four terms in Lok Sabha, I had never given a speech on foreign policy. Anyway, I am happy that I have got the opportunity today.

Shri Sudhakar Reddy spoke on the foreign policy. His party was very clear about the Foreign Policy, anti-imperialism, anti-capitalism, etc. right from the very beginning. While he was speaking on the foreign policy, my friend, Shri Swain asked him: Are you speaking about the Indian foreign policy or the U.S. foreign policy? I also heard very carefully the speech of our learned Member. Dr. Pandeya.

I do not know whether Shri Swain concentrated when Dr. Pandeya was delivering his speech. But he concentrated only when the Communist Party Member, Shri Sudhakar Reddy was delivering his speech. Even Dr. Pandeya has uttered not a single sentence without mentioning the U.S.A. I do not find fault with him for that. Unfortunately, more particularly now, the most developed nation in the world is the U.S.A., which thinks that every nation has to surrender before them and follow everything they say. It is a wrong trend. I support whatever Dr. Pandeya has said. I appreciate it. I do not find fault with it. He has also said that irrespective of whether it is the Congress Government, the NDA Government, or the BJP Government, the national interest is uppermost and the foreign policy is almost the same, except possibly with little variations. I am proud of that. What is the policy? The policy of non-alignment was formulated in the early days of Independence by our great visionary, Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru at a time when there were two warring powers in the world. He had the guts to decide about the non-alignment.

We will never be a satellite to any super power. We have our own independence. We have our desire to be free. Maybe, we are a developing nation; maybe, we did not have enough wealth or as much wealth as they have. But still, in regard to sovereignty, in regard to self-respect, in regard to the interests of the nation, we do not compromise. We are ready to face anything. If really, we were to take a policy of appeasement from NDA Government, even to a little extent, the question comes, why did we fight with the Britishers? Did the countrymen lack food or shelter? They were not lacking those things in those days. There was a strong desire in them to have freedom to rule their own nation. That strong feeling is still there today. I am perturbed about one thing. Every time I think of the foreign policy, particularly the methods adopted by the USA, I am not able to understand one thing. When I visited USA, I was surprised to see a child of six years, seven years or ten years old. If a child there thinks that he or she is intimidated by his or her parents, who take the total responsibility of the child, right from the stage of rearing up, giving love, affection, money and everything, the American law permits him or her to go to the police station and lodge a complaint against his or her parents. That means, the US Government is very particular on the question of giving freedom. But does the US Government take care only about the freedom of its own citizens and not the citizens of the entire world? Do we not have the same privilege? Do we belong to a different creed? Do we have a different blood? Why should the same kind of thinking, same conviction not be applied to other nations? If that is there in every nation, why should there be a dispute at all.

I heard my friend very carefully. It is true that if our relations are excellent with our neighbours, we do not need to bother about anybody, however strong one may be. No Indian is against any Pakistani. We are living in a democracy. We do not have any ambition, unlike in the past when there were kings, there used to be aspirations to acquire other areas and increasing their dominion. We do not have such things. We are very contented with what we have today in India. We want to live within our own means. The same thing is known to them. Why should there be a dispute between Pakistan and India? It is because of the misunderstanding created by some vested interests

in the globe. One of them is USA. It has supplied weaponry at every moment to Pakistan. That has created an impression that we must also be strong. That is the reason why this rupture is going on, the mistrust is going on between the two nations. We are wasting much of our resources only on defence because of that. Where is the need for us to spend even one rupee on defence in this country if our relations are excellent with our neighbours? It is because of the simple reason that tension is being created by the developed nations who want to rule, who want to have their hold in the entire world. We are suffering today. In spite of all these things, our leaders have got the courage and guts to say: "No. We do not yield. We are living in a democracy. We love freedom. We express our opinion irrespective of what you think and what you do. We are not scared of you." I am happy that some of the incidents in the world in the recent past have proved that no amount of weaponry, no amount of wealth can dictate terms or command the entire world. Even one individual can teach a lesson to the mighty nations if only he is determined and he is dedicated. If one were not to care for his life, if hundred people were not to care for their lives, they can do anything. If weapons were to dictate and decide the things in the world, things would have been different. At a time, when there was no awareness, at a time when there was no scientific growth, at a time when people used to depend entirely on their muscle power or lethal weapons that they had in their hands, that was a different thing.

When they had got horses, when they had got elephants and the men who could fight, those were different. But, today, the technology has grown up. They cannot decide simply by that. Sir, I know very well that everyone of us, irrespective of our party affiliations, is very clear that, in our minds, the national interest is uppermost. We may differ and fight with each other on the means - I mean how to bring prosperity in the nation, what policies are to be adopted and all those things - but when it comes to fight, when somebody else wants to encroach into our freedom, encroach our sovereignty, we are all one. We have proved it many a time, which ever Government was in power. This has to be taken care of by all those nations, who think that they can dictate terms to every nation.

Sir, in this context, I just want to bring in some points, which, for quite a long time, I have in mind for our hon. External Affairs Minister. I see this attitude. If a nation is strong enough, however much other nations are, they do not speak a word about it. Only when they think that these nations are less strong, they will try to dictate terms. Say, for example, China. They have a closed market; they are a closed country. They never bothered about growth, about what is happening elsewhere. But, they are determined. They have grown today. Totally diverse policies - USA on the one side and China on the other. Still, did we come across with even one instance where USA tried to encroach into the sovereignty of China? Why? It is because they are strong enough, because they are scared that if they do something against them, it will retaliate and that will lead to so many things. So, the basic moral is that we have to make our own backbone strong. If the backbone of our nation is strong, we do not need to bother about what others say and what others try to dictate on us. So, our concentration should be more on strengthening our own nation, making our nation rich, making our people strong and more competent.

Sir, in a similar way, I wish to bring to the notice of hon. Minister that the role of Ambassadors has changed. Our Ambassadors earlier used to think only a limited manner to discuss about the political relations between nation to nation. But today, trade and economy are playing vital role. They must open their eyes. Even the Minister has to enlighten them about this. Today there are millions of people living in Gulf countries. When they have got some problem, they will look at the Ambassadors there. If the Ambassador thinks that he is His Highness, His Excellency, he will not be accessible to the common man there - what is the fate of the common man there - whom to approach? So, the Ambassador must understand that. He must be a guardian of those nationals there. He must attend to their problems. Some of the countries like Philippines, if something happens to its nationals in another country, the country is reacting, the country is responding. The same thing should happen even with our country, with our Ambassadors. I want this message to go.

Similarly, Ambassadors must identify the areas where our nationals can take advantage of the situation there - not detrimental to the other nation. I am sure that opportunities are available in several countries where our people can flourish - both the technicians and technologists, the entrepreneurs and even the people with skills. This, the Ambassadors have to regularly study and then send reports to the Ministry and advise them so that they encourage our people accordingly and see that our wealth in human resources is put to extensive use, which is good for the nation.

I do not want to make a long speech. However, I am of the opinion, as Dr. Pandeya said, that we must see all methods and we must see all ways to convince our neighbours that there is no need for them to have any mistrust. We must say that we are not interested in encroaching into their territory nor can they. For their own reasons, they are not adopting the same policy as we do, but we must prevail on them to see that wisdom dawns on them, and at least in future, such things can be avoided so that all our resources can be put to development than on these things.

SHRI RUPCHAND PAL : Mr. Chairman, Sir, the previous BJP Government ...(*Interruptions*)

SHRI SURESH PRABHAKAR PRABHU (RAJAPUR): NDA Government.

SHRI RUPCHAND PAL : All right. I stand corrected. The previous BJP-led NDA Government.

SHRI SURESH PRABHAKAR PRABHU : How will you describe this Government?

SHRI RUPCHAND PAL : I shall describe it, but not in your language.

The previous BJP-led NDA Government, besides attacking the very roots of our secular ethos, had committed some other major mischief. One such was that they had committed to unilateralism and surrendered to the US policy. ...(*Interruptions*)

श्री मोहन सिंह (देवरिया) : श्री रूपचंद पाल जी, आप उधर देख कर बोलिए।

श्री रूपचन्द पाल : इधर से उधर चला जाएगा। Sir, I am addressing you; I am addressing the Chair only. The NDA Government, in gross disrespect to the national consensus for foreign policy, the major components of which were anti-imperialism, which was a legacy of the freedom struggle, it went for Indo-US Strategic Alliance. What was that? It was abject surrender to unilateralism.

We recall what happened. When we wanted to bring a Resolution condemning the invasion of Iraq, we found that the BJP-led NDA Government was objecting to the use of the word 'condemnation'. हिन्दी में निन्दा मान लिया, फिर भी अंग्रेजी में कंडेमनेशन नहीं चलेगा। The previous NDA Government was the first Government in this country which had gone for a compromise on the defence missile issue. No country has done that. That Government had done it, when the US was pulling us by the nose.

What is Indo-US Strategic Alliance? Have they given us anything? I am just making a comparison. There has been one Indo-EU Summit and there has been one Indo-US Strategic Alliance. The US have denied us technology, dual use of technology. They have imposed sanctions saying that our scientists had committed something in respect of delivering some knowledge about uranium or some nuclear secrets to Iran. Our scientists had never visited Iran. Only one had gone to Iran, only as a member of the International Atomic Energy Association. But it is still continuing. If some such policies are referred, there is a reaction from the US side. They do not care for any independent foreign policy.

We welcome the initiative of the new Government which has made a clear demarcation from the earlier deviation made by the NDA Government. It said that the UPA Government would pursue an independent foreign policy, keeping in mind its past traditions. The previous Government had forgotten the traditions; it had ignored the freedom struggle; it had forgotten the national consensus, and the respect in which it was held by many developing countries of the world.

Now, we welcome this new Government; the UPA Government, in its National Common Minimum Programme, has clearly spelt out that it would pursue an independent foreign policy, keeping in mind its past traditions.

This policy will see to promote multi-polarity -- not aggressive unilateralism -- and oppose all attempts at unilateralism. When the hon. Prime Minister had gone to New York, he had mentioned there that multi-polarism is our goal. He said that the broad things that he emphasized were India's commitment to multilateralism and to its embodiments and the process of UN reform to enable the body to re-fashion itself to become relevant to our times.

I congratulate the hon. Minister for the steps he has taken to normalise relations with Pakistan at people to people front and also the initiatives taken by the Prime Minister in his dialogue with President Musharraf. It was followed by the visit of the Prime Minister of Pakistan and discussions took place. Of course, you should caution the Pakistan Government that they should not indulge in inciting the sentiments on parochial issues and that they should not over-emphasize and talk about Kashmir only. It should be a composite dialogue. But the Government of India has taken certain steps and the people to people contact is improving. On the trade front also, we believe this Government is taking steps. What had that Government done? The European common market now have 25 members with 450 million people. Now Turkey is wanting to enter and many others are going to enter very soon. EURO is gaining strength day after day.

We have South Asian Association for Regional Cooperation (SAARC). Only because its meeting was being held in Pakistan, the former Prime Minister did not agree to go there. The smaller countries were held to ransom. Nepal, Bhutan, Maldives, and Sri Lanka all complained about it. Now this Government is taking steps to improve relationship with neighbouring countries. Very recently, the President of Sri Lanka had come and discussed very important things.

Hon. Minister for External Affairs is a very capable Minister. He is highly respected throughout the world. When he says something, it carries weight and he has said that the development in Nepal is a matter of grave concern to us. Now, Bhutan is taking steps to flush out extremists who have been taking shelter there. We are trying to improve our relationship with Pakistan, Bangladesh, SAARC countries and with European countries also. We attended EU Summit. We are part of Galileo Project and also of Nuclear Fusion Project. Has it happened in the case of Indo-US alliance? It has not.

Now the Government says that elections are going to be held in Iraq and that it cannot stay isolated from that. But after all, it is an illegitimate Government. The Government has no legitimacy. We appeal to the Government that they should not go beyond imparting training to electoral personnel. Barring that, nothing should be done. The Iraq Government has no legitimacy. More than one lakh people – most of them were civilians – have been killed there. What has happened in Fallujah? There was a genocide even the other day. Post U.S. elections, there may be more pressure on the Government and we believe this Government has the strength to keep itself independent. It has been spelt out by the Government here that this Government will pursue closer engagement and relations with the USA. The UPA Government will maintain the independence of India's foreign policy position on all regional and global issues.

17.00 hrs.

Sir, on the issue of Israel it seems to me, we have a complaint, that the Government wants to continue a special relationship with Israel. A new world order is being created and that will divide the West Bank into smaller enclaves making the formation of a separate Palestinian State unviable. This Government should be able to demarcate it. It will send a message to the Muslim community at large. It would also send a message to the world that we are committed to the Palestinian cause. Their great leader has passed away. In such a situation we must spell out clearly, the special relation that was started by them and was continued by the previous Government for the last six years, that this Government is not at all interested in continuing such a special relationship. We should send out right signals and give the right message to the Muslims and to the world at large. This Government should undo the pro-Israel policy adopted by the previous Government. This is our request to this Government.

Sir, in regard to Cuba I would like to submit that a large number of countries, I think, around 179 countries, voted for lifting of sanctions against Cuba. For the thirteenth time these countries have come out with a Resolution against sanctions. Cuba is a small island country. There have been sanctions against this country for so many years. No medicines are allowed from other countries, no free movement to that country is allowed and even Braille, meant for the blind people, is not allowed. But even then this country is able to survive on the strength of its socialism. The people of that country have been fighting against sanctions for all these decades. There have even been several attempts on the life of its great leader, Mr. Fidel Castro.

