

ELECTION TO THE BOARD OF GOVERNORS OF THE INDIAN INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY, KHARAGPUR

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I have to inform the House that Shri C. P. Parikh being the only candidate nominated for election for appointment as a Member of the Board of Governors of the Institute to be constituted under the Indian Institute of Technology (Kharagpur) Act, 1956, I declare him duly elected for such appointment.

We shall now take up the motion regarding the international situation.

MOTION ON PRESENT INTERNATIONAL SITUATION

THE PRIME MINISTER AND MINISTER FOR EXTERNAL AFFAIRS (SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU): Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, 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 welcome, Sir, this debate in this House on international affairs for a number of reasons: firstly, because in such a debate the comments made by hon. Members are very helpful to Government in considering the situation; secondly, because we feel that in regard to this question of international affairs and these developments in regard to them Parliament should be kept in as close touch as possible, in fact not only Parliament but the people of India. Indeed I have an idea that probably our people generally in the country are more internationally conscious than the people of many other countries. They take interest in these international problems. Our Press, I think, devotes more space to them relatively speaking than the Press of many other countries. I think that is good because these international problems not only affect our own internal problems—we have

therefore to see our own internal problems in some relation to them—but also because thinking of international problems tends to widen our own vision which is right. Otherwise we become perhaps overconscious of the little circle of problems with which we have to deal daily forgetting the larger context in which they function. So, I welcome this debate. At the same time I have a sense of slight unhappiness in not being able to place before this House on this occasion at least any very clear-cut information or clear-cut ideas about many things that are happening. We react moderately or powerfully to events, we criticise them, sometimes we condemn them and we express our disapproval of things. That is fairly easy—whether it helps or not is another matter. It is always easy to condemn others. It is a little more difficult to condemn

12 NOON ourselves or to see our own errors. Much has happened in the past few months which, as the House well knows, has been disapproved of by us and we have expressed our concern and disapproval about it. Much is happening today which we feel very greatly concerned about, not only in its individual context of good or evil, but even more so, in the consequences it has or may have on world peace. We are, in fact going back or have gone back to the concept of the ‘cold war’ in its intense form. Because of these happenings, a certain process of drawing away from it which has been observed during the last two or three years has not only been halted but, for the moment at least, reversed. I do not personally believe that it can be wholly reversed. Too much has happened for us to go back to two or three years ago, but it is a fact that, for the moment, passions have been rising because of some deplorable happenings and the result is something which comes in the way of any cool thinking or dispassionate and objective consideration of events. I can very well understand those strong passions that have been roused and in fact, our own tendency is to react in that way. Nevertheless, we have tried, to the best of our abi-

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

lity, to understand these problems not with a view merely to express an opinion in regard to them, but with a view to help in controlling a deteriorating situation or in finding some peaceful methods for its solution. The governing factor in our thinking and in our action has been this—how can we help in improving the situation, not merely how we can express our reactions or feelings strongly in regard to it? That is relatively easy.

Now, broadly speaking, there are two major problems before the world, or rather, two sets of problems. One might be said to concern Egypt and all that has happened there, including the Israelite invasion, the Anglo-French intervention and invasion and all the rest that has happened. The other concerns Hungary and all that has happened there or may be happening now. These two sets of problems have rather put in the shade many other things that are happening in the world—many other things to which, normally speaking, I would have drawn the attention of this House and spoken about, whether it is Indo-China or whether it is our relation with our neighbouring countries or other matters. And so, today also more or less I shall concentrate my remarks on these two major issues that are giving us so much trouble.

I should like to say just a few words about Pakistan right at the beginning and I am saying these words because, only this morning or yesterday, I read the report of a speech by the Prime Minister of Pakistan in which India found a prominent place. India finds a prominent place, indeed, in many speeches in Pakistan as well as in the press of Pakistan. Normally speaking, one might have felt a little flattered at the attention that is being given to India. But it is really most unfortunate how some leading authorities in Pakistan and the press there have developed certain obsessions and complexes which make it difficult for them to consider any matter in a straightforward way. The other day, a prominent paper of Karachi which refers to India almost

in every issue and leading article called the greatest enemy India, of course. And frequently, I read in those papers from Pakistan articles or comments which amaze and distress me. I can understand their not agreeing with us or their disapproving us or their criticising us. But there are certain standards which, I do hope, might be maintained—certain standards of relatively objective consideration of problems.

Now when we have these major problems outside whether it is Egypt, whether it is Hungary or whether it is any other problem and we are busy in our own country with our Five-Year Plan or other matters, we do not go on discussing our relations with Pakistan. May be, in this House or in the other, we answer questions about it. We may not agree with them, but anyhow, we are relatively cool about it. We are not excited about it and I do submit that, however, bad or difficult a problem may be, excitement does not help. And it amazes me—this state of affairs in Pakistan which finds expression in these exuberant speeches or articles. The Foreign Minister of Pakistan, in the course of the last few weeks or some months, has occasionally made statements which, if I may say so, have almost set a new standard in regard to statements of foreign ministers of any country. I do not wish to revive it or maintain their standard. But it is regrettable that even the normal courtesy and decorum on international affairs, on international controversies or contacts are being forgotten in Pakistan in regard to these matters. What has happened after all? Many things have happened in the world. What has happened *vis-a-vis* India and Pakistan in the course of the last few weeks that in speeches, statement after statement is being made by their prominent men attacking India? I have thought and thought over it. Of course, you may say, "Oh! In Kashmir they have passed the Constitution." Well, that is so. They have passed the Constitution—and a good thing too. But they have been

considering this in the same Constituent Assembly for the last three or four years—four years, I think. Step by step they have gone over it and it has functioned not only as a Constituent Assembly, but as a Legislative Assembly also and they, have, as the House knows, passed a number of laws, made land reforms and all kinds of things. And now, as a final step, they have finalised the Constitution. They have every right to do it. And it may be that this has come as a shock to some people in Pakistan who do not keep pace with events, with the changed conditions. I am sorry if they are so backward in their thinking or in feeling as to what is happening in the wide world. And now there is a barrage of propaganda, attack, on India, because of that—if it is because of that. I do not wish to say much about Kashmir now, because we have to consider other issues today. But I should like to say that all this talk which is so often repeated in Pakistan and sometimes in important sections of the foreign press about Kashmir to the effect that India is breaking its pledges, India is going back on her assurances and so on and so forth is, I may say with all respect, so absolutely devoid of any foundation or any objective consideration of the course of history during the past 9 years that I am surprised that any responsible person should go on repeating it.

The first thing to remember, and remember it always, is that Pakistan is the aggressor in Kashmir, and it is about time that everybody knew about it. In India it is not necessary, but in Pakistan and in foreign countries it is about time that people who go on criticising India should give us their explanation of this fact. Do they deny this fact? Let us have a factual understanding with regard to these points. Opinions may differ. But let us have a clear understanding of all the facts, and the major fact is that Pakistan committed aggression, and still continues aggression in part of the Kashmir territory. That is the major fact. And I may remind the

House that when they talk about plebiscite and about India going back on this first Resolution and the major Resolution of the United Nations Commission, they completely forget that the first thing that was put down in that Resolution was—I do not remember the exact wording—that Pakistan's armies were there. That had been denied by Pakistan. The first thing that the Resolution said was that Pakistan's armies must be withdrawn from the territory of Jammu and Kashmir. That was eight years ago, but that has not been done even up till now. Now, who has failed in carrying out international obligations? Every other obligation followed from that. For instance, we were asked not to withdraw all our armies, but to withdraw—what was that word? I think it was 'bulk'—the bulk of our armies from there. But it was admitted and clearly understood that it was India's duty to give protection to Kashmir. That was made perfectly clear. And after our experience of this utterly unprovoked and unjustified aggression on the Pakistan side, we were not going to leave Kashmir a vacuum for anybody to walk in like that. And after the accession of Kashmir it was our constitutional and legal duty to protect Kashmir. So, that is admitted by everybody and by even the Commission. But when they said that Pakistan's armies must be withdrawn, we agreed to withdraw part of our armies—if you like, the bulk of our armies—and to maintain adequate numbers for the protection of Kashmir. That was our duty. So, that is the position. Now, eight years have elapsed, and they have not yet withdrawn their armies; they sit there still. We went—may be we were wrong in this, but because of our strong desire for peace and in order to come to terms with our neighbouring country we went—very far in our talks. It may well be that many hon. Members sitting here might think that we went too far in our talks, but it exhibited the length to which we were prepared to go to settle this question peacefully. And we discussed the question of withdrawal of our armies and other things,

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru.]

although we could well have said "No, no. We would not talk to you till you have withdrawn your armies". That was a perfectly legitimate question. We could have easily said, "At least put an end to the aggression by withdrawing your armies." We were perfectly justified in saying that we would not talk to them. Still, we talked to them, and even then we could not come to any agreement with them. Even after the withdrawal of their army, I challenge anybody to deny what I say that Pakistan committed aggression in Kashmir. Secondly, that aggression is a continuing aggression, because they have got their armies in one-third of the whole territory of Jammu and Kashmir. And it is true we have moderated our position and we have tried to come to terms with them, and we have even given up the strong position that we had. But these two basic facts remain. The original Resolution of the United Nations Commission laid down as a first thing that Pakistan must withdraw its armies. That has not been done, although eight years have passed. Now, when this Resolution was passed, most of us thought, and certainly I thought, that in the course of a year or eighteen months the Resolution will be given effect to and we will try to solve the problem. And because of that, we rather held our hands in regard to various developments in Kashmir. Well, a year passed, two years passed, three years passed, and like that so many years passed, but no kind of a settlement or even an approach to a settlement came, and Pakistan would not even withdraw its army. Therefore, ultimately we said "We cannot wait for ever or wait till Pakistan agrees to do something, and we have to go our way in Kashmir." It was then that the Jammu and Kashmir Government decided to convene a Constituent Assembly, after two or three years had elapsed and nothing had been done. They asked us, and we said "You are completely welcome to do it—not only a Constituent Assembly, but a Legislative Assembly". They were anxious to have land reforms and various other reforms. So,

they went ahead with it. At that time, there was an outcry in Pakistan, when this Assembly was going to meet, and they said something about India going behind her assurances and promises. Our representative at that time—I think Shri B. N. Rau or Shri Gopalaswami Ayyangar, I am not sure, but one of them anyhow—said that the Jammu and Kashmir Government had a perfect right to have an Assembly—Legislative or Constituent Assembly—and they had perfect right to frame their own Constitution, but the Jammu and Kashmir Government or their Assembly cannot bind down the Government of India or our Parliament. That was patent. But we did not wish to come in their way to go ahead. So, we said that any undertakings that we have given, we shall stand by them, that is to say, any action in Kashmir will not come in the way, although other matters may come in the way. And so, we made that clear statement. Now if I may repeat, the very first part of that joint undertaking between the two countries and the U.N. Commission about the withdrawal of Pakistan's troops was never given effect to. But we cannot wait for ever before we take any action. Secondly, eight years have passed, or even more than eight years since this Kashmir trouble in its present form started. And after all there is such a thing as an assurance not going on for ever and holding things up. Therefore, we certainly allowed and encouraged the Kashmir Government to go ahead with framing their Constitution. I stated, either in this House or in the other, about the beginning of this year or last year, that there must be some finality about these things. It cannot be kept open because Pakistan won't act in a particular way. So, that much about Kashmir.

And may I add that we are not at all alarmed at the prospect of this matter being taken up in the Security Council? If it is taken up, well, we shall have to go back to the whole A.B.C. of this problem, and ask the Security Council, before it does any-

thing else, to examine the aggression issue. Let it examine that issue fully as well as the other connected issues, and not just take it somewhere midway, because in our desire to have a settlement, we had made various suggestions, and in fact various proposals were made.

SHRI H. C. DASAPPA (Mysore): What about the Pakistan Prime Minister's reference to an attack from India?

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: Yes, the hon. Member is perfectly right. What he says is rather amazing to me. It has been stated here as follows:

"The Pakistan Prime Minister, Mr. Suhrawardy, declared here today that Pakistan would continue to seek alliances—military and otherwise—as long as there was 'even a remote danger from India to the country's safety and territorial integrity'."

"He stated that Indians as a whole had not accepted Pakistan's existence and there was every possibility of a leadership arising in India which might work for 'greater India' by undoing partition and annexing Pakistan."

"He took pains to defend Pakistan's membership of the Baghdad Pact and said: 'Even if there is a five per cent. or a two per cent. chance of an attack (from India), I must be strong enough to see that that chance should be zero per cent.'"

It is entirely for the Prime Minister of Pakistan and his Government to decide what alliances or pacts they sign with other countries. They are an independent country, but it is for us to decide as to what our reactions to what they do. The House will remember that this question of Kashmir itself was powerfully affected by the fact that Pakistan came to an agree-

ment with the United States of America for supplying arms, armaments. That changed the situation completely from our point of view and we made it perfectly clear. In fact, talks were going on with the Pakistan Minister and they suddenly came to an end. I do not object in the slightest; how can I? Pakistan is a completely independent country, and I do not wish to come in the way of their alliances at all, but if those alliances in my opinion affect my country, I have to shape my country's policy accordingly; I have to shape our attitude in regard to any world question accordingly.

Mr. Suhrawardy thinks that Pakistan stands in danger of an attack from India. What can I say about that except that this kind of thinking itself, I think, is the result, shall I say an obsession, some kind of obsession or complex that they may have developed? Anything more remote from reality I cannot imagine in this wide world. I cannot speak obviously for every individual in India. I do not know what certain persons with perverted ideas may wish or may not wish, but I do say that it is completely wrong to think or to say that people in India have not accepted Pakistan. They have completely accepted Pakistan, and they have accepted it not only because we agreed to Pakistan, the partition of India—Pakistan came into existence therefore with our agreement—but also because all that has happened in these past years has made it perfectly clear to my mind—and I hope to other minds too—that any kind of the slightest reversal of that partition would be highly injurious certainly to India. Here we are busy with our plans, Five Year Plans, and all kinds of schemes for development, and it would be a person who can only be described as a fool or a lunatic who would put aside all these problems and work of ours and indulge in adventures of that kind. Apart from any other point of view, from the strictly opportunist point of view in favour of India, it would be completely wrong for anyone to think of

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru.]

any kind of adventure or action against Pakistan. I want to make this perfectly clear. It is not a question, as Mr. Suhrawardy seems to imagine that some kind of alternative leadership might do it. Hon. Members are sitting opposite here and in the country, and I am quite sure that there is no alternative leadership which thinks in those terms. The fact of the matter is that the complete failure of Pakistan's policies, international and national, have led them to find some excuse for their public. About their national policies, it is not for me to talk about them, but we know what the economic and political conditions there are, they are not conditions on which one can congratulate anyone. We know, and here a fact which is more important than any other fact, certainly more important than the Kashmir issue, is this fact of the continuous exodus from East Pakistan to India. Let Pakistan explain. Let the great journals of the Western World who talk so much about Pakistan and India explain. They moralise to us and tell us what our duties are. This is an amazing phenomenon. Years have passed; year after year passes, and the exodus continues and three and a half million people have come from East Pakistan to India, may be more.

