

peace-makers, to tell the truth. Truth must be told boldly both to Egypt and Israel if we are to keep our prestige before the world. We must be brave enough to say what we feel in our hearts.

Can we tolerate this interference on the sovereign rights of Egypt? I say, no, do not tolerate it. At the same time, that sovereign right should not stand in the way of others. In the ordinary society when a man has got the right of way over the field of another man, it should not be at the sufferance of the other man. It should not be so. It should not be the wish and will of the Egyptian nation, notwithstanding the fact that they are sovereign, that they will allow only certain ships to pass through the Suez and not other ships. Sovereignty may remain but not sovereignty at the cost of others.

Can we look with equanimity to the aggression on Hungary? I say, we cannot look. We have seen what a rape has been committed here. Another Government was formed here. Nagy was there. Then suddenly withdrawal of troops began. Everybody thought that things will end very calmly and quietly. But all of a sudden, overnight the Russian troops invaded that country and destroyed the whole structure of Hungarian State. Are we going to tolerate this although this has been committed by a friend of ours?

It is quite true that some friends have felt that we should go out of the Commonwealth. But will that itself be a remedy? Will it remedy the state of affairs which are set to us in our face? By just getting out of the Commonwealth what are we going to achieve? What are the things that we can achieve by just getting out of the Commonwealth? That we have not yet assessed. Today, if Burma—Acharya Kripalani said about it; I have very great respect for him as he has been my teacher—has got out of it, we do not realise what sufferings Burma has. It is not on account of getting out of it, but the position of Burma itself is such that it is only the Burmese Government which can

tell us how they are suffering from the Communist operation on the north and the infiltration of the Chinese in the south. If you just go to the streets of Rangoon, you will find that every corner is occupied by a China man. In Burma there are regular perpendicular and parallel roads and at every corner you will find a Chinese. God alone knows what will happen to those who will find themselves in such a predicament. Here, just as Shri V. G. Deshpande was saying—I do not want to use his strong language in which he was saying that the mice which carry disease must be destroyed first—today's speech must open the eyes of my countrymen. Shri H. N. Mukerjee has pleaded—and he has pleaded in no unequivocal language—that it is necessary to destroy lakhs of people for the sake of revolution. If these people would remain inside our country and call for the help of Russians to put up a puppet government and due to that puppet government the Russian troops will march in our country and tell to the world that there is a new government, that will not be a good thing. (*Interruption*).

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The hon. Member must conclude now.

Shri U. M. Trivedi: Shri H. N. Mukerjee took at least 50 minutes to preach to us that revolution means blood and that revolution is necessary. He told us that we should not fight shy of blood. I say we do not want revolution of the type that he envisages. We want a revolution of the type which we have achieved in our country. We should be allowed to live peacefully without the revolution of the type that he wants.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, I am grateful to the House for the many kind words said about our policy and, in particular, the attitude taken up by Government in the course of the last few weeks.

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

When I spoke on my motion, to begin with, I pointed out and laid some stress on the gravity of the situation, gravity not merely because it was a question of war and peace but because many deeper issues were involved, and I appealed to the House to view them in that context.

Sometimes, if I may say so with respect, some hon. Members spoke with some levity as if this was a matter for making fun. Some spoke, as they often do, in some kind of an old-world picturesque manner which had no relation to the facts of today. I was reminded: let us have first things first. I say, yes, first things first. But my difficulty is that many hon. Members never have the first things first before them, but they take the 9th, the 10th, the 50th and the 100th. They never get out of that rut of thought in which they had remained. Shri Kamath talked vaguely of their going to establish a brave new world of democratic socialism. I wish them all good fortune in doing so. What has happened recently? A country, which prided itself on its democracy, like England has blown democracy to bits. A country like France, which had a big socialist party, supports this invasion of Egypt, apart from supporting what is happening in Algeria. Where is socialism and socialist party, I should like to know.

So far as communism is concerned, quite apart from the military adventure which it has indulged in, as I ventured to say, previously, it has done something which has uprooted even the deep faith of many communists, so that you see this uprooting of convictions and a grave crisis of the mind of the people who think—of course, people who repeat old platitudes and so on—that it is impossible to get anything across to them. Here is a deep crisis of the mind everywhere, apart from the deep crisis of the physical world which may lead to war.

We are told by hon. Members like Shri Asoka Mehta, what have you done in Algeria, what have you done in Cyprus, what have you done in

Israel previously, as if the Government of India is a kind of boss for the whole of the world, orders it about and tells it, do this and do that or, as if, alternatively, the Government of India is a kind of debating society like the hon. Member's party which sits down, passes resolutions and then goes to bed with no responsibility left about it. We are a responsible Government, responsible to the country and responsible to the Parliament. We have to talk in a responsible way about a deep crisis. And the first thing to do is to avoid war and not talk bravely of democracy, of communism, of freedom or anything, because all those things fall if war is there. If war is there, there is no democracy left, there is no freedom left, there is nothing worthwhile left. That is the main thing.

Hon. Members say, why don't you go and do this? That is because we judge everything, first of all whether it is going to ease the situation or create a more difficult situation and lead to war. That is the first thing we see. That does not mean giving up any principle. But one does not shout out principles from house-tops whether the occasion is appropriate or not. One does not bring in all the ills of the world simply because one does not like them.

There are in India itself a hundred ills. We know them and we also criticise for that and we also talk about them. But we cannot remedy them suddenly. We have to go through a certain process and work hard before we can gradually, step by step, remedy them. If we cannot do that in our own country, how much less can we do it in the whole world?