SHRI B. MAHTAB (CUTTACK): He is great because he is a Communist.

SHRI RUPCHAND PAL : You may say that if you like. But he is a great leader.

SHRI VIJAYENDRA PAL SINGH (BHILWARA): It is a socialist country.

SHRI RUPCHAND PAL : I know it is a socialist country.

SHRI VIJAYENDRA PAL SINGH : They do not hold elections.

SHRI RUPCHAND PAL : You are not aware of the facts.

Sir, the Government had helped that country by way of giving assistance in certain matters like providing food, medicines in their hour of crisis.

MR. CHAIRMAN : Your time is up.

SHRI RUPCHAND PAL : Sir, I am the only speaker from my party. I shall conclude very soon.

MR. CHAIRMAN: You have already consumed your allotted time.

SHRI RUPCHAND PAL : Sir, restoration of democracy in Myanmar has been our key objective. A message to this effect should be sent to the hon. President of that country or through some other channel that house arrest of the leader of their movement Sun Su Ki should be lifted. That would help in the process of democratisation of their country. The Government of India should also express its concern that such a thing is continuing in that country. This is not a happy thing.

Sir, I would like to make a reference about the letter written by our hon. Prime Minister to the American President George W Bush after his re-election. It is their concern as to what they have decided and what has been the

outcome and what are the reasons for the re-election of George W Bush. In that letter the hon. Prime Minister has written that India can be a partner for combating international terrorism. But who is a greater terrorist than America itself? Such a message should not have been given. It should have been qualified by saying that we have our independent position in regard to terrorism. We know how to combat terrorism. The US President is not the right person. The US policies are not at all conducive for combating terrorism. What had happened after invasion of Iraq in the name of terrorism? Has terrorism come down? Has it been diminished or reduced? No, it has not been so, rather it has given birth to new terrorist activities. So, the letter of the hon. Prime Minister – whatever may be spirit of the letter, we think – can send a wrong message about the independent nature of our foreign policy.

When the hon. External Affairs Minister would reply, he should rather emphasise that India is committed to its independent Foreign Policy and never toe any hegemonistic line or any line of aggressive unilateralism, and should not compromise on any pressure to which they would surrender. They should judge issues from their own independent viewpoints.

MR. CHAIRMAN : Before calling the next hon. Member, I must inform the House that the time of the House would be extended upto 7 p.m. and the hon. Minister would reply to the debate tomorrow.

Now Shri Mohan Singh may speak.

श्री मोहन सिंह (देवरिया) : सभापति जी, मैं आपका धन्यवाद करता हूँ जो इस बहस में हिस्सा लेने के लिए आपने मुझे मौका दिया। हमारे पास पुराने अनुभव के विदेश मंत्री हैं और इनको भारत के राष्ट्रीय हितों की गहरी समझ है। भारत के राष्ट्रीय हितों को सिद्ध करने की अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय रणनीति क्या हो, इसका इनका पुराना तजुर्बा है। इसलिए बहुत सलाह देने की आवश्यकता नहीं है। लेकिन मैं इतना जरूर कहना चाहता हूँ कि किसी भी देश की विदेश नीति की सफलता की कसौटी उस देश की विदेश नीति से अपने राष्ट्रीय हितों की सुरक्षा में कितनी सफल रही है और अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय मंचों पर उस देश के किसी भी हित रक्षा के लिए कितने मददगार हैं, पड़ोसी देशों के साथ उसके संबंध कितने मधुर हैं और इसी के साथ-साथ समय और परिस्थिति के अनुसार रणनीति बदलती रहती है।

एक दौर था जब हमारी विदेश नीति के खाके का निर्धारण हो रहा था, हम एक गुलाम देश थे और हमको दुनिया में ऐसे मित्रों की तलाश थी जो हमारी आज़ादी की लड़ाई में हमारे सहयोगी बन सकें तथा लोकतंत्र की अवधारणा में उनकी पूरी आस्था हो। इस हिसाब से हमने अपनी विदेश नीति की 1935-36 में आधारशिला रखी लेकिन देश की आज़ादी के साथ ही दुनिया की दूसरी लड़ाई खत्म हो गई थी और लड़ाई के वक्त दुनिया का दो हिस्सों में बंटवारा हो गया था। एक तरफ कथित लोकतांत्रिक देश और दूसरी तरफ कथित तानाशाही और ऐसे देश जिन्होंने लोकतंत्र का अपने देश में गला घोंटा था। उस दौर में भी भारत की आज़ादी के जो लड़ाकू लोग थे, उनके उमर दबाव पैदा हुआ कि हमको अंग्रेज हुकूमत के खिलाफ जंग नहीं करनी चाहिए क्योंकि अभी लोकशाही बनाम तानाशाही संघर्ष चल रहा है। लेकिन हमारी आज़ादी के दीवानों ने कहा कि यह सही समय है जब हम औपनिवेशिक शक्तियों पर हमला करके अपने देश को आज़ाद करा सकते हैं और ऐसी सोच के लोगों ने 1942 का अंतिम संग्राम किया था। आज़ादी के साथ ही दुनिया की दूसरी लड़ाई खत्म होने के बाद पूरे विश्व का दो हिस्सों में बंटवारा हो गया। एक वारसा संघ के आधार पर तैयार पूर्वी यूरोप के देश थे जिनका अगुवा बनकर रूस दुनिया के सामने आया और दूसरी तरफ नाटो, सीटो संघ संगठन उसका नेतृत्व अमरीका कर रहा था। इन दो ध्रुवी विश्व में हमको तीसरी ऐसी ताकत खड़ी करनी थी जो विचारधारा के आधार पर समाजवादी हो जिसके राष्ट्रीय उसूल लोकतांत्रिक हों और अपनी विचारधारा के आधार पर समूची दुनिया को उपनिवेशवाद से मुक्त कराना चाहते हों। ऐसे ही देशों का एक ब्लॉक भारत के नेता के नेतृत्व में दुनिया में बना जिसको हम गुटनिरपेक्ष देशों के रूप में इतिहास के रूप में देखते हैं और उस दौर में हमने अपनी विदेश नीति का निरूपण किया। हम एक ही बात कहना चाहते हैं कि फ्रांस के राष्ट्रपति द गॉल ने उस भयंकर तनाव के युग में अमरीकी राष्ट्रपति आयजन होवर और रूस के प्रधान क्रुश्चेव को अपने देश में बुलाया था और उन दोनों का शिखर सम्मेलन विफल हो गया था तथा तनावपूर्ण स्थिति और अधिक तनावपूर्ण हो गई थी। उस जमाने में हमारे देश के प्रधान मंत्री पंडित जवाहर लाल नेहरू ने संयुक्त राष्ट्र संघ में दोनों गुटों के भीतर जो दुनिया को तनावग्रस्त किये हुए हैं, दुनिया का समरस वातावरण बने, इसके लिए प्रस्ताव पेश किया था, जिस पर दुनिया के अधिकांश देशों ने नेहरू जी के उस कदम का, उस प्रस्ताव का स्वागत किया था। लेकिन उस जमाने में भी रूस के प्रधान मंत्री ख्रुश्चेव संयुक्त राष्ट्र संघ के अधिवेशन में अपना जूता मेज पर रख कर उस मेज को पीट रहे थे। हमारी संसद में तो यह कभी घटना देखने को मिल जाती है और बाहर उसकी निंदा भी होती है कि भारत की संसद में किस की घटनाएं होती हैं। वह पहली घटना थी अंतर्राष्ट्रीय मंच पर, जब संयुक्त राष्ट्र संघ में दुनिया के एक बड़े राष्ट्र के बड़े नेता ने इस तरह का व्यवहार किया था। लेकिन उस वातावरण में भारत को मित्रों की तलाश थी। दुनिया की स्थिति बदली। अपने राष्ट्रीय हितों के हिसाब से हमारे पाकिस्तान से जो तनावपूर्ण सम्बन्ध थे, उसमें भारत की सुरक्षा को स्थाई करना था। ऐसे समय में जब बांग्लादेश की आजादी की तैयारी शुरू हुई, तो श्रीमती इंदिरा गांधी ने रूस के साथ एक संधि की। यह संधि भारत-रूस संधि के नाम से विख्यात है। उस संधि में हमने स्वीकार किया कि भारत के हितों पर हमला रूस के हितों पर हमला माना जाएगा। इसी तरह से रूस के हितों पर हमला भारत के उमर हमला माना जाएगा। ऐसा करके एक ताकतवर मुल्क के साथ एक स्थाई शक्ति का भारत ने प्रदर्शन किया।

जय प्रकाश नारायण जी विपक्ष में थे। वे कभी कांग्रेस पार्टी के साथ नहीं थे, यानी सरकार के साथ नहीं थे। लेकिन श्रीमती इंदिरा गांधी ने उनके व्यक्तित्व का इस्तेमाल किया और पूरी दुनिया में उन्हें भेज कर बांग्लादेश की आजादी में जो सैनिक थे, उनके समर्थन में विश्व जनमत तैयार करने में सहायता ली और उनका सहयोग लिया। उसके बाद भारत ने बांग्लादेश को आजाद कराने में एक अहम् कड़ी की भूमिका निभाई। इस उपमहाद्वीप में भारत के भूभाग को सुरक्षित करने के लिए बांग्लादेश आजाद हुआ और पाकिस्तान से अलग हुआ। उस समय भी भारत के साथ अंतर्राष्ट्रीय मंच पर भारत की वकालत करने वाले बहुत सारे देश थे, जिन्होंने ताकत के साथ भारत के पक्ष का स्वागत किया और बांग्लादेश एक आजाद और सार्वभौम मुल्क के रूप में दुनिया में उभर कर आया। जिसको भारत के बाद दुनिया के अधिकांश देशों ने तत्काल मान्यता दी और उसको स्वीकार किया।

जब कभी भी कसौटी पर भारत की गुट निरपेक्षता की नीति, भारत के हितों के हिसाब से उसको तौलने की कोशिश हुई है, तो हमारी वैदेशिक नीति उस पर खरी उतरी है। आज की तारीख में दुनिया तीसरे दौर में पहुंच गई है। यह दौर है अपने आर्थिक हितों की सुरक्षा के लिए, अपने आर्थिक साम्राज्यवाद के प्रचार-प्रसार के लिए दुनिया का नए सिरे से पुनर्गठन हो रहा है। नए सिरे से उस जमाने में अपनी राष्ट्रीय अस्मिता की हिफाजत करने के लिए गुट बनते थे। उस जमाने में अपने देश को आजाद कराने के लिए लोकतंत्र और सार्वभौम बनाने के लिए गुट बनते थे। आज की दुनिया में आर्थिक साम्राज्य बढ़ाने के लिए और आर्थिक सुरक्षा के लिए गुट बन रहे हैं। आपने स्वीकार किया है कि हम एक ध्रुवीय दुनिया को स्वीकार नहीं कर सकते, बहुध्रुवीय दुनिया होनी चाहिए। इसको दुनिया के बहुत सारे देश मान रहे हैं। इसीलिए यूरोपीय संगठन बना, यूरोप के देशों का एक संघ बनाया गया। आज वे लोग अमेरिका के पिछलग्गू होने को तैयार नहीं हैं, जैसे दुनिया की दूसरी लड़ाई के समय उनके साथ थे। आज वे सीना तान कर आर्थिक क्षेत्र में उसकी बराबरी करने के लिए खड़े हैं। उनका यूरो डालर आज की तारीख में दुनिया में अमेरिकन डालर से ज्यादा महत्वपूर्ण और ताकतवर हो गया है और उसकी कीमत भी अधिक हो गई है। तमाम सवालों पर चाहे इराक का युद्ध हो, चाहे इस्राइल हो, फिलिस्तीन का सवाल हो, यूरोपीयन संघ ने स्वतंत्र ढंग से अपनी आवाज को अमेरिका के सामने सीना तान कर, खड़े होकर रखने का काम किया है। एक नया अंदाज दुनिया को उन्होंने दिया है।

हम आपसे आग्रह करना चाहते हैं कि भारत ने जिस जमाने में गुट निरपेक्ष देशों का संगठन बनाया था, आज जरूरत है भारत की वैदेशिक नीति में ऐसी रणनीति बने

कि दुनिया के जो कमजोर देश हैं, दुनिया के ऐसे देश जिनको आज की तारीख में विश्व के औद्योगिक दृष्टि से सम्पन्न राष्ट्रों के बाजार चंगुल से मुक्त कराना है, ऐसे देशों का एक ध्रुव भारत के नेतृत्व में बने। यह हमारी रणनीति होनी चाहिए। इसीलिए जो सार्क देशों का संगठन है, उसको हमें तेज करना चाहिए। मेरा सुझाव है कि जो आसियान देशों के साथ हमारे बढ़ते रिश्ते हैं, उनको मजबूत करना चाहिए। इसीलिए आज दुनिया छद्म युद्ध में लगी हुई है।