THE MINISTER FOR REHABILITATION (SHRI MEHR CHAND KHANNA): More than four millions.

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: My friend says more than four millions. It is an amazing number. One can understand the original exodus from India to Pakistan and from Pakistan to India. There was an upheaval, and it happens, but this is a kind of continuing thing. Surely there is something very sick there, some illness, some disease, which afflicts the people there, which makes this happen, but we are talking about Pakistan's policies.

Mr. Suhrawardy talked a great deal about military alliances and pacts. So

far as I am concerned, he is welcome to his military alliances. He can have a few more if he likes, because if there is anything that is absolutely clear, that has become clear in the last few months, it is the weakness or futility of these military alliances and pacts. I do not quite know what has happened to the SEATO. Nobody has mentioned about it from India for a very very long time, but mention is certainly made of the Baghdad Pact. A good deal of mention has been made of the Baghdad Pact but the Baghdad Pact has undergone a strange transformation. In some ways, the most important member of the Baghdad Pact and certainly the biggest country, the most powerful country in the Pact is the United Kingdom. Now, we find some of the other members of the Pact meeting together and proclaiming, "We have not invited the United Kingdom. We do not want it in this." And it is going to be something in the nature of what is called a Muslim Bloc. They are welcome to it, but the House will see it is changing its character. It is hinted that the United Kingdom may not be in it but that they would like the United States of America to come in as the leading Muslim power, I suppose, in the world. It is really extraordinary, the way these things are explained. I doubt very much—I cannot speak for the U.S.A.—but I would certainly imagine that the U.S.A. is not happy at its being dragged into this peculiar position.

Take this Muslim bloc idea. What was the result of the Baghdad Pact right at the beginning? The first result of the Baghdad Pact which was mainly to bring security to the Mid-Eastern Region was the splitting up of the Muslim and of Western Asia. That was the first effect of it, and to bring insecurity to that area, and if I may say so, to bring about the very thing which it was meant to avoid and to prevent the greater interest of the Soviet Union in the Mid-Eastern countries. After all the Baghdad Pact—what was it meant against? It was presumably against the Soviet Union. Now I am

not quite clear what Mr. Suhrawardy or his predecessors in the Prime Ministership of Pakistan thought about it, because they have spoken in differing voices. They have spoken with great assurance to the United States and to the other countries that in his Pact, of course, we join you in your fight against Communism. This Pact is not meant to be against India. I know they have said so both to the United States and to the United Kingdom and other countries: "It is entirely against the danger from the North that we have this." I know also that they have said to the leaders of the Soviet Union 'This has nothing to do with Communism. Not at all. We are not afraid of you. It is against India.' So these kinds of different statements have been made. I don't know. Whatever it was, the fact remains that the Baghdad Pact was one of the major reasons, I think, for the countries of Western Asia and Egypt falling out among themselves. There was a split in the Arab League which had been holding together. On the one side Iraq and Pakistan and Iran and Turkey and one or two other countries and on the other side, Egypt Syria and Saudi Arabia. Jordan was, to some extent on this side then. Since then it appears to have shifted somewhat. So this famous attempt at securing security of the Mid-East resulted, first of all, in this breaking up of the Arab League and the conflict between those countries is there and it served almost as an invitation for the Soviet Government to take greater interest in Mid-East. Of course the mere fact of geography, the fact that the Soviet Union is there also inevitably makes it take interest. You cannot expect to ignore a great power when it is sitting at your door-step and decide on major policies without the slightest reference to it, but anyhow this was the result of the Baghdad Pact. Gradually many other things happened. I cannot—I am not giving you the history of this but there was the sale of arms, aircraft etc., from the Soviet Union, from Czechoslovakia and others, to Egypt and to Syria, and may be to one or two other countries, which created a

great deal of consternation. I say even that was at least partly due to the system of alliances. If you have an alliance on the one side, inevitably it produced reaction in the other and they try to do that themselves or without an alliance they try to help countries which might serve their purpose. This is the normal way in international affairs. You build up a system of military alliances on the one side. Another system grows up on the other. You build up NATO and the Warsaw Treaty comes up on the other so that you cannot deal with these questions by these systems of alliances and we have seen it today how it broke down. It is breaking down. There was the Baghdad alliance and there were others. They broke down in the stress of events; between Greece, Turkey and Yugoslavia, other factors came in. So, as I was saying, one of the great things that has happened is the futility of this system of alliances, but if Mr. Suhrawardy pins his faith in the Baghdad Pact, he is welcome to it. Anyhow what can I do about it except to say that it is our conviction that these systems of military alliances come in the way of peace, promote insecurity, do not bring about security for which they are intended and actually help in the race for armaments?

So, now, as I mentioned it at the beginning, there are two major areas of trouble—Egypt and Western Asia and Hungary. The two are, of course, entirely different, in kind. In Egypt and in the Western countries, a great deal has happened subsequent to the Anglo-French invasion. But if you wish to prevent yourself getting entangled in all these matters, I think you will come to the conclusion that the very basis of the present trouble is the presence of foreign forces in Egyptian territory. Of course I can go back before they came, but I am not going back to it. It was on the one hand the Israeli invasion of Egypt that started the new and acute phase of this trouble and on the other hand the Anglo-French bombing of Cairo etc., and subsequent landing of forces

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru.]

there. Now so long as those forces are not withdrawn, whether they are the Israeli forces or the Anglo-French forces, so long you cannot get on with any kind of a settlement of any problem there, even mainly dealing with the Suez Canal. We are anxious to have the Suez Canal function as other countries are, but you cannot just do it. You cannot do it till you get rid of these forces which always keep the situation tense and on the verge of war. That, I think, is the core of the problem. Now, if one looks at the present state of affairs in some of the West Asian Countries, one sees confusion. One sees, to some extent, a process of disintegration going on. It is an extraordinary state of affairs, each country complaining against the other. It is difficult for me, with all the sources of information at my disposal, to find out exactly what is happening. It must be much more difficult for hon. Members who have fewer sources of information. We read reports of armies being massed on the borders of countries. Russia, it is said, is massing armies on the borders of some countries. Turkey is massing armies somewhere else or Iraq is massing somewhere. All these are newspaper reports. I don't say that they are correct. I am not saying it. But newspapers every day contain reports of troop movements to this border or that border whether Russia is massing her armies there or Turkey's armies are massed on the Iraqi border or on the Syrian border or some other border or the Iraqi armies on the Syrian border or Iraqi armies are sitting in Jordan it is a most confusing situation and behind these movements are all kinds of intrigues to pull down this Government or even ideas of well putting an end to one or two odd countries and annexing parts of their territories, possibly ideas encouraged sometimes by other more distant powers but anyhow affecting the policies of those countries there.

Meanwhile, there have been internal troubles. There is no doubt about it that all over the Arab countries

there has been intense feeling against the Israeli invasion of Egypt and the Anglo-French action in Egypt. There is no doubt about it. Nevertheless, an attempt has been made by some Governments to oppose Egypt in many ways, to oppose the feeling for Egypt in their own countries. There has been trouble in Iraq because the people are pro-Egypt and the Government does not like it. There has been a good deal of trouble there. Only this morning, hon. Members may have seen the strange arguments advanced by the Prime Minister of Pakistan which are critical of Egypt. After all that has happened, for Pakistan to say that is surprising indeed. It shows the confusion that exists. For the sake of this argument, we may treat Pakistan as a country of the Middle East because its politics and the rest are more or less on those lines though rather more backward than those of the countries of the Middle East. What am I to tell this House about this confusing situation except that one sees, by, the Israeli attack on Egypt and by the Anglo-French attack on Egypt a certain process of disruption and disintegration having started there. The first thing to check this process is for the Anglo-French and the Israeli troops to be withdrawn. Then only can you deal with the situation. Fortunately, the United Nations have taken swift steps to form an International Force and we have contributed to it; our detachment is there. If I may put it in another way, vacuums have been created and are being created in the Middle East and a vacuum cannot exist for long, especially a power vacuum, and there is rivalry as to who will succeed in filling that vacuum. Previously, all this area was supposed to be an area of British influence. Now, the British influence has greatly lessened, to say the least of it. Now, who is to fill that vacuum? It may be either the countries themselves or some outside countries. Naturally, we want these countries to be independent,—to profit by their resources and to be on friendly terms with other countries, but not to be under the subordination of other countries. Now, there is that vacuum at present and whenever there is a

vacuum in such a way, dangers arise. Dangers are not local because, if anything further happens there in the shape of any conflict, immediately it may affect the whole world situation; it may develop into a world war and because of this—the same thing applies to Hungary—we have to be very careful as to what we say and what we do. Our primary object is to prevent war and the secondary object is to help in improving the situation and lessening tensions. If really to satisfy some inner urge in us, we take some action and that action results in worsening the situation, well, that is poor satisfaction that we have condemned the world by giving expression to our strongly-felt opinions but have helped the world go towards the pit of disaster. This is what often checks up and has checked us. Many hon. Members here and the public naturally are not in almost daily contact with things happening and with the dangers of the situation. They react as any normal human beings would react in expressing their opinions, but a Government cannot easily react in that way of expressing itself strongly when it feels that the situation is not so simple. It is not black and white; there are shades of grey and one just cannot say “yes” or “no”. After all, the objective is not the condemnation or the praise of a Government but the settlement of a problem or the easing of tension.

May I repeat that in regard to Egypt, the first thing is the withdrawal of these troops? Unfortunately, there has been great delay in this. After all, there was great speed in bringing them there, and therefore there should be no physical difficulty in taking them away. I am glad to say, as far as I can say, that it is agreed that the Anglo-French and the Israeli forces are going to be withdrawn. They have agreed to that.

I am not saying anything from secret knowledge; this is what has been said repeatedly. I hope they will be withdrawn soon. I believe that the Foreign Minister of the United King-

dom is going to make a statement this afternoon in the British House of Commons and I hope that he will make this point clear in his statement. Therefore, I shall not say much more about it now.

I should like to say a few words about Hungary. Again, here is a question which has powerfully affected people and has raised passions. It has been a terrible tragedy; there is no doubt about it, but, as I stated in the other House. I have no doubt in my mind that in Hungary there has been a popular movement, a popular rising in which large numbers of the people there including—not only including but more especially including—the workers there, the trade-unions there have participated. It is admitted by everybody that in the past numerous grave mistakes were committed in Hungary by the ruling authorities there and it is admitted that these people—everybody again—were justified in raising their voice and objecting to those things happening which are now admitted to be mistakes. But, it is said that they went too far in that direction; may be they went too far, but the point is that it was undoubtedly a popular upheaval against certain leading people in their own country and later, it took the shape of an upheaval against the Soviet forces sent there. Well, this great tragedy occurred. Right from the beginning, I stated repeatedly two things; one is that the people of Hungary should be allowed to fashion their own destiny, and secondly, the Soviet or all foreign forces should be withdrawn from there. Now, these two things have been said right from the beginning. It may be that having accepted a certain policy, it may have to be faced. Whatever it is, the practical politics of it might be considered, provided the policy is understood and is given effect to with fair speed. Things cannot disappear overnight and when these upheavals have taken place, one should like to bring about the changes in a way so as to leave not only as few scars as possible but also so as not to bring about big reactions on

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru.]

the other side which will again create something else. These difficulties occurred but the basic things was that. Now, in this matter we have been addressing the Hungarian Government and the Soviet Government as well as the other Governments who are interested and we have expressed our viewpoint and our concern and we have had replies. I shall not go into all these developments. The House will remember that we sponsored a Resolution in the United Nations together with Indonesia and Ceylon and may be one or two other countries, suggesting that the Secretary General of the U.N. should go there or should be invited there and allowed to go there, and U.N. observers also, I believe, because very grave charges were made about deportations on a large scale. Now, those charges were denied by the Hungarian Government. Now, when charges are made and denied, it does not seem to us to be becoming for any responsible organisation to pass judgment without enquiring. Even though one may be inclined to believe something, one ought to have some kind of an enquiry and that is what we suggested, that the Secretary General and the U.N. observers might go and report. It is not a question of deliberate falsehood being spread but it is so easy in an excited atmosphere that must prevail in Hungary or in Budapest, for all kinds of petty happenings to be exaggerated, for all kinds of rumours to take the shape of facts. Hon. Members know sometimes if there is any trouble here or anywhere what wild rumours circulate about it and we find later that there was little substance in them so that it is difficult to separate the truth from the part that is exaggerated. Anyhow, we took up the position in the U.N. that the U.N.—the U.N. is gravely concerned with this matter—should not decide finally that this has been so, that deportations have happened when it is clearly denied, and it must enquire into it. Now, we were anxious that opportunities for the Secretary General to go there should be afforded and we addressed the Hungarian Government on the subject pointing

out to them and pleading with them that this should be so. Unfortunately, our Ambassador to Hungary is also the Ambassador to the Soviet Union and he fell ill just at that moment and he could not go there. We had a representative in Budapest throughout, the First Secretary, and I should like here to express my high appreciation of the way this First Secretary, Mr. Rahman, functioned throughout these very difficult times. I think he was one of the very very few diplomats who functioned at all in Budapest. Others were there but I do not think they functioned at all during this period, but Mr. Rahman continued to function and continued to report although it took many days for the report to reach us. Because our Ambassador to Hungary, Mr. K. P. S. Menon, could not go there, we asked our Ambassador in Prague, Mr. Khosla, to proceed there immediately as my personal representative to meet the Hungarian authorities and he has been there and is still there now. I believe now Ambassador K. P. S. Menon has also arrived there yesterday. So we tried our utmost to explain our position to the Hungarian authorities because we attach great importance to the Secretary General of the U.N. being invited to go there as well as U.N. observers. Now, normally it is not a good thing for a country to accept outside observers to come in but in the peculiar circumstances of the case and this question of deportations having been raised, we thought it would be desirable. But I am very very sorry that up till now neither the Hungarian Government nor the Soviet Government has agreed to the Secretary General going or to the observers going there. They have said, 'this will be an infringement of our sovereignty and these people coming from outside might unsettle settled things in the public mind'. Well, it is very unfortunate and they say that there are hundreds and hundreds—600 I believe—of foreign correspondents and 'it is not that we are hiding anything'! But the fact remains—I think that is most unfortunate—that they are not allowing the Secretary General of the United Nations to go there. And

the natural inference from this is that people begin to think that the charges brought against them in regard to deportations and others are true or partly true. I hesitate even now to pass final judgment because they have denied them but I cannot hide the fact from this House that the inference which is created in people's minds is that there is some truth at least in those charges and that perhaps they may have been exaggerated.

Then, again, there has been this case which I consider most unfortunate, the case of Mr. Nagy—it is spelt Nagy but it is pronounced, I believe, as 'Nodge'—the previous Premier of Hungary. Now, he took refuge, sought asylum in the Yugoslav Embassy in Budapest; he and some colleagues of his. I will not go into that question as to how and under what circumstances he did that but he did it. Later the Yugoslav Government and the Hungarian Government of Mr. Kadar came to an agreement and written assurances were given about Mr. Nagy returning to his house there. While he was returning, he was arrested by Soviet authorities and sent to Rumania. Now, I must confess.....