Apart from this political and military crisis that we see, if we look at the world, we see—that is a platitude if I may say so—a period of heavy transition from an old world to the new. Whether it leads to the new world or not, I do not know, but it is obvious—whether it is political, economic, scientific, atom bomb—that

this is a period of tremendous transition and it is about time that our mind moved a little with this period and thought about it. Here is the old civilisation changing. I am not talking about the ancient civilisation, but what I mean by old civilisation now, is the present-day civilisation which is changing economically, politically, culturally, for good or for bad. But it is changing.

Take, for instance, what is called a country with the most entrenched capitalism—the United States of America. Everyone knows that thing; the United States today is capitalistic. But the capitalism in the United States is vastly different from what it was 50 years ago. It is getting more and more socialist. It is approaching in a certain direction, because the whole tendency in the world is in a particular direction. It is no good saying I do not like it. I may not like some things in Russia or England. But we have to look at these things objectively without sitting down in this block or this group. First of all, try to draw lessons from them for our own sake. What are we to do in our own country?

Secondly, wherever we have to function in international organisations, we have to function gently, politely, and in a friendly way, and to press our view-points, and not condemning this country or that country. We have sometimes to express an opinion which is tantamount to condemnation and we cannot help it. But the point is, if I may put it so, the old and the new are under conflict. There is something that is emerging in every country. We find perhaps, in a sense, the most advanced type of this thing in the technological world, in the United States. In the Soviet Union it is rather different but, nevertheless, each represents a particular type. We find them in some kind, and not only in some kind but with a great deal of ideological difficulty of war and conflict, and yet, we see both of them represent a new society, perhaps the other country representing it more. It may be good for us

or bad for us. If anyone of you have gone to the Soviet Union, you will find this new civilisation growing up there. There is plenty of evil, there and yet this new civilisation is growing up and trying to break its shackles.

The interesting and fascinating part of it is that it was gradually breaking its shackles. It may not succeed and something else might come. But am I either strong enough or foolish enough to go about condemning America, Russia, England, because I do not like something and I consider myself an acme of perfection in democracy and socialism and every other quality that a country or individual could possess?

Sometimes people accuse us and say, "Oh, you are trying to be very superior, or trying to be, as the phrase goes, 'holier than thou'". We know very well our imperfections and the imperfections are greater than those of other countries. Let us not be afraid of them, because, if we do not realise this fact, we never grow and we shall never grow. The other countries are spiritually greater than us in many ways, and we may be so in some ways too. But we do not like this idea, if I may say so with all respect, of our sitting complacently and then thinking that we are spiritually greater even though materially we are not, and we may be poor. But, if we really grow spiritually, material things do not matter. It is because that we are not spiritually great, in the real sense of the word, that we look in others something which we condemn or criticise.

We sometimes venture to express our opinion. Well, we express our opinion, and why? For two reasons: firstly, we think that it is the right of every country, as of every individual, to express its opinion, and out of the welter of ideas truth sometimes emerges. Secondly, we are so placed—and that is a virtue which we possess—that we are not consumed with hatred of this country or that

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

country, and if a country is consumed with hatred and fear, then its mind is clogged. It cannot think straight. I say with all respect that in the United States, there is no clear thinking about Russia just as there is no clear thinking in Russia about the United States, because the minds of both are clogged with indignation, with fear of the other and hatred of the other. The result is, naturally, all thinking is clogged. I do not say it is permanently clogged, but I am talking about a temporary phase. I have not a shadow of doubt that if they come to know each other more—it does not matter whether they agree or not and they probably will not agree about many things—hatred and misconceptions will go and they will realise one thing more than anything else, namely, that the other country, whatever it is, however wrong it may be in its opinion, is a living entity, a growing entity, has something new and worthwhile that has to be studied and has something to be learnt from. That is the important thing. That is why we have always sought to encourage contacts and mutual understanding.

Now, so far as we are concerned in India, we have had this advantage, and so have other countries too or at least some of them. That is, we can approach other countries in a friendly way. Whether we agree with them or not is a matter which is secondary. Because we can approach them in a friendly way and in a receptive way, we can profit by that contact and approach. We can profit by understanding them. At any rate, we remove the barriers of prejudice in so far as we can.

The greatest danger which the world is suffering from is this cold war business. It is because the cold war creates a bigger mental barrier than the iron curtain or brick wall or any prison. It creates barriers of the mind which refuses to understand the other person's position which divides the world into devils and angels—that we are the angels and the others are

devils. We can take it that we have something angelic in us, something divine in us, but also that we have a good deal of the satan in us. Whether we are a country or individual, the whole point is that we should stress and try out the good in ourselves and take the good from others and thereby suppress the evil aspects.

Now, I claim this is a virtue for us, for our country, for this Parliament and for our people. We are not obsessed by fear. We are not obsessed by hatred of any country. We are not obsessed even with the dislike of any other country. You may dislike here and there but not any country. Therefore, our minds are a little more receptive than those of others—whether it is Communist, anti-Communist or non-Communist or Socialist. I do think that is a virtue in us and it is in the good democratic tradition. When that goes, then it is bad for the world. When it goes completely, then there is war, and war means, as everybody knows, truth becomes a casualty. The first casualty of war is truth. If the first casualty of war is truth, apart from other casualties that follow—the cold war also brings these casualties of truth, not adequately perhaps because the barriers are not so rigid and there is some kind of communication—it encloses one's mind in a shell of prejudice. That is why wars and the cold war of the last few years, have been bad for the world, bad for humanity, apart from the damage that they have done. The cold war has resulted in these blocks of nations and fears, and a race of armaments and the like and all these treaties. We say, "Do not have any military alliance or pact". We honestly mean that, and yet, when I say that, I know the fear in the other party's mind.