पहले संघर्ष आमने-सामने होता था, लेकिन आज भाड़े के आतंकवादी भेजकर, किसी भी देश की शांति-व्यवस्था को भंग कर, उस देश में आराजकता की स्थिति पैदा करने का एक छद्म प्रयास दुनिया के अंदर बहुत बड़े पैमाने पर चल रहा है। इसलिए आज गृह मंत्रालय से प्रश्नकाल में सवाल पूछा गया तो हमारे माननीय गृह मंत्री जी ने स्पष्ट रूप से स्वीकार किया कि हमारे देश के पूर्वोत्तर क्षेत्र में जो आतंकवादी हैं, उनके ठिकाने बर्मा और बंगला देश में भी हैं और इस आतंकवाद को सैद्धांतिक रूप से हथियार और आर्थिक मदद पाकिस्तान की आईएसआई से मिल रही है। यह एक गंभीर चेतवनी है कि जब हमारे देश के गृह मंत्री सदन में स्वीकार कर रहे हैं तब इसका मुकाबला हमारी विदेश-नीति ही कर सकती है।

पाकिस्तान के साथ रिश्ते सुधारने की कोशिश आज की नहीं है। पिछली सरकार और इस सरकार में एक अंतर है। एनडीए की सरकार ने जो कोशिश की वह किसी देश के दबाव में कोशिश थी लेकिन आज की तारीख में रिश्ते सुधारने के जो प्रयास हो रहे हैं वे हमारे स्वयं के प्रयास हैं, स्वतंत्र ढंग से अपने पैरों पर खड़े होकर रिश्ते सुधारने के प्रयास हो रहे हैं। हमारी रणनीति यह होनी चाहिए कि किसी भी कीमत पर रिश्ते तभी सुधर सकते हैं जब वे हमारे देश के आंतरिक संबंधों में हस्तक्षेप करना बंद कर दें।

नेपाल का लोकतंत्र भारत की देन है। हमारी आजादी के बाद अगर भारत का नेतृत्व जगा नहीं होता तो दूसरी लड़ाई के बाद पूर्वी एशिया के देशों में साम्राज्यवाद का राज हो गया होता। चाहे मलेशिया हो, इंडोनेशिया हो या थाईलैंड हो, सभी जगह भारत ने साम्राज्यवाद के प्रसार को रोका और लोकतंत्र के पौधे को रोपा था। बर्मा में आज लोकतंत्र की जगह तानाशाही आ गयी। वहां आतंकवाद के ठिकानों को खत्म करने के लिए वहां के सैनिक तानाशाह को हमसे मदद लेनी है, इसलिए उसका आपने स्वागत किया, कोई ऐतराज की बात नहीं है। लेकिन वहां की जो लोकतांत्रिक शक्तियां हैं अगर वे मजबूत रहेंगी, तभी हम अपने राष्ट्रीय हितों को मजबूत मान सकते हैं और तभी भारत भी मजबूत रहेगा, यह हमारी विदेश-नीति की बुनियादी सोच थी। इसी आधार पर हमने नेपाल और बर्मा में लोकतंत्र को ज़िंदा रखने की कोशिश की। आजादी के बाद हमने नेपाल में आजादी का माहौल देखा था लेकिन आज नेपाल आतंकवाद की चपेट में है और आज बर्मा में सैनिक तानाशाही है लेकिन भारत की नीति ऐसी होनी चाहिए जिससे वहां जो लोकतांत्रिक शक्तियां हैं, उनका खात्मा किसी भी कीमत पर न हो। भारत का मानना यह रहा है कि दुनिया के किसी भी देश में लोकतांत्रिक शक्तियों की मदद करना, उनके आंतरिक मामले में हस्तक्षेप नहीं माना जाएगा। इसी आधार पर हमने दक्षिणी अफ्रीका के लोकतांत्रिक आंदोलन की नैतिक और दूसरे तरीकों से मदद की।

हमारे देश के लाखों लोग पश्चिमी एशिया के देशों में रहते हैं। खाड़ी देशों में आतंकवाद के चलते सबसे ज्यादा शिकार भारतीय हो रहे हैं। ऐसी स्थिति क्यों आई? भारत ने इराक के मामले में गत 4-5 वर्षों में अपनी नीति कई बार बदली है। उसका नतीजा है कि जिन खाड़ी के देशों ने काश्मीर के सवाल पर पाकिस्तान के खिलाफ भारत के पक्ष का समर्थन किया था, आज वहां भारतीय बंधक बनाये जा रहे हैं। अखबारों में खबरें छप रही हैं कि भारत सरकार भारतवंशियों को मुक्त कराने के लिए लम्बी-चौड़ी रिश्वत दे रही है। कहां तक ये खबरें सही हैं, मैं नहीं कह सकता लेकिन इतना जरूर कहूंगा कि खाड़ी देशों से हमारे परम्परागत संबंध अच्छे थे, उनको बनाए रखना चाहिए और वह तभी बनेंगे, जब फिलीस्तीन आन्दोलन में भारत की जो साझेदारी पिछले 50 वर्षों से थी, उसमें थोड़ी कमजोरी आ रही है, ऐसा मैं कहना चाहूंगा। फिलीस्तीन आन्दोलन के सबसे प्रमुख यासर अराफात के बाद फिलीस्तीन के लोग दुनिया में अपने को अनाथ न समझें, उनके पीछे भारत का हाथ है, यह विश्वास फिलीस्तीन जनता को सदैव रहना चाहिए। यही एक ऐसा हथियार है, जिससे खाड़ी की जनता का दिल भारत की सरकार और भारत देश जीत सकता है।

इन्हीं शब्दों के साथ चूंकि आप मजबूर हैं और हम भी मजबूर हैं, मैं माननीय विदेश मंत्री जी को थोड़े से सुझाव देकर आपको भी धन्यवाद देता हूं कि आपने मुझे दो शब्द कहने का मौका दिया।

SHRI SURESH PRABHAKAR PRABHU (RAJAPUR): Mr. Chairman, Sir, at the outset, I thank you for giving me this opportunity to speak on this subject.

I also thank my colleague-Member for initiating the discussion on a subject which normally does not get discussed in Parliament. A subject of such great importance, where the country's interests are being furthered in terms of foreign policy, we hardly discuss in Parliament. More so, the foreign policy is something which can really pursue the country's direction in a particular manner. It takes a very long time to correct or rectify it. Therefore, it is really important and I wish to thank my colleague for initiating this discussion on the subject.

Foreign policy of any country – and definitely for India also – has to further the national interest. It has to further the national interest of our own country in foreign affairs. Therefore, the foreign policy is largely determined by the fact whether we are pursuing our own domestic interest to our own advantage or not. I think this is one of the tests on which we can determine how far we have really succeeded.

So many of my colleague-Members talked about political issues which are dominating the foreign policy. It is inevitable. So, we cannot just have a foreign policy which is isolated and segregated from the political issues of the country or the world. But, I think, we also need to try to encompass so many other concerns that are now there in the world which should also get reflected in the foreign policy.

First of all, I think, we must now make very good use of our strength which can actually be used to our own advantage. For example, the economic development of the country is obviously dominating the foreign policy. We want to develop. The USA is so powerful. Everybody has mentioned about the USA. It is so powerful because it is economically powerful. We cannot wish it away. Somebody was saying that we should try to focus India's interest in favour of the USA. But India's interest lies in making sure that we do not make enmity with a country which is so powerful. Therefore, India's interest is certainly served by the fact that we actually grow economically. So, that is one way that we should do it.

The other sector which we must actually take into consideration – actually it is diplomacy which is going to dominate all over in the years to come – is the environmental sector, the environmental issues. Actually, India has a great advantage in terms of ensuring that. The world over the issues that get discussed are the economic issue and

the environmental issue. So, in terms of environment, we have great advantage because India is not a country which can qualify to be in the G-7 club. But India is a country along with Brazil and China which is growing so fast. The environmental impact of that growth is going to be felt by the rest of the world. So, we can definitely leverage it to our own advantage and see that India is going to make use of this strength. We are not in the G-7 club but we are the P-7 member because we have a great potential to produce. If we cannot actually use it to our own advantage, it will not be good.

Secondly, we must also make sure how we can make use of the Indian community, the Indian diaspora - present all over the world - to our own advantage. We have been holding *Parvasi Bhartiya Diwas* which is one of the very welcome things. They can come back to the mainland. They would realise that the mainlanders really respect them; they are very much concerned about them. But in the same way, we must also find out how the Non-Resident Indians can be used as our ambassadors in ensuring that India's interests are taken forward.

I am aware of the fact that the India-caucus in the US Congress is so strong now that it has multiple Members. This has happened because the Indian diaspora living in the USA could influence them to join the India-caucus. Therefore, in the same way, we should try to use it. Also, our scientists are there. Our scientists are spread all over the world. This world is now dominated by science and technology. So, it is the knowledge economics which is now influencing the world. We should try to find out how the Indian scientists can be made use of to our own advantage because they really matter all over the world.

Next, our foreign policy has to be closer to our own borders first. We must ensure that our neighbours are our good friends. We are actually concerned right now about what is happening in our neighbourhood.

Everybody has mentioned about Bangladesh. Sir, we are very surprised that, we are actually concerned that, what happens in Bangladesh is of great concern to all of us. Sir, there have been attacks on the former Prime Minister of Bangladesh. With God's help, God's hand on her, she escaped the attempt made on her life, but, otherwise, she would have probably not been there today. The minority community in Bangladesh is being targeted; the Media in Bangladesh is being targeted, and this has a great impact on India's relations with Bangladesh. I am really concerned about what is happening in Bangladesh. I am sure the Government of India would ensure that our concerns, the Indian Parliament's concerns, about what is happening in Bangladesh would be taken note of in framing the foreign policy.

Sir, Pakistan is one of our other neighbours. Right now, we are confused because the Government is sending a little confusing message. On the one hand, we are saying that when we are going to talk to Hurriyat, we are willing to talk to them without any condition on anything. At the same time, the Prime Minister has already said in Jammu and Kashmir about the territorial integrity of India - we are not good readers of the geography of the country - it is in response to the statement which was made earlier by General Musharraf. The problem of Kashmir, which is central to Indo-Pak relationship, how that is going to affect the foreign policy, is something which we would like to know from the Government.

Sir, the United States has always been saying that India is a friend of United States. But, surprisingly, whenever India claims at something, they give us a very good verbal support, but in terms of actual action, we have been seeing that now Pakistan is beneficiary of a great largesse given by USA in terms of arms and in terms of financial support. So, how actually this is going to be reconciled? On the one hand, we have got good relations with the United States, and, in fact, my colleague, Shri Rupchand Pal, read out a statement, which was written by our Prime Minister to President Bush congratulating on his re-election. So, I would like to find out how we are going to reconcile this apparently conflicting statement, and this is in relation to our domestic interest.

Sir, in terms of ensuring our neighbours - Bangladesh is one - what is happening in Nepal is also of great concern to us. People are already talking about the corridor between those Maoists in Nepal with the Naxalites in India. Probably, if that is going to happen, one-fourth of India's districts, out of 600 districts, 120 districts would now be inflicted by the Naxalite menace. So, how that is going to affect India's interests? How the Government will ensure that what is happening in Nepal will not have adverse impact on India's security and it is something which I would like to really know.

Sir, I would like to request the Government of India to make a periodical assessment of India's foreign policy. We have got a fiscal responsibility upon which the Finance Minister is obliged to make a statement before the House saying what is the status of the economy. In the same way, I think it is a good idea that the Government of India must take the Parliament into confidence, spell out very clearly what are the short-term, medium-term and long-term objectives of the foreign policy and how they are moving in that direction. This will ensure that such debates can be carried out twice a year or three times a year and that will also ensure that this foreign policy of India would be participatory in nature.

Sir, after the neighbours, I would like to say that some hon. Members have mentioned about our membership with

ASEAN. Sir, in fact, we share our border with Myanmar, which is a member of ASEAN. I think, really speaking, if Turkey can become a member of the European Union, because part of the Turkey lies in European continent, in the same way, we are looking at India's long border with Myanmar. This would qualify us to be a member of ASEAN. We should not become a dialogue member really. We should be, really speaking, a full-time and full-fledged member of the ASEAN. I think the Government must pursue that India, for one reason is that while the world we are talking about through the WTO, all the borders are dismantling. The goods and services can move without any hindrance but, at the same time, new trade blocks have been created. It should not happen that India is left out of these opportunities. Probably, the new initiatives, which were initiated by the Government of India, which is now pursued by this government of having an FTA with the ASEAN, should be pursued very vigorously. At the same time, as I said, the long-term interest, along with the short-term and medium-term interests should be prescribed as to how we become a full-fledged member of ASEAN.

Sir, China is another neighbouring country of us. The Foreign Minister, the other day, while replying to a question in Parliament, has said that while we are committed to resolve the border dispute with China, we would also like to further our economic relations with China. I am sure we cannot miss out an opportunity with China, which is now the fastest growing economy in the world, which is growing so fast that probably one day it will be surpassing the US economy within the next few years' time.

Therefore, our relation with China also assumes great importance. I just now said about our short-term, medium-term and long-term policies. While on the one hand, on the short-term we should know what is the policy that the Government is pursuing in respect of China, on the other hand, we should also explore the possibility as to whether we can have a common market with our close neighbour China which will really put us into a great advantage. I am saying this because India and China are the two largest populations of the world. India has 16 per cent of the global population and China has about 18 per cent of the global population. So, between India and China, we have more than 33 per cent of the global population and if they have a common market, it can influence the world economy in a very significant way.

Sir, our relationship with the Latin American countries is something which, I think, we need to strengthen. We are going East now; we have already gone West; and now, I think, we have to see as to how we can strengthen our relationship with the Latin American countries and that is of great importance to us. It is not just symbolically that we should be talking about Latin America. It should be a very comprehensive package in which our friends in Latin America, some of our traditional friends in Latin America, should not be just talking to us because the language they speak and the language we speak are different and, therefore, we really need to pursue it very aggressively.

