

MOTION RE. INTERNATIONAL
SITUATION

The Prime Minister and Minister of External Affairs (Shri Jawaharlal Nehru): Mr. Speaker, Sir, three days ago, on the 16th of November, I made a statement in this House on the international situation with special reference to Egypt and Hungary. In initiating this debate, it was not my intention to say much at this stage, but rather to reserve my remarks to the end of the debate when hon. Members have expressed their views. I feel, however, that it might be desirable for me to bring before the House some later developments in regard to these matters.

I beg to move:

"That the present international situation and the policy of the Government of India in relation thereto be taken into consideration."

I need not point out to this House how important this debate is. It is important because the issues before the world today are of high importance and deal with questions of war and peace and the suppression of freedom and issues that affect us too directly as well as indirectly. What we say in this House is not merely listened to by our Members here, but has a much wider audience in this country and even abroad. Therefore, I feel rather burdened with this occasion and I wish to use language which, I hope, will not in any way come in the way of such peaceful developments towards peaceful settlement as might be taking place. Three days ago, I mentioned that the situation was a very grave one and although there appeared to be some elements of progress in it, nevertheless, it continued very grave and was viewed by us with concern. That position remains as it was although there are some elements which may be considered to be helpful. But, basically, the situation is a very grave one. I hope, hon. Members also, in considering these matters which are before us and the world, will do so calmly and objectively and, if I may

use the word with respect, with some caution so that their words and our words may not lead to greater tension, and might put perhaps some difficulties in the way of what we seek to achieve.

Now, we read our newspapers daily and everyday there are all kinds of reports and allegations, and naturally, we react to them. And yet it is not particularly easy for us to find out what is true and what is not true and what is perhaps exaggerated. We hear of Anglo-French troops landing somewhere in Israel. I believe this is contradicted. We hear reports of Soviet aircraft going to Syria. This is contradicted and it is said that except for some aircraft that went long before the crisis as a result of purchase by the Syrian Government, there has been no despatch of aircraft there. We hear so many other reports of this kind which either are directly contradicted or are not substantiated. In these cases, there is very great difficulty for a responsible body like us or for the United Nations to proceed on the basis of unconfirmed reports and it might very well not only create complications but come in the way of giving a correct lead if those events happen to be not true, on which the reports were supposed to be based.

Only recently, we have had reports of deportation of people from Hungary, specially young men, deportation, it is said, by Soviet authorities. Now, the Hungarian Government has denied in the United Nations. So has the Soviet Government. I believe even today a resolution has been placed before the General Assembly on this subject based on the newspaper reports which are denied by apparently the two Governments which are most concerned and which should know. Now, it becomes extraordinarily difficult for any one to come to a conclusion without further information or further enquiry into the matter. In fact, I believe it was stated in the General Assembly on behalf of the Hungarian Government that they not only categorically deny

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

this but that they have taken steps to allow some representatives of the workers, young men etc., to go themselves, to sit at the various points of exit from Hungary, to see if anything was being done there or anybody was sent away. Now, it is quite conceivable—it is only a guess—that these young men or workers were being sent to see things for themselves, and it might have been thought that they were being deported. I do not know, I am merely pointing out the difficulty of getting a correct picture.

Now, in regard to Egypt, as the House knows we in India have been intimately associated with events during the last few months. To begin with, even our relations with Egypt are intimate, and we are in constant touch with what happens there. Ever since the nationalisation of the Suez Canal, we were in very intimate touch, so that whatever happened did not come to us without any foreknowledge of the events preceding it. That is, we were in a position, we were in a much better position to judge that situation. It was an open situation at that time. Later things have happened in Egypt which are rather confusing, say, the state of affairs at Port Said etc, but the broad facts were clear to us and therefore we ventured to express a very clear and definite opinion about it.

In regard to Hungary, there was a difficulty that the broad facts were not clear to us, and also the occurrences in Hungary took place at a moment when suddenly the international situation became very much worse and we had to be a little surer and clearer as to what had actually happened and what the present position was. Therefore, we were a little cautious in expressing our opinion in regard to facts. We were not cautious about expressing our opinion in regard to the general principles that should govern conditions there. As the House knows, right from the very beginning we made it perfectly clear that in regard to Hungary or in regard to Egypt or anywhere else,

any kind of suppression by violent elements of the freedom of the people was an outrage on liberty. I said that and I made it perfectly clear that first foreign forces should be removed both from Egypt and Hungary—although the two cases are not parallel, the facts are different, but this fact was there; secondly that the people of Hungary should be allowed, should be given the opportunity to determine their future.

I believe even now facilities are not being given both in Hungary and in parts of Egypt occupied by foreign forces like Port Said, like the other parts occupied by the Israeli Army, to outsiders to go there. On the last occasion I said in this House that from the reports we had received, conditions in Port Said were very bad and that casualties were heavy. The statement I made was cautious. The reports which we had received were much worse than what I had said, but because I did not wish to proceed on those reports without further confirmation, I moderated my language in describing it. The fact is that even up to now, so far as I know, nobody is allowed to go into Port Said. The reports that came to us previously were partly from refugees and we do not usually attach very great importance to a statement of excited refugees—not that they deliberately misrepresent, but they are emotionally wound up and they tend not to give a correct appraisal of events. The reports that came to us about the events in Port Said were the reports of some foreign journalists who had gone to Port Said at the peril of their lives and who had made these statements in foreign papers in Europe. Even so, we hesitated to accept them because they were so bad that we thought they should be confirmed. In fact, we have been suggesting in the case of Egypt, as in the case of Hungary, that it is desirable from every point of view even from the point of view of the occupying forces, that impartial observers, preferably sent by the United Nations, should go, look at the things there and report. I

earnestly trust that the Governments or the authorities concerned in both places will permit this to be done, otherwise all kinds of wild reports are circulated and believed in.

We have been, receiving fairly full accounts, dispatches from our Embassies abroad, our Missions abroad. Almost daily we get these reports from New York, from Washington, from London, from Moscow, from Belgrade, from Cairo, Beirut, Damascus, Berne and some other places, from Vienna and Budapest also, because we have had one of our young officers in Budapest throughout this period. It was true that he could not communicate with us easily and his telegrams usually reach us now about six days late because they have had to go to Vienna presumably by road and then they are dispatched from Vienna. Gradually the picture of events has taken some clear shape. All this daily information that we get not only from our Missions but by the courtesy of other Governments,—more especially I am grateful to the information we have received from the Governments of the United States, of Canada, of the Soviet Union, of Yugoslavia and some other Governments too—all these despatches have resulted in such an abundance of information which is often contradictory, which contradict each other. I will say it gives a picture which is a very confused picture, but it is true, I think, that one can make a fair appraisal of these events. Now, may I just say, without mentioning our representatives abroad, that I should like to express my appreciation of the work done by our Ambassador in Cairo which has been of a high order.

So far as the situation in Egypt is concerned, the House knows that the first contingent of our forces has already gone there. Others will follow. I want to make it perfectly clear on what conditions we sent these forces to join the United Nations forces. First of all, we made it clear that it was only if the Government of Egypt agreed, only then we would

send them, secondly they were not to be considered in any sense as a continuing force continuing the activities of the Anglo-French forces which was entirely a separate thing, thirdly that the Anglo-French forces should be withdrawn, fourthly that the United Nations force should function to protect the old Armistice line between Israel and Egypt, and finally that it should be a temporary affair. We are not prepared to agree to our force or any force remaining there indefinitely. It was on these conditions, which were accepted, I believe, that these forces were sent there. I repeat this because, unfortunately, statements are sometimes made about this United Nations International Force which are not in consonance with the decision of the United Nations or, I believe, with the agreements arrived at by the Secretary-General of the United Nations with Egyptian Government.

Then, the first question that arises in Egypt at the present moment in regard to the Resolution of the United Nations General Assembly is that of the withdrawal of the Anglo-French and the Israeli forces from Egyptian territory. This is a dangerous issue because if there is any attempt to create delay and certainly if there is any attempt not to withdraw, there is likely to be a resumption of hostilities which, I think, will be on bigger scales than earlier.

It is stated—and I believe on fairly good authority—that there has been some days ago, perhaps, some addition to these forces. One does not know when sometimes forces are exchanged, some are withdrawn and some are sent and so one cannot say. But, anyhow, it is a vital matter that Anglo-French and Israeli forces should withdraw from the area they have occupied because without that nothing else can be got going and so long as they remain, there will be constant fear of hostilities being resumed.

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

I have already mentioned about Port Said which requires immediate attention and which can only be done properly by observers being allowed to go there and report. The House may know that we are sending—I think tomorrow—a very large aircraft, in size about 3 Dakotas, of medical supplies and relief goods which are being taken both to Egypt and to Hungary.

In Hungary, as I said, the conditions, especially the rather detailed developments, were for some time not at all clear to us. I am not quite sure if they are completely clear even now; but, I think the broad facts are clear enough. There is little doubt that the kind of nationalist uprising which took place there after demonstrations etc. developed, after coming into conflict with the Soviet forces there. The Soviet Forces were withdrawn from Budapest and a statement was issued on the 30th October, embodying the Soviet policy in regard to these countries, which stated that they would withdraw their forces after consulting the Warsaw Powers and so on and so forth.

It is a fact, I think, that they were withdrawn. But, very soon after, other events occurred in Budapest—and this matter is not quite clear—I think not in Budapest but in Hungary and within 3 or 4 days the Soviet forces returned and in far greater mechanised power. There were big conflicts in Budapest which were ultimately suppressed by the Soviet Armed Forces. Some people say that even while the Soviet Forces were withdrawing from Budapest round about the 29th or 30th, actually the Soviet Army had come across the frontier and that this was not—if I may use that word—a *bona fide* withdrawal at all. Others think that something happened in the course of those two or three days which made the Soviet Government change its policy, because we must remember that before any Government does that, more especially the Soviet Government or the British Government

or any major power, all these separate questions are weighed presumably in the light of other international developments and with the possibility of a bigger flare-up. That is always in their mind. Anyhow, the fact remains that the Soviet Forces came back and there was a major conflict in which a fairly large number of Hungarians suffered as they fought very bravely. And, it is possible that the Hungarian Army itself was on the side of the Hungarian people and in the initial stages the Soviets also suffered fairly considerably, though, naturally, in lesser numbers. It is not, at the present moment, of any great importance that we should know the details of this. The major fact stands out that the majority of the people of Hungary wanted a change, political, economic or whatever the changes were, and actually rose in insurrection after demonstrations etc. to achieve it but ultimately they were suppressed.

I think it is true that there were some elements on the side of the Hungarians which might be called by a word which is rather misused sometimes, 'Fascist' elements. I think it is true that outsiders also came in because the border forces were not functioning and I think it is also true that arms came from outside to some extent. All that is true. But, while all that is true, this is not the major fact. The major fact is that the people of Hungary, a very large part of them, claimed freedom from outside control or interference, objected to the Soviet Forces coming, wanted them to withdraw and wanted some internal changes in their Government. That is a basic fact which nobody can deny.

Another rather implicit feature of the situation, perhaps, more significant than even the fighting that the Hungarian people indulged in is the fact that when fighting stopped—it stopped some days ago, I think they are not fighting now—certainly in Budapest not in Hungary—in spite of

all this, there was rather an extraordinary demonstration of passive resistance. That is, the people of Budapest refused to go back to work, refused to take part in other normal activities at a time when the city was suffering very greatly by the stoppage of work during the period of armed conflict. In spite of all that resistance to forces by fighting, this resistance of people in a peaceful passive way seemed to be, so far as I am concerned, more significant of the wishes of their country than an armed revolt which might be aroused by some groups here and there.

I wonder how many of the hon. Members present here have in mind the past history of Hungary. It is a rather tragic history with frequent attempts to attain freedom, frequently suppressed. During the regime of the Austro-Hungarian Empire, there were such attempts. We know well, nearly 40 years ago, when we in this country first had this picture of non-co-operation put before us by Mahatma Gandhi what we were told; and we really read about the kinds of non-co-operation or something like it in other countries. Among those countries, more especially it was in Hungary, where somewhere in the middle of the 19th century, a movement of passive non-cooperation, passive resistance arose under the leadership, I think, of O'Dver, which achieved some objectives too, though not completely. But then, 5 weeks before the First World War was over, just after the October Revolution, as it is called or soon after, I do not exactly remember the dates, but anyhow, in 1918, there was an upheaval in Hungary; Austro-Hungary was breaking up; the German armies had been there and they were withdrawing and there was an upheaval more or less on the lines of the upheaval in Russia at the time. The leader of that was one Belakuhn, an associate of Lenin and he established the Republic of Hungary. That was a time of intervention by other foreign countries in the affairs of the Soviet Union after the Revolution.

The Rumanian Army marched into Hungary then, and suppressed this new Republic of Hungary and suppressed it, so far as I can remember, in an exceedingly ruthless manner. In fact, it was not merely a suppression of the Republic, but widespread loot of Hungary by these armies. As a result of that the Republic of course, ceased to be and a regime was established under Admiral Horthy, a kind of feudal regime; hon. Members may perhaps remember that Hungary has been in the 19th and 20th centuries one of the most feudal countries in Europe, with very large land-holders, with very out-dated aristocracy. There was conflict between the various groups. Anyhow, Admiral Horthy's regime was there. I had a glimpse in 1918 when I happened to be in Budapest. It was not a very satisfying spectacle; then came the big war. I merely mention these just to bring to the mind of the House this tragic history of Hungary, and there are many names connected with Hungary which are famous in the fight for freedom of peoples. Anyhow there is little doubt that the present movement in Hungary was a popular one; it was a movement with the great masses of the people behind it, with the workers, with the young people in it; maybe, of course, a number of people against it, I cannot speak about all of them and this, I think, has, as I said, become even more patent by this passive resistance of the people in spite of the heavy army's strength being opposed to them.

So far as we are concerned, we entirely agree with what has been stated in the joint statement issued by the four Prime Ministers a few days ago. Apart from this, there is this aspect, if I may say so. The first thing, I think, is that qualified observers could go, whether it is Port Said, whether it is other parts of Egypt which are occupied by foreign forces or whether it is Budapest or some parts of Hungary, they should go and their mere visiting there will not only bring out facts, but will open a

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

window there, which the world can look in, and find out what has happened and what is happening.

Now, behind all these, there are all kinds of other forces at work and other dangers. We want naturally foreign forces to be withdrawn from Egypt as well as Hungary. Of course this question does not arise in Egypt, because there is a Government there, but in Hungary, it does arise. The House knows that during the last year or two, there had been certain currents and motions in Eastern Europe, in the Soviet Union, itself, which have to some extent liberalized the functioning of the regimes there, which in Poland went perhaps farther than in other places, and the same ferment existed in all countries, and the fact which has always to be borne in mind, not only by us but by other countries was that if anything is done which comes in the way of this internal and organic process of change, which may well have the opposite effect to that intended, then it becomes tied up with the larger issues of war and peace. What do we see behind these issues? In the final analysis—fear, fear of the Western Powers, of the armed might of the Soviet Union, fear of the Soviet Union, not only of the armed might, even more so, of the possible armed might of re-armed Germany. All over Eastern Europe, whether it is Poland or Hungary or Czechoslovakia and those countries which have suffered from invasion repeatedly from the German side, there is this fear of an armed Germany; there may be fear from the Soviet Union; it may be a balancing of fears, but there is that fear and because of the fear of the Western countries against the armed might of the Soviet Union, there came into existence the N.A.T.O. and much later, also the other pacts and military alliances like S.E.A.T.O. the Baghdad Pact and the like. Then came into existence as a counterblast the Warsaw Treaty, each pretending to be an association for peaceful

defence against attack, each having the effect really of frightening the other party and making it more apprehensive of danger and, therefore, helping in this race of armaments.

Because of this background, when situation arose in Egypt, that is to say, about 3 weeks ago, when the Anglo-French bombing of Cairo etc. took place, immediately there was a danger of this spreading. The Hungarian situation arose and the two taken together definitely, greatly added to this danger. Now, hon. Members will see—I speak with respect and with deference—it is not my intention in my present speech to go about condemning countries—not that their acts are not worthy of condemnation, but the fact is that because of these two, the situation in Egypt and the situation in Hungary, every attempt is made by one party to lay stress on what has happened in the other place so as to hide its own mis-demeanour. There was the Anglo-French action in Egypt and there was a world outcry against it in the United Nations. Then came Hungary. Bad enough. But immediately it was made use of to hide what is happening in Egypt. The struggle in Hungary was the basic thing so as to somehow cover up the misdeeds in Egypt. Now on both sides this is happening.

Now, I do not mean for an instant to say that we are nobler or higher or purer than other countries. But we happen to be in a position which perhaps, to some extent, helps us not to get so frightfully excited about one side or the other and, therefore, we can view these events a little more objectively, perhaps.

Now, so far as recent developments are concerned, the House will know that only yesterday Premier Bulganin issued an appeal. I received a letter from him containing some proposals for a conference to consider the world

situation and more especially disarmament. The various proposals have been examined and there is no doubt that disarmament is of high importance, more especially in this context. This question as to whether there is a conference or not and whether this question of disarmament will be considered will really be decided by the Big Powers. We haven't got a big army to disarm. Anyhow, in this context, it is the three or four Big Powers that really count. They have to decide this. If we can be of any help in this business, naturally our services will be there.

Now I should like to put before the House a few other considerations, rather to look behind the surface of things, into the deeper changes that are coming out. First of all, we see this brutal exercise of violence and armed might against weaker countries. *Prima facie*, this appears to be the triumph of violence and armed might and this puts every militarily weaker country in peril, its independence in danger, and more particularly, every country in Asia and Africa must feel this danger. That is so. But there is another aspect of it and that is this exhibition of violence and armed might has failed or is going to fail. It has created great damage, great suffering and great bitterness but in the final analysis it has failed or, I think, is likely to fail in achieving anything. Take the aggression of Egypt. I think it is fairly clear that the United Kingdom and France have not gained anything and are not going to gain anything; they will lose much. Apart from the fact that Egypt has suffered tremendously, the United Kingdom and France have also suffered, not in human beings so much although even the loss of human beings has been far more considerable in the Anglo-French side because of the round-about fight and the parachute landing etc. Then there are the very heavy financial losses which are going to continue which will upset all these

countries' economies. It will affect the whole pattern of trade and everything in countries like the United Kingdom and France. The results of this adventure in Egypt are going to be very serious and probably lasting a long time.

It is said that this operation prevented the Russians from coming into the Middle East. I confess, I do not see how it has prevented the Russians coming in. It has, in fact, possibly opened the door through which they might come in future, just as the Baghdad Pact, which was meant to protect the Middle East from the *a parte* or the defence pact, as it is called, really resulted in the Soviet Union taking far greater interest in the Middle East than they have done previously. So, this argument that the aggression in Egypt has succeeded in keeping Russians out does not work at all. In fact, I think, it has made the Middle East becoming the possible scene of a major conflict relatively easier. So, in the final analysis, whatever Egypt may have suffered and England and France may have suffered and may continue to suffer, they are more to lose than Egypt has suffered.

Now, take the other side—Hungary and the Soviet Union. There was no immediate aggression there in the sense of something militarily happening as there was in the case of Egypt. It was really a continuing intervention of the Soviet armies in those countries based on the Warsaw Pact. Now I am not very much concerned about the legal implications of the Warsaw Pact. It may be that some lawyers may say that strictly in terms of the Warsaw Pact the Soviet army should be present there. But that is a very small matter. The fact is, as subsequent events have shown, that the Soviet armies were there against the wishes of the Hungarian people. That is clear.

Shri Kamath (Hoshangabad): A welcome change.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: Any other explanation is not adequate. It is true that the great force of the Soviet Union triumphed in the military way from Budapest to Hungary. But at what cost? And what the final outcome will be, I do not know. I have no doubt in my mind, whether it is sooner or later, the Hungarian people, who have demonstrated so vividly their desire for having freedom, desire for having a separate identity and not being over-shadowed by any other country, are bound to triumph. I have no doubt in my mind about that. Of course, I cannot say what intervening difficulties may come because of this world situation which is very very complicated.

But apart from that, we must realise that all these events have powerfully affected the prestige of the Soviet Union in such matters not only in the many countries which are supposed to be uncommitted countries but more in countries and governments which believe in that country, European countries including, if I may say so, the people of the Soviet Union itself. That is a much more precious commodity—the respect that a country, its Government and its policy has—than anything else, financial or any that you may lose. We see today, therefore, powerful trends, I believe in every country whether it is the Soviet Union or England or the countries of Europe or America, and certainly in Asian and African countries, trying to understand what has happened, trying to find out what they should do and in a state of considerable confusion. Even the clarity of those people who were intimately tied up with one particular policy, with one particular, if I may use the word, bloc of countries is not so quite clear in their minds as to whether that policy was the correct one. In the Soviet Union it was some time back that I said, two or three years back, that certain new trends displayed themselves and affected the life and activities of the Soviet Union and later

the East European countries. But we have seen that the progress made was too slow in the East European countries and they wanted it to be more rapid, and this created a difficulty for the Soviet Union, thinking as they do, with the result of this conflict. Whether this conflict will lead to a greater liberalisation on the part of the Soviet Union or the reverse I cannot say. I would have been clear in my mind but for this complicated international situation. But apart from the immediate future, as I just said, I have no doubt that forces have been set in motion in all these countries among the rulers and among the common people—in all these countries including the Soviet Union or Western European countries or elsewhere—which make people think on somewhat different lines. They say, I believe, that they have been going along wrong lines. All the system of pacts and alliances, where has it led them? Not to peace or security, but to trouble. What is the position now of the Baghdad Pact. You may talk about the Baghdad Pact, but everybody knows that the Baghdad Pact is dead and it has absolutely no life left in it. What the SEATO alliance is doing I do not know, but we have not heard of it for a long time—it may be in a dormant condition. The Warsaw Treaty—we see the effect of it and the reaction to it in the East European countries. It may continue, that is, in form; it has lost its contents.