4 P.M.

Nobody likes spending vast sums of money on arms where they can better spend it. But why do they do it? It is because they are afraid that if they do not do it, something worse might happen. I do not think it will happen,

but that is another matter. Why was NATO started? It was because of the fear of Russia. Why were the SEATO and Baghdad Pact started? It was again because of the fear of Russia or China. I think and I believe most of the Members of this House think that that way was the worst possible way of meeting that particular fear or apprehension; I think events have proved it. It is absolutely the reverse of it. Why was the Warsaw Treaty made? It was because of the fear of NATO and the fear of Baghdad Pact. So, there is action and reaction.

I believe the Russian leaders have said, "we shall withdraw every soldier from Eastern Europe—Poland Hungary, Rumania and other countries—if the foreign soldiers from Germany are withdrawn." You may laugh at that, but there is something in it. It is because they are afraid, just as America is afraid; and, I have no doubt that ultimately all these soldiers will be withdrawn. I will give you an instance. I was reading today the full text of the recent joint statement issued by the Prime Minister of Poland and the Prime Minister and other leaders of the Soviet Union when they went to Warsaw. I will read it out to you, because it deals with this matter; not that it represents my opinion, but it shows the mind of the Poles:

"Both parties (the Polish Government and the Soviet Government) discussed the questions connected with the temporary presence of the Soviet army units on Polish territory. The parties have stated that so far no agreed decisions had been reached which might give the European States sufficient guarantees against the revival of German militarism. The continuous questioning by the revanchist forces of the correctness of the existing boundaries between the European States and in the first place the established and existing western boundary of Poland also is an essential factor impeding the normalisation of relations in Europe.

Both parties reached the conclusion that this state of affairs as well as the present international situation warrant the temporary presence of Soviet army units on the territory of Poland, which is also connected with the necessity of the presence of Soviet troops in Germany in conformity with the international treaties and agreements."

Now, that may be an excuse, but it does represent a fear. I wonder how many hon. Members remember that the present Polish boundary, the western boundary, has never been accepted by Germany. They challenged and said, "we will take back the territory". I offer no opinion on the merits of this question; but, at the back of these problems, the fact which I mentioned on the last occasion can never be forgotten that twice within my memory, and possibly more than twice in other people's memory, the German armies have desolated Eastern Europe and other parts of Europe too. Germany is a great country, great in the arts of peace and very great in the arts of war; it turns easily to the arts of war. It is great in science and all over Eastern Europe, there is a memory of German invasion. Therefore, one of the dominating thoughts in the mind of everybody in Eastern Europe, whatever country it may be, is, "let us not have another German invasion; let us protect ourselves from it". I believe personally that the German people as a whole—at least a majority of them—have no such idea, but the fact is that anything that leads to German militarism is frightening to them; and, as it is, it becomes for the western powers a question of taking no risk. Why did they start NATO? It was because they wanted to take no risk about the Russian power. They say and other parties say, "we will not take any risk". When it became a question of survival, then the fine principles and platitudes do not go far enough; it is a life and death struggle. A cold war is exactly the production of that.

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

Look at this problem today. We have arrived at a sudden international crisis, if I may say so. The crisis, of course, has been brewing all over the place in a sense more especially from what followed the nationalisation of the Suez Canal, the crisis brewed and the House will remember that the Anglo-French forces were sent to Malta and Cyprus soon after nationalisation. They were not moved for some time; they were sent by aircraft carriers, ships of war and others, creating a greater crisis than actually existed and frightening people that a world war was coming. This was the development taking place on one side. On the other side, there was the other development, internal ferment taking place in Poland and Hungary and to some extent in other countries of Eastern Europe too. In Poland they gradually resolved themselves peacefully. The movement was identical. In fact, the movement in a sense was given the start in Soviet Russia itself by loosening certain restrictions and shackles that they had in Poland. In Hungary it did not happen that way and I venture to think that it is quite possible—I cannot be certain of it, nor can anyone be—that this warfare in Hungary resulting in the suppression by the Russian troops would probably have taken a very very different turn if there had been no invasion of Egypt. That thing suddenly let loose all kinds of evil forces, fear and others. First of all, it brought matters to a head. There may be an international war and if there is an international war, well, we are going to take no risks about it.

Secondly, the example of countries like England and France with their high reputation as a democratic world doing something now in the middle of this 20th century released the bonds of law and order and international relations that normally exist to some extent—not to a full extent—and it became easier for other countries to do likewise, especially when fear was attached to it. What is that

fear? I am trying to understand and analyse it. If something happened in Hungary, it made Hungary a hostile power to Russia. Then the hostile frontier comes up to the Soviet Union. Then this may have affected Rumania and Bulgaria and upset things; and, in addition to German militarism, this, that and anything may happen. You may say and I may agree with you that all this was not quite justified. But, if I may say something else, I was discussing these matters once with a great Russian leader and I ventured with all respect to point out to him that the kind of speeches they delivered were not very helpful towards international understanding and they sometimes infuriated the people. He said, "You are quite right; we sometimes do these things. But remember that for the last 30 or 40 years, we have been in a state of siege and we have developed all the complexes of the people who live in a state of seige. We react quickly to the danger and fear of something. We think this is too great a risk. We have got into that habit and we sometimes say many things and regret afterwards." There is this psychology.

Today it may well be said that no country wants war and yet each country is afraid of the other and prepares for war.