Then, the Commonwealth is a platform that is available to us. We hardly talk about it these days. The Commonwealth was created when the Empire was crumbling. It actually re-assembled on a platform of Commonwealth. We should see as to how we can use the Commonwealth to our own advantage. Has the Government really thought about using the Commonwealth platform as a part of the diplomacy? The subject is something that I would also like to be enlightened by the Minister.

Sir, there are three or four small things which I would like to mention now. When we talk about the foreign policy, there are principles, there are ingredients and there are strategies, but to exercise all these, we need some instruments. So, one of the instruments that is available to us is our own Missions that are there in many parts of the world. India is one country, which is one of the few countries, which has so many Missions all over the world. Probably, not many countries have as many Missions as India has got. Now, these Missions should play a useful role. Is the Government thinking of ensuring that there is some accountability on these Missions that these Missions must produce a minimum output? Export is our major priority. Is there an effort on the part of the Government to ensure that technical cooperation between various countries really happen? Can we not actually quantify the output that is expected from each of these Missions?

At the same time, we should also provide the necessary training for properly manning these Missions to accomplish this output because the traditional diplomacy of only conceived politics is no longer valid. Now, the present-day diplomacy has to be multi-disciplinary. As we are talking about a multi-polar world, multi-disciplinary diplomacy is the order of the day and to pursue that, some training is required. Therefore, I would like to know from the Minister whether we are also thinking in terms of providing training not just to the IFS officers, but even to other officers and other personnel in the External Affairs Ministry to equip them to deal with these different challenges that the world is facing.

Similarly, I would like to know whether we are also thinking about creating some specialised service personnel. For example, as I mentioned in my speech earlier, environment is growing as a major policy issue now. Just as the Indian Foreign Service officers have to learn a particular foreign language, in the same way, I would like to know whether we can think about specialising some officers on economic diplomacy, in diplomacy relating to environment etc. If that is done, that will be of great help.

Sir, I was remembering about our old past, wherein we were the leader of the Non-Aligned Movement and we are very proud of that. Now, unfortunately, the Non-Aligned Movement is no longer valid because even if we want to be holding the Non-Aligned group together, others have already aligned with a particular group. That is the reality of life which we must accept. Therefore, in those days, one of the great advantages we had was, we used to invite foreign students from Africa and Asia to come and study in India. Many of them have now become Heads of State and Heads of Government in their respective countries. So, you can imagine the influence that it has on their perception about a country where they were educated. Are we thinking about reviving that possibility in which we should invite as many students as possible, offer them studies in India and train them in India so that when they go back home, they become our own real ambassadors, the brand equity ambassadors, will actually think about India and also participate in their domestic affairs of their respective countries? This is something on which I would like to know what the Government is doing.

Then, there was an initiative called, the Indian Ocean Rim Initiative. I would like to know about it from the Minister because, now-a-days, we do not hear too much about it. Of course, too many initiatives do not really mean anything because they cannot really result in any concrete action. But this Indian Ocean Rim Initiative was a very interesting initiative because, actually speaking, that was a vision which we traditionally had for the people who are located in those countries. Therefore, I would like to know as to how far this initiative has developed and whether there is any change in it.

Sir, I realise I have taken more time, but I will conclude soon. India has been demanding and rightfully so – as a matter of right, it is not that we are expecting any favour from any other country – that India should be a part of a reformed United Nations system in which the United Nations Security Council would be expanded and India would rightfully have a major role to play as a Permanent Member, enjoying the same rights as the present Permanent Members of the UN Security Council have, including the right to veto.

There was a committee which was appointed by the UN Secretary General to look into this issue. That committee submitted its report. But the report, unfortunately, does not provide that type of status to India, which India deserves. I would like to know how we are going to ensure that India's interest will be protected. UN will be reformed, has to be reformed because the UN is asking the rest of the world to reform and if the UN itself is not reformed, it does not really make any sense. Therefore, UN must be reformed, but in the reformed UN, how India will occupy the position it deserves is something how the Government will take us into confidence, that I would like to know.

I will make my last point and then I will conclude. There was a talk about India that it is a sufferer of attacks of terrorism for many years. Many innocent people lost their lives. We are concerned about what is happening in Iraq. So many people are dying. But at the same way, we should also be concerned and should be sensitive to the innocent people dying in our own territory. Many people have died; our Indian Parliament was attacked by terrorists. We are concerned about it. But terrorism, in our opinion, does not start with 9/11. Whereas America thinks that the beginning of terrorism is 9/11 and therefore, that is the beginning of history. We are suffering from terrorism. Therefore, I would like to know how are we building up a coalition of countries around this very important theme terrorism, Anti-Terrorism Theme. It is an extremely important theme. In the changed world we must ensure that all those countries who are committed to work against terrorism, because terrorism is something which affects the common man, the innocent people and the countries, who cannot afford to resist them, should work in a coalition. The US has the ability to resist, but the countries, which are poor, like those who do not possess that much financial capital, are the sufferers of the most. Therefore, I would like to know how are we building the coalition against that.

I wish that this particular discussion, as I said, should be a periodic affair wherein the Foreign Policy will be debated in Indian Parliament so that all of us will be able to express our views. We must ensure that the Foreign Policy is something, which is beyond politics, of domestic politics of India. In a sense that we should not try to attack the Government just because we are in the Opposition and the Government should not try to find fault with the Opposition just because they are now in the Government because Foreign Policy has to be durable, stable and should be able to carry forward as a means of promoting national interest. Therefore, we would like to support and find out how the policy is going to help them.

SHRIMATI TEJASWINI SEE RAMESH (KANAKAPURA): Respected Chairman Sir, I would like to use this highest House of the country to pay my sincere thanks to my 27 lakh voters of Kanakapura in Karnataka who elected me to this highest House of the country to participate in this debate for my country, particularly on the issue of Foreign Policy.

Sir, our father of the nation, Mahatma Gandhi, preached us truth, love, peace, non-violence and mutual-cooperation. Our first Prime Minister Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru practised the very principles of *Panchasheel Tatwa*, which believes in peace, brotherhood, mutual trust, mutual respect, non-violence, cooperation and development.

Our great leader, late Indira Gandhi, built this motherland, India as a *Mahan Bharat*, in real sense. By leading the Non-Aligned Movement. Indiraji contributed all her energy to bring India to the forefront of the world. It is the right place to remember the contributions of Indiraji. She exploited every opportunity to strengthen this motherland as a leader of NAM. At the time of the cold war, the world was suffering in between the pressure from USA and the USSR. It is Indiraji, who boldly organised the Third world and developing countries under the umbrella of NAM. It is very proper that world recognised by paying its respectful homage to Indiraji by awarding the title of Millennium Leader in the year 2000.

Sir, our late Prime Minister, Rajivji, followed the path of our forefathers, who also contributed and strengthened our Foreign Policy. At last, everyone knows that he sacrificed his life for the cause of our friendship with Sri Lanka.

Sir, I would like to remember a number of statesmen who contributed, across the party line, their own knowledge, their own experiences to strengthen India's independent foreign policy in this House. Today, I would like to congratulate my UPA Government under the leadership of Dr. Man Mohan Singh ji, and particularly its Chairperson, Shrimati Soniaji, who believed and trusted our dynamic and experienced leaders like Shri Natwar Singh ji, who had worked with Nehruji, Indiraji and late Rajivji to enrich our independent foreign policy. Today, he is giving his contributions to India. One can see this in UPA Government's foreign policy. It is proper to highlight some important points of our foreign policy. The UPA Government will pursue an independent foreign policy keeping in mind its past traditions. This policy will seek to promote multi-polarity in world relations and oppose all attempts at unilateralism. The UPA Government will give the highest priority to building closer political, economic and other ties with its neighbours in South Asia and to strengthening SAARC.

Dialogue with Pakistan on all issues will be pursued systematically and on a sustained basis. As far as Sri Lanka is concerned, UPA Government has made its stand very clear that it will support peace talks in Sri Lanka that fulfil the legitimate aspirations of Tamils and religious minorities within the territorial integrity and solidarity of Sri Lanka. Outstanding issues with Bangladesh will be resolved. Intensive dialogue will be initiated with Nepal for developing water resources to mutual advantage. As far as China is concerned, UPA Government made it clear that trade and investment with China will be expanded further and talks on the border issue pursued seriously. It is true that our Prime Minister met the Chinese Premier, and one can see with hope that our relationship will improve with China, especially in respect of trade and other aspects.

Sir, it is proper to mention here that even as it pursues closer engagement and relations with the USA, the UPA Government will maintain the independence of India's foreign policy position on all regional and global issues. The UPA is committed to deepening ties with Russia and Europe as well. One can see with the European Union also, India is making special efforts to improve its trade and other aspects. In keeping with the stance adopted by late Shri Murasoli Maran at Doha, the UPA Government will fully protect the national interest, particularly of farmers, in all WTO negotiations. Commitments made earlier will be adhered to, even as efforts are mounted to ensure that all agreements reflect our concerns fully particularly in the area of intellectual property and agriculture. The UPA Government will use the flexibility afforded in existing WTO agreements to fully protect Indian agriculture and industry. The UPA Government will play a proactive role in strengthening the emerging solidarity of developing countries in the shape of G-20 in the WTO.

Sir, today, India is claiming all its credentials to become a permanent Member of the Security Council of UN. I am referring from the United Nations and International Organisations Annual Report. On March 31, 2003, one Report was published that as far as contributions to the peacekeeping operations are concerned, "India continued to be a major troop contributor. It is presently contributing to 11 of the 15 UN peacekeeping operations, providing infantry battalions to two of them, and UN Missions in Ethiopia and Eritrea (UNMEE), helicopters with support crew to the UN Organisation Mission in the Democratic Republic of Congo (MONUC) and a major civilian police component in the UN Interim Administration Mission in Kosovo (UNMIK). India has also committed, in principle, to contribute to the envisaged UN Peacekeeping Mission in Sudan aimed at facilitating an end to the long-running civil war in Sudan."

Sir, India, by trying to become a Permanent Member of the Security Council can play a very important role in resolving many national and world issues.

All these years – everyone is aware that only a few countries used to dominate the world scenario. India, as a NAM country, throughout its historic events knows how it suffered in the hands of colonial powers. That is why it knows the value of the freedom movement. It supported the freedom struggle in South Africa to Bangladesh and many such countries across the borders. It also persuaded its struggle to get released Nelson Mandela, Yassar Arafat and even Aun Sang Suu Ki of Myanmar. By becoming a permanent member in the UN Security Council, India can play a major and decisive role in all its say on human rights as well as socio and sustainable development activities across the Globe and to curb Terrorism which hunts the world today. The UN Security Council is a most important body in the world. India feels that it must have the right to say about the world developments.

As far as curbing global terrorism is concerned, India is the first and greatest sufferer throughout the history. The

latest issue to which we can refer is how the terrorists attacked our very sacred House of Parliament in the forefront of our doorsteps.

Sir, as far as NAM is concerned, recently I got an opportunity, by the grace of my Government, to attend one of the Study Group on the "Role of Parliament in conflict-affected countries" held at Colombo. There I got the opportunity to interact with my African friends, who are young MPs. They expressed their feeling. It is my pleasure to inform this highest House as to what they feel. Today, the world feels, the elected representatives of various countries particularly African countries feel that India should play a very responsible and leading role to strengthen NAM. After the dismantle of the USSR, the world feels that there is an imbalance of power in the world scenario.

As far as Iraq is concerned, I would like to congratulate my Government for not yielding to the demands of the militants for negotiation or ransom in a particular Indian Truck drivers abduction case. My Government, under the guidance of our Foreign Minister Natwar Singh ji and also our Minister of State, Shri E. Ahamed, really deserves a special mention here. We were successful in get releasing our truck drivers without yielding to their pressure and also my country solidly resisted the pressure from the external forces. My country adopted the stand of not sending its troops to Iraq, and I would like to congratulate the UPA Government under the leadership of Dr. Manmohan Singh ji for this.

As far as Palestine is concerned, as I mentioned, India was a great sufferer of the colonial rule. India knows the very fruitful values of the freedom movement. Thus it supported numerous national freedom movements in the world. India always supported their right to struggle for their homeland. One should not forget the fact, while we are taking up some issues, that nearly four million Indian Muslims live in the Arab world. That means, one should be very careful to guard the interest of our Indian Muslims when adopting some stands.

As far as China is concerned, as I mentioned, our Prime Minister had a meeting with the Chinese Premier. Our Prime Minister is having his own way of approach. I am fully confident and I fully believe that we will achieve a major breakthrough in these talks as well as in development and trade. I am fully confident that India, at any point of time, will never yield to any pressure of the foreign forces.

As far as Sikkim is concerned, we have achieved a mileage. Today, we are capable of convincing China that Sikkim is an integral part of India.

As far as Sri Lanka is concerned, again I will like to mention that I got the opportunity to interact with the Speaker ruling party and also with the Opposition Parties.