Regarding the NATO we have seen the differences between the powers included in the NATO. It has ceased to be, if it was so earlier, a kind of spiritual crusade. Both were in a sense spiritual crusades against each other. Both have lost that spirit of crusade. They have only become some paper arrangements behind which certainly are the armed forces which lack on either side their quality or the spirit which perhaps gave them some meaning previously.

So we have arrived at a stage when violence has interfered, and the use of armed forces by the big countries, while apparently it has achieved

something, has really showed its inability to deal with the situation. It is the weakness which has come out in the present day world.

But the fact remains that in people's minds violence has been shown up and this ferment is bound to continue working I earnestly hope that as a result of all these we may survive this crisis and then take further steps towards disarmament, towards putting an end to all these military alliances which have proved so worthless and, in fact, proved so dangerous and try to fashion some new line of approach.

We have often been told, we know, that technology has greatly advanced, and technology has got us the atom bomb and hydrogen bomb which after all is the result of technological progress. When we reach higher levels of technique, the higher levels demand a higher level of international co-operation; they demand really a higher level of social organisation; they demand a higher level of international co-operation. You cannot have an advanced technology and an out-of-date society and an out-of-date system of international relations.

The difficulty is that while technology has gone up to hydrogen bomb, our international relations are still very backward and have not caught up to that. So long as they do not catch up, all these frictions will continue. In our aspect of this question we have these ideas which people, often people of great merit and integrity, have pursued in crusading way—communism or other 'isms'. There is no doubt that the appeal of communism affected large numbers of young men, not today, but 38 or 39 years ago, and it has continued to do that in varying degrees. All kinds of organisations were formed—Cominform, Comintern and so on and so forth. Even though communism gradually became somewhat more, if I may use the word, respectable in people's eyes in the sense that communist governments functioned as other governments, nevertheless it had that aspect of

some kind of religion often spread by intervention. Whether it was armed intervention or other intervention depended on circumstances. Gradually that has become less and less, but it is there.

The whole basis not of the internal economic system which is apparent—you may agree with me or not—but of the international implications of the internal economic system of the country is such as to create apprehensions about intervention in other countries. And we have seen, in fact, instances, but the most recent instance is the fact that undoubtedly the Government in Hungary was not a free Government, was an imposed Government, and that the people of Hungary were not satisfied. Ever since the last war, ten years have passed and more than ten years have passed, and if in the course of ten years in Hungary the people could not be converted to that particular theory, it shows a certain failure which is far greater, which seems to me the failure of the military coup. It indicates that all of us, whether we are communists or non-communists or anti-communists, have to think afresh. We talk about violence. The question of Egypt has come up and the question of Hungary has come up. For the moment it has put aside other questions. Whether it is Africa or parts of Asia, essentially there is no difference, except that one gets used to evil. A new evil creates a sudden reaction, while the old evil we get used to. Therefore we have to view this matter from this point of view that whether the evil is a new one or an old one, if it is based on violence, if it is based on the suppression of a country and a people by armed forces, then it is a bad thing and it has to be removed, liquidated, because so long as it is not done, it will create trouble and friction and possibly lead to war.

Therefore, apart from the outward features of the present crisis, there is this crisis of conscience, a spiritual crisis almost in peoples' minds. I hope that mere strong reactions to events will not smother this spiritual

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

crisis, this attempt to find a better way of international cooperation. That way, I would submit, it has been shown cannot be based on, or cannot have any stability if it is based on armed forces being used to suppress people, wherever they may be and however they may exist. If that fact is accepted, let us have full freedom, whether it is a communist society or an anti-communist society. If violence is once taken away and the ways of violence and the ways of suppression, then everything, all these theories, have a free field. They can be experimented upon and we shall learn by the experience of others, adopt such things as we like and not adopt things that we do not like and progress in this way.

There is one thing more before I finish. I have in view a certain controversy that has arisen in regard to India's voting in the United Nations on a resolution on Hungary. We circulated through the Lok Sabha Secretariat to hon. Members two speeches relating to Hungary delivered by our representative, Shri Krishna Menon on the 8th and 9th November. We got them day before yesterday.

Acharya Kripalani (Bhagalpur cum Purnea): We have got them here just now.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I am sorry. Anyhow, we got them day before yesterday and it was yesterday that I said that copies had to be made. A reading of these speeches will give a better idea than any quotation I can give.

I have today got further details of the voting on those days. I would have gladly circulated it, but I got the telegram only this morning. That resolution consists of nine paragraphs. I think some of you have got it. The first five paragraphs are what are called the "preamble"; the next four are called "operative". Now the voting on the resolution was on each separate paragraph. I do not know whether hon. Members

want the exact figures, or what India did.

Preamble 1: India abstained. There were sixteen abstentions and India abstained. Preamble 2: India abstained.

Shri Kamath (Hoshangabad): May I request the Prime Minister to tell us in each case how the Arab-Asian Group reacted and voted.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I will read out. More or less it is the same, with slight variations.

In regard to the first part of the Preamble the abstentions were Afghanistan, Austria, Burma, Cambodia, Ceylon, Egypt, Finland, India, Indonesia, Jordan, Lebanon, Libya, Saudi Arabia, Syria, Yemen, Yugoslavia. With slight variations this continued, the abstentions in the Preamble.

Preamble 3: as in Preamble 2; India abstained.

Preamble 4: India abstained with that Group.

Preamble 5: India abstained with the big Group.

Now we come to the operative part in which there are four paragraphs.

Operative 1: India abstained.

Acharya Kripalani: May we respectfully request the Prime Minister to read out the operative part.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: The whole resolution?

Mr. Speaker: Copies of the resolution have been circulated. Hon. Members may kindly look into the resolution.

Some Hon. Members: We have not got copies.

Dr. Lanka Sundaram (Visakhapatnam): Only the two speeches of Shri Krishna Menon were circulated.

Shri Kamath: In view of the Prime Minister's categorical statement now,

and also I believe on Friday, that the Government stands for and has supported the withdrawal of the Russian forces from Hungary, may I ask whether this abstention from voting on paragraph 1 of the operative part of the Resolution, is consistent with Government's stand?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: There were four resolutions on Hungary. India voted in favour of one and abstained from some. We must read it in the context. When India abstained she stood for withdrawal, but I am for the moment giving facts regarding the context and the way it was put.

The operative part is—

“Calls upon the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics to withdraw its forces from Hungary without any further delay.”

That is one.

The second is—

“Considers that free elections should be held in Hungary under U.N. auspices as soon as law and order have been restored to enable the people of Hungary to determine for themselves the form of government they wish to establish in their country;”

Here separate voting took place on the phrase “under United Nations auspices”. In this voting, India voted against. So also, apart from the other countries mentioned previously, Ceylon and Yugoslavia. They voted against this phrase “under United Nations auspices”. This was the only thing that India voted against in the whole resolution—the phrase “under United Nations auspices”.

In the remainder of paragraph 2 India abstained and in paragraphs three and four she abstained. When finally the resolution was put as a whole with the phrase “under United Nations auspices”, India voted against. That is the actual position.

Acharya Kripalani: Who else voted against?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: At what time?

Acharya Kripalahi: Who else voted against the whole resolution?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: Apart from a number of countries associated with the Soviets, Yugoslavia, India, Poland, Rumania, the Soviet Union, etc., about eleven of them.

Shri Kamath: Asian-African Group abstained?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: That is all I have to say. I beg to move my motion.

Shri Asoka Mehta (Bhandara): We are grateful to the Prime Minister for the information he has given. We would also like to be enlightened why we abstained on some of these clauses.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I have said that. It is because we did not like the whole context.

Shri Asoka Mehta: I would like to know—let us take paragraph by paragraph.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: Two or three resolutions were put out that day and we did not like the whole object and the context. These are broad directions; for instance, if there is a resolution, you have to see the context. You have to rely on the judgment at the time. One does not have much time to consider these matters.

Shri Kamath: May I request that copies of India's amendments....

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Members will reserve their comments; they will have an opportunity to speak.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I suggest that the hon. Members may read the speeches of Shri Krishna Menon, the speeches that have been circulated because they deal with the points that have been raised.

Shri Kamath: I suggest that copies of India's amendments to this resolution may be furnished to us now or tomorrow. India moved some amendments but they are not available either in the Parliament library or in the Ministry.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I am not sure whether we moved any amendment to this resolution; there were amendments to the other resolutions; I am not sure whether they relate to this particular resolution and I have no further information on the subject.

Mr. Speaker: Motion moved:

"That the present international situation and the policy of the Government of India in relation thereto be taken into consideration."

The hon. Members who are leaders of various groups will have thirty minutes and the others fifteen minutes.

Shri A. K. Gopalan (Cannanore): At the outset, I welcome the Prime Minister's statement on the international affairs and the stand taken by India in the United Nations. I am sure there will be general support in the country for the statement.

In the crisis that has developed as a result of the Anglo-French aggression in Egypt, there has been unprecedented unity in our country in support of Egypt. That unity revealed that, despite many differences amongst us on many issues, we stood together in our love for peace, freedom and human dignity. That unity has got to be maintained because, as the Prime Minister has pointed out in his statement, the world situation remains grave today.

It is all the more necessary to stress the need for this unity, because, while we all feel the same way about events in Egypt, even among the freedom loving forces differences exist on the assessment of what has taken place in Hungary. About Hungary I shall speak later. But, I want to make it clear at the outset that our party

shared the deep distress expressed by the Prime Minister about the events that have taken place there. Our heart goes out to the Hungarian people who have suffered heavily during the last few weeks.

A few weeks ago when news came about the cease-fire in Egypt, there was a general sense of relief not only in our country but throughout the world. We felt that peace had been saved. Today, however, we all realise that while cease-fire was a big victory for the forces of freedom and for world public opinion, the crisis is not yet over. He has given expression to the sentiment which we all feel when he said that although there had been improvement in the situation, if further tendencies were not checked, there would be deterioration of the situation and a reversion to warfare. Tension continues. Why is it so? Is it only because it is the aftermath of the armed conflict? I think it is not the only reason. The real reason for the continuation of tension lies deeper.

As he has just now pointed out, in recent years many places of Asia and Africa held in colonial bondage for long periods have won freedom and are playing an increasingly important role in world affairs. In this our country has set an inspiring example. The peoples of the east are no longer prepared to be the plaything of the colonial powers. Many countries in Asia and Africa are pursuing independent policies, strengthening their national freedom and building relationship with other countries on the basis of equality and using their natural resources for rebuilding their economy in order to ensure a life of happiness and prosperity for their people. For all these, they need peace. That is the reason why the independent countries of the east are among the stoutest defenders of world peace.

All those who value human freedom and desire human progress rejoice in these developments. But these are precisely the developments

that imperialists detest, because these developments threaten their colonial domination, super-profits and also their plans to build these countries into war bases.

It is in this context that I want to explain the developments that have taken place in the Middle-East. The action in Egypt, in my opinion, was not the action of a mad man; it was a calculated move to reverse the whole process which began since the end of the last war. What was this process? It was the emergence of Asian and African countries as independent and sovereign States.

I want to recall the resolution of the All India Congress Committee passed in its session which characterised the Anglo-French action in Egypt as a reversion to the old discredited and colonial methods. It is perfectly correct. These methods have been adopted because the imperialists want to reimpose colonial slavery on the peoples of the East. Egypt was chosen as the victim of the attack because that country is today acting as the leader of the resurgent Arab nationalism in the Middle-East where the imperialists have vast economic and other stakes. The immediate object was to remove President Nasser from power, set up a puppet government and reimpose control over the Suez Canal.

But this was not the only object. There was also the other object of trying to cow down the freedom loving peoples of the other Asian countries and restore their domination in the Middle-East and transform it into a war base. Success in Egypt, if there had been a success, would have been followed up by new attacks on other countries and they would have been compelled to have more pacts like the SEATO or the Baghdad Pact. A blow would have been mounted on India's independent foreign policy itself.

The imperialist action in Egypt was, therefore, an aggression not against Egypt alone. It was an aggression aimed against the entire people of

Asia and Africa. It was an action against their independent policies; it was an action against world peace.

The Anglo-French aggression has rightly been condemned by all peace-loving forces. Here, I want to point out that some Indian papers went so far as to assert that America had regained her moral leadership of the whole world. However, in reality, the American policy, as far as the Egyptian question was concerned, was a policy of duplicity and deception. I want to bring out some facts. It will be remembered that on the 31st October, when the Anglo-French aggression began in Egypt, an official spokesman of the American Government—Mr. Cabot Lodge—said that they would stand by their pledge to help the victim of the aggression. But that pledge only remained on paper. When the Egyptian cities and towns were being bombed from the air, when aggressors had already entered the Egyptian soil and thousands of Egyptians had been killed, Mr. Cabot Lodge in the U.N. Assembly paid only pious platitudes instead of proposing some stern action against the aggressors who had even refused to carry out the directives of the U.N.O. What did he say? He expressed deep regret. Not only did he express deep regret, but he deprecated putting the blame on certain nations like Britain and France and pleaded that "since best efforts to find a solution to the Palestine problem had failed, we must try something new."

This was not all. Another instance is that the American imperialism was fully exposed in the U.N. Security Council. When the Council said that the U.S.A. and the U.S.S.R. should take joint measures to stop hostilities, America joined Britain and France to defeat that proposal. The American proposal was described by the American representatives as 'unthinkable'.

On 5th November, the Soviet Union gave a stern warning to Britain and France. America said that it would oppose any effort on the part of the

[Shri A. K. Gopalan]

Soviet Union or any other country to intervene in the Middle-East. It was also made clear that America was opposed even to the countries' sending volunteers to the aid of Egypt. From all this it is very clear that while professing to sympathise with the victims of aggression the American Government would not merely take any steps to stop the aggressors but would not also allow others to do so. This is one point that I want to bring forward.

Another point is that there was also a cleavage of opinion between Britain and France on the one hand and the Americans on the other. That cleavage of opinion was about the precise measures that should be adopted in Egypt. At the same time, it was evident that America was also as seriously perturbed by the freedom upsurge in the Middle East as Britain and France. It also wanted to suppress the upsurge. What it thought was that after Britain and France had broken the Egyptian resistance it would be able to come out as the peace-maker, establish its own control over the Middle East, appear as the friends of the Asian and African peoples and draw them into military alliances.

We all know that the British, the French and Americans have not succeeded in their efforts. Their calculations have proved wrong. They could not, despite their big military support, crush the resistance of the Egyptians whose gallant struggle has won sympathies from the people all over the world. Again the Egyptian people rallied round their leader President Nasser and heroically defended their home. Public opinion throughout the world including Britain compelled them to take some action and the aggressors stood isolated. On 5th November there was the warning of the Soviet Union and within 24 hours they were forced to declare cease fire.

In this connection I want to refer to our connections with the British Commonwealth. On such a grave

matter as this India, which is the biggest country in the Commonwealth, was not even consulted or even informed of what the British were intending to do. The blocking of the Suez Canal not only inflicted heavy damage on our economy but also jeopardised our plans and projects. We consider it absolutely necessary that India, after what has happened in Egypt, should immediately sever its connection with the British Commonwealth. Our membership of the Commonwealth gives the British the prestige which enables it to deceive the world public opinion.

Sir, I have already stated that the Prime Minister was right in pointing out that the danger of world war continues. An attempt is being made now to divert attention from the crisis in the Middle East to Hungary.

I now come to the tragic conditions in Hungary. The tragic developments that have taken place in Hungary should be viewed in this background. It is to be deeply regretted that the process of democratisation that took place in a peaceful manner in Poland was not possible in Hungary. Very serious mistakes, misdeeds and even crimes had been committed by the earlier Government. There had been illegal acts and excesses. There had been bureaucratic callousness with regard to the needs of the people. There had also been disregard for national sentiments of the people. There was also an attitude of subservience in relation to the U.S.S.R. It has been stated by the Soviet Government that in the relations that prevailed between various States in the socialistic world there had been violations of the principle of equality.

All this brought about justified resentment among the people. Therefore a great popular movement developed. The aims of this were to undo the evil. The aim of the movement that first took place was not to overthrow the Government. It was only to undo the evils which were explained by me before. At the same

time, I want to point out that it must not be forgotten that in Hungary before the war, the worst form of Fascist Government had prevailed. The people had been the poorest among the people of Europe. The workers and peasants were economically down-trodden and politically suppressed. The people's democratic regime in Hungary had put an end to this state of affairs. When, however, the Hungarian people began their struggle against the evils and misdeeds of the People's Democratic Government, they did not want to go back to the old regime. They wanted the maintenance of the socialist system purged of the evils that had accumulated.

But the struggle that began on the 23rd October was joined by reactionary forces also who did not want the Soviet system itself. How the peaceful struggle got converted into an armed uprising is not clear. This is a subject which has got to be clearly investigated by the Hungarian Government and if there were mistakes committed in handling the situation, if excessive forces were used which angered public mind then those responsible for these excesses must be severely punished.

It may be wrong, however, to ascribe the Hungarian developments only to internal forces. What happened after the 24th, as is clear from events, was a planned and organised uprising in which foreign powers played a big rôle. We all dislike intervention by foreign powers in the internal affairs of any country. But foreign intervention does not always take the same shape. Sometimes it takes another shape. The American Government is openly earmarking a sum of 100 million dollars every year for subversive activities in the socialist world.

Shri Asoka Mehta: 200 million dollars.

Shri A. K. Gopalan: My friend Shri Asoka Mehta says that they set apart 200 million dollars. It is also

known that large numbers of reactionary elements after the word was sought refuge in Austria and several other countries. All these people made their way into Hungary and took part in the rebellion. They had been supplied with arms and plenty of funds. All this constituted an intervention in the affairs of Hungary by imperialist powers. It is due to this that repeated appeals by the Hungarian Government to the rebels to lay down arms and repeated concessions to their demands were not headed and the bloody warfare went on.

Use of Soviet troops in Hungary has given rise to diverse comments in many quarters. We have no hesitation in stating that it is deeply regrettable that forces of democracy inside Hungary could not control the situation and the Soviet forces had to be called in. We do not like such things to take place in any country. It must not be forgotten that in the Hungarian rebellion foreign intervention, that is intervention by the imperialist powers, had played a big rôle.

Under pressure of the rebels the Government changed its position several times without any reference to the people. On the 30th October, the Soviet Union announced that it was withdrawing its forces from Budapest. It was then that reaction showed its face and Cardinal Minzenty broadcast from the Budapest radio that capitalist system was to be restored in Hungary. Nagy declared the withdrawal from the Warsaw pact. The new Government appealed for the assistance of the Soviet Union. It was a situation where utter chaos prevailed in Hungary. The country was in the grip of a civil war and elements hostile to the socialist system were striving to convert the country into a base which would be utilised by the imperialists for aggression against the socialist world.

At the time when these tragic events and developments were taking

[Shri A. K. Gopalan]

place in Hungary and thousands of working class leaders were being butchered, the crisis in the Middle East began. Events have shown that the Soviet Union was prepared to help Egypt with concrete measures in her hour of ordeal. What was the Soviet Union to do when the socialist system was in danger and being destroyed in Hungary and a war base created there in a menacing world situation where armed intervention alone could save the world from a world war?

It is evident that the developments in Hungary were connected with the crisis that developed in the Middle East. The imperialists wanted to create a diversion in Hungary in order to maintain the threat against the Soviet Union and the socialist world so that it could be paralysed in a period of grave crisis in the countries of the Middle East. So, a fateful decision had to be taken by the Soviet Union in such a situation. The danger of war in Hungary had to be met in order that they could effectively intervene in defence of Egypt.

I am sure that everybody will agree that the issues at stake were such that if the Soviet Union had not gone to the aid of the Hungarian people in their hour of distress, it would have meant not merely their liquidation of the gains of the socialist system in Hungary but a grave danger to the cause of world peace and the freedom of the people. But acting as it had done, the U.S.S.R. has prevented the creation of a war base in Europe and also defeated the attack on the Egyptian people.

In Egypt, none invited the British to come. In Hungary, the Government invited the Soviet Union. In Egypt, there was no foreign troop. In Hungary, the Soviet troops were stationed under the Warsaw Pact. It must be remembered that in Egypt, attempt was made to reverse the process of national independence. But in Hungary, the uprising occurred while the mistakes of the past were

being corrected and measures towards democratisation were already taking place. In Egypt, however, aggression occurred in order to transform the country into a colony, while in Hungary the Soviet forces were called in by the Government in order to protect the socialist system which was correcting its earlier mistakes.