Acharya Kripalani said something which surprised me, which I thought was not all justified. He was talking about the voting on the Resolution. He said that Yugoslavia voted as they did because they are in fear and terror of Russia. I do not think that anything can be more unjustified than that remark. Yugoslavia, like the other countries, does not go about like Don Quixote with lance in hand, perhaps like some friends of our Socialist Party do, tilting against wind mills, announcing their principles to the world. They have to understand the world as it is. They do not just announce to the world that the world is bad and it ought to be better and go into meditation. Nevertheless, Yugoslavia, for the last so

many years, has stood up against the Soviet Union at great risk, tremendous risk, and stood up by its principles. Lately, in the course of a year or two, some of the barriers between Yugoslavia and the Soviet Union have been removed: removed chiefly by the Soviet Union, not by Yugoslavia except that Yugoslavia agreed to the removal. The initiative came from the Soviet Union. The initiative came from the Soviet Union because of the inner ferment and changes that are taking place in the Soviet Union itself, not because of fear of Yugoslavia but because of this ferment. They have been removed and Yugoslavia's influence in that part of the world has been very considerable. What happened in Yugoslavia has affected naturally Poland, Hungary and other countries. It has affected to some extent Russia itself. It has affected other countries. Yugoslavia has been playing a role of helping and encouraging these movements, two types of movements you may say. One is towards liberalisation or democratisation in their own sense, not perhaps in your own sense, and secondly that each country should be completely independent and not within the influence or dominion of any country or compulsion of any country. They can develop. The Yugoslavs are socialists, communists, not communists exactly as the Russians are. They have their own view of communism. They say, each country must develop socialism in its own way which, I think, is a perfectly legitimate way of looking at it. Anyhow, I shall venture to say that they have resisted throughout and not given up their own policy and their own attitude either through fear or any other impulse emanating from Russia. To say that they were afraid and gave their vote in this manner, seems to me quite an extraordinary thing. I mention this specially because I believe that the Praja Socialist Party has had a high opinion of Yugoslavia and its policy. Some of their leaders have gone to Yugoslavia.

Archarya Kripalani: My high opinion is not less because of this.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I am very glad to hear that. They have gone there, they have conferred with them and representatives from Yugoslavia had come to their conventions, congresses and conferences. I might say that in the last two or three years, some of us in the Government of India and the Government of India itself have come into fairly close contact with Yugoslavia on the personal level, on the governmental level and Yugoslavia has become a country with which we exchange our appraisals of the situation more frequently than any other country. We attach great value to this in regard to Europe. That is because Yugoslavia, first of all, is geographically so situated as to be in intimate touch with the developments in Central and Eastern Europe and Southern Europe. Secondly, historically, linguistically it has been intimately connected with them. The history of the last 30 years has seen both the closest union of Yugoslavia leaders with the leaders of Russia and other countries in Europe and also their parting company with each other and the subsequent coming together again. The result is, the leaders of Yugoslavia, more especially, the President of Yugoslavia, Marshal Tito, are in a better position to make appraisal of the situation. You may or may not agree; that is a different matter. But, it comes from persons of great ability and great experience. Because, experience is not a question of high principles sitting here, but of knowing and trying to get what is at the back of the mind of the other party. So, we value them very much. I am free to confess that we have, to some extent, been guided by their appraisal of the European situation. So far as Asia is concerned, we presume to know a little more than they do and perhaps sometimes they are guided by our appraisal in regard to Asian situations. In regard to the European situation, we certainly attach value to what they say.

I was reading this morning a report of a speech that President Tito delivered, I think, on the 11th of Novem-

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

ber at Pula. It is a long speech. But, the Yugoslavian Government have been good enough to send the twenty-page speech to me by telegram, which reached us yesterday. I was reading it. It is his analysis of the situation in Hungary, in Egypt, in Europe, in the world. The analysis that he has made is special to him. I mean to say that I have not seen any other analysis which would fit in with any other conclusion though analysis may be part of the same. It is true that the objectives before him are not exactly the objectives that any country may have or we may have. That is a different matter. What I submit is, here is a person who has been working for the last few years in his own quiet way for this process of democratisation in the Eastern European countries, changes in Russia, etc., and has played an important part in it. He knows the leaders of those countries thoroughly. He can talk their language, not having interpreters in between. His appraisal is therefore helpful. I am not going to read the 20 pages of the appraisal except to say that in many points it seems to be very correct though in some I find it a little difficult to agree with him. One thing I would read out to you, the remarks that he has made about the present Hungarian Government. I say that because, to my amazement, an hon. Member on this side of the House, in his excitement, talked about Mr. Kadar as a quisling, imposter, as a puppet and what not, and wanted him to be thrown out of the window or some such thing.

4.19 P.M.

[MR. SPEAKER in the Chair]

I do, if I may say so, with all respect, a little more responsible thinking and responsible talk in this House. I am sorry that such utterly ridiculous statements can be made by any Member of this House even though he may be a Member of my Party. Mr. Kadar I do not know, I am prepared to say does not perhaps command the allegiance of the majority of the

Hungarian people. That is a different matter. But, to run down an individual whose whole life and career has been one of fighting and struggling for freedom, who has been sent to prison by the Communist Government in Hungary for a number of years and kept there, that is to say, by the previous Government or the Stalinite Government, if I may call it, and kept in prison for years and who has come out now and who was a member of Mr. Nagy's Government, a senior Member—just to call him a Quisling and all that really does seem to me to go to an extreme limit of irresponsible thinking and speaking.

Other Members said: "Do not recognise this Government." I do not quite understand how those hon. Members think about these problems. Recognition and non-recognition. We have recognised Hungary as an independent country. If some hon. Member tells me it was not independent, not wholly independent, I might be prepared to agree. But I would add there are very few countries in the world which are wholly independent and whose leading strings are not in somebody else's hands. They may be independent countries, in the United Nations they may vote this way or that way, but I doubt very much if their voting is hundred per cent free voting. Quite a large number of countries would fall into that category of lacking complete independence.