SHRI H. N. KUNZRU (Uttar Pradesh): Is it certain that Mr. Nagy is in Rumania now?

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: I believe he is. I believe he is in Rumania; not only in Rumania but in the Carpathian Mountains. He is being kept in a very healthy spot—one of the health resorts of Rumania in the Carpathian Mountains. The fact is, I believe that he is there, he and his colleagues. Also some letters have come from him to his people, I believe, in Budapest. But even though he may be kept comfortably in a health resort, the fact remains that this breaking of an assurance given by the Kadar Government, either breaking it itself or being unable to keep to it, is a very serious matter and I am not surprised at the Yugoslav Government feeling indignant over it

and very unhappy about it. I believe that they have published certain documents. All this does create a very unfortunate impression about the way things have been done in Hungary. Now, I might mention that today the General Assembly of the U.N.O. is likely to consider a Resolution on Hungary. Now, I am mentioning this just to put before the House how difficult our position becomes when a complicated position is dealt with in a simple way and you have to say 'yes' or 'no' to it when neither 'yes' nor 'no' is a correct answer in our opinion. I shall just briefly tell the House what the resolution is. I think it has appeared in the public press. I don't remember. Anyhow, here the resolution refers to all the previous resolutions on Hungary passed by the General Assembly and indirectly, if not confirms them but in a sense does confirm them. Now, of all the previous resolutions, one was our own resolution. In regard to one we were partly agreeable; in regard to some we disagreed completely. Now, in this in the preamble there is this general sweep about all the other resolutions. We do not agree with all the other resolutions that had been passed. We may explain this, of course, but I am saying about the difficulty when we have to vote. If we vote 'yes' we vote for something which we disagreed with in the past. If we vote 'no' then we vote against something which we want to vote for and this difficulty arises. Then, again, in this resolution the Hungarian Government is repeatedly referred to as the Hungarian authorities, that is, the Soviet Government and the Hungarian authorities. That, of course, is deliberate. Now, the Hungarian Government, it may well be so, is not a government which is functioning entirely with its own will and power. That might well be so. I am inclined to think so myself. but deliberately not to call it a Government means that you are not going to deal with it as a Government and they will not deal with you and other steps you have to take later. In fact, you are closing the ground for dealing with them as a Government and preparing the ground for dealing with

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru.]

them in some other way. Now, that may or may not be justified; but that certainly comes in the way of any peaceful approach to this problem by consent of the Hungarian Government and the Soviet Government—whether it is in regard to the removal of the Soviet troops or anything else. So that, it is not a wise approach, even though the statement itself may have some truth in it. Then there is a reference to this deportation of Hungarian citizens, as if it is a continuing process. Now, again I say this is denied completely by the Hungarian Government and the Soviet Government. For us it is true that their refusal to allow the Secretary General or others to go there does put a great deal of blame on them and it is for them to justify all this. Nevertheless, for the U.N. to accept as a fact something which is denied stoutly in this formal way seems to us not quite correct. Then the resolution goes on. It says that they must be called upon—the Hungarian authorities and the Soviet Union—to send a final reply in the next four days. That is all right except that in such matters an ultimatum of four days—the time and the date—does not help. The point is, what are we aiming at? Either we are aiming at some kind of a solution on the lines which I have indicated, that is, the removal of the Soviet armies from there, that is, the Hungarian people should decide for themselves. Now, if we create conditions which prevent this, that is not a wise move.

Then, another thing it says, ask the Secretary General immediately to despatch observers to Hungary and other countries. Now, observe, we ourselves are in favour of the despatch of observers to Hungary, but obviously they can only go to Hungary if the Hungarian Government lets them. They cannot go at the head of an army to observe and to force the Hungarian Government. If the Hungarian Government does not let them go, obviously they cannot go into Hungary. To send them to other countries, to observe what is

happening in Hungary seems rather odd. It means really to go to the refugees from Hungary, to the emigres from Hungary and get their accounts. Now, their accounts are valuable—I do not say they are not, but obviously the accounts of the refugees are one-sided, very excited accounts and it is difficult to form an objective judgment of the situation from that. It only will probably give us a more exaggerated view of a very bad situation and anyhow it will be a view of something that has occurred not of the present.

SHRI K. S. HEGDE (Madras).
What is the alternative that we are suggesting?

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU.
What is the alternative that we are suggesting?—to whom?

SHRI K. S. HEGDE: The course that may be adopted by the United Nations.

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU:
It is not up to me to suggest alternatives. I say this does not work and I say this resolution could have been easily improved upon with a view to making it constructive and functioning. I can improve upon it. I want this process to go on. I want the Secretary General and the U.N. observers to go there. But this thing, at least part of it, I agree with. I have mentioned to you this resolution because the difficulty that arises is that with part of it we agree and part of it we do not. Now, we cannot say 'yes' and we cannot say 'no'. We get into these difficulties. They cannot easily be solved.

Now, I do not know how things will shape themselves there, but here is a situation which may well draft to war: whether in the Middle East or in Hungary, because whether you like or you do not like, the fact remains that you cannot take steps which involve the sudden humiliation of any country—some times you have to, that is a different matter—whether it is England, whether it is Egypt, whe-

ther it is any country. The way to get things done is to lay stress on what you want done avoiding humiliation. Then a country gradually agrees to it. But if in our passion and anger we wish to humiliate a country into the bargain, then it resists that and creates more difficulties and the very solution we desire becomes more difficult.

There is just one thing more I should like to mention here before I end. The House might know that I received a communication from Mr. Bulganin in regard to disarmament. He had sent it to some of the great powers. He has sent me a copy. We are grateful for that. And I sent him a brief reply thanking him and saying that this really is a matter for the big powers to determine. There is nothing much for us to do about it, but we shall gladly help if our help is needed. Now, the unfortunate fact of it is that these proposals had been made at a time when these passions are excited and people think in terms of war. You really have to deal with this atmosphere and improve it and lessen the tensions before you sit down and talk about disarmament. When we read everywhere that forces are being massed in this frontier or that frontier, to talk about disarmament becomes rather unreal. That is what I say. As for the rest, the whole disarmament problem is a most vital problem of the day and until that is done I think nothing much will happen, but again there, there is China—a great country, a powerful country. Is it conceivable that some orders issued by other countries or by the U.N. are going to be accepted by China as orders? You cannot have it both ways, ignore China, keep China outside the pale of international society, and then issue orders to China. I am quite sure that China wants peace and China would gladly agree to any reasonable proposal, but neither China nor indeed a smaller country is prepared to accept this kind of orders even though among the group giving orders might be the Soviet Union. Therefore, it gets tied up, these questions about China's recognition and the rest.

In the last few weeks we have had very eminent visitors here, as the House knows. Only yesterday or the day before—I am getting mixed up—Premier Chou En-lai was here and has gone on a tour of India for ten days or so. I had occasion to talk with him about various matters. They were very profitable talks showing a very large measure of agreement, showing also a measure where we did not agree or where we agreed to differ. There is nothing very surprising about that. The surprising part is that in spite of various differences we do agree on so many matters that we can co-operate, and even where we disagreed in some matters, it is a friendly disagreement and it does not affect our friendship and co-operation. Now this afternoon we are having the Prime Minister of Nepal reaching Delhi. We shall welcome him of course in a friendly and cordial way, because Nepal is particularly and closely associated with us in history, geography and culture. We want it to flourish as an independent country and to develop and progress. But quite inevitably our relations with Nepal have to be closer than those of many other countries because, as I said, of this bond of history, geography and culture.

Sir, I ventured to take a lot of time of this House, and now I move.

SHRI H. C. DASAPPA: We would like to hear also something about the Prime Minister's proposed visit to the United States.

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: There is nothing much to say about it except that I shall be leaving on the 14th December for the United States to see President Eisenhower and I shall come back within two weeks.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN:
Motion moved:

“That the present international situation and the policy of the Government of India in relation there to be taken into consideration.”

SHRI KISHEN CHAND: (Andhra Pradesh): Sir, I beg to move:

"That at the end of the Motion, the following be added, namely:—

'and having considered the same, this House regrets to note—

(i) that the stand of the Government of India with regard to the interference of U.S.S.R. in the affairs of Hungary was not strong and courageous enough in the beginning; and

(ii) that the Indian delegate voted against the resolution regarding Hungary in U.N. General Assembly."

SHRI H. C. DASAPPA: Sir, I beg to move:

"That at the end of the Motion, the following be added, namely:—

'and having considered the same, this House approves the said policy'."

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The motion and the amendments are before the House. We shall take up discussion after lunch.

The House stands adjourned till 2.30 P.M.

The House adjourned for lunch at five minutes past one of the clock.

The House reassembled after lunch at half-past two of the clock, MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN in the Chair.

SHRI KISHEN CHAND: Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, we have listened with rapt attention to a very fine enunciation of the foreign policy of the Government of India by the hon. Prime Minister. Sir, I would have liked to confine myself to the situation in Egypt and Hungary, but as the hon. Prime Minister has referred to the situation in Kashmir and to our rela-

tions with Pakistan, I would have to say a few words in this connection.

I entirely agree with the hon. Prime Minister that nobody in India ever thinks of annulling the partition. We have now in our country, problems like the Second Five-Year Plan, removal of poverty, raising the standard of living and so many other things—such problems that we shall not ever think or desire that once more Pakistan may be joined to India. We do not want it. We have enough of our problems. And it is incomprehensible to any Indian how the Prime Minister of Pakistan gets the notion that there is a chance of India ever attacking that country. Our motto is peace—peace at every stage, almost at any cost. Sir, in the matter of Kashmir we should have continued our stand on this point that until and unless the forces of Pakistan are removed from Kashmir, there should be no talk with the leaders of Pakistan. We yielded on that point and the whole history of the subsequent events has brought home on point only that in foreign policy when you are dealing with foreign relations, whatever policy you may arrive at, you must stick to it and never yield on it. One concession is that we agreed to have talks with the representatives of Pakistan in spite of the fact that Pakistan had indulged in aggression on Indian territory because once Kashmir had acceded to India, it had become Indian territory. The Government should have made it a condition that until and unless the entire forces of Pakistan go out of Kashmir, we will not have any further discussion with them. In spite of that fact, we went on discussing with them and the result is that during the last six or eight years, we have had only calumny from them—from the leaders of Pakistan and the press of Pakistan—and I think that it is partly due to the weakness of our hon. Prime Minister in conceding the request of Pakistan to continue further negotiations.

SHAH MOHAMAD UM AIR (Bihar): Why don't you show that generosity?

SHRI KISHEN CHAND: Sir, you see the result of generosity. You may be generous as individuals but when destinies of nations are under consideration, the foreign policy should not be based on generosity. We do not want a pound of flesh, but we want fair and honest dealings. When we find that the other party backs out of it, we should be very careful that we do not make a mistake of that type.

I agree with the Hon. Prime Minister that the fears of Pakistan are absolutely unfounded. But I will not spend my time on Pakistan or Kashmir. I have sent in an amendment and I will try to explain how the attitude of our Government to the two blocs is different. Sir, our Prime Minister has very ably enunciated the principles of Panch Sheela. Our whole foreign policy is based on these principles of Panch Sheela—a principle of absolute non-interference in other nations' affairs, a policy of peace and promotion of peace. And it is in the interpretation of the principles, that I find certain differences. There have been unfortunately two very sad events in recent years—one in Egypt concerning the Western bloc and another in Hungary concerning the Eastern bloc. If we want to judge our foreign policy, we have to see how the hon. Prime Minister has applied the principles of Panch Sheela in the case of Egypt and in the case of Hungary. We have got to examine carefully whether in the interpretation of the Panch Sheela, he has leaned a little more on the side of the Eastern bloc—that is, the Communist bloc—and against the Western bloc.

Sir, we are a peace-loving nation. We do not want to have anything to do with the two blocs. Our policy is an absolutely non-alignment policy and we should be very careful that we strictly interpret our principles of Panch Sheela evenly between the two blocs and we do not bend even slightly on one side or the other.

Events in Egypt have moved very fast. And if I have to go back to the early stages, the whole event has been

clouded by the subsequent invasion by Israel and the Anglo-French nations. So, if I give the sequence of history and point out some mistakes in the early stage of our foreign policy, they should not be overshadowed or misguided by the subsequent invasion of Egyptian soil by the Anglo-French forces or the Israeli forces.

Sir, I maintain that the Egyptian problem was a simple one. Nobody in his senses will ever deny that the Suez Canal is in the Egyptian territory; geographically and historically, the Suez Canal is situated in Egypt. It is entirely the property of Egypt. But nature in its bounty gives to all nations certain things and they progress only by the best utilisation of nature's bounties. You know, Sir, that Saudi Arabia has got petroleum and if that country develops it to the best advantage, their nation will progress. Similarly, other countries may have gold mines, iron ores and other things. The Suez Canal and the river Nile are nature's bounties to Egypt and the progress and development of Egypt really depends upon the best utilisation of the Suez Canal and the development of the river Nile by the construction of the Aswan Dam. If they can construct it quickly at a cheap price and without taking heavy burden of loans from foreign nations, it can lead to the prosperity of Egypt. I would like to examine this question carefully—the question of our interference in the matter of the Suez Canal and Egypt. It was for the Egyptian Government to nationalise the company which was operating the Suez Canal. It was not a question of nationalising the Suez Canal. Suez Canal was always the property of the Egyptian Government. The only question was about the nationalisation of the company. Sir, I would request you to make a distinction between the Suez Canal and the Suez Canal Company. Now that company is given a concession on certain terms, and it would have been in the interests of Egypt to get the maximum possible terms in order to make the largest profit from the Suez Canal. It is for the Egyptian

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru.]

Government to nationalise the company. Now we have to examine what should have been the principles which should have guided our Government in giving any advice to Egypt.