The Prime Minister has expressed a fear that in Hungary, the developments have checked the progress. I do not think so. If such a thing were to happen as a result of the tragic events on this scale, every one of us will be distressed. But I am confident that such a thing will not happen and that the Hungarian Government have learnt the lessons from the past, and its recent declarations show that, and we have every reason to hope that the process of democratisation, in spite of severe setbacks, will go forward with increasing momentum.

As far as the Indian vote in the United Nations is concerned, some people have criticised India's position on the resolution which was moved in the United Nations. We think that India had acted perfectly well. It is significant that one of the chief sponsors of the resolution was Pakistan which has illegally grabbed part of Kashmir and its attitude towards this whole crisis has been of a dubious character. The elections under the U.N. auspices constitute a violation of sovereignty of any country. Tomorrow, the same logic may be applied as far as Kashmir is concerned. So, those who criticise India's stand on the resolution should ponder over this aspect.

The question then arises as to the position of the Soviet troops in Hungary. The Hungarian Government has declared that negotiations about the stationing of the troops will be started as soon as possible. We hope that these negotiations would be speedily conducted and that the Hungarian people themselves may defend their socialistic gains.

As regards the Warsaw Pact, we are opposed to all military pacts. The Warsaw Pact came into existence as a result of the threat created by the NATO. We think that the time has come to scrap all the military pacts after learning from these crises; it is time that the statesmen of the world decided to come together, scrap all military alliances and withdraw foreign forces from all countries so that a new climate would be created. We all desire that thing to take place.

In this connection, I welcome the proposal made by Switzerland, namely, that the four big powers along with India should meet to discuss the problems that have arisen. It is to be regretted that the American Government has not agreed to this proposal which once again shows the real intention of America.

I am sure everybody in the House will welcome the proposal made by the Soviet Government recently to reduce the armed forces, ban atomic weapons, stop all the tests and remove within two years all military—army, navy and air forces—from foreign countries. So, I think this is the situation where the powers should come together and see that all these things proposed are considered at some conference so as to arrive at a settlement on these issues.

In the end, I would once again stress that the whole world situation remains extremely grave. So, in this hour, it is our duty to see that we are all united and we should see that the situation that has arisen today does not deteriorate and that there will be peace in the world.

Shri Asoka Mehta: Mr. Speaker, we are discussing today the international situation and the policy of our Government towards it. As the Prime Minister has pointed out, the international situation, particularly in those parts where very grave developments have taken place, is somewhat confusing. May I add that the policy of our Government is also somewhat confusing?

Pandit K. C. Sharma (Meerut Distt.—South): And so is your mind.

Shri Asoka Mehta: I am happy that the Prime Minister today has corrected the focus and has set the record straight. It is interesting to find that the Prime Minister and his colleagues, at least a majority of them, when they make an error of judgment, are able to realise that and they ultimately succeed in rectifying that error. In contrast, the party next to me, even after all that they have been saying all these months, continue today to espouse the official line of the Soviet Union.

As far as the Government of India's policy in West Asia is concerned, I would like to go on record by saying that we support unequivocally the firm stand that the Government have taken. While we support this firm stand and while we wish all strength to the elbow of the Prime Minister in seeing that the developments there are met with a firm hand and that the aggressors are not permitted to remain on the soil of Egypt, and that the sovereignty of Egypt is upheld, that the unashamed effort at bringing back the dark forces of colonialism is pushed back with all our might and main, at the same time, I would like to point out that perhaps if this kind of strength, if this kind of unflinching attitude had been taken up earlier, probably these unfortunate developments would not have come about.

Let us take Cyprus. What has been our attitude about Cyprus? The Government of India have hardly said a word about the struggle that people of Cyprus have been carrying on for self-determination and independence. Did not the Government of India know that the British Government was holding on to Cyprus because the British Government wanted to use Cyprus as a military base? And, against whom? Surely, Cyprus would and could be used as a military base only against the Arab States. Did the Government of India at any time warn the British Government that the Government of India

[Shri Asoka Mehta]

would not like or countenance the use of Cyprus as a military base? After the nationalisation of the Suez Canal, developments are taking place, full of grave import. Not a single effort has been made in the case of Cyprus, to my knowledge. I would very much like our Prime Minister to enlighten me whether any effort was made to warn the British against the misuse of Cyprus.

Let us take Algeria. After all, France is involved in it. What has been happening in Algeria? In Algeria people have been struggling for freedom. Since November, 1954, 17,000 Algerians have been killed by the French forces. 35,000 French troops have been in Algeria trying to crush the liberation movement. It was Mendes-France who pointed out recently that those military forces were larger than the total of the French troops engaged in Indo-China on the eve of the fall of Dien Bien Phu. Look at the firmness with which our Prime Minister stood up against the hostilities in Indo-China and look at the lukewarmness with which he has been functioning on the question of Algeria. The Foreign Minister of France came here and he went away with the impression that our Prime Minister had understood and perhaps appreciated the special situation in which France was placed in Algeria. That impression had to be corrected. Later on, when the Algerian question was sought to be brought up on the agenda of the United Nations and when that question was actually put on the agenda with our support, the French withdrew from the United Nations and Mr. Krishna Menon tried to bring back France to the U.N. What is the result? France goes about feeling, no matter what they do with Algeria, even if they send 350,000 troops to kill 17,000 men, India will be willing to intervene and persuade this big power. That the Government of France is led by Socialists is a matter of deepest shame for us; I have made it clear over and over again and I refused to attend their

conference when I was invited saying that their actions are unworthy of those claiming to speak in the name of Socialism. We have dissociated ourselves and we have categorically told them what we feel about them. I would have been happy if in the same clear terms, our Prime Minister also had made them realise that India will never countenance the kind of thing that is carried on. The result is that both the French and the British Governments were emboldened and, perhaps, they thought they could get away with this kind of treatment or with this kind of adventure in Egypt. I am not saying that if we had taken a firm stand earlier these things would not have happened; but I feel that our record would have been much stronger, our moral voice would have had much greater authority if we had functioned in an unequivocal manner all through.

I would like to make a brief and passing reference to the general inaction that we have shown in the dispute between the Arab States and Israel. There are rights and wrongs, on both sides and for a long time, after the signing of the armistice, we know that there have been thousands of border incursions from both sides and hundreds have been killed. There is a demand for a peace settlement, but for reasons most of us know, no progress has been made. This is an area of great tension, an area where, because of this long-standing dispute between Israel and the Arab States, big powers are bound to come in and take advantage of it. Whether the British come in or the Americans, the Russians or the French come in, one or the other is bound to take advantage of it and those of us who desire that there should be peace in that area should have undertaken the responsibility. Our Prime Minister is foremost among them and he should have made an effort to see that the dispute in this acute area of tension does not flare up into a war. Nobody can condone what the Israeli Government has done. We disapprove of

it; we deplore it; we condemn it; but, we must realise that 5·7 million Jews were butchered by Hitler in Europe and today 1·7 million Jews in Israel feel that they have to survive. Whether their fears are justified or not, they want to be a part of Asia; we have recognised Israel as a State and therefore, we are admitting the right of Israelites to exist. So, something should have been done to reduce the acute tension between the Arab States and Israel. I am sorry that because of our inability to mediate in this area of tension, we have become today a somewhat agonised spectator of this conflict between Israel and Egypt, which has been taken advantage of and cynically exploited by the two big powers.

Dr. S. N. Sinha (Saran East): There is no ground for an attack here.

Shri Asoka Mehta: Did I say it is a ground for an attack? Either try to understand what I have said....

Shri Gadgil (Poona Central): Do not have a war here.

Shri Asoka Mehta: I would, therefore, like to point out that our stand on Egypt must be made clear beyond any kind of misunderstanding. We must demand that Egypt be compensated and we must insist that all the aggressive troops must be withdrawn; and, if they are not withdrawn within a reasonable period, I believe India should not hesitate to go to the United Nations and ask for application of sanctions against even these big powers. The only hope of mankind lies in the United Nations and we must do everything possible in this matter. I know the Minister of Commerce and Consumer Industries sitting opposite me is wondering what will happen if such sanctions are applied to India's trade; but, these are the things which we should do, if we are serious about maintaining peace. The most important thing is—I repeat—we should not hesitate to go to the United Nations and take a lead in demanding sanctions against the aggressors in Egypt.

We welcome our participation in the U.N. force and we support the Government's policy in West Asia that the Anglo-French Israeli aggression and the Suez Canal question must be kept completely separate. Any effort at mixing up these two questions should be stoutly opposed, as is being stoutly opposed by our Government.

Now I come to the Hungarian question. As far as this question is concerned, there have been so many policy statements and so many pronouncements that it is very difficult to know where exactly the Government stands. I believe that the latest pronouncement of the Prime Minister probably represents the most considered view of the Government of India. If I remember a right, the Prime Minister said this morning that there is a national uprising taking place in Hungary. He made it very clear. Almost the entire people had risen up because they wanted political and economic changes and they were fighting for freedom. But, what does Krishna Menon say on the subject? Mr. Krishna Menon, speaking our voice, as our representative, said in the United Nations that he would not refer to the Hungarian people as though they were people struggling for independence. Where do we stand? The whole difficulty has arisen from the fact that our position on Hungary has not been clearly precisely stated.

There were developments in Poland. As a result, taking the clue from these developments, there were further developments in Hungary. And Mr. Krishna Menon said on the 20th October that "that is an internal matter of the Hungarian people". Because, it has been repeatedly insisted here that Hungary is an independent country, that Hungary is in the United Nations, it is a sovereign country and that it is an independent country. As if British India was not a member of the League of Nations, and as if we

[Shri Asoka Mehta]

would have ever accepted the argument that because British India was a member of the League of Nations we were an independent and sovereign country!

Shri Gadgil: There is a difference between the League of Nations and the United Nations.

Shri Asoka Mehta: It has no independence. Are we prepared to say that Hungary is an independent country, that the sovereignty of Hungary rests in the people of Hungary? That is the simple question which needs to be answered.

The Prime Minister, and more so his adviser on Foreign Affairs, Mr. Krishna Menon, they have objected to the word satellite; if any one used that word, the Congress Benches are up in revolt. Do we not realise that these countries have been made to revolve in the political orbits around the Soviet Union?

My friend Mr. Gopalan is not here, he also said "We are hoping that troops will be withdrawn from Hungary".

What has happened in Poland? The Gomulka government goes to Moscow and agrees to retain the Soviet troops in Poland! Because, he cannot be the free agent of the wishes of the Polish people. Look at the changes that are taking place in Poland. What happens to our communist friends? When the changes are recognised by Russia, they say that "mistakes were made." Mistakes are made only when they are recognised by Russia, otherwise everything is all right!

Shri Punnoose (Alleppey): How can you find out?

Shri Asoka Mehta: Of course you can never find out, I know your ignorance; people who wear blinkers can never find out.

Troops will never be withdrawn from Hungary, because the Kadar Government will reach a similar kind of agreement with Moscow. And that is all the purpose of the Soviet coup in Hungary, to prevent Hungary getting out of the Soviet orbit. Whether there were Fascists involved in it or not, we shall come to a little later. But let it be clearly understood that what has happened in Hungary is that the people wanted to shape their own future, and by a political coup, by all kinds of manoeuvres and machinations the Soviet Government have prevented the people of Hungary from realising their destiny. And Mr. Krishna Menon gets up and says, on behalf of India, that we cannot call them as people struggling for independence! Not only that. Look at the language. I have never come across a person who can use a language of equivocation more effectively or, may I say, more dangerously than my friend Mr. Krishna Menon. And how does he end his speech—which the Prime Minister asks us to read carefully? He says:

"The great expression of public opinion that has taken place here from every side of this Assembly will itself be a contribution to the solution of the difficult problems before us and to enable the independent country of Hungary to resolve its problems and be ensured to it all the conditions of existence that are envisaged in the Charter of the United Nations."

Hush hush. Not a word about the Russian intervention. Not a word about the rape of Hungary that is going on. How dare we say anything! What is being quietly, politely said here in murmurs, in tones of the utmost courtesy and consideration, all these things will be communicated to Kremlin, and then 'independent Hungary' will be able to resolve its own problems, her internal problems—something on the lines of the riots in Ahmedabad—as Mr. Krishna Menon pointed out! Amazing, fantastic!

Look at the Prime Minister's analysis and what Mr. Krishna Menon gave. And we are still told to read that speech very carefully so that we may know what is the attitude of India! I say with a full sense of responsibility that if this is the way he represents India, Mr. Krishna Menon does not represent India, does not represent the Government of India, does not represent the Prime Minister of India.

Dr. Suresh Chandra (Aurangabad): He does represent.

Shri Asoka Mehta: Here is what he has said. And I want a single responsible Congressman to get up and say that he stands by this expression of opinion, this equivocation of Mr. Krishna Menon.

What happens then? On the 3rd November—my friend here talked about Fascist intervention—*Pravda* had made the charge. The Russian Communist Party daily, the Soviet official daily, *Pravda*, had made that charge. And what did the Hungarian Communist Party's journal, *Szabad Nep* reply to that? And mind you, *Szabad Nep* is the official journal of the Communist Party in Hungary. It said that what *Pravda* had said is an insult to the people of Budapest. It said, "What are the Hungarians doing?" Mind you, it is the Communist Party's organ in Hungary, *Szabad Nep*, which asked the question. "What are the Hungarian people fighting for?", and replied in the words of a great hero of the national upsurge of 1848, Poet Petoff; it approvingly quoted his words and said that Hungary is fighting "to be a free and independent country". Mr. Krishna Menon should note that the Communists of Hungary, when they were trying to free themselves in their moment of national upsurge and national aspirations, replied to *Pravda* and said: If you talk of Fascists, you are insulting the people of Budapest who are fighting for freedom. What are they fighting for? In the words of Petoff, they are fighting for

national freedom and for the independence of their country. That is the reply to Mr. Gopalan—the reply to Mr. Gopalan is not important, but that is the reply to Mr. Krishna Menon who claims to be the representative of India in the United Nations.

What happened on 1st November? On 1st November the Prime Minister of Hungary, Mr. Nagy, appealed to the United Nations. What did he say? He appealed against the entry of further troops into Hungary. He demanded the withdrawal of the Soviet troops. He declared Hungary's neutrality and appealed to the United Nations to put on its agenda the question of Hungary's neutrality and its defence by the four Great Powers.

In the mean time, as soon as this appeal was made, the Prime Minister said he did not know what had happened during those seventy-two hours. The writing on the wall is there for anybody who cares to read it. As soon as this declaration of neutrality was made—the neutrality that we cherish so much, the dismantling of military alliances that we condemn—as soon as Hungary came over to our side, as soon as Hungary joined the area of peace that the Prime Minister is leading, what happened? Soviet troops intervened. And Prime Minister Nagy, on the 3rd November, made this announcement:

"Early this morning Soviet troops attacked the Hungarian capital with open purpose to overthrow the legal government. The Hungarian troops are in combat and the Hungarian Government is at its post. This I announce to the people and the world."

Here is the Government of Hungary, the legal government of Hungary overthrown by an act of aggression, and the Prime Minister goes to the radio and makes an announcement to the world. And our Prime Minister does not know.

[Shri Asoka Mehta]

One of the members of this Government, Madam Anna Kethly, who is the flaming symbol of democratic socialism in Hungary and who fought relentlessly against the Horthy government, who was imprisoned for six years by Rakosis Communist Government this Madam Anna Kethly who has an international reputation as a relentless fighter of freedom, as a veteran soldier in the fight for democracy has sent me a telegram. And this is the telegram that she has sent me:

"In its attempt to throw off foreign domination and establish its national independence the Hungarian people rose in armed revolt and set up a government of its own representatives under the premiership of Imre Nagy. Stop. As the only member of Premier Nagy's cabinet now on free soil, I ask you to urge your United Nations delegation not to recognize the Russian puppet regime of Janos Kadar, to work for the recognition by the United Nations of my mandate as the representative of Hungary's real government, to vote for all measures demanding immediate action in Hungary by the United Nations and its affiliated agencies regardless of Russian opposition, and to demand cessation of repressive measures by Russian forces in Hungary and a halt to the deportation of Hungarian nationals. I also ask you to urge your Government to do all in its power to put these recommendations into effect as well as to work for the reinstatement of the forcibly overthrown Nagy Government and resumption of negotiations between this Government and the Russian authorities in respect to the withdrawal of all Russian troops from Hungarian soil. I ask you to urge that the United Nations be a party to these negotiations.

Anna Kethly, Minister of
State of Hungary....."

14 hrs.

An Hon. Member: From where was this sent?

Shri Asoka Mehta: From New York, the headquarters of the United Nations.

What did our Prime Minister say to this? When the blue Danube was turning red, when the two sides of the city Buda and Pest on the two sides of the blue Danube were flowing with blood, what did the Prime Minister say? The Prime Minister said,

"In Hungary a civil conflict rages. Under a Treaty, Soviet forces were called in and they came to assist. Then the Hungarian Government split into two and what was presumably the stronger section invited Russia to send its forces back to quell the disturbances."

The Government representing the stronger section invites Russia to send troops and the Prime Minister accepts it and condones. What will happen and what are the implications of such a policy. Anywhere, tomorrow, in any one of our neighbouring countries, the Government may split and—who knows which is the stronger section and which is the weaker section—may invite troops from a foreign country. What will happen if we condone this sort of thing in Hungary and say that troops should be withdrawn later on? So long as the Kadar Government remains in power, so long as the Russian puppet Government remains in power, any talk of withdrawal of Soviet forces is just an eye-wash. If we are serious about the withdrawal of Soviet troops, the Kadar Government must go. The Nagy Government, the legally established Government must come into power. Then only negotiations can be carried on. But, on all these questions our attitude was very lukewarm. In England, when England launches an attack on Egypt, the Labour Party protests. Mr. Gaitskell is there to raise his voice of protest. Mr. Nutting

resigned from the Government. In France when the French carried on a war of attrition and ruthless aggression against Algeria, people protested. A Minister of the Government M. Alain resigned from the Government in protest. What happens in Russia? Russia can do anything it likes and get away with it. There is no internal public opinion to challenge the Government. That is why we believe that we have got to talk straight to Russia. That is why we have to say things a little more strongly in the case of Russia than in any other case. In other cases, there are internal checks which can be relied upon to do something. But, in the case of Russia, the Russian leaders have to be made to realise how strongly world opinion reacts to what they are doing. Who embodies the world opinion? Who embodies the conscience of man more than the leader of India, because of the traditions that this country has built up, because of the unique position that this country enjoys and because of the great stature that our Prime Minister possesses? When this conscience of man tried to play politics, when this conscience of man permitted itself to be guided by a real political genius, by a genius for real politics, a genius for all kinds of international adjustments that Shri Krishna Menon believes that he possesses, what is the result? The voice of the conscience of man was muffled. I am glad that today that voice has come out in a fairly strong and unequivocal manner. But, much harm could have been spared if we had not faltered in the past. There are many things which one could have said. But, they are not necessary now. I hope and trust that the line that the Prime Minister has taken, we will adhere to. We shall not recognise the Kadar regime as the true Government of Hungary. We shall demand that the withdrawal of troops in Hungary can take place only when there is a really free Government in Hungary.

What is being done? There is this talk of liberalisation. Maulana Azad, in the U.N.E.S.C.O. sang hymns of praise about this liberalisation and

democratisation. What is this liberalisation and democratisation? The Communists are trying to organise their power within discreet limits. They know that naked power cannot work any more. Therefore, certain adjustments are being made. Are we to be a party to this kind of thing? We believe that sovereignty rests in the people. The people have a right to choose their own leader. The British and the French Governments called Nasser a fascist. Are we calling Nasser a fascist? Why do we permit the people to call Nagy a fascist? Our Prime Minister rightly said the other day and Shri Jaiprakash Narayan re-echoed that sentiment that the people have the right to choose their own leader and their own Government and they can choose Communist Government if they so desire. The Prime Minister has pointed out that ten years of communist rule has convinced the people of Hungary that Communism cannot be the best method of Government for them. Therefore, I would like to say that on the Hungarian question, it is not enough that we say that we deplore. My hon. friend Shri A. K. Gopalan also said that he deplores. It is easy to deplore. A firmer stand has to be taken. As far as Egypt is concerned, a firm stand needs to be taken. On Hungary, a firm stand should be taken by saying that this puppet, stooge Government we are not prepared to recognise. We would like the Nagy Government to come back to power. We would support the Nagy Government's demand for total withdrawal of foreign troops and renunciation of the Warsaw Pact, and for neutralisation of Hungary, which should be guaranteed by the United Nations. The more the smaller countries demand for that kind of neutralisation, the better for the peace of the world.

Shri Gadgil: Sir, the situation, as was well described by the Prime Minister is grave and continues to be grave. What was far more important was his reference that violence is being resorted on occasions when it was possible to follow other methods. The situation is grave not merely to-

[Shri Gadgil]

the nations which are directly involved, but it is grave for the whole world, not excluding our country. It is, therefore, necessary that we must take a broader and higher view of the whole thing and not indulge like a vulture in merely pecking at the soft points in the situation.