I have interacted with many MPs of the ruling Sri Lankan Party, MPs of the UNP, the Opposition leaders and also of the Sri Lankan Muslim Congress. I would like to tell you, because this is Parliament, that one must be aware that though India never interfered in the internal affairs of the other country, it is the need of the hour. The Sri Lankan people feel that India cannot keep quiet from this peace talk. As far as the Sri Lankan people are concerned, they feel that as long as India is supporting their national integrity and their national sovereignty, Sri Lanka is safe in its relationship with India. This is what they feel. Even many of the MPs expressed this feeling. I feel that as long as we are facing the problem of refugees who come to India from Sri Lanka, since we are taking care of refugees, the developments in Sri Lanka always concern India's national sovereignty and integrity. Many forces within India are getting provocation and support from some disturbing forces who operates in Sri Lanka. So, India cannot keep quiet on these negative developments. I would like to bring to the notice of our leader Natwar Singhji that it is the aspirations and it is the feeling of the Sri Lankan people that India should play a very important role to preserve, to guard the Sri Lankan national integrity.

We know that as long as our Tamil ethnic and minority groups like Muslims groups are living in Sri Lanka within their Constitution and legal framework, Sri Lanka can resolve its issues with the help of the neighbouring country. History cannot forget how our great leader and late Rajivji laid down his precious life for the sake of friendship and thousands of our PKF Soldiers to bring peace in Sri Lanka. I would like to recognise his sacrifice with honour and deep sorrow.

Sir, as far as Pakistan is concerned, Pakistan country is the reality today. No one erase it from the Globe. Many times it is a very painful moment for me to remember that once it was the integral part of India, it was part of our life and it was part of our great motherland. We cannot deal with Pakistan like any other enemy country. One don't have choice to take birth in a particular religion or particular place or particular nation definitely we have a choice to live together in peace and harmony. I feel I cannot suspect the patriotism of our Opposition leaders, hon. Shri L.K. Advani ji who was born in a land which went to Pakistan. Likewise, our Prime Minister Dr. Manmohan Singh ji was also born in a land which went to Pakistan. If we can respect the patriotism of our Opposition leader and our Prime Minister, why do we not understand the aspirations of the Pakistan people and Indian people? Today the people of India want peace. The people of Pakistan want peace. If we are truthful, if we are committed and if there is a will, there is a way. I feel all my forefathers fought with this issue. All my elders fought with this issue. At least, in our

lifetime we would like to see harmony and friendship with Pakistan. Nothing is impossible for India as long as she is the biggest democracy in the world. By defending our territorial integrity, territorial sovereignty, I believe, the UPA Government is capable of resolving all its problems with the neighbouring country.

MR. CHAIRMAN : Please conclude.

SHRIMATI TEJASWINI SEE RAMESH : I would like to thank the Chair for giving this great opportunity. I would also like to thank the UPA Government's foreign policy.

...(Interruptions)

MR. CHAIRMAN: This will continue up to 7 p.m.

SHRI VIJAYENDRA PAL SINGH (BHILWARA): Sir, I stand to participate in the discussion under rule 193 regarding foreign policy of the Government. I thank the Members, Shri Sudhakar Reddy and Shri Chandrapan, who have initiated this debate.

When we go down the memory lane of independent India, we find that initially our foreign policy was governed by Panditji, our first Prime Minister.

Those were the days of cold war and he in his own right and with his stature, which was so great, could push the *Panchsheel* principles and the Non-Alignment Movement. We started with that. In the post-cold war era, there has been a paradigm change. There is no USSR like what it used to be and we have a country like the US, which, nobody can deny, is economically and arms-wise the greatest nation.

The end of World War II and our attainment of Independence sort of coincided with each other. We then had the formation of the United Nations with 51 countries. Now, the membership has gone up to 191 countries. Today, the UN is not the same force like what it used to be. We have seen in the Iraq war and in other such international problems that whenever such problems occur the UN has not been really able to have its say. This is a big worry to countries like ours.

We want a place in the Security Council of the United Nations, which is right now one of the most important things that our foreign policy has to focus on. I would like to know from the hon. Minister who has such a great knowledge and experience how we are going to forge our policy towards securing a permanent seat in the Security Council.

I was in Japan some time ago. Japan is also aspiring for a seat in the Security Council and so is Brazil. We would like to know how we could together make a way and influence the great nations. Nobody can deny the fact that India is the largest democracy in the world. We also have one-sixth of the population of the world. Our country has been a democracy for the last 57 years. We have all that strength and I think it is a right of ours that we should have a permanent seat in the Security Council.

This is a vast subject that has come up. We can only touch upon a few things. Foreign policy is such a vast subject that we do not know where to start. If we start with the neighbouring countries, we find that we are having problems with the neighbouring countries. It is not just with Pakistan but with Bangladesh as well. We have Nepal also as our neighbour. We may be having a good relationship with the Government of Nepal but we have problems there. We have to think about how we could really have some advantage from Bhutan and Nepal.

We have shortage of power in India. If we could do have a dialogue with Nepal, we would be able to sort out two problems. We could solve the problem of floods that we have every year in Bihar and UP. Their potential of hydro-electricity could also be explored and exploited. I am told that there is a potential of over 50,000 mega watts of power in Nepal and as much or a little less in Bhutan. We are in discussion with Bhutan.

18.00 hrs.

But because of the problems in Nepal we have not been able to really go ahead on that.

The other big issue today is that in the WTO regime that we live in whether we like it or not, we are in that regime and we cannot get out of it -- there are countries which are forging bilateral trade relationships and they are forming the EPAs and FTAs and we should not lag behind in that arena. There are EU and NAFTA and now we have the ASEAN countries, the small countries in Asia which started this ASEAN movement. Now, they want to have relationship with the bigger countries like China, Japan, India and Korea. ...(Interruptions)

श्री मोहन सिंह : सभापति महोदय, छः बज गए हैं।

MR. CHAIRMAN : Time has already been extended by another one hour. Your Party has another two Members to speak. So, please wind up.

...(Interruptions)

SHRI VIJAYENDRA PAL SINGH : Sir, I have hardly started. It is such a big subject. ...(Interruptions) If we focussed only on the ASEAN or the neighbouring countries or the UN, then we could have really said something. However, let me wind it up in two minutes.

Shri Suresh Prabhu has very rightly talked about a lot of things. I will not go into what our Government did and how we were successful in the foreign policy because Shri Rupchand Pal has said a lot of things about it. I do not want to answer him. But I would like to just make a point that he was really praising Fidel Castro. I do not know why he was praising the dictator like that.

Anyway, I would also like to say that India today has good relationship with Pakistan. I had an opportunity to go to Pakistan with the SAFMA delegation. There I found, when we were talking to the parliamentarians there, that everybody wants to have a trade relationship with us. They say that Kashmir problem is there, but we must circumvent that and have better trade and commerce relations with India, visa relaxation, more train services and more bus services. If we do all these things, then our relationship with Pakistan would really improve.

I will really touch upon one more point before I end my speech. As far as foreign policy is concerned, from the Nehruvian times we have had a very stable policy and we would also like the Government today to always consult the Opposition on major changes or major opinions that they want to put across to us so that we can put our bit into it.

Now, I come on the NPT and CTBT. We have not signed the NPT or the CTBT. But along with that, today we have a power shortage in our country. The nuclear fuel is the cheapest in the world. We do not have access to it and we do not have access to the technology also. France meets its power supply by nuclear energy, 85 per cent of their energy supplied is nuclear to the whole of France to meet their electricity demand. They are ready to give it to us. But have we talked about it? Can we circumvent the NPT and CTBT? Please have talks with Japan which also has that nuclear capacity and the capability. With Russia, we have already signed the agreement for new Light Water Reactor and they are coming out. We have signed with them. They are giving us the technology as well as the fuel.

But, can we have more of peaceful nuclear energy? I think, most of the countries have realised that India is a very responsible nuclear power – I call it a nuclear power – and with that responsibility we can say that we need the peaceful nuclear technology. I want to know from the hon. Minister as to what he would like to say and how we can acquire this.

SHRI TATHAGATA SATPATHY (DHENKANAL): Thank you, Sir. There were lots of ideas, brilliant speeches. The House is honoured and we all feel enlightened because all the hon. Members of this House have sincerely tried to put forward their ideas on a very tricky subject and that is the foreign policy of India. I will speak less because I believe in action more than words. But since words are all that matter in this House, let us be brief.

Do we honestly have a foreign policy? That is the first and foremost question that arises in my mind. Is it that today India is in a diplomatic drift? We know not where we are heading, and what we want. Yes, we cry like babies – 'please give us a seat in the U.N. Security Council, please also give us a veto power'. We gang up with two or three other countries like Brazil, Japan and Germany, of course. But then the 'father' of Germany sits in Washington DC and he says : 'Look baby, what are you doing with these darkies? Move away'. So, Germany goes away from the playground and the poor Indian diplomatic corp is completely unaware of what is happening.

Why should we be in such a state? It is primarily because – I would say what the hon. Member from Rajasthan suggested a little earlier and he said very correctly – probably, during Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru's time we had some sort of a goal to attain in our foreign policy where we ganged up with Gamal Abdul Nasser or with Tito or with the few other countries who thought – because they could not fit in absolutely with the Americans or could not sit on the laps of the Soviets – that maybe if we come together, we could forge an alliance that would let us survive in this world which was going through that terrible Cold War period.

But after that, if we all brush up our history, during Mrs. Indira Gandhi's time, our heights of diplomacy were shown when the then Foreign Minister, Mr. Dinesh Singh went to Rabat where all the Muslim Heads of nations were getting together and he was humiliated because he was not allowed to address the Heads of States. Not only that, he was not even allowed entry. In the late Sixties the Indian External Affairs Minister was not allowed entry into the conference hall where all the Heads of States of Muslim nations were meeting in Rabat. It was the worst, and it was the beginning of the decay or the beginning of the rot of the Indian foreign policy.

There have been bright moments also. For instance, I remember, that during Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee's

Government, there was a political will, and there was a political initiative, which came into play in the diplomatic arena. Perhaps, in some cases it worked, and in some others it did not work, but there was, definitely, a political will. We wanted to be friendly with Pakistan. We extended our hand, but they did not accept it. They slapped us back. It is okay, but internationally, we had a claim that we are making an effort, and we are trying to get close to them.

Shri Vajpayee also made a gesture by himself going to Pakistan, and conveyed that we are not only talking, but we intend to put into action what we are preaching. In a way, you can say that, he even risked his life trying what he believed in. Internationally, India gained at that moment of time because if you see history, especially the Musharraf era, Pakistan has successfully been outsmarting us each and every time.

General Pervez Musharraf has grown up in Delhi, and probably, he knows the Indian psyche. Now, he is in a position to decide the fate of his country, and he has completely made a fool of all of us. I am saying this because he is taking the initiative.

18.12 hrs. [Shri Varkala Radhakrishnan in the Chair]

Today, we are calling the world a global village. If there is a political destabilisation or a civil war in the Ivory Coast, then the European community goes without chocolates or coffee or the prices go up. I have just cited an example to show how small the world is getting. In this kind of a world, Musharraf is always five steps ahead of India as far as diplomacy is concerned, as we are unable to predict him. He might be talking absurd things, which I personally do not think are always absurd, but just like the issue of the UN Security Council seat where we are crying : "Give it to us." Similarly, with Pakistan also we are always saying 'no'. For everything, we are saying 'no'. We do not want a third country mediation. It is okay. We are accepting Kashmir as a trouble spot, and he is claiming that it is a trouble spot, and we are accepting it. We are saying that we will talk to you alone.

If we had not accepted Kashmir as a trouble spot, then we could have said that : "There is no trouble. Kashmir is a part of India, and we have no quarrel with you on it. You go your way, and we go ours." But we were not able to say it. We did not have the foresight to say it, and now that we have accepted it, the problem is that our dear bureaucrats -- sitting in the External Affairs Ministry -- are unable to give some solutions, which India could air to the international community, and India could say that : "Look we have this proposal. Do you want to speak on this, and do you want to mediate on this?" 'No', we do not have any ideas. We are bereft of ideas. We have no solutions to offer, and that gentleman -- who holds the power of being the President, and is the army head -- is brilliant enough to badger us, and to corner us every single time. He is coming up with weird ideas, and he is getting us nailed.

We have nothing to say. What do we have? We have no opinions about Afghanistan, we have no opinion about Iraq, and we never had any opinion about Bosnia. Our business community decides what should be the exchange rate between the 'Euro' and the Indian 'Rupee'. If I had business with Europe today, I would like that in relation to the Indian 'Rupee', let the 'Euro' be jacked up. When I get my money, I get a bigger share. That means, economically also, we are at a complete loss to decide where we want to position ourselves. In today's world, whether it is politics or anything else, people are jumping from this side to that side or that side to this side. It is a positional thing -- where to position yourself. Similarly, with diplomacy, India is unable to decide where it wants to position itself. Therefore, we were at a complete loss, when America dictated Germany that, 'Forget India. Do not get into that U.N. Security Council thing; I will take care of your interests. Get away from that.' Voila! Germany left us high and dry. Like I said earlier

MR. CHAIRMAN : Your time is up.

SHRI TATHAGATA SATPATHY : I am just getting into my steam.

MR. CHAIRMAN: If you cooperate, we will complete the discussion by seven o'clock. If you go on speaking, we will not be able to complete it by seven o'clock.

SHRI TATHAGATA SATPATHY : Sir, you are 'Radha' and 'Krishna' rolled into one. The spirit of endurance, the spirit of tolerance is in you. A great man like you must have patience.