Sir, a few facts and figures will not be out of place to be mentioned. You know, that the total income of the Suez Canal Company at present from the total tonnage handled is 35 million pounds. I am just giving round figures, and hon. Members should not criticise if some odd thousands of pounds are left out. The income is roughly 35 million pounds, and the expenses are 24 million pounds, leaving a profit of 11 million pounds. According to the present agreement, the Egyptian Government was getting 7 per cent. of the net profits before the nationalisation. It means that the Egyptian Government was getting 7 lakh pounds from the Suez Canal Company. And you also know that when this question of nationalisation of the Anglo-Iranian Oil Company came up, the Persian Government nationalised the Abadan refinery. The result was that the Iranian Government suffered very heavy losses, and after three or four years, they had to climb down and come to some sort of agreement by which they did not get as good terms as the Saudi-Arabian company gave to the Saudi-Arabian Government and the Sheikh of Bahrain. Sir, in other cases, by better negotiations and by better handling of the situation, they have got better terms. After all, the Suez Canal is going to be used by other nations, and if Egypt could get the maximum possible amount from the company without losing its sovereignty, it would certainly be better. As I pointed out, the Suez Canal is situated in Egypt and it is the property of the Egyptian Government. And the Egyptian Government could have got very good terms from the Suez Canal Company if they had asked for such terms, and thus they could have built the Aswan Dam. Frustrated by the refusal of the American Government to grant a loan for the construction of Aswan Dam, probably the Egyptian

leaders thought that they should kill the hen that laid the golden eggs and immediately get all the golden eggs out of it. They thought that they would be better off, if they could get by nationalising the Canal Company the entire 10 million pounds—the annual profit—as a contribution to the Egyptian exchequer. But, Sir, the people who are going to use the canal must have some sort of security. Otherwise what is going to happen? There are trends in this world that there should be bigger and bigger tankers, and if there are bigger tankers of 60 thousand tons or more, they will not be able to pass through the Suez Canal, and they will therefore go *via* the Cape of Good Hope, and the cost of transporting oil by a big tanker of 60 thousand tons will be only half the cost of transporting it by smaller ships through the Suez Canal. So, sir, if you do not give enough security to other nations, there is a danger that the other nations may take steps by which the effectiveness and the usefulness of the Suez Canal may be reduced. They will be able to circumvent it by building bigger tankers which will go round the Cape of Good Hope and carry the oil and petroleum at a cheaper cost than smaller tankers passing through the Suez Canal. Our advice should have been that as long as the sovereignty and the suzerainty of the Egyptian Government is recognised over the Suez Canal, the Egyptian Government should bargain in such a way that they got maximum profit from the operation of the Suez Canal.

Sir, in the case of the Arabian oil company, the royalty is paid on the basis of barrels. The Egyptian Government could have demanded a certain percentage of the total amount recovered as the gross receipt, and they could have even asked for about 15 per cent. Thus they would have been able to get over 5 million pounds, that means nearly 50 per cent. of the profit. And if they had got 5 million pounds, they would have been able to build the Aswan Dam in ten years' time, only out of the royalty from the Suez Canal Company. But what was

the advice of our Government? Of course, we are not leaders of the whole world. It is not our duty to go about advising everybody. Only when our advice is sought, we can tender it. And when our advice is sought, it should be in the interest of the country in the long run. We want prosperity and peace in Egypt. We are the well-wishers of Egypt, and when we are the well-wishers of Egypt, we should be very careful that we take a long-term view of things and give our advice in the best interests of the Egyptian nation. The advice that we tendered was not in the best interests of the Egyptian nation.

SHRI P. N. SAPRU (Uttar Pradesh): What was our advice?

SHRI KISHEN CHAND: Sir, it is given in every newspaper that certain terms were given by the Government after the nationalisation was announced. Certain terms were notified as a basis of negotiation between the Western Powers and the Egyptian nation for the operation of the Suez Canal. I am only referring to the conditions which were offered by our Government as a means of negotiation.

SHRI K. S. HEGDE: That was after the nationalisation had taken place.

SHRI KISHEN CHAND: Yes, after the nationalisation, I know, Mr. Deputy Chairman, that nationalisation was announced by the Egyptian Government, and we had no voice in it. But after the nationalisation was announced and there was a difference of opinion between the Western powers, who were using the Canal, and the Egyptian Government, and we were tendering our advice, at that time we should have taken a long-term view of the whole question. We should have seen that by better utilisation of the Suez Canal and by raising the royalty the Egyptian Government would have benefited. Sir, the subsequent event have really dimmed the

issue. The invasion by the Israeli and the Anglo-French Governments has really clouded the issue, and we cannot now clearly see as to what should have been done by the Egyptian Government, if these invasions had not taken place. Now, the canal is blocked, and it will take five or six months more to clear it. There has been great loss of life in Egypt, in Port Said and various other places. There has been great financial loss by the destruction of property, by the destruction of the armaments owned by the Egyptian Government. All these have followed because we did not clearly understand the situation that it was only a question of the Canal Company.

SHAH MOHAMAD UMAIR: Why don't you say that the invasion was pre-planned?

SHRI KISHEN CHAND: My contention is that the result of all this will be that the Egyptian Government will lose heavily during the period that the canal is not used and subsequently when alternative routes are found by other nations and the use of the Suez Canal is reduced. That was one side of our advice in the matter of the Western Powers.

Then I come to the other side of the picture; I come to Hungary, and hon. Members will have to carefully examine the sequence of events. The hon. Prime Minister in the Lok Sabha during the foreign affairs debate referred to a point of history that during the last thirty years Germany had involved the world, at least the European world, in two great wars. As a consequence of these wars, the people of Europe, both of east and west, are very afraid of each other, and as a consequence of this, if the Western powers have NATO, the Eastern powers must have a Warsaw Pact. It is quite understandable that the Eastern powers have a Warsaw Pact and the military might of the USSR is stationed in Poland, Hungary, Czechoslovakia, Rumania, etc. But what is not understandable is: Why should the economy of the East

[Shri Kishen Chand.]

European nations be dependent upon the USSR? There was an Iron Curtain during the last ten years and we could not see behind it, but now in the last one year after the death of Mr. Stalin, the great leader of the Russian nation, that curtain is being lifted slowly, and we can see behind that curtain the growing resentment of the people of the East European countries against the Soviet Government, against the economic policy of the Soviet Government. What is colonialism? Colonialism only means the economic exploitation of one nation by another nation; it is not the stationing of armies; it is not the wielding of political power. It is economic exploitation. From the events in Poland it is very clear that the people of Poland resented the economic exploitation of Poland by the USSR. They revolted and they have been able to get some freedom from that economic domination.

Then came the turn of Hungary. In Hungary also, the people revolted. The hon. Prime Minister himself has correctly stated this morning that it is the trade unionists, it is the workers, who have revolted. I have no other facts except what the hon. Prime Minister himself has given. It was a fact known to everybody that Mr. Imre Nagy established a People's Government in Hungary, but the Russian Government came forward and set up a puppet Government. The Indian Government, our Prime Minister, was the first to recognise that puppet Government of Mr. Kadar. We are wedded to the principles of Panch Sheela, we are wedded to the principle of non-alignment. I have tried to give you the picture of our behaviour in connection with the affairs of Egypt, where the Western powers were involved, and now I am giving you the picture of our interpretation of the same Panch Sheela principles where the Eastern powers are involved. Knowing fully well that it was a puppet Government established by a foreign nation, the Russian nation, we were very quick to recognise it immediately, and when there was a

resolution in the United Nations asking that a plebiscite be taken in Hungary under the aegis of the United Nations, our representative voted against the resolution. Sir, I have great admiration for Mr. V. K. Krishna Menon. He is our roving Ambassador and Minister without Portfolio. He is representing our Prime Minister in the United Nations. There is a saying in Sanskrit that you should say the truth but it should be said in good words, in palatable words:

Satyam Bruyat

Priyam Bruyat

is the Sanskrit adage. Mr. Krishna Menon probably says the truth but in such unpalatable terms that he creates more enemies for our country than friends. He is always trying to follow his master's voice, but sometimes that voice does not reach him or before it reaches him, he comes to certain conclusions, and in the case of the resolution brought forward in the United Nations General Assembly regarding Hungary, possibly these instructions did not reach him in time, and anticipating instructions, he acted in a way that has brought down the prestige of India, that has made other people say that in our interpretation of Panch Sheela, we are prejudiced against the West and inclined to favour the East. I submit that we should not tender advice unless it is sought, but when we tender advice, it should be fair, and it should be an absolutely neutral interpretation of our principles. I therefore submit that our representative in the United Nations should be very careful, when he is speaking the truth, he should speak it in very palatable words. You will carefully see the words that I have used in my amendment:

"That the stand of the Government of India with regard to the interference of U.S.S.R. in the affairs of Hungary was not strong and courageous enough in the beginning;"

Mark the words 'in the beginning'. Today, the stand of our Prime Minister is different from what it was a

month back, at least three weeks back, when the first discussion took place in the Lok Sabha. Even in the last two days you would have found that there was a change. When we are laying down the foreign policy of a great country like ours, we should be very careful, whether in the beginning or subsequently, that we do not have to change our position.

SHRI GOPIKRISHNA VIJAIVAR-GIYA (Madhya Pradesh): No fundamental position has changed.

SHRI KISHEN CHAND: The fundamental position has changed in so far as the Prime Minister now realises that the present Government of Hungary is probably not representative of the people of Hungary.

SHRI K. S. HEGDE: In the light of more facts.

SHRI KISHEN CHAND: The Prime Minister has already sent his representatives to Hungary in order to make enquiries, but when in the United Nation a resolution was brought forward to have a plebiscite under the aegis of the United Nations, our representative voted against it. If hon. Members do not think that this represents a change of policy, what can I say? I am not saying that our foreign policy is bad. I began by saying that I entirely agree with the main fundamental principles of our foreign policy, principles based on Panch Sheela. My grievance is that in the interpretation of those principles

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Your time is up.

SHRI KISHEN CHAND: And so, I move my amendment.

3 P. M.

SHRI H. C. DASAPPA: Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, I have an amendment against my name and that is

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The amendments are moved.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA (West Bengal): We have to consider the motion here. We have just started. How does his amendment come at this stage. Let him speak later.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: There are about 18 names from the Congress Party. So, the hon. Members will please restrict their time to fifteen minutes.

SHRI H. C. DASAPPA: I will try to limit my speech within that time.

Sir, we are living in very difficult times. Historic forces and currents are on the move and we are experiencing changes almost every minute, I should say. So, as the Prime Minister has been pleased to say, it is a situation which is confusing and which baffles the people who have got to deal with the affairs. I therefore, before I make any remarks, beseech those friends who might feel inclined to be critical of the way in which foreign affairs are being handled to take a large view of things and to look at the picture as a whole and not be meticulous in trying to pick holes here and there. I say this because, if you only envisage what the status of India was at the time of obtaining freedom and what it is today, I think that will give us an idea how far we have advanced and how much we have got to feel proud about the position we are in today. Therefore, when you think of this large canvas, I think the remarks made by my hon. friend Shri Kishen Chand will have practically no place in the debate and it practically pales into utter insignificance. We have got to think of our position in India. What was India before 1947 and what it is now? It must be acknowledged by even the staunchest of our Opposition friends that it holds a very high place in the comity of nations. That cannot be denied and I don't want to elaborate on this because it is so self-evident. The second thing is about the position of Asia in the world. This great hemisphere which was the happy hunting-ground of the Western powers, today has

[Shri H. C. Dasappa.]

attained its freedom. Colonialism is practically dead, may be not fully, and Asia today is resurgent and vibrant with activities and developments. If we just pass on a little more to Africa, Africa which had been the most backward country in the world, is today alert and awakened to its rights and I think no power on earth can today stem the tide of its progress towards freedom and independence.

AN HON. MEMBER: Since when did Africa become a country? Africa is a continent.

SHRI H. C. DASAPPA: My friend should understand a little the idioms. When I say Asia, Asia does not become a country. When I say Europe, it does not mean Europe is a country. Therefore there has been a great revolutionary change which has tilted the balance very much in favour of Asia and Africa and may I request my hon. friends to just bestow a little thought on the person who has played the most significant role in this resurgence of Asia and Africa? I think we are fortunate in having had at the helm of affairs in India at this most critical part of our history, one with such a great vision, and forethought and one who, I should think, correctly interprets the soul of India. He has been a disciple of Mahatma Gandhi and I know even in the pre-freedom days, Mahatma Gandhi's foreign adviser or may I say, foreign Minister was Pandit Nehru. Therefore right from his early days he has studied these world questions such as few have done and it is that which has come to our aid.

Let me go on to the specific matters in issue. We have got two blocs in the world, one the Western democratic bloc, or as my friend might probably would say, the Imperialistic democracies or capitalistic democratic Governments and then we have got the Soviet bloc on the other side, these two mighty powers, each one with a philosophy of its own. But what are the creeds of these two powerful blocs? Have they abjured vio-

lence or have they got violence as their basic principle? Is it not a case of race of armaments in their case? Therefore their political philosophy is based on violence and armaments. It is almost the Old Testament idea. I don't want to cast any reflections but generally speaking, it is a case of an eye for an eye and a tooth for a tooth but what is our philosophy? It is fairly evident when we examine NATO, Warsaw Pact, Baghdad Pact and SEATO on the one side and then when we think of the Bandung Conference—I don't say Bandung Pact, there is no Pact—and the Bandung spirit. I would call it Bandung spirit. Now it is the Bandung spirit which has ultimately resulted in Panch Sheela, which is one of the most glorious contributions which any nation could make at any time and which I am happy, India has made through its Prime Minister. I feel that in the years to come Panch Sheela must come to be accepted by both the Blocs, maybe rather gradually but yet inevitably and irresistibly. We were making a fairly good progress these few years with this Bandung spirit. Nations which had misunderstood us were coming closer to us. I will come to it a little later. But somehow in the last few days, there has been a reverse gear and a most difficult situation has been created. I am an optimist and I think the present troubles have just arisen, whether it is in Suez or Egypt or Syria or anywhere else, just to test the strength of this new Bandung spirit.

Now, either the Bandung spirit succeeds or there is bound to be a world war and a catastrophe. There is no doubt about it and I have no misgivings about it. Therefore, Sir, whatever evils it may contain in itself, some goodness will come.

Sir, let me take the line which the hon. Prime Minister has taken. In fact, Sir, we were mostly to confine ourselves to the Suez and the Hungarian issues in this debate but in view of today's report of the speech of the Prime Minister of Pakistan, it was inevitable that that should also form

part of the Debate. With regard to Kashmir, I do not want to repeat here anything that the Prime Minister said because he made out an excellent case for India's stand, and a very righteous stand. I only want to add, Sir, that no less a man than Earl Clement Attlee, after making a thorough study of the question, has come out with a statement that Kashmir's position today as a part of India cannot be questioned. We cannot by any means say that he is at all partisan. He is a man with a great stake and he represents a very great Party in England and with the full knowledge of all the facts, Earl Attlee says that today there is no more doubt about Kashmir being part of India. I would spend one or two minutes on the speech of Mr. Suhrawardy, the Prime Minister of Pakistan. I do not want to go over the whole ground but let us see his logic. He speaks of the necessity for these alliances—this Baghdad Pact and others—to strengthen himself against aggression. As he has said, there is no question of aggression from Russia. He himself, in his speech, says that it is too much to think of a big war now because there is no possibility of a world conflagration. He admits that and then, referring to India, says that even if there is a 5 per cent. chance or a 2 per cent. chance of an aggression by India, attack from India, he should be prepared for it. Ultimately, Sir, he turns a somersault and says, he knows there is no question of war from India at all but he must have these alliances to see that he is strong enough to enforce his claims with regard to Kashmir and the Canal Water dispute. This is the kind of inconsistency that is there in his speech and I do not think it merits any more consideration. All that I can say is that there is not the remotest chance of our non-recognition of Pakistan now. It is just a red herring drawn across for the purpose of his own unjustifiable actions.