The immediate need is to end the conflict wherever it is rising and then create an atmosphere in which it will be possible to work out and formulate a permanent, positive and enduring peace. Unless this is done, it is just possible that the situation may worsen, although it does contain some elements to justify the hope that it may not and it may prove a little successful. I would appeal to the Members of the Opposition that this is a situation in which we should think across party lines and work out and formulate a policy which will be not only in the highest interests of this country, but in the highest interests of the world. I do not suggest that they should give up their right to put hard questions to the Government. I do not suggest that they should not be critical, but having worked out a policy with general approval, they should, like any other Member of this Party, be loyal to it.

Today we are all taking up moral positions. Whether it is the Eastern bloc or the Western bloc, everybody is taking up a moral position, but they are for the purposes of psychological warfare. The real moral principles and values which really are the warp and woof of national life woven on the long loom of time are neglected. Therefore, we must lift up this issue from its immediate context and consider in what way we can suggest a solution which will, as I said, bring positive and enduring peace. What is the cause of the entire trouble? Only a few days ago, top leaders of the world were saying that the chances of a third world war had practically disappeared. We now know that between peace and war there is just a dash, and anything might happen any moment in the

future, because what has happened in the course of the last two weeks does not justify any hope that nothing worse will happen.

As was pointed out by my friend Shri Asoka Mehta, the trouble started because Israel and Egypt could not pull together.

Shri B. S. Murthy (Eluru): They were not able to pull together because of the Western nations.

Shri Gadgil: In the first place, the creation of Israel State may be an act of historical justice or poetic justice, but it had created a volcano in world politics, and it will continue to erupt on and off until some satisfactory solution is found out. As to what the Egyptian Government stands for in this connection, I shall just read—not that I approve of it, but only to give the background:

“Egypt has decided to despatch her heroes, the disciples of Pharaoh and the sons of Islam, and they will cleanse the land of Palestine. Therefore, ready yourselves; shed tears; cry out and weep, O Israel, because near is your day of liquidation. Thus we have decided and thus is our belief. There will be no more complaints and protests, neither to the Security Council, nor to the United Nations, nor to the Armistice Commission. Nor will there be peace on the border because we demand vengeance and the vengeance is Israel’s death.”

Shri Mohiuddin (Hyderabad City): May I know the source of the quotation, Egyptian or Israeli?

Shri Gadgil: This is an official Cairo Radio broadcast of 31st August, 1955.

Shri Mohiuddin: But who has published it?

Shri Gadgil: Then in an Order of the Day, issued on 15th Feb. 1956 Maj.-Gen. Ahmed Salem, Commander of the Third Egyptian Division which

was then stationed in the Sinai Peninsula, said:

"Every Commander is to prepare himself and his subordinates for the inevitable campaign against Israel for the purpose of fulfilling our supreme aim, namely the annihilation of Israel and her extermination in the shortest possible time and in most brutal and cruel battles."

As against this, what is the feeling of Israel? This is well illustrated by the statement made by its Prime Minister that Israel wanted this to be undertaken as a preventive war. It has got all the elements of a *jehad*. Here is what the Chief Rabbi did when the Sinai peninsula was invaded. The Chief Rabbi placed a Torah in the leading jeep and said:

"You are about to enter holy soil. For in this land Moses, our teacher, received the law."

Unless the problem between Egypt and Israel, or, in other words, between Israel on the one hand and the entire Arab world on the other, is satisfactorily solved, I am of the view that there will not be world peace, and in these troubled waters both the blocs will continue to fish as has been suggested by my hon. friend Shri Asoka Mehta.

14.15 hrs.

[MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER in the Chair]

What the Britishers did is sufficiently known. It is an act, in the words of the Prime Minister, of unmitigated aggression. Now, attempts are being made to find out some moral reason for it, and as Bernard Shaw has well said, the Englishman never lacks a moral reason for whatever he does, and if Egypt is attacked by the British today, it must be for international good! But the question is: has that solved the problem—the problem of having an enduring solution between Egypt and Israel? And has the Suez Canal issue been solved? It has not been solved.

Therefore, we took the right attitude in demanding that aggression must end. Our first aim is to end the conflict, and our second aim is to create an atmosphere in which an enduring solution can be discussed and later on implemented.

There has been a cease-fire, whether as a result of our efforts or somebody's threat. Anybody can take the credit, but we merely claim that we have done our humble bit.

Shri Gidwani (Thana): Pakistan is taking credit.

Shri Gadgil: During the last eight years, by following a certain policy and by standing for certain principles our great country and our great Prime Minister have built up a reputation for fairmindedness, of judging everything on merits, and it is because of this our responsibilities have grown. And in order adequately to discharge those responsibilities, if the Prime Minister in certain circumstances takes a cautious attitude, it must not be misunderstood because, if there is any country today which is trusted by others more than another, it is India, and if by our actions here or by our speeches we weaken this position ourselves, then it is not only a matter of disaster for this country, but it is a matter of disaster to the whole world. Therefore, when the Prime Minister took up a certain attitude with respect to Hungary, let us understand the back ground. When war starts, truth is the first casualty, and in this particular business, the policy that was gradually becoming popular in the world, namely of peaceful co-existence and the working of the law of Panch Shila have been reversed. In fact, the pulse of Panch Shila is now completely benumbed. There has been no respect for the territorial sovereignty, there has been interference in matters which are purely internal. In other words, the great hopes we built about Panch Shila and the great things we expected as a result of the adoption of a policy of co-existence by the several countries in the world, all those hopes are dashed. Any judgment can only

[Shri Gadgil]

be passed if there is honest, accurate and positive information. Now, what is the position with regard to this.

We have been supplied, at least I have got some literature from the Congress of Cultural Freedom, some from the Socialist Party, some from the Chinese Embassy, some from the USSR Embassy and it seems that nobody is certain as to how the situation in Hungary was at any given time. So far as Egypt was concerned, we know that in the letter addressed to the English Prime Minister by the attacked Egypt it was stated that the USSR authorities long before England consequences of any attack on Egypt would be disastrous, and yet England did it. So far as Hungary is concerned, here are some quotations from French Socialist papers which go to show that all those things which were represented by a particular party are not correct. We have the reactions of Marshal Tito; we have the reactions of other countries. Therefore, if my responsibility because of the reputation that I stand for fairness and that I judge everything on the merits of the case is greater, I must know the truth, the whole truth before I pronounce any judgment. And, if the Prime Minister of our country gradually goes from one information to another, there is nothing inconsistent in it. It only shows how very alive he is to truth. The moment he knows it he is not concealing it. My own feeling is that even in this confusion there are certain facts which stand out broadly and boldly.

One fact that I have to point out is that the U.S.S.R. allowed the process of democratisation to continue. In fact, it seems it was their policy. They allowed it in Poland; they allowed it in Hungary. But certain other people took suspicious interest in this and, naturally, the U.S.S.R. must have thought that it was a matter which would ultimately result in danger to their security. Whether such a fear

is justified or not is another matter. But the fact today remains that up to a point the U.S.S.R. was favourable to the democratisation and later on it changed the policy. Will we be justified, when the situation is so fluid and so uncertain, in giving a final or dogmatic judgment on a situation of this kind? Or would not prudence and statesmanship demand that we should approach the thing very carefully?

Shri Asoka Mehta praised our Prime Minister and said that he was the conscience of the world. Indeed he is. If he is so and if he follows one policy in a particular matter for which you give him credit, why not be a little generous to wait for a time and to leave him to take what tactics he should use if you agree that his ultimate aim is to establish peace and abolish violence and war? You can be certainly charitable to that extent.

Now, that is the position with respect to Hungary. The Government of India and the Congress Party have repeatedly made it clear that we stand for democracy and wherever freedom is in danger we will go to the help of those who are fighting for freedom. This has been made clear so many times.

Something about the vote in the U.N.O. has been said and it has become a matter of great controversy. But, what is the basic attitude, leaving aside the vote which has been very adequately explained today by the Prime Minister? What is the basic attitude; what is the basic approach to this problem? If we say that we do not stand for democracy, then I can understand. But, when our principal basic values are absolutely there; you cannot pick up one thing, one soft spot. As I said, you must take a higher view away from the din and dust of the immediate controversy and apply your mind, all your moral force to find out a formula which will be of enduring value.

Today every weak nation, weak in the military sense, is jeopardised. If, what has been done in Egypt or if what has been done in Hungary according to the interpretation of my socialist friends is not dealt with properly—it may be by this method or that method—it will develop. As to which method should be followed, I am prepared to trust the Prime Minister; although I am critical of him, all the same, in this particular respect I am loyal. Therefore, the real question is, are we for a permanent solution or are we merely taking personal or party advantage of the situation as it is developing from time to time? I believe that it is not merely a political crisis; it is a moral and philosophic crisis that is facing the world. We have to answer the question whether we stand for mere political expediency or whether we stand for the freedom and dignity of man. That is just the question. It may be that it may have been formulated in the context of present circumstances but this is a particularly broad issue that we have to answer.

If anybody thinks that the use of nuclear weapons will bring in peace, he is wrong. If anybody thinks that dollars will bring in peace, he is also wrong. Positive peace can only come when certain ideas, certain understanding, certain modes and values are accepted by the whole world. Let us, therefore, make it abundantly clear beyond doubt that we stand for the solution of all outstanding questions in the international world by peaceful means. And, in approaching this, let us also be peaceful, non-violent in our language also. Let us be peaceful in this, as Gandhiji said, you must be non-violent in thought, word and deed. Even resorting to dishonesty for an honest cause is bad. Therefore the greatest responsibility today lies on the shoulders of our Prime Minister.

I would, as I said in the beginning, request my friends here to consider this whole question not in terms of

any party expediency or party outlook. If we are broadly agreed that the situation in the world may develop into anything and that it is our duty above all to see that there is no drift and that the entire international life is directed to a definite goal where the elementary values of freedom and dignity of man will be secure, are we not justified in backing up the policy of the Prime Minister?

That is just the question. I am sure that the Prime Minister is trying to do that. You may ridicule persuasion; you may ridicule this, that and the other; you may condemn secret parleys, private assurances or tactful whispers, as elements of conspiracy; but persuasion by appealing to what is noblest in man, to his good instinct, is a method to which we are pledged and that is a responsibility cast on us even under the provisions of our Constitution. Therefore, after the first immediate stage of ending the conflict today the conflict must end—the people must come together, as Plato has said it becomes wise men, to confer and converse and not leave things to drift for themselves. Are we going to allow the events to overwhelm us or are we going to control the events and make them move in a manner in which we think our ultimate values will be realised? I do not want to say anything more. But I appeal to my opposition friends to just consider this. It is no use condemning Mr. Krishna Menon or condemning that man. Persons don't count. What is the principle? If you agree, don't make the thing unnecessarily bitter but strengthen the hands of the Prime Minister in this particular respect because he represents the pulse of the world and if he fails everything fails.

Dr. S. N. Sinha: Sir, the first speaker from the opposition benches the leader of the Communist group set the whole Hungarian question upside down. He made a perfect "Sirshasana" of the whole international situation. Well, I will take it up first and try to set it right. What one has to bear in mind today about the situation in Eastern

[Dr. S. N. Sinha]

Europe and what is happening in Hungary is this: It is a great nationalist revolution against all the misdeeds committed in that country by the Stalinist imperialists. It is all a lie, a distortion of historical facts to say that some outsiders who are fascists or whatever they may be have instigated this. It is clear from the statement of the present Prime Minister, if we call him a Prime Minister, though in the common vocabulary he is a Quisling or a puppet; I will read what he, Mr. Kadar, has to say about the present revolution in Hungary. He says:

"There must be unanimity as to the fact that the basic reasons for the popular movement begun on October 23rd should be sought in the grave mistakes and crimes committed to the detriment of the country's working people by the Rakosi clique which enjoyed decisive influence in the leadership of the country and the party. It ought to be also kept in mind that the indignation of the masses which rose against these harmful acts and methods was absolutely legitimate. The purpose of the masses taking part in this movement was not to undermine the people's power in the Hungarian Peoples Republic but on the contrary to strengthen and fortify it by coming out against the mistakes."

I quote from the horse's own mouth. This is from the News and Views of the Soviet Union, dated November 14, 1956 which is being circulated. So, you will see that there was a revolution and the revolution is going on still in Hungary and the innocent people of the cities are being massacred. If you follow it carefully, you will find that it was after Hungary's declaration of its neutrality and because it withdrew from the Warsaw Pact and the Prime Minister of that country called upon the United Nations for the protection of the Hungarian neutrality and Cardinal Mindszenty asked the people to give

prayers, that the Soviet troops re-entered and the Soviet tanks roared on the Hungarian soil. It was most unfortunate—if you know the city you will understand it well—that in Budapest the massacre began from the Parliament Square there. After all, Parliament is the highest place of sanctity for the democratic ideas. But, unfortunately, in Hungary the massacre began from that place. And what did they do? Their first act was to just liquidate the former Government and they put another puppet by the name Kadar as Prime Minister there.

Here you have to see what has happened by this act of the Russian troops or Russian tanks in Budapest. The Stalinist aggression on Hungary has reduced Hungary not only to less than a sovereign State but to the lowest level of a slave State. In actual fact it is so and in the words of our Prime Minister "it is an outrage of human dignity and freedom". Today Hungary is less than a sovereign State and the problem before the whole world is: how to pull it out again and how to make it right or correct these wrongs done to her.

In Egypt happily the aggressor could not change the Government. President Nasser stood like a rock. But here they have changed it. There is also another difference. When one aggressor, the United Kingdom, was in Egypt, there was opposition in Great Britain itself. At least half of the population, if not more, opposed the action which the British Government have taken. But here we have to see correctly the Soviet system and what is happening there.

The vital question today before the world is how to just set it right. We have to correct the wrongs which have been done in Hungary. I have no time to go into details. That is why I am skipping over the details. So, in this case it is not very important how our delegation voted here or there. That is not important. The most important

thing is to see that we are in a very favourable position and our country and our Prime Minister are in a very favourable position to solve some very intricate problems of the world. Perhaps the historical forces have assigned our country and our Prime Minister to see to it that less bloodshed is committed in the world and perhaps, if it is possible, no bloodshed at all. So, from this point of view, if we see the matters, we will find that during the last few years, since we have come closer to the Soviet Union, the prestige of the Soviet Union also has gone high. In many circles it is due to us, due to our sincerity, that it has gone high and we can utilize it today and say to the world what our stand is and how far we appreciate the Soviet system and how far we are not going to appreciate it. My personal view in this respect is that our country and our Prime Minister can play a very great role, a very unique role.

A year ago when comrade Khrushchev was here I had a chance to interpret one of his speeches in the Rashtrapati-Bhavan and I know to what heights he took the freedom of the people and the cause of the oppressed colonial people. Today we have to read to our esteemed friend: those are the words which you uttered and you have to keep those words and you should not drown those words under the thunders of your bullets, big shells and cannons in the streets of Budapest. Then the Soviet Union was very eloquent about Panch Shila, and before this House I read many times the statements of the Soviet Union that they believe in the Panch Shila. Now we have to remind them and tell them: this is not the Panch Shila; you should be a little more loyal to the Panch Shila and don't behave like this, stop flowing blood or making a blood bath in the Hungarian Parliament Square. So, as a friend of the Soviet Union we can advise that country to pull out not only from Hungary itself but from the whole of the Eastern Europe. Anybody who knows the problem of Eastern Europe, as I claim to know,

will agree with me that it is in the interest of the Soviet Union today to pull out from the whole of Eastern Europe.

I will analyse it in a few words giving a military picture. You have to see that 1½ million soldiers, satellite-troops have gone today against Russia. Anyhow, Russia cannot count upon those soldiers or the Ukrainian soldiers in Russia itself to shoot their own brethren in the interest of the Soviet Union. In this sense the majority of the forces and the resources of the Soviet Union are bogged up in Eastern Europe and they will have to pull out today or tomorrow. As Shri Asoka Mehta was mentioning, they have to come to terms as in the case of Poland. Do you know the real reason why they have come to terms with Gomulka? It is for this reason: In the post-War period, Stalinist Russia took from Poland Vilno and other cities and gave Poland in compensation certain territories from Germany—Breslau, Stettin and other portions of Silesia. All these territories behind the Oder-Neisse line were given to Poland and in order to keep them Poland had to get Russian soldiers on their soil. Because this was grabbed from Germany they had to get soldiers to keep it under their control. Poland didn't have that much soldiers, and so Russian soldiers were there. This was the position and that is the reason why in Poland it was possible for the Russians to come to terms with Gomulka. But Hungary has no such problem. Hungary has shown quite a different way to the world. This revolution has shown the Stalinist brutality, naked brutality, in all its vulgarness, cruelty and deceit.

Today also we read in the papers that Comrade Khrushchev has said that the moment the Western Powers retrieve and move their soldiers from Western Europe, he is ready to pull out his soldiers from Hungary, Rumania, Poland and other places. Here is the starting point where we can intervene and we can say "Behave in the same way". We are going to

[Dr. S. N. Sinha]

call a six power conference or whatever it is; the main talk should be there about the Russian retreat from Eastern Europe.

You allow us to see the situation in Eastern Europe and how it is happening. It is a most horrible thing that the Secretary-General of the United Nations has not been allowed to visit Budapest; he had been asked to come and talk, even for humanitarian matters, in Rome, which was correctly refused. The point is that nobody else is allowed in that area to see what horrible things are going on there. I am sure the revolution is still going on in Hungary. I know the Hungarians and I have quite a number of friends there. I also know that those friends are not going to yield. Our Prime Minister has said this morning that this revolution is going to succeed and I am sure Hungary is going to be free. It is our duty to support her cause.

Comrade Khrushchev had last year congratulated me for my proficiency in Russian. He will congratulate me more if he takes my advice about Eastern Europe, because that is in the interest of Russia, and as a best friend of Russia I am saying that they are losing now. Today the Prime Minister has also made it clear that Russia is losing not only in resources but also in its prestige and many other matters. When I say this, I am termed an American agent and that I represent the American point of view. That is the easiest way of condemning things and that has been the greatest Stalinist lie. I will prove it to you.

If you do not take this action for your country and if you are not aware of the dangers which are there threatening in Budapest, you will have to face some very very grave dangers in Kashmir on your borders and many other places. When I came to this Parliament, it was I who placed on the Table of the House those documents containing the talks which Stalin had with Hitler about the division of the world—and he had his

eyes on Kashmir and the whole of India. Those documents have been published now, and it is anybody's look-out just to see them. The Stalinists have only shelved those documents; they have not forgotten them because the opportune time has not come. Nobody believed me at that time and Russian papers also wrote about me that I was an American agent. Everybody who does anything for his nation is condemned as an American agent. Look at also Budapest. What has happened there? The Nage Government and others were tolerated so long as they were not nationalists, and as soon as they turned to do something which was in the interest of Hungary and was contrary to the interests of the Soviet Union, they were liquidated. That is the easiest thing to brand anybody as an American agent that is a slander and that is a total Stalinist lie to condemn anything that is nationalist as American inspired and so on.

Comrade Khrushchev says if from Eastern Europe we pull out, the Americans will come there. But why not take the Indian example? Even when we were fighting for our freedom, the British diehards used to say; the moment we pull out from India, the Russians will come in and India will fall into foreign hands. Has India fallen into anybody's hands? Of course, not; we are independent. What Gandhiji said at that time was this: let it go to the devil, to Hell, but you just quit India; that is my point. In the same way let the Russians say to Hungary or anybody: you go anywhere you like; it is in my own interest that I am pulling back and that will be the best thing.

It is not possible today to put the great countries of Eastern Europe, whose culture is rather higher in many respects than that of Russia itself, under subjugation for such a long time.

Purposely I am differentiating when I am saying Soviet Union and the

Stalinites, because every close observer of the Soviet affairs today knows that a great fight is going on in the Soviet Union, between the adherents of the Stalinist Imperialists and the de-Stalinites. The leader of the de-Stalinites is Comrade Khrushchev. He has done quite a lot and when we talked about Ukraine, I also put him a question and he was of the opinion—and it was also broadly broadcast—that a certain amount of democratisation is necessary not only for the Soviet Union but also for the neighbouring countries—what is commonly known as the Soviet satellites. He was for that and his forces are working. But there is also another force in the Soviet Union which is represented by one Mr. Swisloy, and I have heard his speech on the 7th of this month on the Revolution Day—the original speech broadcast from Moscow. He is the leader of the Stalinite group in Russia. A great fight is going on between these two forces. We can appeal to Comrade Khrushchev and tell him: What you told us in Delhi will be remembered by you, keep your word and work for democratisation, which is in the interests not only of all the countries which you are leading but also ultimately in the interest of everyone including India, the Soviet Union and of the whole world.

If we do not stop the bloodshed there, I have my doubts. There are a few people who study the original documents very seriously and I have a habit to do so. In those documents you will find that the Stalinites have still their eyes on India. If you ask me, why were you against the Communist Party, my reply is, it is because the whole object of the Communist Party is to bring the Soviet slavery, as it has been proved in Budapest. Today you will believe me; three or four years ago you would not have believed me, and you would have treated it lightly. If the same situation as in Hungary is created in a country the Soviet soldiers would come in and the country would fall into the hands of Russia. That is the real role of the Communist Party, the role of treachery which you find in Hungary and in many other places.