I am just reading a paragraph from President Tito's long speech. After the analysis, he said:

"We must help today the Kadar Government. Comrades, I have gone a little away from the matter of which I have spoken. I wanted to tell you that viewing the current developments in Hungary from the perspective of socialism or counter-revolution, we must defend Kadar's present Government. We must help it because it is in a very difficult situation"

I will not read more. The point is that the situations that a country or the world has to deal with are not black and white, are not simple. Very often in the world or in our individual life or our national policies one has to choose what is called the lesser evil. One might take a particular step in order to avoid a catastrophe, in order to avoid a war.

Some hon. Members seem to think here that everything that has happened in Hungary was dead clear and there was no doubt and we can deliver a fine speech about it. I can tell them that during these last twenty days or so,—because this crisis we might say arose in its present form with the ultimatum to Egypt by the United Kingdom and France round about the 31st October—during these days or the first fortnight certainly, my Ministry of External Affairs here worked till the small hours, of the morning because we were in a difficulty what to do, what to say, what to reply, getting all kinds of messages from our own people, from other countries, leaders of other countries, at midnight, at one O'Clock at night, having to answer it immediately, sometimes trying to telephone to other continents. It was a difficult situation. A situation is not resolved by the enunciation of a maxim. One has to take a step to improve and a step that will avoid worsening the situation. And the first thing we had all the time in our mind was that we must avoid a war, we must do everything in so far as we can to avoid a war because if there is a war everything goes to rack and ruin; if there is not, one can repair the damage, one can gradually begin thinking on straight lines and do something. And to some extent that has been the fate of many of our diplomatic representatives elsewhere.

Hon. Member Shri Shiva Rao complained that we did not give the House enough information, that we should issue memoranda to Members from time to time. I should be very happy to give as much information as we can from time to time, but I do not quite understand what he meant.

If Parliament is sitting, naturally if anything important occurs, it is my business to come to Parliament and state it, and no memorandum is necessary. It not, I can otherwise do it. But in these 2½ weeks—Parliament met on the 14th, from two weeks practically before that—with an ever-changing situation, with facts not quite clear and our trying to get those facts, it was not an easy matter to issue a memorandum, lest we say a wrong thing or the right thing at the wrong time. Remember this: right may be right, but right said at the wrong time may create wrong. It is a very difficult thing, in these matters what to say, when to say and how to say it.

Then again, Acharya Kripalani said that our diplomatic representatives ought to have sensed that this was going to happen. Well, if they could do so, I would have been very happy, but how we should expect our young men to sense future happenings like this when, as far as I know, hardly anybody in the wide world knew of them, is more than I can understand. It is a fact that in so far as the Israeli invasion of Egypt took place, there were some rumblings three or four days before. The House may remember that almost exactly one month before the Israeli invasion of Egypt, Mr. Ben Gurion, the Prime Minister of Israel, declared that he was not in favour of a preventive war and he was not going to have a preventive war—just a month before he attacked Egypt in a big way. It is an extraordinary way for a Prime Minister to give that kind of assurance and break it within a month.

There were some rumblings in the sense that one felt it and presumably because—naturally, the resources of England and America are far greater than ours—President Eisenhower issued some kind of an appeal, a vague appeal, asking Israel and others to restrain themselves. There was some talk of people being ready for evacuation. We read that in the newspapers just a little before. Then came the Israeli invasion.

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

So far as the Anglo-French ultimatum was concerned, so far as I know, no country in the world including all the Commonwealth countries, including America which is a very close ally of England and France, knew anything about it till just before the ultimatum. I got a message just about simultaneously with the ultimatum, late at night. I got it late at night when the ultimatum was to expire at 8 O'Clock the next morning I got it at midnight or thereabouts.

We need not go into this question which Acharya Kripalani and other people have repeatedly referred to, namely why were we not consulted. Nobody was consulted, even the United States which is of such great importance to the military and other policies of the United Kingdom, and there is naturally very considerable resentment in the minds of some—if not all, most Members of the Commonwealth—that in a matter of this kind they were not consulted. However, the point is it did come like a bolt from the blue, and no diplomatic representative, however experienced he might be, unless he dealt in some astrological methods, could possibly sense this.

Two or three months ago I met our Ambassador in Egypt while coming back from my visit to Saudi Arabia and Syria. He came to Beirut. I found him rather ill from sheer hard work. In fact, to my great dismay, as he and I were walking in a corridor in Beirut, he suddenly collapsed, fainted. It was astounding. We took him up, put him in bed and he gradually revived. Just so much overwork. I told him: "Please rest a little here in Beirut for at least seven or eight days." The day after when I came here, we got the news of the nationalisation of the Suez Canal, and immediately after this, news of British ships of war moving about. Poor man, he had to hurry back to Cairo. He went to Cairo and worked hard again all the time, because there was work in Cairo then, very hard work during these two or three months. When he was thoroughly worn out, we gave him a little leave

and we thought that now, after the Security Council had decided the six principles on which the Suez Canal question will be settled, the danger of war was over. Most people thought so and actually a date was fixed or suggested by Mr. Hammerskjold, the Secretary-General of U.N. for the meeting of representatives of Egypt, England and France and may be some others. Curiously enough that date did not come up and on the day which Mr. Hammerskjold had suggested for the meeting, that very day the British ultimatum, the Anglo-French ultimatum came. I think it was the 29th, if I am not wrong. And so, this poor man, our Ambassador in Egypt had just come away for a little rest, on casual leave, when on the second or third day of his arrival these things happened. He telephoned to me from Hyderabad and said, 'I must go immediately'. I said, 'Yes; go back'. How was he to go back? All the Airlines to Cairo had stopped. Then he said, 'I will go to Damascus'. The Damascus line was stopped. He said, 'I will go to Istanbul and work my way through'. He says, 'From here I go to Rome and go there'. He comes back from Rome. From there he goes to Libya and from Libya to Cairo. The roads are being blocked there and nobody can go there. He comes back to Rome and then goes to Khartoum and from Khartoum by road and river he finds his way to Cairo. This was the process of his going back.