There is one more point in regard to the speech that I would like to touch before I come to the other subjects. Talking about these alliances

and others, the Prime Minister of Pakistan refers to the large Muslim population in India as being "my countrymen". It is in quotations and there can be no mistake about it. Coming as it does from such a responsible person, we cannot simply cast it aside as a mere joke. One has got to read into it something more than what has come before our eyes and it is the sub-conscious mind that is working in them that—in spite of division of India of pre freedom days and each one having its own loyalties—they are probably looking forward, in a very stupid way to some day when they can think of the support of the Indian Muslim population. I hope our own Muslim friends will give the lie direct.

With regard to Suez I feel that the present position is very satisfactory in the sense that the United Kingdom, France and Israel are withdrawing their forces from Egypt. I only hope that they will do it as early as possible because it is in their own interest to do so. The sooner they do it, the sooner will the Suez Canal be opened and the sooner will the normal traffic be opened. I say that even though there is the withdrawal of troops, still the question remains of a suitable understanding so far as the Suez Canal is concerned. Israel is another bone of contention. I hope that the new fact that has emerged, namely, India's special role in the Middle East which America is thinking of, will result in a proper solution of both these questions of Israel's position in the Middle East and the Suez Canal. I was surprised at my friend who speaks and goes away, Mr. Kishen Chand, talking about profits of the Canal and so on. The P.S.P. is a funny Party; each one speaks his own voice and there are hundreds of voices in the P.S.P. Their leader, Mr. Ashok Mehta . . .

SHRI JASWANT SINGH (Rajasthan) : He is here.

SHRI H. C. DASAPPA : I have got the speech here and I can read it, if necessary. Mr. Mehta says very clear-

[Shri H. C. Dasappa.]

ly this, namely, that he welcomes our participation in the U.N. Force, and supports Government's policy in West Asia. He also says that he supports Government's stand of keeping the Suez Canal question and the Anglo-French aggression separate. The entire policy of the Government of India, so far as Egypt is concerned, is endorsed by their leader and here Mr. Kishen Chand speaks of profit and loss and so on.

SHRI KISHEN CHAND: I said that our policy is very good.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Let there be no interruptions.

SHRI H. C. DASAPPA: I would like to say a few words on Hungary and then finish. Hungary is a lovely country but it has had a most unfortunate and chequered history right from the beginning. In fact, Sir, Fenner Brockway, in his "Non-co-operation in many lands" refers to the Hungarian fight against Austria and the part played by Mr. Deak. Budapest is on the banks of the Danube and there is a beautiful island, St. Margaret. Hungarian music is well known and the people are colourful and very hard working. It is most unfortunate that they are in the throes of this struggle. Mr. Kishen Chand mentioned about the original stand of the Government of India or some such thing. After the speech, the very clear speech, of the Prime Minister, I thought he would have understood that the facts were not clear in the beginning; even today, he says, they are not very clear. The observers are not there, the exact situation is not known, but, on general principles, the Prime Minister has been very clear and that is, there is no question of arresting the democratization of any country or preventing any country from having the form of Government it likes. He is against any foreign intervention in the internal affairs of a country because as per Panch Sheela it is one of the cardinal principles. Therefore, I think there could

be no mistake whatever with regard to our stand in regard to Hungary. Some people were saying that the rebellion or the revolt was not only of workers and other local elements but that there were some Fascists behind it. That is what we see in some of the Communist inspired press. I would only say this in reply: If it is inspired by Fascist elements, the last person to support their stand would be the Prime Minister. The House will remember that years ago, before we got freedom, when he was passing through Italy, Mussolini's personal representative went to the hotel where Mr. Jawaharlal Nehru was staying and earnestly beseeched him to come and see Mussolini. It was a great privilege in those days for people even to have a few minutes with Mussolini. What was the reaction of Mr. Jawaharlal Nehru? He refused to go and see him. That was the stand that our Prime Minister took. If there was any such Fascist hand in the rebellion he would be the last person to support it or countenance it. Therefore, Sir, I would beseech the hon. Members to endorse the foreign policy of the present Government without any opposition.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Mr. Deputy Chairman, we participate in this discussion on international affairs at a very critical moment in world's history. Even today as we speak here, there are occupation forces and invaders on Egyptian soil who have shown more inclination to remain there than to withdraw and I am not one of those who would be willing to say, on the statements that they make, that they are going to withdraw because I have in my knowledge facts to the contrary and the developments in their camp clearly indicate that it is their camp to dig in there and stay there as long as possible. Not that they will succeed; I know that world public opinion today is strong to secure the expulsion of the invaders from the Egyptian soil. I have not a doubt about it but it would be a profound mistake to think that they are going to so easily quit the land they have invaded.

Mr. Deputy Chairman, we have heard two speeches and I was a little surprised from the speech that had been made from our side of the House that there was an attempt to be wise in the matter of advice that ought to have been given to the Egyptian Government by the Government of India. We are not dealing here with the earnings of a company. We are dealing here as an independent nation with the fundamental question of rights of nations, civilised behaviour, international law and good orderly relations between nations. When a country was invaded by two aggressive Powers with their stooge preceding them, then there is no good in saying that some sort of an advice should be given as to how President Nasser could have got more money from the Imperialists or for that matter from those who are at the helm of the company's affairs. I can understand this thing from our friends of the Socialist Party who seem to be a little more excited and concerned with the Hungarian affairs than with the Egyptian developments. I pity them, because they are very wise people and they are motivated by sincere socialist ideas but the moment they started looking through the window after the curtain had been lifted they seemed to be just hovering over the room in which Cardinal Mindszenty lived. I would have been very happy if Mr. Kishen Chand did not enter into the Chamber through the window over which the curtain, according to him, seemed to have been lifted.

Now Mr. Deputy Chairman, as far as the Egyptian question is concerned, what the Prime Minister said, generally speaking, everybody would support in the country because right from the beginning of this development his stand has been worthy of our nation and we have no hesitation in stating it here and elsewhere to the wide world. I think he made a great contribution when he came out with a denunciation of the aggression and used powerful language which was needed on that occasion. I think that he was speak-

ing in conformity with the sentiments and urges of our people and there is no doubt that everyone in the country shared his thoughts and sentiments in this matter. And he is right today also in saying that the crux of the problem—I think he used the words of the problem—is the withdrawal of the invaders from the Egyptian soil. I again share his view wholeheartedly and I do not think that the Egyptian problem could be solved until and unless the Egyptian soil has been cleared of the last invader. Now, remember that it is a month since the U.N. passed its resolution and since then a number of reminders have been given but the Anglo-French Imperialists and the Israeli hirelings continue to defy those Resolutions and the world public opinion and they remain on Egyptian soil. To us, and according to international law, it is a continuing invasion of the Egyptian soil. Invasion continues; therefore we are dealing with a situation of invasion and the cease-fire should not detract anyone from the fact of invasion that is there. And I think we all agree with Mr. Krishna Menon when he said that the invaders had no right to dictate terms. I do not see why our friends here should be so perturbed about Mr. Krishna Menon. I am a critic of the Government and very rarely do admirations or praise come from me as far as the Government is concerned but as far as international affairs go and even with regard to what Mr. Krishna Menon is saying I am at one with him and I think he has rightly expressed the sentiment of our people. If anything, he deserves a tribute from our side and from all sides of the House. It is most unfortunate that some hon. Member should have resorted to a most unfair criticism of Mr. Krishna Menon's stand.

Now, how do we seek the withdrawal of the forces from the Egyptian soil? We have been told that the British Foreign Secretary would be making a statement in the House of Commons this afternoon. We do

[Shri Bhupesh Gupta.]

not know what exactly he would be saying but it seems that the members of the British Cabinet do not like to withdraw at all. For instance, there was a statement by Mr. David Eccles, Minister of Education, at Wiltshire on the 26th of last month in which he laid down a number of terms before we can expect that they would withdraw. He said, 'the conditions for our withdrawal are that the United Nations should go and take over and that the U.N. force should be effective in the sense that it stays there while we and our friends work in and through the United Nations to solve the problems I have enumerated.' This is what a British Cabinet Minister said only the other day. That is to say, his view of the matter is that they would have the United Nations force to do the dirty job for them and they expect to function through the U.N. force and remain somehow or other in Egypt. That is how their mind is working today. Again Mr. Butler has made a statement in which he has said something which does not give 'us any hope that they are going to easily withdraw from that country. Then I find this from a British paper of November 20. About 100 Tory M.Ps. signed a document or a memorandum condemning or opposing the U.N. Resolution which calls for the withdrawal of Anglo-French forces and that report also mentions that earlier in a statement to a U.S. magazine, Mr. Butler, acting Prime Minister, refused withdrawal from Port Said till the United Nations had agreed to British terms. This is what we get from the sources that come from England and from the utterances of eminent British statesmen and leaders of the Government.

SHRI H. C. DASAPPA: It is out of date now. They have agreed to withdraw.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I leave it to Mr. Dasappa to believe in the *bona fides* of the British. I do not believe in the *bona fides* of the British. I want to see them withdraw here and

now and if they do not withdraw it is necessary for us to act in such a manner that whatever they may say, they are thrown out of Egyptian soil. That is how I would view the matter. I think I would be right in expressing the sentiment that I would be very happy if Mr. Dasappa's wishes are fulfilled. But you are dealing with people who know no civilised laws, who violate other countries' territories with a view to returning to colonialism and re-establishment of colonial regime of plunder, terror and loot. That is what you have before you when you deal with these people. That is why I say that I have my vague doubts but at the same time I have confidence that we can secure the expulsion of these invaders from that country.

Now, what makes them so bold as to defy the U.N. Resolution? Well, two of the big Powers France and Britain are involved in this aggression as direct participants. Then you have got the Israeli aggressors. But these are the two big Powers and behind them they have got also the United States. Whatever the United States may be saying in this matter, they are playing a double game. On the one hand they pretend as if they withdrawal of the forces of aggression are interested in securing the early sion. On the other hand, they are saying things which precisely come in the way of asserting world public opinion in such a manner or taking steps through the United Nations or otherwise, so that the objective is achieved, namely, the withdrawal of the aggressive invaders from Egyptian soil. Now, as you know, the United States representative was at pains somehow or other to cover the crimes of Britain and France, her allies. We can understand these things, so that we should not be taken in by this kind of tall utterances of the United States of America and we should also remember the United States' interest in elbowing Britain and France out and taking their position in the Middle East. They are playing a big game in this matter, the game of power politics, resulting from the Middle East rivalries between Britain and the

United States that exists today. Therefore, you must remember that we should know these things in order that we do not count on much what they are saying, namely, the United States.

Now, I think, Mr. Deputy Chairman, that it is necessary for this reason for the Bandung powers to act together, concertedly and unitedly. It is well known that the whole thing goes against the Bandung declarations. It is also well known that the Bandung powers are opposed to this kind of thing and would like to bring to an end this shameful chapter. But what is of importance today is to see how the Bandung powers can translate their declaration into action. It is a very good thing that the Prime Minister of China is in our country today and we are very glad to think that there is a good deal of common ground, much more common ground than differences, between the two Prime Ministers. We would only request that the two Prime Ministers should find ways and means of dealing with the situation in such a manner that all the peace loving Bandung powers can move into action immediately should the invaders refuse to quit the Egyptian soil. We are not helpless. It is true that we are not thinking in terms of immediately using a sort of military force and all that; but we have got moral power which does exert a great influence over the whole world, creates public opinion and gives momentum to it. At the same time, we have got certain other weapons in our hands. Mr. Deputy Chairman, I ask you, why must not you think of using the economic weapon? We are in a very advantageous position *vis-a-vis* Britain in order to use the economic weapon, so that Britain does listen to us—the language the British Government understands. We have known by now that Mr. Bulganin's letter, I think, put more sense into their heads than many resolutions, good resolutions that we had passed. Not that most of those resolutions were not important. They are very important in a way. There-

fore, I say that the time has come when we should think of taking certain economic actions. For instance, we can see that they do not get any materials which go to help the war purposes or preparations of Great Britain. We send a lot of materials as export from this country to that country. Cannot we think of putting an embargo on these, until and unless the situation is cleared up, until and unless the aggressor has been made to abide by the decisions and the resolutions of the United Nations and public opinion?

Then, Sir, we would also be justified in demanding some compensation from Britain. I do not agree with Mr. Krishnamachari when he says that the dislocation of the Suez Canal would not affect our economic development. I think by now he has himself seen that it does affect us. I think it has inflicted already a great injury on our economy and for that we hold Britain and France responsible. I think we can easily think in terms of telling Britain that they have caused unilateral economic injury against us and we would be within our rights to demand compensation from them for the damage that they caused to our economy and to our trade.

Then, Mr. Deputy Chairman, comes the question of 'Commonwealth relations', and I think, whatever may have been our views on this matter, differences over this matter in the past—I mean the Congress party and ourselves—today the time has come when we should think of this matter and see the need for quitting the Commonwealth. It is not in keeping with the dignity of our people and our country that we should continue in that association in which Britain is the head and whatever may be your intentions—I know the Prime Minister is actuated by quite different intentions from those which guide Mr. Eden. I know that. I am not at all suggesting that they have got anything common as far as objectives go. But what is important for us to know in this connection is that the aggressors—Britain—use the Com-

[Shri Bhupesh Gupta.]

monwealth as a sort of moral cover for their unholy actions. Their stock is low in the world. They are losing ground politically and morally and to some extent materially also and in this situation they want to uphold such an association with a view to bluffing the people, deceiving the people, and it is they who want to profit by this association and the moral force that we take into this. Therefore whatever may be our intentions, whatever we might think of achieving through that association, the time has come when we must quit that association, in order to deny these people the justification they give in such an association. It has become a one-way traffic of aggression. Had it been otherwise, I am quite clear that there would have been no aggression in Egypt. We are the biggest country in the Commonwealth. Our population accounts for nearly sixty per cent. of the Commonwealth population and Mr. Eden had the gumption and the audacity not even to consult the Prime Minister of India before he embarked on decisions of this kind on which depended not only the fate of Egypt, but the fate of the whole world, world peace and of every Asian and African country. Can you imagine a more preposterous course than this? Still why must we continue in this Commonwealth? What have we gained in this association? I would beseech the hon. Prime Minister to tell us for once as to what we have achieved. I know we have achieved many things in the affairs of the world, but we have done so in spite of the Commonwealth association, and not because of that association. That is what I want to say. Now, our role in the world affairs lies outside this Commonwealth association. That is very clear and if anything the Commonwealth association has become a great liability to us. It is an insult to our freedom; it is an insult to our position in world affairs. Therefore, I think the Prime Minister would be well advised now to sever the Commonwealth relations. And speaking personally, I would ask the hon. Members opposite—is

Mr. Eden any match for Shri Jawaharlal Nehru? Is he match for Shri Jawaharlal Nehru, that is, to sit at the head of the Commonwealth where Prime Minister Nehru sits? I ask you that question not in a partisan spirit, because I think that Shri Jawaharlal Nehru today in world affairs represents a great force and represents a great country and man to man he is head and shoulder far and above Mr. Eden. There is no comparison between the two. It is disgraceful that the Prime Minister of our country should be sitting with him, in No. 10 Downing Street.