If we do not take this lesson from Hungary, we will be making a historic blunder, for which we will have to regret and also the posterity will have to regret—we have no right to make this blunder. In the name of peace we can approach the Soviet leaders and tell them to leave Hungary to the will of the people there. If the people of Hungary want to follow Cardinal Mindzenty—you know the whole story of Cardinal Mindzenty, books have been published, films also have been there, he has become the real hero—what is wrong there? What was his crime? Because he prayed to God, it does not fit into the Communist way of life, and all people who pray to God should be liquidated and shot. What a funny argument it is! If the people do not adhere to them, is that the way to remove them? I myself do not pray to God, but that does not mean that when other people pray, I should shoot them. If I do so, I will make them more adamant and make them pray to God. That is exactly the thing that the Soviet Union is doing there and that has been mentioned also by Mr. Kadar. In his speech Cardinal Mindzenty, as soon as he came out of the jail, asked the people to pray. That was the reason that the whole empire is crashing—the Soviet Empire not only in Hungary but also in Poland, Rumania and everywhere. It is going to crash, no doubt. Those are the dictates of history; nobody can stop it. The sooner it is done, the better it is in the interest of all concerned.

Previously, the British have shown the way. Whether it is white colonialism or red colonialism, it is immaterial. It is colonialism and it is brutal and it must go. So, our country must unequivocally support the cause of Hungary today; if we do not do it, then we will be failing in our duty.

I have not spoken about events in Egypt but perhaps I need not, because the lead here has been so correct. There has been such a correct lead that the world forces of peace are all with us under the leadership of our Prime Minister. I am sure that nothing untoward is going to happen there.

[Dr. S. N. Sinha]

I am not a *gyotishi* but I think that there will be no more of bloodshed; there may be slight upsets but there will not be much bloodshed which will lead to a greater conflagration.

But, in Eastern Europe, if we do not see things in their correct perspective and just ignore them, a very great conflagration will take place there. Not only Europe will be in flames but other parts too and we do not know what part of the world will be safe from that conflagration. That is why, it is our duty to study the affairs of the Eastern Europe and see things as they are, in their correct perspective. It is our duty to support the freedom of Hungary.

There is a misunderstanding of our policy on the continent of Europe. I have been receiving letters during the last two or three days saying that the prestige of our country is going down because we are not supporting the freedom of Hungary and we are doing something wrong. Let us tell the world that we stand for the freedom of not only Hungary but also of every other country; we stand for the freedom of the people everywhere. We do not want any country to suffer under the white or red colonial rule. When the international situation is very tense and when the dark clouds of conflagration are hovering above us, I am reminded of what I read in my student days. A Hungarian poet, whom Shri Asoka Mehta has also quoted—a great poet, Sandor Potofi—wrote: "We vow we can never be slaves." We must do everything in our power to see that there do not remain slaves any further. Whether there are slaves of the Soviet or slaves of the British, it is just the same crime everywhere. With these words, I support the foreign policy of our country.

Finally, I may add that when we were fighting for the freedom of our

country, I wrote in the title of my book:

Revolt of Asia:

"Light is breaking;

Thrones are quaking,

Hark! The Trumpet, of the
FREE!"

The situation which we see today should be transformed for the betterment of humanity and the whole world.

— Shri V. G. Deshpande (Guna): Sir, I am very much impressed by the high moral tone of the whole debate (*Interruptions*).

पंडित क० ब० शर्मा : हिन्दी में
बोलिये ।

श्री वि० व० देशपांडे : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, जिस नैतिक स्तर पर और जिस आध्यात्म-वाद के आचार पर यह वाद-विवाद चल रहा है, उस को देख कर मैं अत्यन्त प्रभावित हुआ हूँ। परन्तु जिस प्रकार से इस सदन के विभिन्न विभागों ने एक बड़े नैतिक स्तर पर हमारे प्रधान मंत्री की नीति का समर्थन किया है उस से कभी न कभी मेरे अन्तःकरण में भय भी पैदा होता है। मेरे रक्त-रंजित साम्यवादी भाई भी उन के नैतिक स्तर का समर्थन करने के लिये आज यहां खड़े हुए हैं। उनकी इन सब सद्भावनाओं का मैं आदर करता हूँ लेकिन इस के साथ साथ मैं यह भी कहना चाहता हूँ कि एक कृत्रिम-बायुमंडल, एक आर्टिफिशियल एटमस्फीयर इस सदन में क्रियेट हुआ है, उस का निर्माण हुआ है, ऐसा मैं समझता हूँ। बात यह है कि हम जंगल में जा रहे हैं और दूर से देखते हैं कि एक शेर ने दो तीन आदमियों को मार दिया है और उस के पश्चात् हम और हमारे साथ जो दो तीन आदमी खड़े होते हैं वे कहते हैं कि शेर गलती पर था जिस ने इन आदमियों को मारा और कोई दूसरे

आदमी कहते हैं कि ये आदमी ग़ज़ती पर थे । इस तरह से मैजिस्ट्रेट का काम हम शुरू करते हैं और कहते हैं कि जो कुछ हंगरी में हुआ ठीक हुआ, जो कुछ रूइन्चेव ने किया ठीक किया, जो कुछ मिश्र ने किया ठीक किया या जो कुछ इज़रायल ने किया ठीक किया या ठीक नहीं किया । इस तरह से हमारा आज की दुनिया में केवल एक ही काम रह गया है कि हम दुनिया के प्रत्येक भाग में शान्ति को बनाये रखें । इस चीज़ को ध्यान में रखते हुए कृष्ण मेनन माषण कर देते हैं और कह देते हैं कि यह ठीक हुआ या नहीं हुआ, यह गलत किया गया है या उचित किया गया है । इस प्रकार से निर्णय कर के आप ने एक प्रकार से कृत्रिम और एक काल्पनिक वायुमंडल का निर्माण यहाँ कर लिया है और कर रहे हैं, ऐसा मैं समझता हूँ ।

मैं एक बात को मानता हूँ और वह यह है कि भारतवर्ष अभी अभी आज़ाद हुआ है, भारतवर्ष अभी बड़ा कमज़ोर है और यदि शान्ति बनी रहे तभी हम उन्नति कर सकते हैं और तभी हमें कुछ लाभ हो सकता है । अगर ऐसा न हो तो जो कमज़ोर आदमी है वह ताकतवर नहीं बन सकता है । इस दृष्टि से जो अज्ञात हैं, जो भलेमानस हैं उन के लिये इस दिशा में थोड़ा बहुत प्रयत्न करना तो ठीक है और यहाँ तक तो मैं आप के साथ सहमत हूँ । परन्तु इस के आगे जा कर केवल रूस में, इंग्लैण्ड में, मध्य एशिया में शान्ति प्रस्थापित करने के लिये हम को क्या क्या करना चाहिये, साइप्रस के लिये हम ने लड़ाई क्यों नहीं की और दूसरे देशों के लिये लड़ाई क्यों नहीं की, इस प्रकार की बातें करना मैं समझता हूँ व्यर्थ है । आज आप यहाँ देखते हैं कि दुनिया के बारे में जो जो बातें हम सोच रहे थे और कह रहे थे वे बातें सब गलत साबित हुई हैं ।

आज बीसवीं सदी में दो विश्व युद्ध देख लेने के पश्चात् दुनिया में, मैं समझता

हूँ, आज कोई भी युद्ध भोल नहीं लेगा । बड़े बड़े देश पंचशील पर अग्रल करने की घोषणा करने के पश्चात् लड़ाई करेंगे नहीं, नेकिड एग्शन करेंगे नहीं, नमन आक्रमण करेंगे नहीं, ऐसा हम समझते थे । पंचशील की संधि हम ने बड़े बड़े देशों के साथ की है । रूइन्चेव और बुलगानिन यहाँ पहुंचे और उन्होंने ने हमें कहा कि अगर कोई आप पर आक्रमण करता है तो ज़रा पहाड़ी से आवाज़ देना और हम चले आयेंगे । हम समझने लगे थे कि स्टालिन, लेनिन इत्यादि को छोड़ कर मोतम बुद्ध और पंडित जवाहर लाल के अनुयायी अब बुलगानिन और रूइन्चेव बन गये हैं और दुनिया में शान्ति का निर्माण होगा । अमरीका पर भी हमारा प्रभाव पड़ा और इंग्लैंड तो पहले से ही शान्ति का पुजारी था । तो इस प्रकार की आशा हम करते थे । हम ने एकदम देख लिया है कि इजिप्ट जिस को हम बड़ा दुबला और कमज़ोर समझते थे, उस ने एक दम राष्ट्रीयकरण कर दिया । उस के पश्चात् हम आशा लगा रहे थे कि अब शान्ति होगी । परन्तु इंग्लैण्ड और फ्रांस की फीजें हमारे देखते ही देखते वहाँ उत्तर गई । उधर रशिया भी हंगरी में चला गया और हज़ारों लोगों को मौत के घाट उतार दिया गया । इन सब बातों से एक ही निर्णय पर हम पहुंचते हैं कि पंचशील हैज़ फ़ैल्ड (फ़ैल हुआ है), यू० एन० ओ० हैज़ फ़ैल्ड । मैं चाहता हूँ कि इन्हें फ़ैल नहीं होना चाहिये । दुनिया में हज़ारों लोग मार दिये गये हैं, हज़ारों का कत्ल हुआ है, खून की नदियां बहीं हैं और इन सब भयानक दृश्यों को देख कर तथा इन सब बातों को सुन कर मुझे भी दुःख होता है । पंचशील को असफल नहीं होना चाहिये । पंचशील की विजय मैं चाहता हूँ, शान्ति की विजय मैं चाहता हूँ । लेकिन अमरीका, इंग्लैंड, फ्रांस तथा रूस यहाँ आपस लेने के पश्चात् किस तरह से नमन आक्रमण कर सकते हैं, यह हम ने देख लिया है लेकिन फिर भी हम अपने

[श्री वि० च० देशपांडे]

ईर्दगिर्द एक कृत्रिम एटमसफीयर (वातावरण) पैदा कर रहे हैं। क्या हम कह सकते हैं कि हिन्दुस्तान पर कोई आक्रमण नहीं करेगा और क्या हम केवल जज का ही काम करेंगे। हम तो वैसे ही कर रहे हैं जैसे कि एक मैजिस्ट्रेट म्यूनिसिपल केसिस में जिस साइकिल सवार के पास लाइट नहीं थी उस को दो रुपया जुर्माना कर देता है और अगर कहीं मोटर का एक्सिडेंट (दुर्घटना) हो गया तो उस को छः महीने की सजा कर दी। साइप्रस पर जजमेंट (निर्णय) दे देना, मिश्र के केस (मामले) में जजमेंट दे देना, हंगरी के बारे में जजमेंट दे देना, इतना ही घंटा आपका रह गया है, यह आप न समझें। आप के देश को भी खतरा हो सकता है। आज भी दुनिया के अनेक देश हैं जिन के हित आप के हितों से टकराते हैं। बड़े बड़े देश आप के देश के साथ लगे हुए हैं। आप के पास ही पाकिस्तान है, जिस ने अमरीका के साथ सैनिक संधि कर ली है और अमरीका की फौज और शस्त्रास्त्र बल उस के साथ हैं। हों सकता है कि कल वह आप पर आक्रमण कर दे। आप के एक ओर चाइना है और उधर आसाम में नागालैंड है। आप पर लाल संकट भी आ सकता है। ऐसे समय में आप के देश को क्या करना चाहिये, दुनिया के देशों के प्रति आप की नीति क्या होनी चाहिये, इस का विचार आप अधिक कीजिये। इंग्लैण्ड के साथ आप के सम्बन्ध रहने से आप खतरे में पड़ सकते हैं या आप की उन्नति हो सकती है, यह भी आप मोच लीजिये ! आप की इच्छा तो यह जान पड़ती है कि दुनिया देखे कि आप ईजिप्ट के लिये मर रहे हैं। ईजिप्ट के बारे में भी आप ठीक तरीके से सोचें। केवल यही न देखें कि किमी की सोवीयेन्टी (सत्ता) खतरा में है। केवल वही प्रश्न नहीं है। यू० एन० ओ० में जब ईजिप्ट का प्रश्न आया, तो आप ने पक्ष में वोट दिया, परन्तु जब हंगरी के विषय में रेज़ोल्यूशन पर पैराग्राफ-

बाई-पैराग्राफ वोटिंग (पैरा-वार मतदान) हुई, तो श्री कृष्ण मेनन की गलती हुई और वह गलती पंडित जी के जोरदार समर्थन से सुधारी जा सकती है, यह मैं मानने के लिये तैयार नहीं हूँ। उन की यह बात तो समझ में आ सकती है, कि वहां पर यू० एन० ओ० के तत्वावधान में इलैक्शन (चुनाव) के सिद्धान्त को मान लेने से एक गलत प्रकार का उदाहरण कायम हो सकता है, लेकिन फौजें निकालने के विषय में आप के रुख से तो एक ही बात दिखाई देती है और वह यह कि आप पूरी तरह से रशियन ग्रुप (रूसी गुट) में शामिल हो गये हैं और दूसरों के खिलाफ हो गये हैं। आप की अशक्तता का ध्यान रखते हुए, दुनिया का मत आप के बारे में यह हो, यह आप के लिये कोई सुरक्षितता की बात है, ऐसा मैं नहीं समझता। मैं आज आप को इस बात के लिये दोष देता हूँ कि आप पाजिटिवली, निश्चित रूप से इंग्लैंड और अमरीका को छोड़ कर रशियन ग्रुप के साथ बैठ गये हैं, जिस के कारण आप के देश को कभी भी खतरा हो सकता है। ईजिप्ट के विषय में विचार करते हुए हमें यह बात भी अपने सामने रखनी चाहिये कि It is not a case of injured innocence (यह ठेस पहुंची हुई निर्दोषिता का प्रश्न नहीं) ऐसी कोई बात नहीं है कि वह कोई रमणी है, जिस पर आक्रमण किया गया है और नाइट्स (वीर) अपनी शिबैलरी (वीरता) दिखाने और उस की रक्षा और सहायता के लिये पहुंच रहे हैं। ईजिप्ट के सामने क्या महत्वाकांक्षा है, यह हम जानते हैं, मक्का में नासिर साहब पहुंचे और उन्होंने ने कहा कि हम ने अल्जीरिया से ले कर इंडोनेसिया तक मुस्लिम हैजिमतनी — मुस्लिम आधिपत्य — स्थापित करना है। संसार के सब मुसलमान राष्ट्रों का एक संघ बनाने की महत्वाकांक्षा को ले कर ईजिप्ट खड़ा हुआ है। मैं यह नहीं मानता हूँ कि सब उस के नेतृत्व में चले

जायेंगे। आज पाकिस्तान और ईजिप्ट की भी लड़ाई है। बगदाद पैकट के भी टुकड़े हो गये हैं। लेकिन फिर भी एक बड़ा संकट आप के सामने है। आज अमरीका और एशिया जैसे महान् देशों में संघर्ष है और उन में से किसी के विरुद्ध भी आप की नीति होने से आप को खतरा हो सकता है।

15 hrs.

जहां तक इजराइल का प्रश्न है, उस के विषय में मेरे सभी मित्रों, श्री अशोक मेहता, गार्डगिल महाशय, जो कि बड़ी शान्ति और अहिंसा के प्रचार के लिये आज आये थे, और अन्य माननीय सदस्यों ने कहा है। दुनिया ने माना है कि उस को एक राष्ट्र के रूप में जीवित रहना चाहिये। स्वेज कैनल के विवाद में हम ने देखा कि ईजिप्ट हमेशा अपना सामान ले जाने के विषय में उस का विरोध करता रहा। यह बात नहीं है कि इजराइल पर कोई आक्रमण, कोई अत्याय, कोई पाप ईजिप्ट ने नहीं किया है। इस तथ्य को सदा हम को अपने सामने रखना है।

आज सब से मुख्य आवश्यकता इस बात की है कि हम इस बात पर विचार करें कि हम को ब्रिटिश कामनवैलथ में रहना चाहिये या नहीं। इंग्लैंड ने ईजिप्ट पर हमला किया है, उस ने पाप किया है और हम न्यायाधीश हैं, इसलिये हम उस को सजा दे दें, इस प्रकार हम को इस प्रश्न को नहीं देखना चाहिये। हमें यह सोचना चाहिये कि इंग्लैंड के साथ रहने के कारण कहीं हम दुनिया के किसी संघर्ष में न फंस जायें और उस का कोई दुश्मन कभी हम पर हमला न कर दे। इस सम्बन्ध में एक बात मैं आप को बताना चाहता हूं। हाल ही में वहां जो कुछ हुआ, उस से मैं बड़ा हैरान हो गया हूं। जब मैं इंग्लैंड का पांच छः सौ साल का इतिहास देखता हूं, तो पाता हूं कि विदेश नीति के बारे में कभी किसी अधिकारारूढ़ दल का विरोध नहीं किया गया। स्पेन के आरमेडा के साथ लड़ाई में इंग्लैंड के कैथोलिक

और प्रोटेस्टेंट सब इकट्ठे हो गये। किन्तु आज मुझे यह देख कर बड़ा आश्चर्य हो रहा है कि लेबर पार्टी अधिकारारूढ़ दल का विरोध कर रही है और रास्तों पर प्रदर्शन हो रहे हैं। हमारे पंडित जी कहते हैं कि प्रदर्शन नहीं होने चाहिये, लेकिन वह तो प्रदर्शन हो रहे हैं। अगर ऐसा यहां होता, तो यहां कोई मंत्री गोली चलवा देता, लेकिन इस प्रकार की कोई बात वहां नहीं हुई। मैं सोचने लगा कि ऐसा क्यों हुआ, अंग्रेज तो बड़े हुशियार, बड़े काबिल और बड़े डिप्लो-मेट हैं। मैं ने महसूस किया कि इस में कुछ राज जरूर है, इस में जरूर उन की कोई चालाकी है। वह चालाकी बाद में मेरे ध्यान में आ भी गई। आज हिन्दुस्तान में लोग ब्रिटिश कामनवैलथ के खिलाफ हैं, परन्तु कल चुनाव होता है और टोरी पार्टी हार जाती है और लेबर पार्टी विजय होती है, तो सब भाई कहेंगे कि अब झगड़ा मिट गया, अब इंग्लैंड के साथ रहना बुरा नहीं है। एक ही उद्देश्य की पूर्ति के लिये आधा इंग्लैंड एक तरफ हो गया है और आधा इंग्लैंड दूसरी तरफ हो गया है। वे भिन्न भिन्न बातें करते हैं, परन्तु लक्ष्य दोनों का एक है। आज लोग कहते हैं कि इंग्लैंड ने सीज-फायर (युद्ध बन्दी) कर दिया है। मेरी समझ में नहीं आता कि उस ने क्या खाक सीज-फायर कर दिया है। यह तो वही बात है कि चोरी कर ली, डांका मार लिया या लड़की उड़ा ली या तिजोरी अपने कब्जे में कर ली और फिर कहा कि अब लड़ाई बन्द, अब हम नहीं लड़ेंगे, गोली नहीं चलायेंगे। इंग्लैंड का उद्देश्य तो पूरा हो गया। उस की सेनायें स्वेज क्षेत्र में पहुंच गई हैं और इन्टरनेशनल पुलिस फोर्स भी वहां पहुंच रही है। ईजिप्ट और इंग्लैंड की लड़ाई ही इस बात पर थी कि स्वेज पर एक देश का नियंत्रण हो या अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय नियंत्रण हो। अब जबकि उस पर अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय नियंत्रण हो गया, तो इंग्लैंड को क्या किसी हकीम ने बताया है कि लड़ाई करते रहो।

[श्री वि० ब० देशपांडे]

इस के बावजूद उस ने अभी लड़ाई बन्द नहीं की है। अभी तक उस की फौजें वहां मौजूद हैं और पहुंच रही हैं। मैं यह नहीं मानता कि वहां पर रशिया की धमकी के कारण, या श्री कृष्ण मेनन की इधर उधर दौड़-धूप के कारण वहां पर लड़ाई बन्द हो गई है या युद्ध विराम सन्धि हो गई है। मैं यह नहीं मानता कि इंग्लैंड ने सीज-फायर किसी से डर कर किया है। तथ्य यह है कि इंग्लैंड ने जो चोरी करनी थी, जो डाका मारना था, वह मार लिया है और अपना काम कर लिया है।

इन सब बातों से यह स्पष्ट हो गया है कि आज संसार में न कोई अहिंसा को मानने वाला है और न शान्ति को मानने वाला है और न ही नीति और न्याय के आधार पर अपना काम चला रहा है। ऐसी परिस्थिति में हम एक देश के साथ जुड़े रहें, इन-एबिटंबली (अनिवार्य रूप से) बन्धे रहें, तो हम किसी खतरे में ही फँस सकते हैं। मैं यह देखकर भी हैरान था कि एक तरफ इंग्लैंड की फौजें ईजिप्ट की ओर बढ़ रही थीं और दूसरी तरफ एटली माहब यहां दिल्ली पहुंचे हुए थे और पंडित जी से बातें हो रही थीं। उन्होंने ने वहां यह भी कहा कि हिन्दुस्तान कामनवैल्थ के बाहर नहीं जा रहा है। मैं तो समझता हूँ कि इंग्लैंड के विरोधी दल और अधिकारारूढ़ दल का अन्दरूनी समझौता है कि आप विरोध कीजिये और हम जा कर हमला करते हैं, कल एटली चुनकर आये या ईडन चुन कर आये। वे सोचते हैं कि कामनवैल्थ कायम रहे, कोई भी दल सत्तारूढ़ हो। देश के लिये वहां कोई भी दल सरकार से बाहर जा सकता है। इस के मुकाबले में यहां हिन्दुस्तान में छोटी छोटी बातों को लेकर झड़पिटाई चल रही है, एक दल में भी लड़ाई चल रही है। यदि हम को अपने हितों की रक्षा करनी है, तो हम को पहली

बात यह करनी पड़ेगी कि हिन्दुस्तान को ब्रिटिश कामनवैल्थ में एक दम बाहर निकाल लेना चाहिये।

श्री भागवत झा आजाद (पूनिया ब संथाल परगना) : नहीं नहीं।

श्री बि० ब० देशपांडे : यहां पर हम कितने ही जोर से व्याख्या दें या शान्ति और नीतिमत्ता की बातें कहें, उन में हमारी इस समस्या का समाधान नहीं हो सकता है। (Interruption)

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Order, order. Even if Panch Shila has failed, Members should not fail now.