Then, about the High Commissioner in London. Because of some quietening of the situation some leave was asked on grounds of health and she came here. Immediately these things came. The next day she telephoned to me here and said, 'I am ready to go back'.

Shri Kamath: She did not come to Delhi?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: She was in Allahabad. She telephoned to Delhi. She said, 'I am ready to go back immediately!'. I asked her to come here first and then she went two or three days later. She could have

gone two or three days earlier but there was trouble about her health and she went as early as she could.

One word about our representative in Hungary, about our Ambassador in Hungary. He is Shri K. P. S. Menon who is also our Ambassador in Moscow. He normally lives in Moscow but pays his visit there. That applies to several countries like Poland because we have not got men to put up Embassies everywhere. Because of this ferment in Hungary going on for some time, we had decided to send a more junior official to be stationed there to report to the Ambassador or his First Secretary. This young man arrived there, I think, about two weeks before this outbreak in Hungary. He has been there throughout. He has done good work. He is a very young man who has just arrived in a new country. But he has done good work. We have asked our Ambassador, Shri K. P. S. Menon; who is also our Ambassador in Hungary to move there immediately and report.

A good deal has been said, either directly or indirectly, hinting at the fact that there has been some difference of opinion between the Government of India here and our Delegation to the United Nations. I should like to make it perfectly clear that there is complete unison of thinking and action in the Government of India and our representatives. First of all, before they go, we have long talks and we discuss the matter. Secondly, we are, so far as one can be, in constant communication. One cannot do so always, naturally, because emergency sessions are held there constantly. Suddenly, at midnight resolutions are put forward and suddenly passed because of the emergency. Even today when we were sitting listening to the speeches here, I was summoned by telephone from New York telling me what was happening today. I may tell the House what is happening today. It is just as it was happening previously. Here is a resolution which is being proposed by some countries with regard to Hungary in regard to the report about deportations from Hungary. I have not got the wording of the resolution

here. Maybe it has appeared in the Press. Anyhow, reports have appeared about these deportations saying that the United Nations must immediately send people and take action etc. We did not approve of this resolution. We put forward another resolution. We said that reports had appeared about these deportations. This has been denied by the Hungarian representative and the Soviet representative. It is therefore desirable to find out what the facts are as quickly as possible, because, naturally, the whole conception of deportation is not only distasteful but instinctively bad. We must find out what the facts are and ask the Hungarian Government to allow representatives sent by the U.N. or the Secretary-General to go and enquire into this matter. I have not the correct wording here. It is the sense of it. We thought that it is wrong for a responsible Organisation like the United Nations to pronounce a judgment without enquiry. Enquiry before judgment will not make any slight difference; it is far better to enquire. In fact, judgment without enquiry is a bad thing. We said, 'You enquire into it'. I do not know what is going to happen in the General Assembly today. If our resolution is taken up and it is passed, well and good. If the other resolution is given precedence and ours does not come up and if the other one is passed we will not vote, we will abstain. You cannot say the first paragraph is this and the second paragraph is that and there is nothing wrong in it. You cannot take these things like that. We have to take the whole thing as it is and the background of it and what is meant by it.

Take this resolution that has been so much talked about, the resolution of November 4th against which we ultimately voted, the resolution by Pakistan, Cuba and two or three other countries.

Shri Kamath: On the 9th.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: Take that resolution, the whole context of it. It is no good saying that the preamble said something about the United Nations and we are not against it.

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

One has to see the context of it. One has to see the objective of it, what is meant by it, because, unfortunately, these are the difficulties that have arisen.

Things in Egypt and Hungary have both led to the intensification of the cold war. That is bad. The Soviet Union forgets about Hungary; puts a cover on it and talks about Egypt and Anglo-French aggression only. The other countries forget about Egypt and talk about Hungary only.

Acharya Kripalani: Let us talk about both.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: The Socialist Party is also forgetting about Egypt and is talking about Hungary only. (*Interruption*) I would just ask you to find how much time has been given in the speeches to Hungary and how much time to Egypt. You can just calculate it from the records of speeches here in this House. What is more, it is not merely the time, but the stress of it, the whole emphasis of it.

Shri Kamath: Let us sit down and do it.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: Unfortunately, with all respect to my elders and others, this has gone into wrong hands. There is interference in such matters, especially Hungary, by such associations like the Association for Cultural Freedom, Democratic Research Service and so on.

Shri Kamath: Are you thinking of Bulgarian?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I am not referring to Bulgarian; I am referring to the Democratic Research Service. I am referring to some organisation going by the rather pompous name of the Society for Cultural Freedom. I do not know what democracy and culture is there about the organisation. They are merely political organisations; just like they have political organisations for this and for that, they have for culture but mainly and only for the promotion of Communism. So in spite

of high-sounding names, these rival organisations have sprung up, normally with their headquarters in Bombay, closely associated with the Praja Socialist Party, doing propaganda for democracy and freedom in this peculiar way. So that is the difficulty.

Here are two very vital issues affecting the world, and instead of those issues being considered on their merits, each one of them is considered more from two points of view. One is the point of view of the Cultural Freedom Society; the other is just to run down our Government as a convenient handle to do so. It is unfortunate. Because of this the resolutions that are brought in the United Nations, not all of them but some of them, are brought largely with a political intent, that is, to down some parties, maybe to down the people who are agitating in Hungary, to down the people in Egypt. Speeches are delivered from that point of view so as to divert public attention from one matter to another.