SHRI KHARABELA SWAIN (BALASORE): Sir, It is a very important issue. Let him take his time. If the time has to be extended, it can be extended.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We will have to finish it before seven o'clock. I am not prepared for further extensions. We cannot allow this discussion to continue beyond seven o'clock.

SHRI TATHAGATA SATPATHY : The problem is that there is nobody to think about India, when political parties are going to face elections in my knowledge, except the N.D.A., no other political party had foreign policy issues to pose before the voters because nobody ...(*Interruptions*)

SHRI SANTASRI CHATTERJEE (SERAMPORE): Who told you?

SHRI TATHAGATA SATPATHY : I read, Sir. The problem is that our brothers from the Left like to carry a baggage that has withered away as a State -- the Soviet State has withered away. However, the thought process stays. I am also a progressive man. I am not saying that we should not look at a world which is unipolar, and by God's grace, there cannot be a unipolar world. So, instead of carrying a former Soviet baggage or a China baggage or an America baggage, is there anybody who wants to carry an Indian baggage? That is not comprehensible or that is, probably, not acceptable to many of our colleagues and comrades. Where does India want to go?

If you see any big nation, if you go to the North American continent, you will see that the Canadians hate the U.S.; you will notice that the Mexicans hate the U.S., but they all want to rush, go past the border guards, and get into the U.S., for jobs. Similarly, if you see our neighbours, whether it is Sri Lanka, whether it is Bangladesh, even Pakistan or Nepal, whether they want to be night-watchmen or whatever, they would all like to come to India, but nobody in our neighbouring countries likes India. What have we done about it? Have we taken any steps to improve a people-to-people relationship between these countries? No, we have not. We are stuck either with America or with some communist country. But what happens to new nations that are being born today? What happens to, say, the C.I.S., countries?

I think, if we ask most people in India, they would not even know what are the names of the CIS countries. These are realities. These are realities that we are trying to avoid. It is primarily because this is a country where we are not able to formulate a politically oriented foreign policy. You look at the US. When there is a change of guard at Washington DC, the Ambassadors to different important countries are changed because they are people who are committed to the policies of that particular President. That does not happen here.

We have bureaucrats who are representing you in Beijing, they are representing you in Washington, and they are representing you in Brussels in the EU. It is the same people. Tomorrow they could be transferred to Chad, or to Turkmenistan, or to Kazakhstan, or to Thailand. So, eventually, there is no think tank in India which is specialising on foreign affairs. We have to formulate policies where we create think tanks which concentrate on certain areas of the world, which come to know the details of these areas, and which will be able to advise the Government on the policies the Government has to take.

The Vajpayee Government had a policy of 'Look East'. We have to look North and look East. We have to look at the CIS countries because they directly affect our economy. When the CIS countries had excess production of steel, our steel went down the hill. Similarly, to the East lie treasures. Right from history, every European nation has been trying to reach the East. Vajpayeeji had the foresight, had the vision, to see 'Look East' as a foreign policy. He also wanted that a road should be built from India to Vietnam, to Ho Chi Minh city into Saigon, which would bring about economic growth not only for India but all along the route, thereby creating an aura of good feeling, an aura of happiness which will eventually boil down to a good feeling towards India.

The Government of India has to get out of the cloak of bureaucracy. The foreign policy has to be discussed in Parliament and only then we can expect that in the years to come, or in the days to come, we will have a nation which will be respected not only by our neighbours but will be respected by every other country in this world.

SHRI C.K. CHANDRAPPAN (TRICHUR): Sir, I am thankful to my friend Sudhakar Reddy for raising this discussion. It provided an opportunity for all of us ...(*Interruptions*)

MR. CHAIRMAN : My advice to hon. Members who are taking part in the discussion is to kindly cooperate by taking not more than five to seven minutes each. Then only we will be able to finish the discussion today. Otherwise, we will not be finishing the discussion today. Anyhow, there can be no extension of the sitting after 7 p.m. today.

SHRI C.K. CHANDRAPPAN : The Minister is going to reply onlt tomorrow. That has been announced already.

SHRI KHARABELA SWAIN : Sir, since the Minister is going to reply tomorrow, even if it is half an hour late today, let us extend the sitting today. This is such an important matter.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We will have to finish it by 7 p.m. at any rate.

SHRI KHARABELA SWAIN : Never in the past the time was so strictly enforced. Sometimes discussions have gone up to 9 p.m. also.

MR. CHAIRMAN: There is time already fixed for it. We have to adhere to it.

SHRI KHARABELA SWAIN : It should not be restricted to this subject only. It is such an important subject and everybody wants to speak on it. How can you say that it will be restricted to 7 p.m. only? My request is, even if it goes beyond 7 p.m. by half an hour, please extend the sitting. Let the hon. Minister reply tomorrow, we have no objection to that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: If the Members do not cooperate, what can I do? We will have to go by the time.

SHRI C.K. CHANDRAPPAN : We are all cooperating with you, Sir.

SHRI BIKRAM KESHARI DEO : Sir, a discussion on foreign policy is taking place in this House after a very long time. How can we restrict it like this?

MR. CHAIRMAN: There are many Members including Shri Swain who are yet to speak. They will take time, I know.

SHRI KHARABELA SWAIN : We will cooperate with you, Sir. We will speak nothing out of context.

SHRI C.K. CHANDRAPPAN : Sir, shall I continue? ...*(Interruptions)*

MR. CHAIRMAN : The thing is, I am becoming an unpopular figure.

...*(Interruptions)*

THE MINISTER OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS (SHRI K. NATWAR SINGH): I have one thing to say. The Prime Minister of Morocco is here. The Prime Minister is meeting him at seven o'clock. I am required to be there. If I leave the House, you will be entitled to say that I should have been here. If I do not go there, I will be told, I should have been there. Can you help me?

MR. CHAIRMAN: We will complete this discussion today by seven o'clock.

...*(Interruptions)*

SHRI KHARABELA SWAIN : It was not decided in the Business Advisory Committee meeting that it will be taken up today. The Government has no other business and hence they forced it on us. ...*(Interruptions)* Now, the hon. Minister is saying that he has some other business. We did not demand that this subject should be discussed today. It is a very important matter. ...*(Interruptions)* The Government has put it because they have no other business. It was not decided in the BAC. ...*(Interruptions)* How can you say that? It is not because the hon. Minister will not be there. So, no Member will be allowed to speak. ...*(Interruptions)* Why did you want this discussion today?

SHRI K. NATWAR SINGH: This decision was taken with full consultation. I had been informed of it yesterday. It was not a slap decision. ...*(Interruptions)*

SHRI KHARABELA SWAIN : I am a Member of the BAC. It was never decided there. ...*(Interruptions)*

MR. CHAIRMAN: Shri Chandrappan, please continue.

...*(Interruptions)*

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF DEFENCE AND MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF PARLIAMENTARY AFFAIRS (SHRI BIJOY HANDIQUE): We have only decided to extend the time up to seven o'clock. ...*(Interruptions)*

MR. CHAIRMAN: Only up to seven o'clock.

SHRI BIJOY HANDIQUE: Yes, we have decided. It was announced by the hon. Chairman at that point of time. It was announced that discussion will be over by seven o'clock and the hon. Minister will reply tomorrow. Why do you go on extending the time? Then, there will be no end to that. ...*(Interruptions)*

MR. CHAIRMAN: No extension is possible.

SHRI BIJOY HANDIQUE: By seven o'clock, please complete the discussion. ...*(Interruptions)*

SHRI KHARABELA SWAIN : In the last Lok Sabha, it was extended after it was declared in this House that it will be completed by a particular time. ...*(Interruptions)* You know it pretty well. Your party, when they were on this side, had extended the time up to seven o'clock and 9 o'clock. ...*(Interruptions)* I argued very vehemently. ...*(Interruptions)* Government must have its way but the Opposition Members must also have their say. ...*(Interruptions)*

How can you say the time has been restricted up to seven o'clock? ...(*Interruptions*) It was decided.
...(*Interruptions*) That is all right.

SHRI BIJOY HANDIQUE: How do you postpone it? ...(*Interruptions*)

SHRI KHARABELA SWAIN : Tomorrow, other Members will speak and then the hon. Minister will reply.
...(*Interruptions*)

MR. CHAIRMAN: We will decide as to what to do at seven o'clock.

...(*Interruptions*)

SHRI C.K. CHANDRAPPAN (TRICHUR): Mr. Chairman, Sir, this gives an opportunity to this House to discuss one of the most important aspects of India's foreign policy. Many Members have made very valuable suggestions. I would like to point out one thing. I do not want to narrate the things which have been narrated already. India's foreign policy had derived from the heritage of our freedom struggle and it continued during the time of Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, an independent foreign policy that was anti-imperialist and that was supporting a policy of peace and which also supported the liberation struggles all over the world.

One of the cardinal changes the NDA Government had brought into being was that they were saying that the policies were the same. I think there was a major change brought about by the NDA Government, that is, instead of following an independent foreign policy, it became more subservient to the U.S. imperialism in its foreign policy terms. Now, I would like to cite examples.

One is, the National Missile Policy, a policy by which the U.S. wanted to control the whole world. The NDA Government was soft-peddalling with it.

When on the environment policy, the Kyoto Agreement was acceptable to all the countries in the world, the US, single-handedly took a position that they would not agree to that. On the Global Warming problem, they took a high and mighty position and said that they were not going to sign the Kyoto Agreement. The NDA Government did not even protest against this. These are some of the areas where you became more subservient to the US imperialism.

Some of the Members spoke about the US in an awe-inspiring term that they are so rich, so powerful that we have no way other than submitting to them. That is not the position. After all, what is our history? We fought and won Independence against the British who were in those days ruling the whole world. The Sun never set on the British empire. We were fighting them. And we fought against them. We fought not only for the Independence of this country, we extended full support to all those people who were fighting for Independence in other countries. We were not afraid of imperialism. Then, we became independent. And continuing with that position, we took an independent foreign policy, the bedrock of which was independence, peace and unity of all those newly independent countries against imperialism. Non-alignment was not merely a kind of neutrality. Non-alignment was explained by Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru and later by Shrimati Indira Gandhi. It is a policy of opposing imperialism; it is a policy of supporting the newly liberated countries; and it is a policy of peace against efforts of war. I can cite ever so many examples of what we have done in those days in pursuing that policy. It is from that position that a basic change was made when the NDA came into power despite all the tall talks about their great foreign policy.

18.33 hrs (Shri Pawan Kumar Bansal *in the Chair*)

Today what is the situation? Today, the new Government has come. Last week, the Russian President was here. We are initiating – it is a very important thing – a policy by which India, China and Russia will go together. It creates a condition whereby we together prosper economically, it has an implication in terms of preserving world peace. It will also promote trade and other relations with other countries. We also have a policy towards former Asiatic States of the Soviet Union. We are a member of the Shangai-7 which includes China, India and other countries in this region.

The point is that we will try to have more trade relations, more friendly relations, and all these relations will be based on the idea of preserving world peace and good neighbourly relations between the States. So, around India, we are pursuing the same policy with other countries whether it is Sri Lanka, Nepal, Burma or other countries. With this emphasis, an independent foreign policy should question the American attempt to hegemonise the world in the line they think. I think, this Government will succeed in bringing the foreign policy to its old stand back to rails.

We should have an independent foreign policy which will take this country in the path of peace and solidarity with the people who are fighting for their own independence.

The last point which I would like to make is this. Let us not mistake that America is the biggest democracy; they are very rich and so, we have to surrender, as our BJP friends say

...(Interruptions)

SHRI BIKRAM KESHARI DEO (KALAHANDI): Will the hon. Member yield for just two minutes? ...(Interruptions)

MR. CHAIRMAN : Perhaps I would not allow that because we have to conclude the discussion.

...(Interruptions)

SHRI BIKRAM KESHARI DEO : I have a request to make. â€¦ (Interruptions)

MR. CHAIRMAN: I would not be able to permit you.

...(Interruptions)

SHRI BIKRAM KESHARI DEO : The hon. Member is yielding. ...(Interruptions)

MR. CHAIRMAN: But his yielding does not make much difference. I am saying something else. You cannot speak; please bear with me. Let him make the point.

...(Interruptions)

SHRI BIKRAM KESHARI DEO : I will take one minute. ...(Interruptions)

MR. CHAIRMAN: There are Members from your Party to speak; somewhere I saw your name also in the list. So, when you get time, you can make this point. Now, I will not permit you.

...(Interruptions)

SHRI BIKRAM KESHARI DEO : The hon. Member is yielding. ...(Interruptions)

MR. CHAIRMAN: That is not the point. Please sit down. Please understand. That is not the way to do it. You cannot speak now. I would not permit that. I will call you later.

...(Interruptions)

SHRI BIKRAM KESHARI DEO : Sir, I am helpless. ...(Interruptions)

MR. CHAIRMAN: You may take note of the points that he is making.

...(Interruptions)

SHRI BIKRAM KESHARI DEO : Sir, I feel helpless because I am not getting protection from the Chair. Please give me two minutes. ...(Interruptions)

MR. CHAIRMAN: Let him conclude. Shri Deo, I will give you enough time to speak. You will have time. Let us not waste the time now. You can take note of the points that he is making and later on, you can reply.

...(Interruptions)

MR. CHAIRMAN: I am sorry; we would not be able to do that.

...(Interruptions)

SHRI BIKRAM KESHARI DEO : I am only pleading with you. ...(Interruptions)

MR. CHAIRMAN: No. I am sorry. Shri Chandrappan may please carry on with his speech now.