We want an end of that state of affairs. Mr. Deputy Chairman, if I have been a little exuberant over this matter it is

SHRI H. C. DASAPPA: Luckily not all U.K. is like that—not the whole of the United Kingdom.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: The United Nations lives. There are other people in the United Nations. We are demonstrating the force before No. 10, Downing Street against Mr. Eden's policy, where the common man calls for action. We have faith in England, but that is a different England. That is not the England of marauders and buccaneers.

Mr. Deputy Chairman, therefore my suggestion is that this demand should be reconsidered. Forget the past, past arguments and all that. Today it is necessary to reconsider this demand in the light of the latest developments that have taken place. I think nothing will be lost if you start reconsidering this and take the step which Shri Rajagopalachari has suggested. He is not an extremist. He does not share our views in many matters. He is a politician on your side of liberal persuasion, and even he has been forced to put forward this demand that you should quit the Commonwealth. I think it merits your serious consideration today and we are prepared to discuss this matter with anybody. I think the case on our side or the demand that we are making has become quite irresistible.

I know if Prime Minister Nehru's prestige was not involved in it, if he himself had not supported it or for that matter if he has said that he has an open mind neither for nor against and if he wants the opinion of the Congress Party and of the country, he will have 99 per cent. of the votes against the Commonwealth, and there is no doubt about it that he would be persuaded to take that course. Unfortunately certain past commitments, certain past declarations are coming in the way, declarations which have been belied by the people who are supposed to have honoured them. Mr. Deputy Chairman, therefore I say that we should reconsider this matter. As far as we are concerned we say that we should immediately quit the Commonwealth, and I think the Government Party would reconsider this matter and take steps in this direction.

Then about our sterling balances. Why should we keep our sterling balances in that manner in the hands of those people who are committing aggression? I know the difficulty of withdrawing them, but I think that the old sterling balances agreements should be annulled and new agreements should be signed so that we can easily draw upon them. Unless we do this, whenever, it becomes necessary for England it will deny us these sterling balances and we shall forfeit them. This is what is my fear. After having seen what they have done in Egypt I think it is very essential to take steps in this connection.

Then about the Middle East Situation, Mr. Deputy Chairman, trouble has started again. Now you hear warmongering voices against Syria in Baghdad, New York and Paris. Now hysteria is sought to be worked up in Syria against the Baghdad Pact. Baghdad was a place well known for thieves. Now it seems to be well known for some other gentlemen who sit there with the help of others. It has been Baghdad's lot to be notoriously known, whether for the 'Thief of Baghdad' or for some other gentlemen who sit at the head of the Government there at the moment. Mr. Deputy Chairman, what I am suggest-

ing in this connection is that they are trying to create a situation in order to complicate matters and find justification for imperialism to remain there. It is strange in this connection that Mr. Suhrawardy should have now come out with different types of arguments. He says in his speech that he was not prepared to characterise the Anglo-French invasion of Egypt as a return to colonialism. In his view it was merely an attempt on the part of these powers to see that the Suez Canal remained free for international navigation. The invasion aimed at restricting the sovereignty of a certain country for the benefit of the world. A most strange utterance from the Prime Minister of a country whose people put him in power with a view to protecting their freedom, with a view to developing good international relations, with a view to seeing that aggression was halted, and now the position he has taken up is not only a gross betrayal of his own people but it is a betrayal of all good principles held dear to our hearts. Mr. Suhrawardy is all out to support the Baghdad Pact. It is not dead. I say that you may have this. I share the Prime Minister's confidence in this matter that, Baghdad Pact or no Pact, we can hold our own, we can fight those aggressors, we can halt them and finally push them back. But that is not to say that these elements who constitute these Pacts have given up their game. Not at all. You see the few trips of Mr. Suhrawardy to Baghdad and other places, and after that comes from him a statement of this kind in which he tries to put a different interpretation on what is rightly called the naked and brutal aggression against Egypt. I am sure the Pakistani people do not share his view. I am sure the Pakistani people will look after such a Prime Minister who had the audacity to betray them and betray the mandate they gave him. After all Mr. Suhrawardy's accession to power is unthinkable unless you keep in mind those resurgent forces in Pakistan who have dis-inherited the Muslim League, thrown it out of power, and who are look-

[Shri Bhupesh Gupta.]

ing forward to new, welcome developments in their political life. But this is what Mr. Suhrawardy says and one which we cannot but take note of, and he would not have said it, Mr. Deputy Chairman, unless and until he had the backing of the United States of America, and therefore he is now the biggest champion of the United States of America and is talking in terms of military alliances and all that, and he thinks that the United States would be on their side. He openly says it. Such a statement comes not from Mr. Suhrawardy alone. It comes from Washington and here is the editorial of the *New York Times* in which they dig up the Kashmir issue again in order to provoke Pakistan against India. The *New York Times* editorial today says that Pakistan has again been obliged to bring the case of Kashmir before the Security Council of the United Nations Organisation, and action should be taken, and then so many things are said. The *New York Times* has taken up the case of Kashmir. Mr. Suhrawardy speaks in this manner after coming from Baghdad—all these things have some meaning, they are interconnected. Therefore, I say that what Mr. Suhrawardy says should be taken as a sort of link in the chain of developments that are taking place in those countries. Now, I believe that it would be possible for us to defend our own position. India is, as far as Pakistan is concerned, on firm and secure grounds, and I know that the Pakistani people would not misunderstand us because I know that in the streets of Dacca there have been demonstrations for friendship with India, against the military pacts, for cancellation of the military pacts. These are the very people who make and unmake governments, and they have given a good account of themselves, and even if Mr. Suhrawardy misbehaves they know how to deal with him. It is also a good thing that even some of the Karachi papers, for instance the *Imroz*, came out with a sharp editorial against Mr. Suhrawardy's foreign policy, and they called it a dangerous foreign policy. Therefore, let us not be misled . . .

SHAH MOHAMAD UMAIR: The Pakistani people have publicly asked Suhrawardy and Iskander Mirza to quite their offices.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: These editorials are there. I know that certain other elements in their country may try to mislead public opinion, but I know that as far as the people of Pakistan are concerned they are determined to see that these policies of military pacts and alliances, the policy of red eyes against India, policy of illwill between our two countries do not succeed. And we have got the President of the Awami League in East Bengal who has come out against these pacts and military alliances, and he leaves no room for doubt as to where he stands. Mr. Deputy Chairman, this is what I want to say about Pakistan. As far as we are concerned we shall cherish friendship with the people of Pakistan. This is a fundamental faith with us because we know that such friendship is necessary not only for our interests, not only for their interests, but for the interests of all Asian and African countries, and anything that comes in the way of that friendship we will oppose no matter from which quarter it comes, and anything that helps that friendship we will support no matter who initiates that.

I will now say a few words about the Prime Minister's visit to the United States. This is very important. He made a passing reference to it. We attach great importance to that visit.

SHRI B. B. SHARMA (Uttar Pradesh): May I ask if he has anything to say about Hungary?

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I attach great importance to that visit because, I think that the Prime Minister will avail himself of this opportunity of impressing upon the head of the United States of America that China has got to be admitted into the United Nations. We are very glad that, even at the U.N.E.S.C.O. Conference here, the Government of India's representative played a noble

part in that direction and I hope that it will be carried forward elsewhere and especially when the Prime Minister meets President Eisenhower, because that is of great importance for world peace and for security of Asian-African countries and for that matter, every country in the world.

Sir, another aspect of this matter requires attention in this connection. I think the Prime Minister should make it clear to the United States Government that we do not approve of their tactics. I know the Prime Minister would do it. But it is necessary to tell them that, if Mr. Suhrawardy speaks in this manner it is because he is getting incitement and encouragement from the United States of America. And the United States of America has no business to meddle in Kashmir affairs. It is the internal question of the people of Kashmir and if there is any outstanding dispute between the two countries, it will be settled between themselves and the United States should not come into the picture at all to create further mess in the situation and cause provocation.

The other question is about Formosa—Taiwan. We are very glad to find that the Chinese Premier has expressed his desire—a profound desire—for a settlement on this issue with the United States of America and he is prepared to discuss the matter with them. And he has even offered a high post to Chiang Kai Shek—it is in the papers. That certainly shows to what extent the Chinese Government is prepared to go. I think that that would have strengthened the Prime Minister's hands while he deals with this question with President Eisenhower. The question of the liberation of Formosa is of vital importance not only to China but for all of us and that is another matter which. I have no doubt, will engage the attention of the Prime Minister when he goes to the United States of America.

In this connection, I cannot but mention Goa. I say this because, after what we have seen in Egypt, we cannot allow these military build-ups on

our soil. We have seen how Israel was used against Egypt to facilitate a big plan of aggression against Egypt and all Asian-African countries. Can we then remain silent or quiet when we find on our soil that the Portuguese Government is building up military bases, building up military forces and keeps that portion under occupation? Even from that consideration, it is essential to pursue a more vigorous policy—an active policy—for the liberation of Goa. Otherwise, we may come to grief. We cannot take any risk in this world when aggression is abroad and when the aggressors do not think that the time has come when they must stop.

Then, references were made to the Hungarian situation. I can quite understand the concern of all hon. Members on this side of the House and on the other side about the tragic developments that have taken place in that country. None of us are happy over it. We are all pained over it. We are sorry that Hungarian patriots, no matter on which side they fought—Government side or the other side—fell and died. We are sorry also that the Soviet forces which had been there at the invitation of the Hungarian Government under certain military agreements and which, at one time, were taking a leading part in liberating that country, should be among the victims of aggression. (*Interruptions.*) Sir, we are all sorry for it. I do not expect hon. Members to be in complete agreement in regard to everything that I am saying. But I am trying to present an exposition of the situation so that we may bring our minds to bear on the subject a little more dispassionately and objectively. It is easy to allow ourselves to be guided by prejudices. It is difficult sometimes especially in a complicated situation like this to discern the truth and base our judgment and assessment on truth. It is an endeavour that we should all make, and I am very glad that the Prime Minister is making an endeavour in this matter in order to ascertain the truth. It is quite understandable that he

[Shri Bhupesh Gupta.]

should be concerned over it and I quite appreciate the manner in which he has set about finding the truth, although I may not agree with everything that he has said. But I would like to say as to how I view this matter.

Let, hon. Members consider my point of view. This is not—what I am saying is—God's own truth. What I am telling you is only certain things that have come to my knowledge and I think these should be weighed in the scale of mature judgment without which judgment would be incomplete, however much valuable you may think of the facts or knowledge in your possession. It is true that what developed in Hungary on the 23rd October was a legitimate people's demonstration against certain grouches or injustice or abuses that were committed in the past regime. There is not the slightest doubt about it. And the Hungarian Government itself had abetted it. But, as you know, Sir, sometimes good demonstrations are taken advantage of by certain imperialist forces. Let us not forget that fact. In this connection, we must keep in view that, if it were a question of a discontented people, if it were a question of people with a just, legitimate cause which infuriated them, then many of the things that took place would not have happened. If it were a question of Hungarian people trying to solve their problem of democratisation within the framework of socialism, if necessary, by replacing one socialist government by another, the American and the British imperialists would not have been the first to take the issue to the United Nations. The French and British imperialists would not have been talking with their hands still dripping with the blood of the Egyptian people. We would not have been interested in the statistics of the French representative coming to the United Nations Assembly on the 4th of November, speaking eloquently for Hungarian freedom. Let us remember this thing. Mr. Dulles would not have been there first showing himself as the greatest

champion of freedom in the world and Mr. Eden or for that matter, the British politicians echoing him and joining his chorus. Let us remember this fact. Sometimes, it is necessary to adjust that course in our toleration. I think that this is also one of the ways of judging international developments.

I will just read out to you, not from the Communist sources, but from other sources, something to which you will give more credence:

"The other day, Allen Dulles, head of the United States Intelligence Service, told a closed session of the Senate's Foreign Relations Committee that they had known in advance of the Hungarian putsch."

That is taken from the *New York Times* :

"On the eve of the bloody events in Hungary, Bela Varga, the leader of the Hungarian emigrants centre in the U.S.A., said in New York that the underground circles in Hungary were about to start a rebellion. Varga 'foretold' that Mr. Nagy would come to power again in a week or two and Cardinal Mindszenty would be released."

Now this is from the same journal.

The Dutch newspaper *De Telegraaf* wrote about the events in Hungary under the meaningful headline :

"The Hungarian revolt had been thoroughly prepared."

"The Hungarian revolt was not spontaneous."

The article reads:

"It had been thoroughly prepared long beforehand. It is becoming clearer with every day that . . . a powerful underground movement had existed."

As early as October 25, the United Press of America correspondent reported from Vienna that the rebels were evidently well-armed and that

this indicated that a well-trained and well-armed underground evidently took advantage of the growing unrest in Hungary to strike at the Communist Government.

The United Press of America reporter in Vienna wrote :

"Within hours of the start of the revolt thousands of red, white and green flags, all of them bearing the traditional 'Kossuth' coat of arms, appeared as though by order. Equally thousands of red, white and green armbands appeared suddenly."

"Every one had a weapon."

"Another indication of the preparations is the ease with which the rebels secured transport. Every unit had lorries. There were couriers with motor-cycles."

Then, the well-informed American journalist, Mr. Drew Pearson, with whom many of you are familiar, wrote in the November 9 issue of the *Daily Mirror*—this is a very good paper which would command respect in certain quarters on this side and on the other side—that, by some strange coincidence almost all prominent figures from the 'satellite countries' (that is how they call the People's Democracies) now residing in Washington returned to Paris on the very eve of the events. Among the names of such persons was that of Ferenc Nagy, leader of the Hungarian Peasants' Party.

Please do not confuse this with that Mr. Nagy who is now somewhere in Rumania, we are told.

The German News Agency ADN, reported on October 29 that Hungarian fascist elements, who after the war established their residences in the camps of Nuremberg and Fuerth in West Germany, will be sent to Hungary. Deutsche Press Agency announced, "Some of those Hungarians are already on the way to participate in the combat."

4. P. M.

Then, Sir, the '*Statesman*' printed a despatch from the *Times*, London—a very respectable paper in very respectable quarters—which quoted an exalted Viennese lady saying: "There is something macabre about the way in which the Hungarian aristocracy has rushed to the rescue, out of every night club in the world."

Then, Sir, the New York 'World Telegram and Sun', in a despatch from Munich by its special correspondent suggested that the espionage organisation of the former Nazi General Gehlen helped in preparing the counter-revolutionary rebellion in Hungary. The correspondent wrote that 'well-informed diplomatic circles' assert that General Gehlen's network of agents was instrumental in the counter-revolutionary outbreak in Hungary.

The correspondent writes that "General Gehlen reports directly to West German Chancellor Adenauer and is financed from special funds at the Chancellor's disposal." The correspondent points out that the Gehlen outfit is camouflaged as a far-flung commercial enterprise.

Now, Sir, this is another interesting thing. The New York Times, analysing the class composition of the rebels, said openly that they were the remnants of the overthrown classes—rich men whom the Communists had made poor, former landlords and wealthy peasants, clergymen subjected to repression and others.