In the first week of November world attention was concentrated on Egypt, and as the House knows, there was a tremendous reaction all over the world against the Anglo-French and Israeli aggression in Egypt. Just then the Hungarian question came to the front. That it had been there and it deserved close attention undoubtedly and caused great concern I agree, but the way it was taken up again was that it was viewed almost with the relief that it happened in Hungary so that attention might be diverted from Egypt to Hungary, and in this picture the poor people of Hungary played little part. I am not speaking of those people; I am talking of those who look at it from this angle about the future of those people. They are thinking of the Hungarian question as a pawn in the chessboard of international politics. just as others who are thinking of the Egyptian question as a pawn in the chessboard of international politics. It becomes very easy to be swept away

especially in the passion and excitement of the moment. It is the business of a delegation not to be swept away by this. It is the business of a delegation to check these things. So it is not a question of phraseology of a paragraph or a sub-paragraph, but the whole context of it, how it is produced and when it is produced. One hon. Member, I forget who he was, mentioned something about the timing of it and the country who produced it. With all respect, none of the important countries put forward this resolution. They may vote for it afterwards, but they did not sponsor it. Why did they not sponsor it? They did not think it was a responsible resolution at the moment. Naturally when it came to voting, they thought they had better vote for it. It all comes in this way. All this tremendous propaganda against India is raised in other countries and to some extent in India. India voted this, India voted that etc. It is obvious that the whole thing had a political motive and objective behind it, to run down India, because India had taken a strong line in the United Nations about various matters. That is the clear objective. Most people of course did not know all the facts, and one cannot blame them for the reaction they have. But I say that the objective of all this was to try to put the Indian Delegation and the Government of India in the wrong in this matter, and may be many people in India were affected by that barrage of propaganda.

I do beg of the House to consider this with regard to all the accounts or what is said. That is why I took the unusual step of circulating the two speeches which Shri Krishna Menon delivered on the Hungarian question because the speech clarifies our attitude fully, and I want the House to read them and judge thereby. Therefore, I wish to repeat, to remove any misapprehension, that in this particular matter of the resolution, in regard to the speeches—naturally the speeches were not vetted by me before, but reading it subse-

quently—it does represent our viewpoint and that vote was a perfectly correct vote. If a similar situation arises, We shall again vote in the same way—I wish to make it perfectly clear—because our attitude to Hungary or Egypt will be judged. But we are not going to be dragged into a wrong formulation of the policy by a resolution which, according to us, is not properly phrased. It may be that a particular bit of it by itself may be right. If I may refer to hon. Member, Shri Kamath's amendment to this particular resolution which I have moved, part of that amendment may seem to be innocuous—I am not going to accept any part of it, that is certain because, as Shri Kamath has frankly said, it comes with a different objective. He is opposed to our policy and he is perfectly justified in putting forward that. But, of course, I am perfectly justified in resisting that, even though a bit of it here and there may by itself sound good. I cannot take a bit here and a bit there.

May I refer to one matter which several Members have brought up—the question of Israel—and demanded from us the policy we followed in regard to Israel? We have made no secret of our policy or the reasons for that policy in the past. We recognised Israel some little time after it had entered the United Nations and had been recognised by a large number of countries. We recognise it because it was our policy to recognise any country that was an independent functioning country represented in the United Nations. We recognised it. We recognised a country which we had not long recognised for other reasons, like Spain, entirely for other reasons, but we came to that conclusion, whether we had disagreed in the past or at present with Spanish policy, and we are glad that we have recognised it and we have now representation from Spain here. Having done so, it is true that a logical consequence of that was to exchange diplomatic mission, subject, of course, to our having the person-

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

nel. But we were trying at that time throughout—I am talking about the last two or three years—mainly to help in some way or other in lessening the gap between the Arab countries and Israel; not that we wanted to push ourselves in, but we thought perhaps we might be able to help. We tried that and we came to the conclusion that in view of the existing passions, if we exchanged diplomatic personnel with Israel, our task would become difficult. There is no logic in it. It is a question of seeing the existing situation and deciding how best you can serve your objective in view. I told the Egyptian people and others about this, but I must say that progressively I have been surprised at the aggressive tendencies of Israel. There has been plenty of aggression on the other side and wild speeches made also. But if hon. Members will look at the record kept by the U.N. observers who have been sitting on the Armistice Line there, they will find that the number of aggressions from the side of Israel—there have been aggressions on both sides—have exceeded those from Egypt.

Finally, this last action of Israel has amazed me. It is the most foolish gamble that any country can play, quite apart from the morals of it, which are wrong. I am completely at sea at the present moment. Even some months ago, I had some hopes that some kind of a settlement might emerge. But, at the present moment, my mind is completely blank in regard to a settlement between Egypt and other Arab countries and Israel. Such tremendous passions have been raised that a very great deal of time should elapse before the people could forget what had happened.

Shri Chattopadhyaya (Vijayawada): Could we know the reasons why, at this juncture, in spite of all that has happened to take us away from the Commonwealth, we still continue to be in the Commonwealth? The Prime Minister has not spoken about it.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: Thank you for reminding me.

The hon. Member reminded me of the Commonwealth connection. This question has come up in a different context on many occasions and I have warmly defended that connection for a variety of reasons. It is perfectly true that, because of this Anglo-French attack on Egypt, this question had to be thought about afresh. It was a new and important factor and as some hon. Members have said, a veteran statesman of ours had been writing and speaking on this subject. So also others. Well, we have given thought to it and I spoke about it the other day, in Calcutta.

First of all, it is up to us to decide, when we so choose, when there is adequate reason for us to do so, as to whether we should leave the Commonwealth. I do not think, considering everything, that it is desirable for us, because of this particular happening, to leave the Commonwealth. I want a dissociated—not that it need necessarily be dissociated—consideration; I do not think it is right for us to act in such a way. Why do we take any action? To achieve certain results. The only possible result I see here is to exhibit our strong feelings in this matter. That is the result and that is something which may be worthwhile just to show. I do not think that we have been lacking in the expression of views about recent events in Egypt. We expressed them very strongly and nobody doubts them anyway. Therefore, to do that, merely to express again our views about it, is not worthwhile.