...(Interruptions)

MR. CHAIRMAN: Shri Deo, you will get time otherwise.

...(Interruptions)

MR. CHAIRMAN: No. This will not go on record.

(Interruptions)*

MR. CHAIRMAN: Shri Deo, this is not going on record and therefore, please do not speak.

...(Interruptions)

MR. CHAIRMAN: Shri Deo, please do not address the hon. Member. This is not going on record. Shri Chandrappan may please carry on with his speech.

...(Interruptions)

MR. CHAIRMAN: This is not going on record.

...(Interruptions)

MR. CHAIRMAN: Shri Deo, I seek your cooperation. This is not going on record. Please let him complete his speech.

...(Interruptions)

SHRI C.K. CHANDRAPPAN : My last point is this. When we speak of America and its great importance, we always have reservations about their imperialist policy. It was American Secretary of State who described India's Non-Aligned Policy as "immoral". They consider it immoral to be non-aligned. It was they who supported all kinds of sabotage in our country.

This is the last point. Very recently when there was trouble in Assam, it was again the CIA which gave an uninvited offer. We did not ask them to offer anything. But they said that they have better machinery and they have expertise to tackle terrorism here, etc. In the name of tackling terrorism, we do not want US

*Not Recorded.

imperialism to poke its nose in our internal affairs. We should be clear about it. We should follow an independent foreign policy. We should be always on the side of those who are fighting for independence. We should be always for peace. With our neighbours, we must have good neighbourly relations. The present foreign policy is taking us in that direction. With these words, I conclude my speech.

SHRI KHARABELA SWAIN (BALASORE): Thank you. The foreign policy of a country is a continuing affair and generally, it does not change with the change in the Government. That is why, it does not make much of a change when the new Government has come.

I must thank them initially for doing two things at least – one is that they did not agree with the President of Pakistan for the removal of army from the Siachen Glacier and secondly, for the way this Government handled the hostage crisis in Iraq. For these two things, I must congratulate them.

Later, I would come to the criticism that was levelled against us by the Leftists particularly who suffer from US-phobia.

Like in an old record, when its pin gets struck up somewhere, it goes on repeating the same thing, all the time these Leftists are talking about colonialism, hegemony, imperialism, subservient and so on. If you go through the records of last 20-30 years, you will find the same record is being played by them again and again....(Interruptions) They are the only experts on imperialism and not us. Anyway, now they say, do not send your election officers to Iraq because there is an illegitimate Government in Iraq. For the time being we also do agree. When our Government was in power, we did not agree to send our Peace Keeping Force to Iraq. I agree with it.

Let us go with the recommendations made by the Committee that was set up by Mr. Kofi Annan, the U.N Secretary General. Under the Chairmanship of Thai Prime Minister, Mr. Anand Panyarachum a recommendation for the expansion of the Security Council was made. He recommended as to which country should be a member of the Security Council. It was recommended that the members should be chosen on the basis of their willingness to contribute to the peace and security efforts of the Council including peace keeping and peace building. It has also recommended a new UN body, the peace building mission, which would identify countries at risk of violent conflicts, organise prevention efforts and sustain international peace building efforts.

If India wants to become a world power, it must have three or four things. Firstly, it should be able to resolve its own problems. If we do not solve our Kashmir problem and we want a third party intervention in that, nobody will treat us as a super or world power. America solves its own problems. India should also be able to solve its own problems if it

wants to become a super power. Secondly, India should move itself from sub-regional mentalism. We should not think that we are the leader of only South Asia or Asia. We should not think like this. Let us think that we are a world power and we should behave like that. For that reason, India should also indulge itself more and more in peace keeping efforts all over the world. May not to Iraq but India should be able to send its Peace Keeping Force wherever it is required. Otherwise, why should the world recognise us as a world power?

Last but not the least, India should not take loans from small countries rather it should give loans to small countries. With all pride I can say that when Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee was the Prime Minister, for the first time we decided in principle that we will not take loans from small countries like Holland, rather we waived the loans given to the least developed countries. So, the UPA Government should also follow it.

Now, let us come to the point which is very much related to India, that is, the Kashmir problem. Let me tell the hon. Minister that the Huriyat Conference is not willing to talk to either the Prime Minister or to the Home Minister but wants to talk to the Prime Minister of Pakistan. Is it not a message that they are treating this Government as soft? Is it not that they are treating us to be weak? The hon. Prime Minister has told that all options are open. What does he mean by saying that all options are open? Does he mean that he is willing for a third party intervention in Kashmir? Is he willing to accept the Pakistan President's proposal to divide the Indian part of Jammu and Kashmir to fight some more areas? Is he willing to accept the Line of Control as international border? Is he willing to keep the LoC under the control of the bilateral force or under the UN force? Is he willing for all these things? This type of statement that all options are open creates confusion.

The statement which was given by the Pakistan President on 6th January, came out after a great deal of effort. The President said that he will eschew violence and terrorism. He assured not to allow its territory to be utilised by the terrorists. He also assured that he did not refer to any core issues. But now he says that Kashmir is the core issue. The same President did not say that there was any core issue in the last January, but now he is saying so. Therefore, we in the NDA, have a feeling that gradually the world, Pakistan, and the terrorists are thinking that probably this is a very soft and weak Government. I will be very happy if the hon. Foreign Minister dispels the doubts which I have just mentioned.

Recently, Mr. Putin, the President of Russia came to India. He first said that he wants India to be a member of the Security Council but he wants that India should not have the veto power. Just after a day, he said that he agrees with this. This type of confusing statement could have been avoided. Now again a news item has appeared in the newspapers today that the help for the Tarapore Atomic Fuel Reactor will be stopped. I would like to have an answer from the hon. Minister in this regard. If it is correct, what is the Government going to do so that Russia does not breach the agreement which they had with India in regard to Tarapore Atomic Fuel Reactor?

Very excellent speeches have been made by many hon. Members. I will not repeat those points. I would just make two-three suggestions. The Nathu La Pass near Sikkim should be opened quickly so that the trade with China could be increased. In fact, I had been to Nathu La Pass about some months back. People are eagerly waiting that it should be opened so that India has bilateral trade relationship with China.

I would also like to request the hon. Minister that if not directly -- as it is a very controversial issue -- through track-II diplomacy, the Chinese Government should be requested that it should allow His Holiness Dalai Lama for a dialogue. The Chinese Government should have a dialogue with him since His Holiness has disbanded the idea of an independent country in the name of Tibet. Tibet should be given a real autonomous status in the State of China.

As regards Bangladesh, fencing on the border should be completed as quickly as possible so that there could be no more infiltration. As regards Israel, it is a partner of India in its war against terrorism. We are having the same problem. So, how can you say that we should not have relationship with it? Even with least amount of water, Israel has shown the world that agriculture could be developed through drip irrigation. We should learn from them. If the United States of America can have relationship with Pakistan and India together, why can we not have relationship with both Middle East Islamic countries and Israel? It is in our interest to have good relations with these countries.

Sir, lastly, I would like to make reference with regard to the assertion made by Shri Rupchand Pal that Indo-US Strategic Alliance was an abject surrender by us. He probably knows that it was for the first time in history that the Indian Air Force and the American Air Force had a joint exercise in Gwalior and also they had a joint exercise in Florida. Did this ever happen? Does it mean an abject surrender? Anyone visiting the United States would know that 36 per cent of the scientists in NASA are Indians; 26 per cent of doctors in the USA are Indians and in the Silicon Valley, 38 per cent of the computer programmers are Indians. Even then he would want that we should not have a relationship with that country. Did he mean to say that it is America alone that is taking advantage of their relationship with us and we are not having any advantage? America is the only country that is fighting against terrorism. It has taken the lead.

Sir, India has shown to the world that it is a power to reckon with when our former Prime Minister, Shri Atal Bihari

Vajpayee got an invitation to attend the summit of the G-8 countries. That is one of the achievements of the previous Government. The previous Government did this and we expect that this Government would also follow the brilliant foreign policy pursued by that Government.

SHRI M.P. VEERENDRA KUMAR (CALICUT): Sir, I would not take much time. I would not repeat any points.

Sir, I was really amazed at the statement made by the Hon. Member that India must behave like a superpower. I agree that we must be a superpower. One would like to be a superpower and accept that there is a superpower. I want to quote an instance here. If a country is a superpower, then who is the superman? The Defence Minister of a country is the superman. Our great former Defence Minister, Shri George Fernandes went to the United States and he was bodily checked at the immigration security check. I asked Shri Fernandes -- he was my old colleague -- as to what had happened. He told me that he had to lift his hands, show himself, take his shoes off. Now, if the Defence Minister of our country had to be bodily checked apprehending security threats, then where is the concept of our being a superpower?

Sir, I will quote another example. I had been a part of the delegation that went to attend the Commonwealth Speakers' Conference. The Hon. Speaker, Shri Somnath Chatterjee led the delegation. Do you know what did he say to the US Immigration people? He said that he was the Speaker of the greatest democracy in the world and if he was bodily checked, then he would never enter their country. We were honoured to go with him. Now, people like us, the Members of Parliament, should we have to remove our shoes for reasons of security check to enter a country like the United States? They demand it and we had to do that because of this concept of their being a superpower.

Sir, we talk of America taking advantage of us. That is all right. But should we accept hegemony? What is the agreement on agriculture? Now, 375 billion dollars is being given as domestic subsidy to farmers in America. We have recently concluded our deliberations in Geneva on this. Could we not have convinced the US that we could not have continued with this policy? Americans always look at their safeguards, they have their own policy, they have their own laws and they have their own vision. But they also have a policy for their own country. Do we have any such policy except the policy of subjugation?

Sir, it was mentioned by the hon. Member that America is meeting terrorism. Who created terrorism? Osama Bin Laden is a creation of America.

MR. CHAIRMAN : You please address the Chair? Please refer to the points raised by the hon. Member but you please address the Chair.

SHRI M.P. VEERENDRA KUMAR : Mr. Chairman, I am sorryâ€ (Interruptions)

SHRI KHARABELA SWAIN : Everything has a cause...(Interruptions)

MR. CHAIRMAN: Please do not interrupt him now. You had your turn.

SHRI M.P. VEERENDRA KUMAR : Sir, Osama Bin Laden was trained by America...(Interruptions)

MR. CHAIRMAN: Nothing, except what Shri Veerendra Kumar is saying, will go on record.

*(Interruptions)**

SHRI M.P. VEERENDRA KUMAR : He was trained by America and sent to Afganistan to fight Soviet Union. That man becomes a terrorist now for America. Sir, after Iraq and Iran fought, after the conclusion of the war, the Deputy Foreign Secretary of US said that Saddam Hussein was the saviour of the Middle-East. How many people were dead in Iran? Even after the Kuwait War, after the attack on Baghdad, the Vice-President of US who was heading Haliburton and Company was having business with Baghdad. What I say is, America is creating terrorism. You can say that America is challenging terrorism. America has created terrorism in Iraq, in Palestine and the world over.

*Not Recorded.

Here, I will come to Pakistan. Both the Governments, unfortunately, want crisis. If Pakistan wants crisis in India, we want it in Pakistan. It is always used for political exigencies. I remember Dr. Lohia had said, Sir we had worked with him, we should talk of Indo-Pak Confederation. We must address the people of Pakistan. We do not want long crisis. The US wants it. Pakistan has accepted US as NATO power. The US is giving them arms. The biggest war machinery is run by US. They are giving arms to Pakistan. They are giving arms to Afghanistan and everybody. They are creating the entire world crisis. We do not want hegemony. Of course, it is true, it is a unipolar world. We have to have a policy where we should have a say. Subjugation cannot be a policy. Hegemony cannot be a policy.

Abdul Garel Nasser had the courage to take Suez Canal because India backed him. So, our Foreign Policy had helped Egypt. Is it not? We must have the policy with honour. We should have a policy not for hegemony or acceptance of Super Power and we should not just be treated to achieve their objective.

I would conclude. Take Kyoto protocol for instance. Who is creating affluents in the world? What is the reason for global warming? US is going to be the first victim of global warming in 25 to 30 years. We are not responsible for global warming. Bangladesh is not responsible for global warming. The United States is responsible for global warming. Do we have any say against their policy on Kyoto protocol? So, I do not say that we have to fight with the US. Not at all. We have to keep relations with US with honour.

Sir, I will come to African countries and Latin American countries. Do you know what is happening in Venezuela? We know what is happening in Mexico and the entire Latin American countries because of the hegemony of US. We have to unite all those forces. We have to be the leaders of the African and other countries. We have to bring together all those Latin American countries which are really fighting with grouse and grievances against the Super Power. We have to go to the people of Palestine and have to talk with the people of Iraq. We should have our own strength and base and deal with the United States without sacrificing our respect.

In 2000, we allowed EXIM Policy because of President Clinton's visit. Otherwise, would this much of import have taken place by now? We are suffering due to lack of price for cash crops. I do not want to go into all that. That was done only to please President Clinton. We cannot be just a puppet in their hands. Somebody said that we should have sent our troops to Iraq and we should have taken our people to conduct elections there. What type of elections will take place in US? Kofi Annan was quoted. Who is Kofi Annan? Was he respected by US? Was it not without the sanction of the United Nations that US sent the troops to Iraq? Collin Powell addressed the United Nations and convinced Iraq has WMD. After that, what did they say? Now, they say that there is no WMD and that United Nations has taken for a ride. United Nations is used as a tool by the US to discipline other countries for their own use. So, we have to have our own independent Policy based on our strength. We have to unite all those forces who are fighting hegemony and who do not want to accept imperialists' postures. We have to lead them once again. We cannot allow or accept that US is a unipolar force. If America is a unipolar force, I think India can help to create world opinion, and the world opinion, will become a fore. We must follow an independent Policy.