Then, Sir, there is one more thing. The biggest Hungarian landlord Count Eszterhazy who owned whole countries, took up his quarters in Budapest and with great impudence advertised his far-reaching plans. He would call up certain foreign embassies and say: "This is Count Eszterhazy speaking. I returned to political activity and I am staying in Budapest. In the near future I hope to restore fully my influence, to take back my estates, and also enter the Government. In case of need you may contact me on problems of interest to

[Shri Bhupesh Gupta.]

you in Hungary.” I hope no contact is being established with some of our friends in this country.

Then, Sir, a Minister of the Nagy Government announced that the collective farm system would be abolished from October 30. Mendelson in a letter to the New Statesman and Nation said: “Then, as the people were beginning to rejoice because of the withdrawal of the Russians, the old uniforms of the pre-1945 Horthy army were brought out again, particularly in the provinces, and worn by some of the improvised temporary police forces.”

Then, Sir, Cardinal Mindszenty, speaking on the Budapest radio on 3rd November, declared that Hungary would return to capitalism and private property would be restored there.

(Time bell rings.)

Mr. Deputy Chairman, I would therefore ask the Government to consider all these facts fairly and squarely, because they tell a tale which is not always told by some hon. Members in Parliament or outside. Now what does all this show? This shows that there is discontent among the people, and their popular demonstration is taken advantage of for counter-revolutionary restoration in Hungary, for delevering Hungary to the imperialist and the fascist powers. How would such things serve the cause of world peace? How would such things give any guarantee to the Hungarian people of their freedom and sovereignty? Would such things not result in Hungary being a veritable war base for Anglo-American imperialists to build up their military forces? How would that help to establish world peace. I cannot understand. It is precisely because the imperialists thought that Hungary would be available to them as a powerful stronghold for their intrigues and conspiracies and for their military build up, they shed a lot of crocodile tears on the Hungarian situation. We find that some of our Socialist friends have allowed themselves to be

carried away by the anti-Communist prejudices from the imperialist quarters. I know that they are our friends, but they have been thoroughly misguided in this matter and they have been misinformed. And they have allowed their prejudices to have the better of their judgment. Nothing can be more regrettable than this, Mr. Deputy Chairman. And I am sure that the Members on that side of the House who have a natural and legitimate concern for it would not allow themselves to be carried away by any prejudices in this matter.

Now about the U.N. Resolution. I find that the U.N. Resolution created a certain problem. I hope that that problem would be solved. But it is necessary to understand as to why the Hungarian Government is opposing the implementation of the U.N. Resolution, in so far as it proposes to send certain Observers there. This is what Mr. Kadar says :

“The events in Hungary are a matter of our own domestic concern and we uphold our sovereignty. But there is also another aspect of the question. The cease-fire on October 30 was a unilateral measure; the counter-revolutionaries did not cease fire, but on the contrary intensified the bloodshed and atrocities. And when they were given a rebuff, all calls of counter-revolutionaries boiled down to one thing: hold out, the American forces are coming, hold out, the United Nations forces are coming. Many people are no longer clear about the difference between American forces and United Nations forces.”

Now, Sir, that is what he says. I am not at all saying anything beyond what he says. But here is a point of view which is well worth considering, especially when we have known how the U.N. Observers whom we invite to go there with all good faith would behave in that part of the country. We have that experience very close in our own country. I know that the U.N. Resolution has been passed and Pandit Jawaharlal

Nehru is motivated by one set of desire. I believe he wants a genuine solution of the Hungarian problem. He wants to see the end of the tragedy with a happy solution of the problem. But there are others who support the U.N. Resolution for no other purpose than creating provocation and getting a handle or a foothold in order to carry out their unfinished task, the task of promoting counter-revolution in that part of the country. Let us, therefore, be careful about them. We should not allow our concern over this matter to so guide us that we give a handle to these people who have no good faith in this matter and who are interested in grinding some political axe and who are interested in pushing further their plans of counter-revolutionary restoration in Hungary. As far as our Government is concerned, our Ambassador is there. Mr. Khosla is there and Mr. Rehman is there. It is clear that the three representatives of the Government of India are there and are going round these places discovering things for themselves. That shows their confidence in us; that also shows that we would get the facts that the Prime Minister requires for basing our opinions and judgment on the matter. We should not get ourselves mixed up with the other shady elements who are interested only in imperialist and capitalist counter-revolutionary restoration of fascism, I am grateful to the Prime Minister for having read out the resolution which was going to be moved in the United Nations. How can he support that resolution? India can never support that resolution. That resolution is yet another manoeuvre to use the United Nations Organisation, its name and authority, to exploit the sentiments of the people, with a view to pressing forward the counter-revolutionary gains, with a view to disrupting the relationship between peace-loving nations, for instance our country on the one hand and the countries of socialism on the other. It is an outrageous manoeuvre, and I think that Mr. Krishna Menon would never support it. It is not a question of drafting only. Let the Prime Minister draft it, and we will see how he drafts it. The Prime

Minister was very frank about it, but I cannot understand that resolution. It says 'Hungarian authorities'. A Government is in the U.N. Organisation, a recognised Government. Nobody has declared that Government out of court. If in that resolution it is said 'Hungarian authorities', there should be something behind it. Any other stand would have been to play into the hands of the fascists there. Therefore, we have to be careful. Now, the pity of the situation is that sometimes we do not know where we should draw the line.

Mr. Deputy Chairman, I want to make it clear that we are not for military blocs. We do not like foreign forces to be stationed in any country, but at the same time we recognise the situation in which such a thing has developed. N.A.T.O. produced the Warsaw Pact, but the Warsaw powers made it clear that the moment N.A.T.O. was annulled, the Warsaw Pact also would come to an end. Not only that; there was a proposal that the signatories of the two pacts should meet for this purpose but it was turned down by the leaders of the N.A.T.O. countries. Even in the disarmament proposals circulated by the Soviet Prime Minister there were similar suggestions, but they have been turned down. Therefore, we should not equate Egypt with Hungary. We know that Chou En-lai has assured us:

"On the other hand, the Indian Government and people can rest assured that they will always have the full support of the Chinese Government and people in their struggle for the defence of their sovereignty and territorial integrity and the promotion of world peace."

Even after this can we equate the Socialist camp with the imperialist camp? Can we equate China with Britain or for that matter the Soviet Union with the U.S.A.? I think we must have a balanced judgment. We must recognise that there are friends who are prepared to fight shoulder to shoulder with us.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN:
Close your remarks, Mr. Gupta.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I hope that developments will take place soon when the Hungarian problem will get solved, but one thing I would like to make clear that the people of Hungary and for that matter all people, would never never, allow Hungary to be delivered into the hands of the Anglo-American powers for the restoration of fascist gangs like that of Horthy. They would not like the night club rulers to come back to Hungary. If anybody thinks that that kind of thing is going to happen, he is living in a fool's paradise. Socialism is not going to be allowed to be butchered by these gangsters. Socialism will be defended. No doubt mistakes have been committed and they must be rectified. The process of democratisation must be guaranteed, sovereignty must be restored and equality of status with other socialist countries must be completely ensured. All these things will happen. The cause of Socialism cannot be strengthened by taking Hungary out of the socialist system and placing it on a silver platter and putting it into the hands of the imperialist powers.

SHRI G. RANGA (Andhra Pradesh): Mr. Deputy Chairman, I wish to express and extend my whole-hearted support to the foreign policy pursued by our Prime Minister during the last decade and especially during the recent crisis in international affairs. It is an interesting political phenomenon in our political life here that, while there are organised apologists for the Soviet political forces in foreign affairs, there are no apologists at all either for the British or the French or any other political force in the world. We have just now heard a very passionate apologia for what is happening in Hungary. We have no grievance at all about what has fallen from our friends in the opposition. With what they have said so far as Egypt is concerned, we agree. We agree that Great Britain and France behaved atrociously towards poor Egypt. We

also know that our Prime Minister hastened to condemn their action as naked aggression, and the whole country has stood by him. It was easy for him to make that declaration because the British and the French openly came out with their ultimatum. There was no secrecy about it. The only secrecy about it was that no one knew that they were going to issue an ultimatum until they came out with the ultimatum, but once they gave it, it became public property. Naturally it became easy for our Government to condemn that aggression, but when it came to what was happening in Hungary, it was not so easy for us. My hon. friend, the leader of the Communist Group, was saying that we had our three representatives there, that the Hungarian Government threw open its doors and gave all possible information to them, but our own Prime Minister was here to say even as late as the 19th of last month that it was not possible for them to get proper information, and that was the reason why he had to make statements about it when he had been to Calcutta and earlier also. Those statements were not satisfactory and that was the reason why he made a most satisfactory statement on the 19th of last month.

Sir, I wish to say that the statement made by the Prime Minister in the other House will come to be treated as the touchstone on which the doings of the great and small powers will come to be judged for many years to come hereafter. That was a statement to which, I am sure, all the lovers of freedom all over the world will look as the guiding star for their own activities. That statement has made it perfectly clear that, in spite of all the quotations that my hon. friend over there has just now read out, the rising in Hungary was a people's rising, was a popular rising, was a real revolutionary uprising therefore it has to be treated as such. In spite of that, our friends on the other side would like us to believe that there was some nefarious power working behind, that, there was an underground move-

ment, and that America and various other countries were behind it and that that was the reason why the uprising took place. I think that is a wrong way of looking at it. The mere admission made by hon. friends here today and also by Mr. Kadar and various other people also in Hungary, make it perfectly clear that the ten years of Communist administration that was imposed upon those people, with the aid and support of the Soviet forces that had been there ever since the Armistice, because such an anathema to the different classes of people, oppressed them so much, insulted their own national sentiment to such an extent, even to the extent of changing their codes and emblems, their flags and everything and even their language and idioms, that the people had to rise against it and nobody could possibly complain, if, in the face of all that was happening, there were forces which had to work in the underground in order to work towards that uprising. Nevertheless it was a spontaneous national uprising and I sincerely hope that similarly, attempts will be made in all the other occupied countries or the South East European countries, in order to achieve their own democratic administration. (*Interruption.*) It is only too clear that when Poznan riots took place in Poland, Soviet Russia wisely came to terms with the Polish people. When the people of Eastern Germany also rose in revolt against their own oppression, Soviet Russia had the wisdom to come to terms with them. Soviet Russia was also on the way to come to terms with the Hungarians themselves in that country and actually on the 30th of October they were negotiating for the withdrawal of Soviet troops and also for proper measures to look after the internal security when unfortunately the Anglo-French invasion of Egypt gave them an excuse not only to break off those negotiations but also to rush in their own troops and their own armaments and then catch hold of the Ministers themselves and others generally, who were discussing with them the question of cease fire and put them in jail. This is how it has happened. It is no good our try-

ing to blame only Russia or the British and the French. Both of them seem to be up to the same game. Both of them seem to be pursuing the same imperialist aggression but unfortunately. . . .

SHRI K. S. HEGDE: Both of them are colonialists.

SHRI G. RANGA: Unfortunately the rest of the world is so much divided in its own affections that many other things equally nefarious, have gone without being properly condemned and brought before the bar of public opinion. What have the Americans done in order to help the Algerians, whose leaders—like the Pancha Pandavas,—whose five revolutionary leaders were suddenly and disgracefully captured by the French people while they were guests and were going from one country, which was a former French colony, to another country which was also a French colony. Merely because the pilot happened to be a Frenchman they were taken away and were kept as captives. That is as great a heinous deed on the part of the French Government as the attack on Egypt, and yet the American press has kept silent. This is our difficulty and that is all the more reason why there is justification for the stand our Prime Minister has been taking for the last ten years so unswervingly and so persistently with such great faith, of non-attachment either to this bloc or that bloc. We find that the French Government is keen on remaining in Egypt for as long as it is possible. It is most unfortunate that except for a few parties out of the many parties they have in their own Parliament, and a few daily papers, the rest of the French people are behind this invasion. It is a thing to be very much regretted but that is not the case in England. It is surely to the eternal credit of the British Labour Party or the Opposition there and their leaders Mr. Bevan as well as Mr. Gaitskell, that they have stood so solidly, so heroically, against their Government and have even threatened to take the extremist possible constitutional steps in order to thwart the Govern-

[Shri G. Ranga.]

ment in its policy of invasion. I had the privilege of being there, in the Gallery of the House of Commons, along with my friend who is sitting on the Treasury Benches, Mr. K. C. Reddy, on one or two days and I was able to witness the debate that was going on. The Labour Party never gave any quarter at all to the British Government, to Mr. Eden and his supporters, Mr. Selwyn Lloyd and other people. It is that which is the justification for the Prime Minister's insistence that we should not be hasty in regard to our policy of whether to remain in the Commonwealth or not. We have forces both good and bad in every country. Fortunately, in England they are so equally balanced against each other that any day the present Conservative Ministry may be replaced by the Labour Ministry and the Labour Party has already made it perfectly clear to the rest of the world that they feel just as strongly about Egypt as we do. There was an occasion when their Foreign Minister wanted to make a statement on Hungary. But the Labour Party would not allow him to go ahead with it because they said it did not lie in the mouth of the Conservative Ministry to talk of it when they had the problem of the Suez Canal and while their own tanks and their guns were destroying the people of Egypt. The same thing can be said in regard to my friends' attitude also. They take the same line that the Conservative Party and the Conservative Ministry in Great Britain has been taking most unfortunately and with such disastrous results.

Having said that, I am all in favour, indeed I felt very happy, when I read in the papers, that Mr. Krishna Menon has emphatically stated in the United Nations that the aggressors cannot be given the right to say how and when the Suez Canal was to be cleared and by whom and that somebody else has to pay the cost for it. He insisted that Great Britain and France should pay for what mischief that they have themselves perpetrated over the Suez Canal. That

is the line that we should take and that is the line we have taken and I am sure every patriotic Indian would like to congratulate our delegation there as well as our own Government for the strong and courageous stand that they have taken, the unequivocal stand that they have taken, even while remaining within the Commonwealth.

Having said that, I would like to say a word about the African freedom movement which is going on in the different countries of Africa. The Gold Coast is going to be free. Nigeria, also, is trying to be free but what is happening in Kenya? How long are the Kenya people to be allowed to be sabotaged, to be oppressed by the British Imperialism? What is happening in the Central African Federation except that the Negro people are being kept down by a small minority of white men, while they themselves are claiming to be having self-government there? What is the position in Tanganyika and Uganda and in all these countries? It is quite possible for the various Imperialist powers to go on complaining about India's foreign policy in trying to encourage these people but the truth remains there that the African people, as has been said by my hon. friend Mr. Dasappa, are awakened, astir and they are going to achieve their own freedom and very soon they are going to hold their own conference—the African Congress—on the soil of Africa for the first time in the history of the Congress and I sincerely hope that our Government would be able to place its moral and material support at the disposal of these people in order to help them also to become free.

(Time bell rings.)

May I have a few minutes more, Sir?

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Fifteen minutes are over.