श्री बि० ब० देशपांडे : आज हमारे चारों ओर खतरा बढ़ रहा है। शुक्रवार को हमारे प्रधान मंत्री ने अपने भाषण में कहा कि उन को तो भय प्रतीत होता है कि इन छोटी मोटी लड़ाइयों से बड़ी लड़ाई होने की आशंका हो सकती है—यह तो नमन हुआ है, जैसा कि गायन के पहले नमन होता है। इन बातों की दृष्टि में रख कर हिन्दुस्तान को बाहरी देशों के साथ अपने सम्बन्ध रखने चाहिये। हम अपने नैतिक स्तर से दुनिया में शान्ति का राज्य स्थापित करेंगे, यह महत्वाकांक्षा बड़ी अच्छी है, परन्तु उस से पहले हम को अपनी इन्टर्नल स्ट्रेन्थ को—आन्तरिक शक्ति को—बढ़ाना होगा। और केवल मैं ही ऐसा नहीं कहता हूँ। अभी परमों लखनऊ में डा० राधाकृष्णन् जी ने कहा था कि बाहर के देशों पर निर्भर कर के और तत्वों और नीति का प्रचार कर के हमारी विदेश नीति अच्छी नहीं हो सकती। जिस तरह से मैं कहता हूँ कि हम को कामनवैल्थ में नहीं रहना चाहिये उसी तरह और भी अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय गतियां हैं जिन की ओर हम को ठीक तौर से ध्यान देना चाहिये।

किसी भी देश को जब गुलाम करना होता है तो उस देश में पहले अपनी पार्टी

पैदा की जाती है। कम्युनिस्ट पार्टी के कहने पर ही रूस हंगरी में घुसा। यहां पर कहा जाता है कि दोनों परिस्थितियों में अन्तर है। रूस तो हंगरी में कम्युनिस्ट पार्टी के कहने पर उसे मजबूत करने के लिये गया था। यहां भी हम देखते हैं कि जब विदेशों का जिक्र आता है तो नारे लगाये जाते हैं। हम इस प्रकार के दलों को यहां उत्तेजन देते हैं। अभी हमारे लोगों ने राष्ट्रीय स्वार्थ को समझा नहीं है। हम तत्व की बातें करने लगते हैं। लेकिन हम को मालूम नहीं कि हम अपने देश में विदेशों के कितने एजेंट पैदा कर रहे हैं, कोई यहां किसी विचारधारा के रूप में बैठे हैं और कोई किसी दल के रूप में हैं। और हम देखते हैं कि आज उन में परिवर्तन हो गया है। वह कहते हैं कि हम रूस से सम्बन्ध नहीं रखते। वे पहले शान्ति की बात करते हैं, फिर प्रजातंत्र की बात करते हैं और फिर स्वतंत्र नीति की बात करते हैं। और जितना जितना ये लोग ऐसा करते हैं उतना उतना मेरा शक बढ़ता जाता है। आज हमारे देश में और दुनिया में बड़े परिवर्तन हो रहे हैं। इन परिवर्तनों को देखने के पश्चात् हम को अपने घर की ओर देखना चाहिये। आप जानते हैं कि प्लेन पहले चूहों में पैदा होता है। हम को देखना चाहिये कि यह कौन कौन से चूहों से पैदा होता है और फिर उन चूहों को मारने का काम भी हम को अपने इस देश में करना पड़ेगा। ये चूहे कोई विचारधारा के स्वरूप में, कोई जाति के स्वरूप में और कोई दल के रूप में पैदा हो गये हैं। हमारे पास-पड़ोस में अनेक प्रकार के हमारे दुश्मन हैं। उन की तरफ हम को ठीक तौर से ध्यान देना चाहिये।

दूसरी बात यह है कि आप को कामन वेलथ के साथ सम्बन्ध तोड़ना है। दूसरे देशों का जो प्रभाव इस देश में हो उस को कमजोर करना और उस का निर्मूलन करना है। इस के पश्चात् हम को देश की सैनिक शक्ति को बढ़ाना है और देश की सीमाओं की पूरी रक्षा करनी है। इन चीजों पर ध्यान

न देना और यह कहना कि दुनिया का नेतृत्व हमारे पास है, और रूस की तरह हम भी बड़े राष्ट्रों में गिने जाते हैं, इसलिये हम को डरने की आवश्यकता नहीं है क्योंकि कोई हम पर हमला नहीं करेगा, मैं समझता हूँ कि इस प्रकार सोचना बुद्धिमानों के स्वर्ग में रहने के समान होगा। मैं प्रार्थना करूँगा कि अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय राजनीति के साथ पहली बात आप को यह ध्यान में रखनी चाहिये कि किस प्रकार दुनिया में बर्बरता का नमन नृत्य हो सकता है और इसी प्रकार के किसी भी आक्रमण का सामना करने के लिये हम को देश की सैनिक शक्ति बढ़ानी चाहिये, देश की शस्त्र शक्ति बढ़ाने की तरफ ध्यान देना चाहिये। और इसीलिये आज मैं सरकार से प्रार्थना करूँगा और सदन से भी अनुरोध करूँगा कि एक पंचवर्षीय योजना हम ने ममान्त की है, दूसरी पंचवर्षीय योजना का हम ने प्रारम्भ किया है, हजारों करोड़ रुपया हम ने पहले खर्च किया है और आगे भी करने वाले हैं, किन्तु इन हजारों करोड़ में देश की रक्षा की योजना कहीं दृष्टिगोचर नहीं होती। मैं कहता हूँ कि अगर आप को इस पंचवर्षीय योजना में कुछ परिवर्तन करना पड़े तो उसे आप करिये, लेकिन इस का कुछ हिस्सा देश में शस्त्रों के कारखानों के लिये रखिये ताकि आप अपनी नाविक, आकाश की और स्थल की तीनों प्रकार की सेनाओं को मजबूत बना सकें। आप को देश के अन्दर अनिवार्य सैनिक शिक्षा दे कर देश को मजबूत बनाने की ओर भी ध्यान देना चाहिये। इस में हम को निराश होने की कोई आवश्यकता नहीं है कि अमरीका और रूस तो बहुत आगे चले गये हैं, अगर अब हम शुरू करेंगे तो क्या बनेगा। पिछले छः सात सालों से हम ऐसे ही सोचते आ रहे हैं। मैं कहता हूँ कि हम को यह काम कभी न कभी तो प्रारम्भ करना ही होगा और यदि आज भी हम प्रारम्भ कर देंगे तो पांच सात साल में हम बन जायेंगे और देश को मजबूत बना सकेंगे और इस शक्ति को हम अपने

[श्री वि० व० देशपांडे]

देश में और दुनिया में शान्ति प्रस्थापित करने के काम में लगा सकेंगे। हम अपनी शक्ति किसी देश को गुलाम बनाने के लिये नहीं बढ़ाना चाहते, जैसे कि रशिया हंगरी में कर रहा है या जैसा कि इंग्लैंड और फ्रांस ने ईजिप्ट में किया है। परन्तु हम को अपने देश की रक्षा करने के लिये और पृथ्वी पर शान्ति प्रस्थापित करने के लिये सैनिक दृष्टि से बलशाली बनना पड़ेगा, और इस की तरफ अगर हम ध्यान नहीं देंगे तो केवल पंचशील और अहिंसा पर आधारित हमारी विदेश नीति सफल नहीं हो सकती। इतना ही मेरा अनुरोध है।

Shri B. S. Murthy: Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, the world situation today is very grave, very dangerous and threatening. Unless some effective, immediate steps are taken, I am afraid the much unwanted third world war will soon begin and, perhaps, the much dreaded atom bombs might come into play and destroy the humanity.

It is evident that the cease fire is not yet completely implemented by the nations concerned. It is also evident that the aggressor nations, especially the United Kingdom, do not feel that they went against the moral standards of the world. Recently the Prime Minister of England said that they had nothing to regret. This is a very significant term and both the U.N. as well as the other nations of the world should take cognizance of this fact that England and France have nothing to regret.

Of all the events that took place I am shocked at the way in which Russia conducted itself with reference to Hungary. As soon as the Second World War was over, Russia mobilised its forces and began to hold peace conferences, instituted Stalin peace prizes and went every way possible to see that the world opinion was mobilised for peace. In the U.N.O. it always tried to see that all the

colonial countries were made independent. Recently our Panch Shila has also been agreed to by the Russian leaders when they came over here. Having done all these things to see that the world does not involve itself in a third world war, I do not understand why Russia should take the law into its hands and send armies to quell the nationalist rebellion in Hungary.

Shri Asoka Mehta was criticising Shri Krishna Menon that he did not represent India's opinion, not even the mind of our Prime Minister. He said that our international policy is rather confusing. I am afraid Shri Asoka Mehta was confusing the issues. Anybody who wants to criticise Shri Krishna Menon should place himself in the particular position in which Shri Krishna Menon was, in the United Nations, while making that speech or coming to that decision. It is very easy for us to sit outside, either in the boxing match or in a wrestling match or in a foot-ball match or in a cricket match, and say "Oh, this should have been done like this". But when you are in the field, fighting against odds, naturally you might make a decision which may not concur with that of others.

What was Shri Krishna Menon Speaking and what was the decision he took? Our Prime Minister was at pains to explain that we did not vote against the whole resolution. He has divided the resolution into the preamble and the operative portions. He said that one single point regarding the elections being held in Hungary under the auspices of the United Nations was objected to and we have reasons to object to it, because the same dagger that is being shown to Hungary was long ago shown to us and we resisted it successfully. Having resisted it, as far as India is concerned, how can we be parties to such a resolution? Because that particular phrase has been included in that resolution, India had to oppose it and in opposing it, Shri Krishna Menon

made a speech suitable to the occasion. I do not understand why Shri Asoka Mehta should say anything against it and much less Shri Jai Prakash Narain, who thinks nothing of this world and says that everything is of Heaven and who, in the name of Sarvodaya, comes and tries to criticise it adversely? Therefore, if Russia is true to the principles that prompted her to go about the world and propose a peace conference, and if she had any respect for the signature of hers in the Panch Shila agreement, Russia will set an example to the rest of the world today.

The Egyptian question is hanging fire. The Egyptian question, I think, will solve the problems of the African continent in one way. I do not know how it is going to solve them, but I have some premonition that it may lead to rid the African country of the white people who are today dominating that country and sucking the blood of those so-called dark and black people there. The question today for the whole world is whether the world is to be involved in a third world war. Many Governments are anxious for the third world war. But the people all over the world are not for it. Therefore, a difference must be drawn between the Governments of different nations and the peoples of those nations. In Russia, I am sure that all the people are not for another conflict. The same can be said of England, for, Mr. Gaitskell and others of the Labour Opposition there are trying to prevent Sir Anthony Eden from taking any further wrong step.

What should be done? Our Prime Minister said in the morning, "We have nothing but the moral force". Well, moral force has done something unique in the world as far as India is concerned. It is with the moral force that Mahatma Gandhi led 400 million people to freedom. We did not hit anybody and no blood was shed. Therefore, with the same moral force, I am sure that our Prime Minister can mobilise the world opinion and rouse world conscience and see that the United Nations is strengthened, and that Panch Shila is made

not merely a sheet of paper but a creed that will stay permanently in the world. I want some steps to be taken in order to see that the possibility of a third world war is ruled out completely. We must see that this is done either through the UNO or through any other media. We must see also that the military pacts are scrapped, that the foreign troops from Cyprus, Algeria, Viet Nam and other countries are removed immediately. This must apply not only to the European countries but all countries. Wherever there is any foreign troop existing, it must be removed. Unless and until this is done, I am sure any day, anything might happen, and then the whole world might be involved in a ruthless and bloody war which will spell ruin to human culture and human civilisation.

Therefore, I feel that our Prime Minister should not only use his friendly relations with Russia and England and the United States, but also see that all the weaker nations of the world are brought together so that the whole world will come to this opinion, namely, the mightiest nation with all its military powers should be able to live on friendly terms with the tiniest nation, wherever the latter exists, without causing the tiniest nation any fear of invasion or, much less, of liquidation.

Shri D. C. Sharma (Hoshiarpur): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, when I sat listening to the discussion on foreign policy this morning, I felt that most of the speakers have taken our foreign policy to be an anthology—some parts of which are to be appreciated and some parts of which are to be criticised; some parts of which are to be taken for granted and some parts to be called into question. I believe that our foreign policy is one and indivisible. It is an organic whole, and an organic unit. The strength of our foreign policy lies only in this, namely, that it has stood for certain principles and certain rights of humanity. Therefore, there has been that success accruing to it of which, I think, even the most

[Shri D. C. Sharma]

hostile critics in this House are aware.

It was said by an hon. Member that India is assuming to itself the role of a judge or the role of a magistrate which does not befit this country. I do not think that India is laying claim to any role of that kind. It is not this kind of role which India has played or which India is going to play, but, as I said at the beginning, we have certain principles and those principles are the principles of truth and they are the principles of Panch Shila. As a nation we are young only so far as freedom is concerned and as far as culture and civilisation are concerned, we are old, and we have a right to speak in the name of those principles and judge every issue that comes to us.

While I sat listening to the speeches, I heard one hon. Member advising that India should take the position like the one taken by the Lady of Shelott. The Lady of Shelott lived in isolation cut off from the rest of the world; she did not come into contact with the world as such.

Shri B. S. Murthy: Were you with her then?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: There should be no private conversation here. Let the hon. Member continue.

Shri D. C. Sharma: I must say that there are some persons who have been saying to us that we should live like the Lady of Shelott, cut off from the currents of the world, good, bad and indifferent; that we should not take to life as it comes to us, but must live in a world of shadow, looking at the shadows in the mirror. But, I believe no nation can afford to do so. The policy of isolation cannot befit any modern nation, big or small and every nation has to be in the current of affairs of this world or, if I may use the expression, in the main stream of the currents of this world. Therefore, to advise us not to do this thing or that thing is something which means a kind of national segregation or

national isolation and I do not believe India can follow a policy of that kind.

There are some persons who have appreciated our Prime Minister's statement with regard to Hungary. I think everybody has appreciated the statement made by our Prime Minister about Egypt. But, there are some persons who have tried to criticise Mr. Krishna Menon, saying that Krishna Menon does not represent India; he does not represent the Indian Government etc. They have said all these things about him, but I think their eloquence, if there was any, has been wasted, because the stand which Shri Krishna Menon took at the U.N. has been before the country for the last few days and everyone who has read the proceedings of the U.N. carefully would see that Shri Krishna Menon had not done anything which went against the interests of our country or against the interests of the principles for which we stand. If there is any doubt left in the minds of anybody, I believe that the statement which the Prime Minister made last Friday and the speech he delivered today on the floor of the House clearly show that the stand Shri Krishna Menon took was in conformity with the best principles of both the U.N. and our country. So, I do not think that one should take exception to the stand he took about the situation in Hungary.

One of the most pathetic speeches that I have heard was the one made this morning saying that the U.N. has failed; Panch Shila has failed and everything has failed. I am sorry that a speech of that kind should have been made U.N. has failed; Panch Shila has failed; everything else has failed, but the speaker has not failed. I ask that gentleman, if U.N. has failed, what organisation is going to take its place? If Panch Shila has failed, what other principles are going to take its place? I would submit that if U.N. and Panch Shila have failed, it is not this country or that country whose foreign policy has failed; it is humanity that has failed. I would say that if that

happens, it would not be a sad day for humanity, but a tragic and catastrophic day for humanity. I would, therefore, ask my friends not to utter such dismal statements, because we are standing on the verge of a crisis and our attempt should be to do everything in our power to avert that crisis and not precipitate it by making statements which do not fit in with the circumstances of the case and which are not in keeping with the spirit of the times.

It has been said that our country is surrounded by Pakistan, China, the Nagalland etc., which are potential sources of danger to us and that our foreign policy should be such as to make our defence potential as strong as possible. As our Prime Minister has said on more than one occasion on the floor of the House and as other Members have also said, I think it is no use raising such boogies. It is no use creating such scares, because our policy has been so far and is going to be for all time to come a policy of friendship with every nation. Even though Pakistan has so many differences with us and so many points at issue with us, I must say that we have tried to be as friendly to Pakistan as possible. We should remember that goodwill pays its dividends much sooner than illwill; friendship pays its dividends much sooner than antagonism. After all, it is not a world which should not be looked upon as a just world; in the long run, it is a just world. Therefore, I would say that the policy of friendship with our neighbours and other countries that we are pursuing is the right policy, because this policy alone can reduce tension.

Again, it has been said that we should quit the Commonwealth of Nations. I think the Prime Minister will be there to give his verdict on it, but I must say one thing. I read the message which the President of the U.S.A., sent to our Prime Minister on this question. I have also followed the correspondence between our Prime Minister and Marshal Bulganin and I cannot help saying

that there is a great measure of common understanding between the U.S.A., the U.S.S.R. and our country. Here or there we may not see eye to eye with each other; but all the same, it cannot be denied that even the U.S.A. has come to appreciate our stand in the affairs of the world. The U.S.S.R. has also come to appreciate our stand. But, I must say that there are sections of the British Press—this also includes the B.B.C. broadcasts—which present India in colours which, I should say, are not true to facts and circumstances. Anyone who reads most of the comments in the English papers will think that India is a country which is hostile to the Commonwealth of Nations. A big section of the British Press is always out to misrepresent India and India's policy. I would say that this is not the right thing to do. While other countries are able to understand and appreciate us, I see no reason why a section of the Press in Britain, with whom we have had so many years of contact, should be always out to say things about us which are not justified by any circumstances or conditions.

As far as our foreign policy is concerned, there are certain principles and I believe those principles have been given attention to by our Prime Minister in the statement that he made. Can anyone take exception to those principles? Can anyone say that those principles are not the principles which should guide the destiny of this world or the destiny of mankind?

I take Egypt, for instance. Is it not a great tribute for our country that a statesman like Nasser has said "Indian brethren"? I do not think he has used the word brethren in a formal sense but as a very affectionate term, which means that we have tried to say the correct things about Egypt. The Prime Minister said that Egypt has acted with a large measure of propriety and forbearance. And anyone who has read the accounts of the Egyptian action for some time past would come to the conclusion that truer words were never spoken.

[Shri D. C. Sharma]

Again, our Prime Minister said in his statement on Friday that we are concerned with attack on the freedom of anybody in the world; we are concerned also with strong nations dominating, by armed force, weaker nations. And, again, he said that we do not want to support colonialism. With regard to Hungary he said that from the very beginning we made it clear that in our opinion the people of Hungary should be allowed to determine their own future according to their own wishes and that foreign forces should be withdrawn.

What I want to say is this, that so far as our foreign policy is concerned, its main ideas are now there for anybody to see. And I believe that the voice of India so far as Egypt is concerned, the voice of India so far as Hungary is concerned and the voice of India so far as others are concerned has always been the voice of reason, the voice of justice, the voice of international law, the voice of human freedom and human dignity.

During the last few years we have had to face crises, if not more often, at least three times. There were crises in Korea, in Indo-China and there was the crisis in Egypt, and again there was the crisis in Hungary. And I must say I feel proud as a citizen of India that the line we took with regard to all these issues has been a line which has been justified by events. And if some thing that our line with regard to some country is not justified now, I can say that after a month or two it will be found that our line was the right line to take at that time.

But one good result that has accrued from our foreign policy is this. Our Prime Minister was saying all the time that these military pacts are of no avail and these military pacts do not lead to the added safety of nations but they create the very conditions which they are brought into being to control. That is what our Prime Minister was saying, and he was speaking for the whole of

India. Now, you have seen that there was the Baghdad Pact. It was created, and time has shown how prophetic was the statement made by our Prime Minister. One country says, "I will not attend the meeting of the Pact if another country attends it; we will keep out of it". And you find that this Baghdad Pact has died a natural death, because these pacts in the circumstances of the case are not going to be in any way conducive to the welfare of humanity. Have we not done something which has shown the utter futility of these pacts? I would say, if nothing else, our weight has been cast, our influence has been exercised on the side of and in favour of those persons who suffer under the domination of those people who want to preserve colonialism in one form or another. Colonialism is something which refuses to die, which tries to reincarnate itself in some other form, which resurrects itself again and again. But I would say that this colonialism, which has been the bane of humanity and which has brought distress and all kinds of things, this colonialism has found the most mighty opponent in our foreign policy. If people speak in terms of 'independent' and 'sovereign' nations, independent nations which will not be trampled over by others, it is to some extent because—I would not be so presumptuous as to say that it is entirely because of us—we have fought this good fight against colonialism.