Again, we have to consider it from both the point of view of the immediate problems and from a longer viewpoint. The immediate problem is, again, how we can prevent the situation from deteriorating towards war—I mean the world situation. We feel that any such ac-

tion would not tend to help in improving the situation but would rather make it worse. That is one important consideration.

In another context too, we feel that, subject of course to there being no war and presuming that the world somewhat settles down, we think that it is desirable that should continue—this Commonwealth connection. We think it is helpful; it can help peace; it has helped peace. That does not mean that a Member should remind me: how do you keep the peace immediately? We do not of course know but I say that you could not have done it otherwise either. We have to weigh so many problems that have come up and, more especially, in this growing complex world situation we do think that it would be wrong for us, merely to show our irritation and anger at certain things that have happened, to cut off this Commonwealth connection. We feel that it is good for us and, if I may say so with all respect, good for England too to have this connection. I know at least some of the other Commonwealth countries, whose opinion and whose friendship we value, would also very much like us to continue there. But, of course we live in a fluid state of affairs and I do not know how the international situation will develop; it depends upon that too.

There were many things said and I am sorry if I missed any points made in the debate. But, I would refer to one thing. Acharya Kripalani said something about the statement issued by some Members of our U.N.O. delegation. As far as I remember, all the Members who issued it, are Members of Parliament, very well-known to hon. Members here. It is not for me to give them a testimonial. But, I will say this that, some days ago, they informed me—I did not know that they were bringing out a statement—that they were surprised at all this out-cry going on about India's vote. They said: "We have done it in this spirit. We have heard the speeches and that

was their opinion and they informed was the only line we can take." That me so. Then, ultimately, they decided to issue this statement which they have every right to do. Naturally, one does not expect the official members of the delegation to issue statements in favour of Governments action. But, I would like—I hope the House will not think that I am doing this merely for the sake of formality—to express my high appreciation of the work of our delegation, more especially, of the Leader of the delegation. We have reached nearly a stage where there is this inner and deeper crisis which we have to resolve not because we are in any way better than any other countries, but simply because we are friendly to other countries and we have been put in a position where we can help a little.

In the course of the next few weeks, I am going to the United States, chiefly to meet President Eisenhower. I am greatly looking forward to this visit not only because the United States is a great and powerful country but because also President Eisenhower is a great man who has exercised his influence and has undoubtedly been, I believe, instrumental in the maintenance of world peace on every critical occasion. I am sure that meeting him will be a profit to me.

5.00 P.M.

Here again, in about ten days or less than ten days, the Prime Minister of China, Mr. Chou-En-Lai, the leader of a great nation, our neighbour, a very important person and a very able person, is coming here. This itself rather lights up the way we function in the international sphere. We meet in a frankly and friendly way the great leader of the United States. We meet frankly and in a friendly way a very prominent leader of the new China. And in a sense, maybe to a slight extent, we do become a link between people who have parted and who do not otherwise meet. That is a service we can perform, not, again, because

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

of our being better than anybody else but simply because circumstances and our policy have placed us in that position.

The House knows how we have regretted greatly during the last many years the exclusion and worked for the inclusion of China in the United Nations. We have done so not only because we thought it the right thing to do but because not doing so seemed to us very harmful to the world, more harmful to the world than to China herself and, progressively, the longer China is kept out the harm to the rest of the world is greater than to China herself. The other day we put this matter forward again in the United Nations and some other resolution was passed, I believe, although some kind of a controversy has arisen over it whether it was regularly passed or not by sufficient number of votes. But we may do that in the United Nations regularly and people may think that we are just doing it formally, as a matter of course. But it is something infinitely more than that. We consider this matter to be of the utmost significance for world peace. We consider it utterly and absolutely wrong to go on keeping China outside the United Nations. We consider it injurious to the United Nations and to the other countries. For my part I am convinced that if China had been there many of the troubles of the Far East might not have taken place. And if China is not there, may be, other conflicts may continue to rise up. I do wish to lay stress on this.

I believe there are three amendments to this resolution. I have referred already to Shri Kamath's amendment. Then there are two amendments by Shri V. G. Deshpande, which I think do not require any words of mine, a reading of them will convince every person that they have to be dropped like hot bricks. Then there is another substitute motion which is merely a commendation

of our policy. I am too modest to say anything about it.

Mr. Speaker: I shall now put the amendments to the vote of the House.

Shri Kamath: May I request you, Sir, to put the two parts contained in my amendment separately to the vote of the House?

Mr. Speaker: We normally sit till five o'clock. All Members of the House may not be willing to sit long and vote on the amendment part by part. Shri Deshpande also has given a number of parts in his amendments. Therefore, I shall put the amendment as a whole.

Shri Kamath: I would request you kindly to read my amendment, Sir.

Mr. Speaker: Members have got it in the Order Paper.

Shri Kamath: Not all.

Mr. Speaker: Does he think that if I read the amendment they will vote in his favour. Anyway I will read it. The question is:

That for the original motion, the following be substituted:

"This House having considered the present international situation and the policy of the Government of India in relation thereto—

(i) regrets that India abstained from voting on the operative part 1 of the Five Power resolution on Hungary in U.N. General Assembly on the 9th November, 1956; and

(ii) is of opinion that in the interest of peace and freedom the Government of U.S.S.R. should withdraw its forces from Hungary without any further delay."

Those in favour will please say 'Aye'.

Some Hon. Members: 'Aye'.

Mr. Speaker: Those against will please say 'No'.

Several Hon. Members: No.