SHRI G. RANGA: In regard to these South East European countries, I would like to say one word more. We are not very particular whether

they remain communistic, socialistic or democratic. We do not want to insist that they be this, that or the other. We would like them to be democratic; we would like them to be socialistic but we would also like them to be co-operative. In those countries, even today there are underground forces, not forces merely but even political parties. There is the most important and powerful party, the peasants' party which was functioning before the Communists came and violently drove them away, drove them out of their country with the help of the Soviet Army. These parties used to form Ministries in those countries. In Hungary, it was actually the peasants' party which formed the Ministry and such people have been the Prime Ministers before in those countries; but they had to flee their countries merely because of the violence of the Communists and the violence of the Red Armies. Those people have their supporters in those countries; their parties are still functioning. They are not reactionary; they are not in favour of the Roman Catholic Cardinals or any of these people. They are democratic and they believe in the co-operative commonwealth and in democratic socialism. Those people are carrying on their own democratic propaganda but they necessarily must remain underground. Those people have got to be helped, if not directly by the Government but by other ways. I cannot expect the Government to get itself implicated in any of these things but it is the duty of all lovers of freedom all over the world and also in our country, to stand by those people and hope against hope, if need be—and I do not think it is going to be against hope because of the things that have happened in Poland and Hungary in the recent weeks—that these people should be able to gain freedom in their countries. What is it that we want? We want all these ten satellite countries to be free even within the Soviet Bloc. Let them become nationally free just as Yugoslavia has become free. If it is right for Yugoslavia, be it a revolutionary country or a socialistic country or a communistic country, to be free from Soviet

influence all these eight years and to snap its fingers in the face of Soviet Russia and yet survive, then it must be right for all these ten satellite countries to become free to achieve their national freedoms and get complete freedom to decide what sort of a Government they should have. On all these points, I am glad, Sir, that we have received strength and a powerful strength from our own Prime Minister and I am sure that all these people in the South East European countries and also in Africa, will be doubly grateful to the wisdom, the statesmanship, the farsightedness and the heroism of our Prime Minister who has had the courage of developing this non-attachment programme and of following it for all these ten years which today is standing us in good stead all over the world.

SHRI AHMAD SAID KHAN (Uttar Pradesh): Mr. Deputy Chairman, I rise to give my wholehearted support to the foreign policy announced by our Prime Minister this morning. That the foreign policy of India has succeeded is self-evident truth. There is nobody in India who doubts and if anybody has still any doubt, he should only go out of the country and see what respect our foreign policy commands in other countries.

Before I deal with the two aggressions which were committed recently, I would like to make a few observations about the attitude of Pakistan as described by our Prime Minister. Pakistan has again started a campaign of abuse against India. I am sorry for it although I am not surprised at it because we often hear these periodic outbursts of abuses from Pakistan. They say that they are afraid of India, that India is going to attack them knowing full well that we believe in Panch Sheela and also that we are great believer in peaceful co-existence. If proof is needed, we negotiated with the French for the transfer of the French possessions; we have not taken over Goa by force as yet. These are the clear proofs of our policy and still they are saying that India is their enemy. I do not think they are working under any

[Shri Ahmad Said Khan.] complexes; they are doing it purposefully and the reason is this: Since Independence, they have made so many changes in their Governments. Five or six Prime Ministers came on the stage and disappeared and whenever any Government is in danger of being attacked by the various parties, they want to protect themselves by raising this bogey of fear of India. This is really what is at the bottom of these terrific outbursts of abuses from Pakistan. I would only tell them this: "Please look into your own affairs. Put them right before you talk of others. Do leave us alone. If you really want to become strong, unite your own nation and look after the minorities. Let there be a united and strong Pakistani nation. Then only can you become strong, not by raising this sort of objection against other countries. You cannot get strength in this manner."

As to the aggressions against Egypt and Hungary, I would like to say only this that, these aggressions have shocked the confidence of the nations all the world over. Sir, an aggression is wrong from whatever quarter it comes; but coming as it does from those very quarters which pose themselves to be the guardians of the security of the smaller nations, who pose themselves to be the angels of peace, it is doubly heinous, reprehensible and cruel. Sir, you must have noticed that among the aggressors, three of them are founder-members of the 'United Nations and the permanent members of Security Council. If the permanent members of the Security Council are going to commit aggression, where will security take shelter? That is the point. Human intelligence is so acute that you can find arguments for or against anything; but the real test of an argument rests in the fact of its appeal to an unprejudiced and impartial mind. These aggressors have put forward many arguments and reasons for their aggression. For instance, in Hungary, it is said that this was due to the anti-revolutionary movements which had to be crushed.

(*Interruption.*) Some of our friends here have got up a sort of apologia for Russia; but I would ask my friends here, "If the country has experienced a Communist government for ten years and now wants to make a change, is that an offence? Why should they not be allowed to effect a change? Why should they not be allowed to have a government of their choice and why should they be given a blood-bath for the reason that they want to change their government?"

As far as poor Egypt is concerned, many reasons have been given. One of the reasons given was that this was necessary to stop the war between Egypt and Israel. Very well, let us examine this. If it was for this purpose, then the obvious thing was that this military might of France and Great Britain ought to have gone against Israel's army to stop it from crushing Egypt. That was the obvious thing to have been done. Instead of that, they crippled and paralyzed the residents of the country which was defending herself. Is this the way of guarding the peace of the world? Yes, that is one way of guarding the peace, but it will be a peace of the grave-yard; it cannot be peace with justice. The other reason has been put forward that it was done because of Communism coming into the Middle East. Very well, let us examine this point also. Has this stopped Communism? Has Communism been stopped or has the door been opened wide for Communism to enter into the Middle East? Sir, ideology cannot be fought with bullets. To fight an ideology we must put forward a counter ideology more attractive to the people than the previous one. By this action they have forced these Middle East nations to look up to Russia as their saviour and as their protector. These nations were not only non-Communists but anti-Communists because many of them are monarchies and all of them are deeply religious. Neither a monarchy can go hand in hand with Communism nor a religious nation can be a good companion to Communism. By this action of theirs they have put them

in such a difficult position that they have no other alternative but to look towards Russia as their champion. Luckily for the Western nations, Russia simultaneously committed aggression and for this reason I am sure even the Middle East nations are bewildered as to where to go and to whom to look for protection. There can be one other reason also. Though it has not been given out by France or Great Britain, one cannot help feeling that it was due to the nationalisation of the Suez Canal. Because as soon as this announcement was made by Col. Nasser mobilisation began and when one puts these two things together, one sometimes feels that Suez Canal may be at the bottom of all this trouble. From that point of view also, it can be asked, was there any urgency for it? The Suez Canal was open all right; the ships were going through without let or hindrance. The whole affair was before the U.N.O. which would have, I am sure, evolved a formula that would have protected the sovereignty of Egypt on the one hand and would have given assurance to the user-nations of free passage through the canal. Where was the need and where was the urgency for this attack? By this attack, they have blocked the Suez Canal. With all these threatening clouds on the horizon of international politics, there are silver linings also. One of the silver linings is the attitude of the United Nations Organisation. They have expressed themselves in the most clear terms against this aggression. The other silver lining is the attitude of America and there I will give the United States all the credit because two of her most powerful allies were involved in this aggression and in spite of that they took up the case of the weaker nations and raised their voice against this aggression. The third silver lining is that although this aggression has been committed by the Government of Great Britain, the nation unanimously is not behind the Government in this affair. In fact, in my life I have never seen such a sharp difference between the Opposition and the Government in Great Britain on any foreign matter as on this occasion of Egyptian aggres-

sion. These are the silver linings in these threatening clouds.

My friends proposed that we should go out of the Commonwealth. Well, I cannot understand this. I think this suggestion is the result of some misconception of the position. The members of the Commonwealth are not subordinates to each other and here is a proof of it that England committed this aggression and India expressed herself most vehemently against that aggression. The Commonwealth is really an association or a panchayat of free sovereign independent nations who sit together and discuss matters of common interest and therefore I see no reason why we should walk out of the British Commonwealth. If it is suggested that we should not associate with the aggressors, then we will have to walk out from the U.N.O. also because the three permanent members of the Security Council have committed aggression there. Sir, our Prime Minister is now going to visit the United States and I do hope that he will impress upon the President of the United States in what way this aggression has affected the weak and small nations and how it has shaken their confidence in the sweet promises of the big Powers. I hope he will also tell them what to do to reassure them.

As far as the weak nations are concerned, my advice is this that it is impossible for us to compete with these big Powers in the race of armaments but if our leaders try to get our nations united, if we try towards the solidarity of our own nations, then I am certain that we can never be subordinated or subjugated by any other nation. Sir, I give my wholehearted support to the policy expressed by our Prime Minister.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: Mr. Deputy Chairman, this morning we heard with rapt attention the world situation analysed in a masterly way by our distinguished Prime Minister. In his analysis he dealt with three problems that are facing the world.

[Shri Jaswant Singh.]

First of all, the Prime Minister dealt with our neighbour, Pakistan. We have noticed from the history of the case which the Prime Minister gave to us how we have been obliging the aggressive actions of Pakistan at every step, even I should say, at the cost of the interests of our country. The villainy and the abuse that is being hurled against our country by Pakistan from the very beginning since the division of the country took place is too well known to be spoken of now. The great massacres that took place of the population was started by Pakistan and since then they want to turn out by some means or other every Hindu so that there may not remain even a single member of the minority community in that country. Those of us who live on the borders of Pakistan like Rajasthan, and particularly in the former state of Bikaner whose common border with Pakistan is something like 200 miles and over, know what hardship we are facing at the hands of Pakistan. Whenever we approach our State Government and the Centre for redress, we are told to keep quiet and we are assured that justice in the end will prevail but this is encouraging Pakistan to make more and more inroads on our country and always we are blamed before the eyes of the world that it is because of the aggressive policy of India that Pakistan is like this.

As far as Kashmir is concerned, we heard a pathetic story from the Prime Minister that we were in an advantageous position and even then to oblige Pakistan we had to give up our own interests. Now again we hear—I do not know how far it is true and I hope in the reply the Prime Minister or the spokesman of the External Affairs Ministry would kindly say as to whether it is a fact—that the Government of India as a matter of policy is thinking in terms of allowing Pakistan to retain one-third of Kashmir which is at present in its possession. Some time ago it appeared in the papers that the Prime Minister is thinking on the lines of the present division of Kashmir.

This is definitely against the interests of the country. When they are aggressors, to allow the aggressors to keep the booty in their hands is definitely against the interests of the country and it is high time that our country took some active steps to see that our ancestral, sacred home and country that is in the possession of Pakistan is restored to us without loss of time.

The second question is in regard to Egypt. I have heard different viewpoints expressed on the floor of the House and according to the ideologies of different parties, my reading of the situation is that, of course, the Prime Minister is a distinguished personality and is a personality which is one of the few in the world. We have seen during the last eight or nine years that the prestige which the country has acquired after independence is something tremendous and there cannot be a comparison of what we are soon after independence and what our international position is today. But the fact remains that in these two examples which the world has witnessed, where criminal suppression of human freedom and liberty has taken place, somehow or other our policy has been too mild. In other words, we have used two standards to examine the two happenings. First of all, take the case of Egypt. It is a matter of pride for Indians that the reaction of our Prime Minister was immediate and firm. He lost no time in condemning the aggressors. From the very day when the Suez Canal Company was nationalised by President Nasser, there was an uproar in England and in France. Immediately the Prime Minister in this House denounced the intentions of those two countries and at every subsequent stage he lost no time in supporting President Nasser and opposing the viewpoints of the two countries which eventually invaded Egypt. If we follow the succession of events that took place, we feel that those who are acquainted with the characteristics of the British nation should have had no doubt from the very beginning that when the interests of their country are involved

they would go to any extent, howsoever peace-loving and otherwise justice-loving they may be. As neutralists, of course, they have set standards for fairness and justice. But where the interests of their country were concerned, they throw overboard all sense of justice. They will go the whole hog to acquire what they consider is in the interests of their country. Therefore, for a small country like Egypt, where President Nasser wanted to act in haste and in certain respects wanted to copy Hitler or Mussolini, it was crystal clear that he was bound to come to grief, because he had to deal with two nations which would never leave him alone. Some time ago, it appeared in the papers that before he nationalised the Suez Canal Company, he happened to mention this fact to Marshal Tito and Tito seemed to have advised him that he should leave this problem alone, lest he should find himself in a real hot water. And this is exactly what has happened. After he nationalised the Suez Canal Company, he was constantly in touch with our country and naturally he took advice at every step from our Prime Minister and from our Ambassador in Egypt. It is all right for a big country to stand on its sovereign rights, but for a small country to pick up a quarrel with big powers, especially in regard to matters, the repercussion of which was international, was not right. The sovereignty over Suez Canal, as far as Egypt was concerned, was never questioned. But in a matter like this, the treatment of Egypt against Israel in not allowing its ships to pass through the canal, it was evident that if they were in sole authority to control the canal, anything might happen.

SHAH MOHAMAD UMAIR: It is wrong. It has already been denied and contradicted a hundred times by Egypt.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: It has been denied by President Nasser and yet Israeli ships were not allowed to pass through the canal. Well, it is very difficult in international matters

to trust anybody and the result is what we are seeing here. But as far as our Government is concerned, it left no stone unturned to denounce the aggressors.

But, Sir, what has happened when the aggression on Hungary took place? We have heard an impassioned speech of Mr. Bhupesh Gupta and he has put his point of view. And we have heard the Prime Minister's speech and other Members. But we cannot get away from the fact that while dealing with Hungary we have been very cautious. We treated this question with a little hesitation as to how to proceed with it. It was on the 22nd of October that this uprising in Hungary took place and it was the direct outcome of the de-Stalinisation policy of Moscow. In east European countries which wanted to throw away the domination of Moscow, these uprisings took place and Hungary also aspired for independence. After two days, Mr. Nagy came to power and also he was arrested and thrown away. The Soviet forces came and occupied Hungary and we know all these events which I need not reiterate. For at least two weeks, we never even raised a voice or whispered as to what was happening. On top of it what happened? Our representative at the United Nations, Mr. Krishna Menon, said that it was a purely domestic affair of the Hungarian people. This was a position which astounded the world and the position of India was compromised, particularly when we are raising questions in the United Nations like treatment of non-Whites in South Africa and the suppression of Algerian revolt by France. We say that these two questions are international affairs. But when a foreign army coming from Soviet Russia fights against the people of Hungary, killing them by the thousand—in the streets thousands and thousands of refugees are running away from Hungary and taking shelter in other countries—who would like to leave one's country—we say, our representative at the United Nations says that the question of Hungary is a purely domestic matter.

[Shri Jaswant Singh.]

Sir, this is a policy which discredits our country in the international affairs especially when during the last eight or nine years we have built up our reputation and position to the highest point in the world.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You will take more time, I suppose.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: Yes, Sir.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: We have got a large number of names. So we will sit through the lunch hour tomorrow. The hon. Members will come prepared. The House stands adjourned till 11 A.M. tomorrow.

The House then adjourned at five of the clock till eleven of the clock on Tuesday, the 4th December, 1956.