Therefore, I would say that our foreign policy stands justified. Time has justified it. If there are persons who take exception to an item of our foreign policy today, I can say that they will come round to the view which I am expounding at this time, after some time and say that our foreign policy is one of the biggest things that has happened in this world for the good of humanity, for the good of the world, for the oppressed people of the world and for preventing all kinds of tensions and for stopping the catastrophe to which some nations want to lead us to.

Shri N. R. Muniswamy (Wandi-wash): Today's discussion is significantly very important because we are making certain pronouncements as regards the present international situation.

The Prime Minister the other day made a statement, which was a written one, and today he has a statement extempore. Of the two statements I find that he has taken a different turn today. I wish to bring it to your notice that on the other day three points were brought out from his statement. The first point was so far as Egypt is concerned and so far as the Anglo-French aggression on Egyptian soil is concerned, because in a way they have helped the Israeli aggression. The other point was our diluted form of condemnation of the Russian interference in Hungary and of its being a domestic affair. Today his statement was very pertinent and very dogmatic, in the sense that he has not left anything for doubt, and he has taken this attitude of condemning the Russians for their intervention without any justifiable cause. The third point which he has made today is a defence of the action of the ablest representative of India. Mr. Krishna Menon,—the action taken by him in the resolution that was passed in the United Nations.

I shall first of all deal with the Anglo-French aggression of Egypt and their interference on Egyptian soil. I cannot for a moment subscribe to the view that there had been some conspiracy with regard to this invasion. But I think it is a step that was taken unthought of, in this sense that when Israel made an aggression on Egypt, the Anglo-French Powers,—who had been brooding that they should have taken certain steps much earlier to control the Suez Canal—and they had been insisting on it and paving the way for a long time for international control of the Suez Canal,—now they look that action "for assisting the invasion of Israel." The ultimatum given by the Anglo-French

Governments about keeping off these two nations, that is Egypt and Israel, ten miles away from the Suez Canal is only a bunkum. It is only for the purpose of invasion and to do havoc ultimately in Egypt that they have simply put forth this as an excuse. Therefore I would say that though not pre-meditated, they took this turn to safeguard their position in the Suez Canal. The world opinion is in this way. They have condemned the Anglo-French aggression in Egypt. Almost all the countries of the world have joined in this condemnation of the Anglo-French aggression. So far as India is concerned, it was very halting in the condemnation of similar aggression in Hungary by Russia by sending their troops. It is said as if the people in Hungary wanted the assistance of Russia with a view to stabilise their Government. This is equally an excuse like the one that the Anglo-French people have put forward with regard to their action in Egypt. The Russians have also this excuse for that the people in Hungary wanted their assistance. My study of the position shows that these countries have got their own methods of doing things in interfering with the affairs of other countries.

As regards the Russian interference, we are happy in the sense that the Prime Minister has now taken not a halting attitude, he was very straightforward and very forthright in the criticism that he has levelled against the Russians. I should suppose that this may not be palatable to the Russian statesmen and leaders. I know we are not here to be guided by anybody's opinion with regard to our attitude. We must pursue a policy which is not in any way dictated by anybody or by considerations whether anybody would like it or not. But, this much I can say. This Russian friendship is of recent origin. This is a new acquisition. Our old friends are the British and the French people are against whom we have taken the cudgel. I am sure they have become our enemies. So far as to the U.S.A. is concerned, they are our doubtful friends. They are doubtful

[Shri N. R. Muniswamy]

because they have taken a different turn now in inviting our Prime Minister with a view to see that a cleavage is created with our recently acquired friend and he is tilted towards the western democracies. It is quite possible that the statesmen in western countries are more shrewd than many of the leadership here. I hope that our leaders will at any time stand superior to them in wisdom in political affairs.

So far as the defence of Shri Krishna Menon is concerned, much has been said in his favour that what he did was warranted by the circumstances that were prevailing at the time of the taking of votes. I have not gone through the contents of the Resolution. What the Prime Minister has said is this. There were certain portions which dealt with the preamble and other portions which dealt with operative portions and one important operative clause was the conducting of elections under the auspices of the U.N.O. Our representative wanted to express his dissatisfaction at this and so, he voted against it. He has abstained from voting in regard to the other aspects. Evidently, he wanted to be either neutral or wanted to express disapproval by abstaining from voting. In this aspect also, nothing would have titled the whole balance if he had abstained from voting, as he had done much earlier with regard to the other items. He could have abstained from voting. Since the whole resolution was put to vote, he had to oppose it though as regards some of the portions with which he did not agree, he was able to stand aside. To that extent, I should say that it was only a tactical blunder which he committed. Only if he had thought for a second moment, he would certainly have abstained from voting as he did earlier.

Our attitude has been one of clear indication that we do not belong to any power bloc, either the Russian side or the U.S.A. side or the Anglo-French. We have been pursuing a

clear path of advocating non-violence, and truth and telling other countries that any day, violence will prove to be harmful not only to the countries that perpetrate violence, but also to the countries against which it is perpetrated. The present policy which we pursue, in all probability, is going to stand in good stead in the long run. This will pay a rich dividend not today but in the long run. For the present, we may indirectly incur a certain displeasure or dissatisfaction or a short of wavering in our friendship with other countries. Nobody expected that these developments would take place in foreign countries and, much less, that we would have to pursue a policy of condemning the countries which have resorted to violence and causing havoc to humanity. Our Prime Minister has given good thought to the subject. He has not been saying anything about the Russian interference in Poland, Rumania or Hungary. Now that he has got certain data, he has to take a definite stand against the Russian interference in Hungary. Whatever may be said with regard to the requisition of Russian forces in Hungary, the way in which the Russian forces have been sent there and the atrocities committed by the Russians as reported in the newspapers, and the report of independent persons who had visited Hungary to the Prime Minister and other Governments should bear testimony to the real situation there. That was the report prepared without caring for anybody's fear or favour. So, we have to take up this policy in condemning the aggressors whoever they may be.

If we really wanted to have international peace and do good service to humanity, the only thing is that no country should interfere with another country's affairs and Panch Shila enunciated by our country should be adopted. I know, for some time, people have been doubting the efficacy and efficiency of Panch Shila in practical

politics. It is quite true that people who are in possession of arms and ammunition may laugh in their sleeves as to the efficacy of Panch Shila. It is true that we have no arms and ammunition except our moral strength. The time has come for testing how far this moral strength could stand before arms and ammunition. We have now in a way succeeded in seeing cease-fire in Egypt, though the situation there does not warrant complacency in the sense that everything is O.K. There are circumstances which create agitation and suspicion in us. The Anglo-French forces are still persisting there and certain conditions are put forward to their withdrawal. Any conditional withdrawal is no withdrawal. The forces are even now persisting there thinking who is to go first, whether the Russian forces should leave Hungary or the Anglo-French should vacate the Egyptian territory.

16 hrs.

At one stage, before 1935, India had three religions, Hinduism, Buddhism and Islam. In 1935, the Buddhists separated themselves from us. From 1935 to 1947, we had two religions here, Hinduism and Islam. After 1947, even Islam has gone out. So, there is Hindu *raj* here, and here we are adopting secularism, and we are being surrounded by other countries and people of other religions and in the face of that we have also to pursue a certain policy to see that we do not interfere with others, nor allow others to interfere with our country. Therefore, the present policy of Panch Shila is merely intended to see that everybody lives well and there is no interference in the affairs of one another. At one stage we thought that our neighbour Pakistan would be very friendly towards us, but in spite of our being very lenient and tolerant with regard to their attitude, they continue their anti-Indian propaganda, and Pakistan is trying to exploit the present situation also against India. We have to see that we come out honourably from this trouble. The Pakistan Government is now thinking that some blunder might be committed by the Government of India which

they can take advantage of and see that some trouble is caused even in India itself. I am sure they will not succeed in that, and that ultimately they will realise that what they thought was wrong. The other countries are very inimical towards our country in the sense that we are now rising up high in the estimation of the world because the so-called powerful countries are seeking the assistance and guidance of our Prime Minister in case of trouble and he is able to inject new ideas and new theories and thus clear the trouble. That is entirely due to our detachment, that we are having certain moral standards and basing our conduct on Panch Shila. Our guiding principles in foreign affairs are the principles enunciated in Panch Shila.

I can only say at the end that our Prime Minister has made these pronouncements which are very categorical and positive, and our position has been made clear to all the countries, whether friend or foe, and ultimately they will all realise that the policy pursued by the Government of India is the right policy, and that they will come round one day or other to see that this policy is pursued all over the world.

Shri B. Shiva Rao (South Kanara—South): It is some time since I have taken part in a debate on foreign affairs in this House. It strikes me that this debate is somewhat different from all the other debates which I have witnessed in the House on foreign affairs. In the past, whenever we discussed Government's policies or actions in the international field, the world situation at any given moment was more or less static. That unfortunately, is not the case today.

16.04 hrs.

[PANDIT THAKUR DAS BHARGAVA in the Chair]

I was struck with one or two passages in the Prime Minister's statement on Friday when he gave us his assessment of the world situation, and

[Shri B. Shiva Rao]

the keynote, it seemed to me, lay in two sentences which I am quoting:

"The world appears now to be in the grip of the fevered psychology of war and I am reminded of the months preceding the last Great War. It may be that the little wars we have had are only a first round and bigger conflicts lie ahead."

It struck me as a very gloomy assessment of the situation, and nothing he said this morning has relieved to any considerable extent that gloom. This factor must weigh with the House in this debate, and in fact, must override all other considerations. There have been criticisms and there will be criticisms of some aspects of the Government's policy today and tomorrow, but it seems to me that our main task should be to see whether out of all the comments and the criticisms that are made in the course of the debate, there emerge points which may usefully serve as guides to the Government in its foreign policy in the immensely difficult days that lie ahead of us. In performing that task, many hon. Members must have felt as I have done, that sufficient information was not available to us.

I had expected after the Prime Minister's speech on Friday that the External Affairs Ministry would take the trouble to circulate a memorandum to all hon. Members containing all the facts, the texts of the various resolutions and other relevant information with particular reference to the proceedings of the General Assembly. I made an unsuccessful attempt during the week-end to obtain this information. Only this morning after I came to the House I was given the texts of the two speeches made by the leader of the Indian delegation to the General Assembly. I presume that these speeches also appeared in the *Hindustan Times* today. It seems to me that the External Affairs Ministry should at least hereafter take the trouble to keep the House informed from time

to time of the various developments that take place, not only in the General Assembly but outside in reference to the international situation.

The Prime Minister, in the course of his observations today, referred to the vast amount of information that the Ministry receives from various capitals in the world. Much of it, possibly a good deal of it, is confidential information which cannot be disclosed to anyone outside the Government; but there may also be a certain amount of information which would be useful both to hon. Members and to the Indian press. I mention the Indian press because in this crisis the press has been very badly served by the news agencies which function both in New York and in other parts of the world.

It is difficult for us, placed as we are, to determine with any precision how long this crisis will continue to remain full of danger. Accusations and counter-accusations are being made almost every day. The British now claim that their aggression in Egypt has prevented Soviet intrigues in the Middle East from succeeding. On the other side, we have the Soviet Union's claim against the Western powers' action in regard to the events in Hungary. To the British Prime Minister what has happened in Egypt is not a war, it is only an armed conflict. In Hungary, thousands of ardent, young Hungarian patriots have died, but it is explained that they were only the representatives of certain reactionary elements in that country; and so this game goes on, of covering ugly facts with fine phrases, and meanwhile the world is drifting into more and more dangerous situations.

I realise that mere condemnation of aggression or of any other form of guilt is not going to solve the problem that is confronting humanity at the present moment. The question is whether there is a way out to prevent mounting suspicion and mutual

hostilities overwhelming the world in disaster.

Sir, I am glad that the Prime Minister has firmly turned down the suggestion which has been made by many in the country, including so respected a statesman as Shri Rajagopalachari, that India should walk out of the Commonwealth. Precisely how this would help either Egypt or the rest of the world, I cannot see. And, it seems very odd that many of those who have advocated this step and have so readily condemned British aggression in Egypt do not seem to have a word of sympathy for the people who have suffered from Russian atrocities in Hungary. But, that apart, I fail to see why we should cut off our association with the British people for the blunder of a Government which is in power today and which may be replaced by its opponents tomorrow. The Commonwealth association imposes on us no handicaps and no limitations. But it does enable us to maintain an outlook which stretches beyond continents and races.

We must, therefore, look round for positive remedies at the present juncture. Mere non-co-operation and boycott will bring no relief. I suggest that we should consider first of all immediate steps to prevent further deterioration of the world situation and make efforts to bring back the world from the brink of war. And, secondly, when those efforts have succeeded, we can then think of long term measures to reduce tensions all round.

I think it is a very fortunate coincidence that the Prime Minister is due in Washington some time next month for talks with President Eisenhower. A meeting between these two world statesmen would, at any time, have been of great significance and value to the rest of the world. But, in this crisis, these talks may produce enduring and far-reaching results. Today, the situation is difficult, but it is at least fluidic and uncertain. But one cannot say what movements may take place in many parts of Europe in the next few weeks and create further

complications. And I, therefore, take the liberty of suggesting to the Prime Minister that, subject to his own engagements and President Eisenhower's convenience, he should hasten his visit to Washington as much as possible. I venture to suggest that these talks should be regarded as of the utmost urgency for the sake of saving world peace.

Sir, the joint statement issued by the four Prime Ministers of the Colombo Powers last week and the one which our Prime Minister made in the House on Friday stressed one common point; namely, that the United Nations must be strengthened in all ways so that it may prove for the future an adequate instrument for the maintenance of world peace. That brings me to the question whether the Charter, as it stands, is capable of answering all the present and future needs of the world. I say from my experience of the functioning of the United Nations, as a member of the Indian Delegation for a number of years, that the Charter, as it stands, is a very inadequate and poor instrument.

Let me take only one provision in the Charter as an example, because both these statements to which I have referred have indicated the undesirable consequences of military pacts. Such pacts hastened the death of the League of Nations and I have not the least doubt that the United Nations is bound to go the same way—sooner or later if the Charter is not meanwhile suitably amended. Article 52 of the Charter permits the formation of such military pacts and it almost encourages them to do so. So long as that provision is in the Charter no real remedy is possible. In fact, according to the terms of Article 52, members of the United Nations entering into those arrangements are asked to solve all their disputes through such regional arrangements or agencies even before going to the Security Council.

I was in San Francisco in 1945 when the United Nations was formed and

[Shri B. Shiva Rao]

the draft of the Charter was produced. The Second World War, at that time, was in its final stages, but the framers of the Charter were in a hurry to complete the task before the differences between the Soviet Union on the one side and Britain, France and the United States, on the other, all Allies in the last War, could come to the surface. In 1945, there were 51 members of the United Nations of whom only 6 were from Asia and 2 from Africa. I am, of course, not including the Union of South Africa in this number. Actually, at that time, India was a member of the United Nations only by courtesy, because we were not a free nation in 1945, and the Indian Delegation was chosen by the British authorities. The voice of Asia was hardly heard at San Francisco. But in these 11 years, the position has greatly improved. There are at present 79 members of the United Nations, of whom 18 are from Asia and 6 from Africa. And the Asian-African group, as I have seen for myself, consisting of these 24 members is a factor today of growing importance, not only in the United Nations but in all its Councils and specialised agencies.

I do not suggest that the revision of the Charter is going to prove an easy or a smooth task. I do not underrate the difficulties. Nevertheless, I am convinced that serious and collective effort should be made to overhaul the United Nations in several respects in accordance with the needs of today. This is neither the time nor the occasion for a detailed discussion of the revision of the Charter. But, there is one point which I would like to mention, because in both the documents to which I have referred, there is a statement that at the root of many of our troubles today is the revival of the colonial spirit. Let us make no mistake about it. The colonial spirit is not the monopoly of the powers of Western Europe. There are other forms of colonialism which have sprung up in other parts of the world in recent years.

It was my privilege to represent India for 5 years on a special committee of the U.N. on Colonial Areas, the non-self-governing territories, as they are called in the Charter. That chapter, Chapter XI, is the weakest part of the Charter today. No doubt, some progress has been made in the economic, social and educational fields in several colonies. But, I have noticed, especially in recent years, a definite and growing reactionary spirit at work. In fact, there is a determined effort on the part of some Colonial Powers to make the authority of the United Nations over colonial areas as vague and shadowy as possible. But the situation is not without its bright side. There are 24 members of the United Nations from Asia and Africa, as I have pointed out, who will support the strengthening of the provisions dealing with Colonial Administrations. Not only these countries, but an increasing number of Latin American Republics take an active and sympathetic interest in the welfare and the progress of the colonial peoples. I am bound to add that American tradition is strongly and consistently against the maintenance of colonialism in any part of the world. These are favourable factors of which the fullest advantage should be taken at the present moment. I express the hope that the Bandung Powers will give serious consideration to this matter without further delay and place it on the agenda of the next session.

Shri Joachim Alva (Kanara): There have been whispers, nay, some protests about our foreign policy. It is the continuation of what has been followed in the past. After we attained independence, we had to face so many difficulties. Friends who were doubtful, both within and without, thought for instance that India would not live long enough and could not make any progress because of instability. They thought that we were in the grip of communal frenzy. But they were all disappointed. They have also attacked our internal policies—our socialist pattern of society.

Hence their condemnation of our foreign policy.

Our foreign policy has been essentially of one and the same pattern from the day we attained independence right up to date. Our foreign policy has been based on the strength of ages, the philosophy of Hinduism, the essence of Buddhism, and the good things of Islam, Christianity and Sikhism as never witnessed either by the East or the West. We still hold to that policy and when we do not change that policy, we cannot become selfish. We are all brought together by common ties. We do not give away in action what we deny in thought.

The architect of our foreign policy, is the man who has been nurtured in the science and philosophy of the West and who was reading Marxism and who sat at the feet of our greatest man, Mahatma Gandhi, such a man can never have double standards. I am afraid my friends Shri Jaiprakash Narain and Shri Asoka Mehta, with whom I spent some happy days 25 years ago in Nasik prison and for whom I have great affection and regard, have gone astray from the right path. They have found fault with our internal policy and they have found fault with our foreign policy. I am afraid the atmosphere of the great city of Bombay still weighs in their minds. And what is the atmosphere of Bombay? The Forum of Free Enterprise, the Democratic Research Institute and the Indian Cultural Freedom plus M. R. Masani! These are the agencies which have much to do with foreigners. I am glad that we have spurned their influence.

I looked for one word of condemnation in the practical speech of my hon. friend, Shri Asoka Mehta, about by-passing Egypt. The attack on Egypt by the Anglo-French forces was the worst attack of this century after the end of the last war. Let us not forget it. Egypt has suffered for over hundred years since the time Napoleon had cast his covetous eyes on the Nile area and they are still having

trouble in the Suez Canal area. I had a talk with the Egyptian Ministers in Cairo as also the members of the Revolutionary Council in 1954. I can say that if I am not mistaken the Egyptians are patriotic and determined men. I may say with all the humility that though we have a huge army, we have not the same set of men in our country. They are having a big fight to root out corruption. They may be inexperienced but they are quick and they are learning things. I asked one of the Egyptian Ministers why they did not receive Mr. Chou-en-Lai when he passed through to Cairo in 1954. But then within a year they had revolutionalised their thought and they have made friendship with everybody. They will not take a cent of American money if it means bondage of their country. Let us not forget that. Is it not our duty to go to her help? Is it not our duty to be on their side? What prevented my friend Shri Asoka Mehta from saying that we are solidly behind the people of Egypt in their sufferings? But only the question of Hungary has been taken up. We were trained under the inspiring leadership of Mahatma Gandhi. When British bombs were falling on Egypt we have condemned Britain in the strongest terms. Now when the Russian troops have entered Hungary the Prime Minister has said the same thing about the attack on Hungary. Let us not also forget that nobody raised a voice in San Francisco when U.N. Charter was being hammered out there in 1946. My friend Mr. Shiva Rao referred to San Francisco. Molotov's was the solitary voice raised on behalf of India at San Francisco then. What guarantee have we that we will be free on the Pakistan border? When guarantee have we about our Kashmir and Goa border and that India's independence will not be set at nought? We are not sure about it. But we have got the will to fight if our liberty or freedom is in danger. The Congress party has got the will and so long as it is in power there is no danger. We fought the British imperialism that way and survived.

[Shri Joachim Alva]

Now we are condemning Russia. It was Russia's business to have made friendship with Hungary 15 years ago. If they have failed in that policy, it is so much the worse for them. Then, what about Western Germany where the Americans are sitting tight?