19.00 hrs.

MR. CHAIRMAN : There are two more Members who want to speak. Do I have the sense of the House to extend the time by another fifteen minutes?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Yes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

SHRI ASADUDDIN OWAISI (HYDERABAD): Mr. Chairman, Sir, thank you. At the outset, I would like to point out to the hon. learned BJP Member who talked about India not participating enough in the peace keeping troops. In this regard, I would like to quote United Nation's fact sheet. It says that India is the third largest provider of peace keeping troops to the UN. Currently 2735 Indian troops are being deployed in various peace keeping missions. Moreover, we have received awards. The Indian Army was awarded Paramvir Chakra, five Mahavir Chakras, one Kirti Chakra and 19 Vir Chakras. The risk involved there is huge. More than 200 brave soldiers have laid down their lives. In one incident the Indian peace keepers were exposed to the risk of AIDS. One of the contingents which went to Cambodia came back with 28 soldiers having HIV positive virus. So, we are participating in peace keeping force. But the difference is that we want it to be sanctioned by the Security Council. That is why, we oppose over here any troops being sent to Iraq. That has to be sanctioned by the Security Council and it should be under the United Nations, not under America.

Then, he talked about Tibet. There are many issues to be resolved with China. We should always remember Panchsheel policies. The most important aspect of Panchsheel policies was that we will not interfere in matters of other countries. When the BJP was in power, the Prime Minister went over there and we achieved a great thing for our country. After that, Sikkim was recognised as part of India. It was removed from Chinese official website and maps. They agreed that it was not an independent country. So, it will be in the interest of our nation that we should not talk about other countries.

Coming to Dalai Lama, what we are doing with Dalai Lama and what is our position, Dalai Lama knows very well.

We have never allowed this great nation of ours to be used against any country. This is the principal that has been followed and it should be continued to be followed.

I have listened to various things about India not having a foreign policy. The Common Minimum Programme talks about it very clearly. I would also like to reiterate over here what the Minister of External Affairs has stated. He has emphasized that India's foreign policy is not dedicated to any dogma or doctrine. It has flexibility to deal with problems in international relations as and when they come up. What more do you want? It is very clear.

Then, I come to our relations with Israel. I am opposed to India having strong relations with Israel because we have always committed ourselves to the Palestinian cause. I can understand him having good relations with Israel. It is because Israel is anti-Islam. So, there is a meeting point between the *Hindutva* ideology and the *Zionese* ideology. ...*(Interruptions)* I am not yielding to anybody.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Nothing will go on record excepting the speech of the Member who is speaking.

*(Interruptions)**

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Swain, please do not interrupt him.

...*(Interruptions)*

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Swain, this is not going on record.

*(Interruptions) **

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Swain, please do not interrupt him.

...*(Interruptions)*

*Not Recorded.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Swain, please listen to me. Do not interrupt.

...*(Interruptions)*

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Swain, I did not permit anyone to interrupt you. Now, I will not permit anyone to interrupt him.

...*(Interruptions)*

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Swain, you had your say. Please let the Member speak.

...*(Interruptions)*

MR. CHAIRMAN: Let the Member speak.

...*(Interruptions)*

MR. CHAIRMAN: Nothing will go on record.

*(Interruptions)**

MR. CHAIRMAN : Order, please. I would request the other hon. Members also not to interrupt him. I will deal with the situation. Nothing except what Shri Owaisi says will go on record. Shri Owaisi, please carry on.

*(Interruptions)**

SHRI ASADUDDIN OWAISI : Sir, he has said something. My friend, I was born in free India. In fact, if you go back to Hyderabad and ask about ourselves and our family background, it will tell a lot of things. You are a proud Hindu. I am a proud Muslim. We are proud Indians also. We take pride in that. Please do not say that we are afraid of that. Nobody is a coward here. People have given the verdict to us. So, we are standing here....*(Interruptions)*

MR. CHAIRMAN: Shri Owaisi, you must also not address them. Please address the Chair. Then, you can avoid all these things.

...*(Interruptions)*

SHRI ASADUDDIN OWAISI : I am sorry, Sir. I will address the Chair....(*Interruptions*)

*Not Recorded.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Nothing has gone on record. Please sit down. It is only what Shri Owaisi is saying will go on record. Interruptions will not go on record. Anything said without the permission of the Chair will not go on record. So, please sit down. Shri Owaisi, please carry on. Hon. Members, do not interrupt him.

(*Interruptions*)*

MR. CHAIRMAN: Shri Owaisi, do not address anybody but the Chair.

...(Interruptions)

सभापति महोदय: आप उनको बोलने दीजिए वरना समय बर्बाद होगा।

SHRI ASADUDDIN OWAISI : My intention of raising the issue was not to make him angry.

MR. CHAIRMAN: You forget about that. Please carry on. Please make your point.

SHRI ASADUDDIN OWAISI : Unnecessarily, he is losing his temper and becoming angry....(*Interruptions*) Shri Swain, you must agree that you have lost power....(*Interruptions*) I can understand it because you have lost power. You must agree that you have lost power.â€¦ (*Interruptions*)

सभापति महोदय: बात को बिगाड़ने से क्या फायदा है? आप अपनी बात कहिए, कुछ और नहीं।

...(व्यवधान)

श्री संतो गंगवार (बरेली) : सभापति महोदय, ओवेसी जी यदि इधर इशारा करके बोलेंगे तो हमें जवाब देना पड़ेगा। ... (व्यवधान)

सभापति महोदय: मैंने उनसे कह दिया है कि वह चेयर को एड्रेस करके बोलें। यदि किसी ने कोई बात कही है तो उसका जिक्र कर सकते हैं लेकिन चेयर को एड्रेस करके ही बोलें।

â€¦ (व्यवधान)

*Not Recorded.

श्री असादुद्दीन ओवेसी : मोहतरिम, मैं आपकी तरफ मुखातिब होकर ही बोल रहा हूँ। यह गैर- जरूरी इंटरप्ट कर रहे हैं और गुस्सा हो रहे हैं। मैं आपको ही अपनी बात कह रहा हूँ।

Now, I make my point about Israel. This talk of Israel is very good in respect of drip irrigation. Hon. Members have said about that. Please go to Andhra Pradesh. Please go to the Assembly Constituency of the ex-Chief Minister Shri Chandrababu Naidu – Kuppam constituency - who was supposed to be the hi-tech Chief Minister. It has totally failed there. Crores of rupees of tax-payers money have been lost in Kuppam. I would like to bring to the notice of the Government my apprehension. My apprehension is that there is going to be the forthcoming round of the political consultations in Israel. India's proposal is to sign a new arms deal. We have done a very good work. We have established relations with Pakistan. We have good relations with the Arab nations, especially after this Government has come into power. We have good relations with Iran. We have good relations with China. If we keep on procuring arms from Israel, all the good work that has been done, the relationship that has been built up in the last six months, especially the good work that has been done by the Foreign Ministry, it is all going to have an impact on that. Secondly, India has always voted against Israel in the United Nations. It must continue to do so.

Regarding our relationship with United States of America, I would say that our relationship with the United States should be on the basis of equality and mutual interest. We are proud to be Indians. We are not going to give up our responsibility or be subservient to the United States. If it is on the basis of equality and mutual interest, it is fine. There is no problem with that. The United States' fight against terrorism, which is of direct relevance to our country, cannot become a tool for the hegemonistic ambitions of the United States. That is what we are saying. We are not against the United States of America. Yes, we should have good relations. But we should not allow hegemonistic ambitions....(*Interruptions*)

MR. CHAIRMAN: Please conclude now.

SHRI ASADUDDIN OWAISI : I am concluding. Lastly, a proposal has been mooted that this Government is going to send our election observers to Iraq to teach and explain to them the intricacies of parliamentary democracy. I would request the Government to reconsider the decision once again. The reason being that if we send our election observers and our people from here, this will be a tacit recognition of the interim Government that has been propped up by the United States.

We will be giving them recognition. The Interim Government in Iraq has been propped up by US and we all know that.

Lastly, the conditions are favourable for India to play a larger role in international affairs, firstly because of our improved relations with Pakistan and secondly because of reversals of US in Iraq. US must be having military success in Iraq, but politically it has utterly failed in Iraq and the whole world is looking towards India because of the stand which we have taken of not sending troops to Iraq.

Finally, I would like to make a small point. My time has been taken away by the unnecessary interruption that has been made. I would request that our relationship with the Arab world should be strengthened further, especially with UAE, Saudi Arabia and all the GCC countries.

Sir, I thank you very much for giving me this opportunity.

MR. CHAIRMAN : Shri Bikram Keshari Deo will speak now.

Shri Bikram Keshari Deo, we have to adjourn the House at 7.15 p.m. So, please formulate your points in such a way that you are able to conclude your speech in five minutes.

SHRI BIKRAM KESHARI DEO (KALAHANDI): All right, Mr. Chairman, Sir. I will speak on the points that I wanted the House to know.

First of all, I congratulate both the hon. Members, Shri Suravaram Sudhakar Reddy and Shri Chandrappan who have raised this discussion because a discussion on the foreign policy is taking place in this House after a very long time. In my tenure of six years as a Member belonging to the NDA, I think, no such lengthy discussion on the foreign policy had taken place. There were only some statements which were read out by the various Ministers concerned, but no discussion on the foreign policy had actually taken place in this august House during the last six years. So, this is a welcome measure.

Today, India is a fast emerging economic power and it is maintaining the same foreign policy which was initiated from the Nehruvian era, right from Shri Swaran Singh and it is being followed till Shri Natwar Singh's time. We had very competent Foreign Ministers at the helm of affairs to decide about our foreign policy and we have got very good diplomats in the country who have managed the foreign policy very well.

Sir, our friends from the Treasury Benches were saying that we have become subservient to the Americans and we have become servants of the Americans. I would like to point out one thing to them. When the NDA Government came to power, we conducted the Pokhran nuclear tests and the Americans threatened to outsource our IT experts in America. But that policy was reversed in US and our IT boys are still working there today.

Secondly, some Members have rightly mentioned about the Kyoto Protocol here. In the World Summit for Sustainable Development at Johannesburg, all the 187 countries which have attended the Summit have admonished US for not signing the Kyoto Protocol.

Now, after 9/11, the entire scenario of the world has changed. After the signing of the WTO Agreement in 1993, the entire global economic scenario is changing. So, India also has to change and change very fast. We have to be in tune with other countries and the NDA Government had initiated that process.

For, example, in the case of Pakistan, the world powers wanted that India and Pakistan should talk and we talked. Before that, after the Simla Agreement, there was so much of stagnation in our relationship till the Lahore bus *yatra* undertaken by our former Prime Minister Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee. After that, the Agra Summit had taken place. They were all moves towards normalising our relations with Pakistan. They were all very essential for the development of neighbourly relations and peace in the SAARC region and also in the Indian Ocean Rim region.

These actions have been taken by the NDA Government. So, they should take out from their mind the doubt that during the tenure of the NDA Government we followed a different foreign policy for the country. No; there was continuity with some changes for the betterment of the country. Did their Government previously think for the Muslim brothers? Did they initiate the Haj Bill? During the tenure of the NDA Government, the External Affairs Minister brought forward a Haj Bill for the benefit of the Muslims who go on the Haj trip to Mecca and Medina on pilgrimage. For the first time after Independence, such a Bill was brought forward and passed by the NDA

Government and a lot of powers and subsidies were given and now they dab us as a Hindu fundamentalist party!
...(Interruptions)

Therefore, the Indian Diaspora has contributed a lot. We should take full initiative of their intelligence, of their intellect, of their professionalism. They should come to India so that India's economy would grow. We are a fast growing economy. During NDA Government's regime, the GDP never went below average 5.4 or 6.4 and the inflation had never risen more than 4.5 per cent in average. But today the inflation rate has gone up...(Interruptions) It has got its ramifications. So, we should have a durable Foreign Policy because global ramification will take place if we are not careful, and if we do not watch our steps. In the UN General Assembly, the millennium goal was announced by UN Secretary General, Mr. Kofi Annan. I think, we should try to follow that. As far as being a member in the Security Council, I think, the people are in the right path for getting India into the Security Council. In the last six years, this was initiated with full vigour.

I congratulate Shri Jaswant Singh for making China, for the first time, accepting Sikkim to be an integral part of India. It was never accepted before. Sikkim has been accepted as integral part of India. Kashmir is also an integral part of India and nobody can take it from us. When 545 States in the country signed the Instrument of Accession, Kashmir was one of them and the people of Kashmir integrated it with Bharat, that is, India.

Therefore, this discussion is a welcome measure. In future in the able hands of our hon. Minister, who has also been an excellent diplomat, the Government will forge India's Foreign Policy and make India stronger and diplomatically more savvy for the Indian democrats.

MR. CHAIRMAN : All the hon. Members who have given their names have spoken. The hon. Minister would reply tomorrow.

Now, the House stands adjourned to meet again tomorrow at 11 a.m.

19.17 hrs

The Lok Sabha then adjourned till Eleven of the Clock
on Wednesday, December 8, 2004/Agrahayana 17, 1926 (Saka).