Now, in the case of Goa what is our position? The Prime Minister of Canada said one thing about Goa when he was here and by the time he went away he said something else. They have something else to say about Kashmir. We must know who our friends are and what their motives are. We must distinguish between wheat and chaff. America and France and Britain have not said a word about Kashmir or Goa. So, when we come to the question of our foreign policy, let us not forget who our friends are.

There is another aspect which was dealt with by my hon. friend, Mr. Asoka Mehta and that is the attack on Mr. Krishna Menon. As I said, they are all speaking under the influence of the Bombay Democratic Research Institute etc. and are attacking Mr. Krishna Menon and others and the foreign policy of the country as a whole. Now Mr. Krishna Menon has attended a series of conferences and has taken part in negotiations and he has raised the prestige of our country very high. There is no use in finding fault with him. If you engage a prominent barrister to defend or argue your case, has he to take your instructions every now and then? Is it not up to him to take every step or whatever course of action he thinks expedient in the special circumstances in emergency cases in the interest of his client? Once you entrust a case to him, it is up to him to act in the best way. Let us not quarrel on that point.

Only recently the Swiss Government has rejected the idea of American inspectors sent out with uranium fuel project. The Swiss Government were not prepared to the American observers going round about and

observing things, in the reactors which they were going to set up in Switzerland. Then what is the objection to have U.N. observers in Hungary? We have enough experience of the functioning of U.N. observers in Kashmir. This House knows only too well how they took sides in controversial issues. U. N. observers are not people who are above party politics. So, there was nothing wrong in rejecting such a proposal.

Today international morality has broken down and the first blow at international morality has been dealt by Britain and France. And Russia has also followed suit. The international agreement which we tried to build up as a result of the Panch Shila from the time Marshal Tito arrived in India is still in suspense. At that time many people were doubtful of its utility. But as a result of Marshal Tito's visit, there was a chain of events and Panch Shila has grown. When the Russian leaders came here, they were given a thunderous welcome. But we have never shut our eyes to what is happening. When they interfered in Hungary, our Prime Minister clearly stated that we did not like their interference in Hungary. We have to ask our friends or foes whether they will adopt peaceful methods. What is Marshal Tito supposed to have said? I have not the exact statement, but I would like you to verify it. He is supposed to have said that the first invitation to the Soviet to intervene in Hungary was wrong, but the second invitation had helped to save the forces of socialism. If that is the case, we want to know how the Allied warnings were friendly. If Britain thinks that it can beat down Nasser, to use a very expressive phrase, they are mistaken. *The New York Times* of 4th November contains an item from Nicosia that Nasser has a secret weapon, the weapon of Arab nationalism and that Nasser is more of a hero than he has been to the street mobs of Cairo. This was dispatched from Nicosia. As I told you already, we have not liked Hitler baking

down the five million Jews and roasting them in Germany, nor do we like even the Russians to undermine the force of law and order and start violence in Hungary. Our hearts and our sympathy go out to oppressed and suffering friends whether they be in the East or the West.

The Prime Minister was one of the first statesmen in the whole world to raise his voice when the Americans were carrying on nuclear experiments in Japan and thus endangering the lives of the Japanese people. We are one in condemning aggression and violence on any and every side. But let us not forget the main topic of Egypt. It was a question of a 130-day episode. On June 13, to be exact, the British and French troops left for Suez Canal and in October they launched their attack. In less than 130 days the Anglo-Saxon and French troops were in Egypt preceded by Israeli aggression. Here is a leader in the *Economist*, dated September 22nd 1956—

"Nobody can tell at this stage whether Britain really would have used force against Egypt during the first 48 hours if it had had the force available and in position; the fact is that the force was not available and in position, and this realisation overwhelmed the dangerous initial impulse to slap Nasser down."

We are all apt to forget the French attack on Morocco, on Tunis and Algeria. The British bases are in Lybia. Bases are equally dangerous as stationing of troops. If the whole of Africa or North Africa, a great deal of Asia and other parts of the world are strewn with bases, if the Americans object to an independent government in Guatemala, if the British said that their frontier was on the Rhine, if the Americans said that their frontier is on this side of the Rhine, then is it very unjustified when Russia, which had got its freedom after years of hard struggle, wants a friendly states around her. We do not want any country to be annihilated from the face of the

globe, whether it be England, America, U.S.S.R. or China. We want them to live in terms of friendship. Then only we can have a footwork and groundwork of Panch Shila. Otherwise our own prosperity in a world of unprosperous areas and unhappy days will not be a thing worth enjoying or worth possessing.

What happened to the three-power declaration of 1950 guaranteeing assistance to the victims of aggression in the Middle East? It is only being used because Egypt had to be grabbed, the British had to get back to Suez. I do not want the House to forget the cardinal fact, namely that Egypt has suffered for the sake of India, Egypt has been held in bondage even after India was set free. Therefore, we have always to look to them with an eye of sympathy and we should be of assistance to them.

Mr. Selwyn Llyod, the Foreign Secretary of the U.K., told us in a public meeting in Delhi that the Baghdad Pact was aimed upwards, was aimed northwards, was meant perhaps to annihilate the northern powers. The Baghdad Pact has been torn to pieces; it consists of a company meeting without the Chairman or the Managing Director, and yet they want to pump life and oxygen into that Pact. You are aware how this House was rocked with agitation after the visit of the U.S. Vice-President Nixon to this country, after he went to Karachi and after his return to Washington it was decided to arm Pakistan, how we were very much feeling the cold war. Let us judge other powers, other peoples and other nations by the same yardstick that others apply, in a moral sense and let us apply always the correct moral values. The League of Nations was smashed up because America would not join it and now the United Nations Organisation has been morally smashed up by the Anglo-French combination. Unless they quit from Egypt, unless the Sinai Desert is cleared by Israel, there will be no peace in the Middle East. What has Israel done to Egypt you all know—

[Shri Joachim Alva]

Israel is a small country after all! Not for the next 100 years will the Arabs forget her or forgive her. I am only analysing a situation and am not taking any sides. I am only describing what has happened. Those who advocate the cause of peace in the Middle East should remember that we are very much interested in Israel and Egypt living in terms of amity, in terms of economic co-operation, in terms of a settlement of the refugee problem, and these will be settled only if the Anglo-French forces and Israel forces quit Egypt.

Sir, I am grateful to you for giving me this chance to speak on this occasion. And last but not least, one word about the 'open-sky' declaration made by Marshal Bulganin yesterday; this is one further step in the cause of peace. Whether it came at the right time or wrong time, whether it came with this motive or that motive, we are not concerned with it now. For the Soviets to consent to the open sky inspection is indeed a very substantial progress, and it is almost the first time that India has been asked to sit on a conference table with these great powers. Whether the other countries accept it or not is not what we are concerned with now. We have not invited ourselves nor do we want to sit on a table with other great powers. But India for the first time has been invited to take her active place along with the other great powers—England, America, U.S.S.R. and France. And I hope that before long China will not be excluded.

Shri Sarangadhar Das (Dhenkanal-West Cuttack): I fully endorse what my friend, Shri Asoka Mehta, has said about Hungary. I do not have much to add to that except to say that the Prime Minister today delineated the whole story with regard to Hungary up till now from the beginning.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru : May I interrupt a minute? A complaint is made that I had not helped them

with anything. I have done everything. I have done everything as it came to me. I said that normally details of the voting do not come, that voting takes place about half a dozen times a day, it is complicated voting and the details do not come. I said previously that each paragraph is voted on separately. If more details are necessary, I have to send for them. I got Shri Krishna Menon's speech the night before last. Yesterday I asked for copies to be sent round and it is here this morning. I did as far as it was possible for me and I could not do it earlier.

Shri Sarangadhar Das: I was not going into the matter of the vote in the U.N.O. The Prime Minister's announcement, from the time of his speech in the U.N.E.S.C.O. meeting, has been stepped up in one way or another until we have a complete picture now.

16.41 hrs.

[MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER *in the Chair*]

Whether all the information was available from the very beginning or not, the Prime Minister has now admitted that it was the absolute right of the people of Hungary to have their own Government and no foreign power could intervene. This should have been stated long ago and if that had been done by the Prime Minister, I believe, with the most cordial relations he has with the Russian rulers, the matter might have been different. All this suffering that the Hungarian people had gone through would have been obviated. However, now that he has drawn the full picture and put the blame where it belongs in the matter of Hungary just as he has been doing with regard to the Anglo-French and Israeli attack on Egypt, I believe that he is now in line with the other great power of the other bloc, namely, America.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: Who is in line with what? I am in nobody's line.

very beginning, condemned the action of Soviet Russia in Hungary.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I am in line with nobody except with our country. We agree with the United States on many matters and we disagree with them in some. We agree with the Soviet Union on many matters and we disagree with them in some matters.

Shri Sarangadhar Das: When I say that we are in line with the U.S.A., it does not mean that it showed us the way and the Prime Minister followed it. I do not mean that. I meant that it was what the American Government had done from the beginning in condemning the Soviet action in Hungary; that position is now completely asserted by the Prime Minister.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I will again tell him that that is not so.

Shri Sarangadhar Das: That is my view.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The hon. Member may have his own views; there is no harm in that. But, the Prime Minister says that we are not in line with them in this matter.

Shri Sarangadhar Das: I have understood that. The world has been covered with dark clouds during the last two or three weeks both in Egypt as well as in Hungary. I feel that there is always a silver lining to every cloud. This silver lining, I see, is in the attitude taken by the U.S.A.'s President Eisenhower in regard to both these cases. For many years lately the U.S.A. had been doing everything by military pacts and so on, and by spending millions of dollars with a view to contain communism where it is and not to allow it to spread any further. In doing that, it has aligned itself with many reactionary forces and sometimes supported colonialism. That is why in India and elsewhere, there has been a cry, particularly by the communist friends, about American imperialism. I am convinced that there is no American imperialism. There never

was any. It has never grabbed any land anywhere. There might have been—there was in the last century—dollar imperialism, particularly in South America but in this century, things have changed and there is no such thing as imperialism. With a view to contain communism they have made alliances in one place or another and it really meant that they were supporting the colonialism of England and France. During the period after the second World War, the three had been going together. Many a time it had been said during the last three or four years that the Soviet Government had been trying to create a rift among them. By remaining together with Britain and France, certainly the U.S.A. was supporting colonialism. But, in this case, it condemned it, the moment there was this invasion by the Anglo-French forces and Israel. I am also glad to note that the plan which it had to supply U.K. and France with oil from the American continent is also being held up. I suppose this to be the economic sanction which it is trying to use against U.K. and France.

They have also condemned in equal terms the action of the Soviets in Hungary. The President of the United States has been impartial in this matter. When our Prime Minister goes to visit him, it will be the proper time for him, because he has the most friendly relations with the Soviet authorities for the last two or three years, to play the role of a mediator between the two blocs without any spirit of revenge against anyone. Although we are condemning the action of Britain and France, we know what they are going to suffer economically during the next few months in regard to oil and other things. There should be no spirit of revenge against U.K. or France or the Soviet Russia. If he can play that role properly and bring about evacuation of the forces not only in Hungary but in other East European countries as well as in Egypt, negotiations could be started and the

[Shri Sarangadhar Das]

U.S.A. and other countries could be persuaded to get rid of the bases in foreign lands. Then it will be a great thing and what Egypt and Hungary have suffered lately will not go in vain. Of course, we have to remember that this is not an easy task. However, it must be tried and the world must be rid of this suspense. The fear that any time any little war somewhere or other will result in a third world war must be banished from this world.

श्रीमती कमलेश्वरी शाह (जिला गढ़वाल—पश्चिम व जिला टिहरी गढ़वाल व जिला बिजनौर—उत्तर): श्रीमान्, प्रधान मंत्रियों के स्पष्टीकरण को हम सभी ने सुना। हमें आलोचना से डरना नहीं है। हमारी जितनी आलोचना की जायेगी उतना ही हमारा लाभ होगा क्योंकि आलोचना किसी को ब्रुटि की दिखाने के वास्ते होती है। और आलोचना चाहे किसी भी विचार से की जाये, जिस को आलोचना की जाती है उस का लाभ ही होता है। इसलिए आलोचना को तो हमें अपनाना है। हमें तो केवल यही ध्यान रखना है कि हम ठीक कार्य करते रहें और जहां तक हो सके सब के साथ भलाई करते रहें और दूसरों की मदद करते रहें। यही हमारे लिये सब से अधिक श्रेयस्कर होगा कि हम सब के साथ मित्रता बनाये रहें।

आज मिस्र पर अनुचित हमला हुआ है और हंगरी पर अनुचित हमला हुआ है। कौन ऐसा व्यक्ति होगा जिस के मन में इस से दुःख न हुआ हो और कौन ऐसा होगा जो इस को निन्दा न करे? इन बातों से हम को दुःख होना स्वाभाविक ही है।

झगड़ा मिटाने के बहाने मिस्र पर हमला किया गया यह किसी से छिपा नहीं है। यह बहुत ही निन्दनीय बात है। इसी प्रकार हंगरी पर आक्रमण भी निन्दा की ही वस्तु है।

संयुक्त राष्ट्रसंघ जनरल असेम्बली के प्रस्ताव की एक धारा का हम ने विरोध किया। मैं अपने को राजनीतिज्ञ तो नहीं कहती, लेकिन जहां तक मेरी समझ में आया है, यह बात हम ने उचित ही की है कि उस प्रस्ताव की एक धारा का हम ने समर्थन नहीं किया। आज अगर हम पर भी इसी प्रकार काश्मीर के मामले में बौत जाये तो क्या जो हमारे मित्र देश हैं वह इस बात का समर्थन करेंगे? हरगिज नहीं करेंगे। इसीलिये मेरे तुच्छ विचार में हम ने इस मामले में जो किया है वह ठीक ही किया है।

आज बड़े बड़े राष्ट्र अणुबम जैसे घातक अस्त्रों का निर्माण कर रहे हैं और उन का परीक्षण करने से नहीं रुक रहे हैं। इस का क्या अर्थ लगाया जाये? इस का यही अर्थ लगाया जा सकता है कि अधिक से अधिक लड़ाई और संहार करने के लिये नये नये उपाय सोचे जा रहे हैं। इस के लिये हम को यही सोचना है कि हम इन परीक्षणों को कैसे रोकें और उन देशों को कैसे समझावें कि उन को ये बातें नहीं करनी चाहियें। इन से केवल संहार ही होगा, कोई लाभ नहीं होगा।

श्रीमान्, मैं आप से पूछती हूँ कि पाकिस्तान का हमारे साथ किस तरह का व्यवहार है। कब तक हम अपनी सहन शक्ति को मजबूत बनाये रखेंगे? ईश्वर करे हमारी सहन शक्ति न डिगे और हम सदा उचित बात ही करें। पाकिस्तान पर हमारा कितना ऋण है जो वह हम को वापस नहीं कर रहा है और फिर भी हम से मांग अन्न की और दूसरी चीजों की की जाती है। और जहां तक हम से हो सकता है हम वे चीजें देते रहे हैं। मेरी ईश्वर से प्रार्थना है कि हमारी सहन-शक्ति का बांध न टूटे।

कुछ दिन हुए हमारे यहाँ लंका के प्रधान मंत्री आये थे और उन्होंने ने यहाँ बहुत प्रेम प्रदर्शित किया। पर यह भी विचारणीय बात है कि लंका में सदियों से रहते हुए जो हमारे भारतीय हैं उन को तो निकाला जा रहा है। तो केवल यहाँ आ कर प्रेम प्रदर्शित करने से क्या लाभ हो सकता है? यह प्रेम का प्रदर्शन तो ऐसा हुआ कि मन में तो कुछ और है और व्यवहार कुछ और है। यह नीति कहां तक उत्तम है और इस से किस तरह संसार का कल्याण होगा यह भी विचारणीय बात है। इसी प्रकार गोवा में भारतीय कब तक यातना सहते रहेंगे ?

हमें तो सोचना है कि हम ऐसे कठिन समय में किस तरह से बचें। हमारे सामने यह प्रश्न है। मेरे विचार से तो इस प्रश्न का यही एक हल है कि जो उचित है उस से हम पीछे न हटें और उसे जाहिर करने में संकोच न करें। यही एक हल है जिस से हम अपनी स्थिति ठीक रख सकते हैं। हमें किसी से दुश्मनी नहीं करनी है। पर हमें उचित बात कहने में डरना भी नहीं है।

आज सब देश एक दूसरे को दबाना चाहते हैं। यह राजनीति कहां तक उचित है? कोई भी देश इस बात का हकदार है कि वह स्वतंत्र रहे। इसलिये जहां तक हो सकता है हमें तो यही देखना है और यही प्रयत्न करना है कि सब देश स्वतंत्र रहे और जिस देश को भी दबाया जाये, उस की हमें सहायता करनी चाहिये, चाहे कितना ही बड़ा देश उस को दबाता हो। इस से यह मालूम हो जायेगा कि चाहे हम निर्बल हैं या बलवान हैं, पर हम सदा सत्य का ही साथ देते हैं और सत्य के बल पर ही हम किसी से डरते नहीं हैं।

• श्री श्रीनारायण दास (दरभंगा—मध्य) :
उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, संसार आज ऐसी विषम अबस्था में आ गया है कि जिस में इस बात का पूरा खतरा नजर आता है कि एशिया और अफ्रीका के, या संसार के सभी दूसरे

• देश जो सैनिक अस्त्र शस्त्र से सुसज्जित नहीं हैं, जिन के पास सैनिक ताकत नहीं है, उन की स्वतंत्रता खतरे में आ गई है।

हम समझते थे, जैसाकि हमारे प्रधान मंत्री ने कहां, कि आज की दुनिया में इस तरह का नग्न आघात किसी देश की स्वतंत्रता पर पड़ सकता है जैसाकि भिन्न देश पर पड़ा है। जब रूस के प्रधान मंत्री और वहां की कम्युनिस्ट पार्टी के मंत्री यहां आये थे तो उन्होंने ने हमारे प्रधानमंत्री के साथ मिल कर जिस नीति की घोषणा की उस में भी हमें और दुनिया के बहुत से मुल्कों को यह विश्वास हो गया था कि अब पुराने रबैये में आमूल परिवर्तन होगा और दूसरे देशों की स्वतंत्रता का आदर किया जायेगा और उन के भीतरी मामलों में हस्तक्षेप न करने की नीति बरती जायेगी। लेकिन हंगरी में जो वाकयात हुए हैं उन से स्पष्ट मालूम होता है कि वहां की जनता में जो उस देश की व्यवस्था के खिलाफ उत्साह पैदा हुआ था उस के विरुद्ध रूस का वह रबैया नहीं रहा जिस की हम आशा करते थे। हो सकता है कि रूस के सामने कुछ विशेष कठिनाइयां रही हों और उस को मजबूर हो कर अस्त्र का सहारा लेना पड़ा हो, और दूसरे देश में अपनी फौज भेजनी पड़ी हो, लेकिन दुनिया के और मुल्कों को यह बात बिल्कुल स्पष्ट मालूम पड़ती है कि अगर रूस ने वहां पर शान्ति की नीति अस्तित्व की होती तो अच्छा होता और जो दुनिया के वातावरण में एक नया परिवर्तन दिखाई दे रहा था उस में वृद्धि होती। यद्यपि बहुत से देश पंचशील के सिद्धान्त को पूरे तौर पर नहीं मानते, और सहअस्तित्व के सिद्धान्त को पूरे तौर से नहीं मानते, पर ऐसा मालूम पड़ता था कि दुनिया के बहुत बड़े हिस्से के राष्ट्र ऐसी नीति अस्तित्व करेंगे कि जिस से दुनिया में अमन कायम रहेगी। लेकिन हम देखते हैं कि पश्चिम का साम्राज्यवाद देख रहा है कि एशिया से और अफ्रीका से उस का

[श्री श्रीनारायण दास]

कदम पूरे तौर पर उखाड़ना चाहता है। वह सिंहावलोकन कर के यह देख रहा है कि कहीं कुछ ऐसा रास्ता हम अस्तित्थार कर लें जिस से हमारा साम्राज्यवादी रूप चाहे परिवर्तित रूप में ही सही, लेकिन फिर भी एशिया और अफ्रीका के कुछ मुल्कों में रह जाये।

विश्व पर बिना किसी तरह के प्रवोकेशन के, बिना किसी तरह की उत्तेजना के जबकि संयुक्त राष्ट्र की सभा में यह बात तय हो गई कि स्वेज समस्या को हल करने के लिये कुछ सिद्धान्त मान लिये गये और कहा गया और प्रस्ताव किया गया कि सम्बन्धित देश जैसे इंग्लैण्ड, फ्रांस और इजराइल यह सब मिल कर स्वेज की समस्याओं को निश्चित

सिद्धान्त पर तय करने की कोशिश करेंगे, इस के मान लेने के बाद भी यह देखा गया कि यकायक इजरायल ने मिस्र पर चढ़ाई कर दी और उसी के साथ साथ इंग्लैण्ड और फ्रांस ने भी ईजिप्ट पर चढ़ाई कर दी

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The hon. Member is likely to take some more time.

Shri Shree Narayan Das: Yes.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: He may continue tomorrow.

17.02 hrs.

The Lok Sabha then adjourned till Eleven of the Clock on Tuesday, the 20th November, 1956.