

### CO-ORDINATED SCHEME OF SPECIALISED DAIRY FARMING

111. MOULANA M. FARUQI: Will the Minister for FOOD and AGRICULTURE be pleased to state:

(a) whether a three-year co-ordinated scheme of specialised dairy farming with centres in a number of States has been finalised by the Dairy Science Committee of the Indian Council of Agricultural Research;

(b) if so, what is the cost of the scheme; and

(c) what action has so far been taken for implementation of the scheme?

THE MINISTER FOR FOOD AND AGRICULTURE (SHRI A. P. JAIN: (a) Not yet finalised. Details of the scheme will be revised by an *ad hoc* Committee, being set up for the purpose.

(b) and (c) Do not arise.

### PILOT PROJECT FOR TRACHOMA CONTROL NEAR ALIGARH

112. MOULANA M. FARUQI: Will the Minister for HEALTH be pleased to state:

(a) whether a pilot project for trachoma control has recently been inaugurated near Aligarh;

(b) if so, whether it is being executed under the joint auspices of the Government of India and the World Health Organisation; and

(c) if the reply to part (b) above be in the affirmative what are the terms of the agreement under which this project is being executed?

THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH (RAJKUMARI AMRIT KAUR): (a) Yes—at Tappal, 32 miles from Aligarh.

(b) Yes.

(c) As per agreement signed between the Government of India and the W.H.O., the World Health Organisation is to provide—

(i) one Trachomologist for a period of two years.

(ii) one Comberg Slit Lamp,

(iii) two fellowships of 6 months' duration each in 1958 (1 Medical Officer and 1 Pathologist).

and the Government of India is to supply all personnel, materials, equipment and transport necessary for the project. The work on the project is progressing satisfactorily.

### MOTION ON PRESENT INTERNATIONAL SITUATION—continued

SHRI JASWANT SINGH (Rajasthan): Mr. Deputy Chairman, yesterday I was speaking of our foreign policy as far as it affected Pakistan, Egypt and Hungary. The Prime Minister in his address told us that the political and economic conditions in Pakistan were deteriorating and that therefore the Government there was trying to find an excuse for their public. Also Mr. Bhupesh Gupta told us that the people of Pakistan, particularly in East Pakistan, were not with their Government. On this point I would like to submit that whatever the conditions of the people of Pakistan may be, as far as the question of India is concerned, they are one. We in Western Rajasthan, particularly in Bikaner, are more acquainted with the people of Pakistan. Thousands of people from our border crossed over to Pakistan. We deliberately sent them over because their lives were in danger and many of them would have been killed. At that time the Muslim League was at its height, and every Muslim of India more or less was associated with the League.

SHAH MOHD. UMAIR (Bihar): every Muslim.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: I do say that most of the Muslims were associated with the Muslim League, and only a few of them were with the Congress. Mr. Jinnah time and again had been saying that the Congress was a Hindu organisation.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: We are now concerned with foreign policy.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: I am replying to my friend who interrupted me. If you do not want me to reply to him.....

SHAH MOHAMAD UMAIR: I did not interrupt, I rather protested on behalf of the Congress Muslims.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: I said 'Most of them'. It was a fact whether you agree or not.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You come to foreign policy.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: I am on my point also, if you listen to me. All the people residing in that part of the country would not have anything to do with the Muslim League. They were staunch Indians, and if anything, they had sympathy with India only, but when partition took place, they went over to the Pakistan side. What is the attitude of those people there? They have old connections with us, old contacts. Whether with or without visas or passports, they come over and have contacts with us. They enter into monetary dealings with us and then go back to Pakistan. On the other side of the Gang Canal between Bahawalpur and Bikaner, they say slogans, and we hear them:

“हमने पाकिस्तान लिया हंसते हंसते, हिन्दुस्तान लगे लड़ते लड़ते।”

I am referring to the mentality of the Pakistanis, whatever their economic and political conditions. They may be rent with dissensions, but as far as India is concerned, they are all one. Therefore, if we adopt a complacent attitude with regard to Pakistan, when their mentality is like this, it is definitely going to be against our interests.

Sir, it was pathetic and distressing to see the Prime Minister talking helplessly while he dealt with the exodus of millions of Hindus from East Pakistan. It was surprising that he showed such helplessness in dealing with that situation. The position of the poor Hindus, wherever they go, is like that.

Here our West Bengal Government says that they have reached the saturation point and the other States are unwilling to take them on, and we are sending them to the Andamans, where they are unwilling to go. Pakistan is sending from that side thousands every day to our country. Sir, it is today that we mourn the death of Sardar Patel. If he had been amongst us here, Pakistan dare not adopt this policy towards India.

SHRI GOPIKRISHNA VIJAI-VARGIYA (Madhya Pradesh): Even then the exodus was there.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: In what proportions? Pakistan would have known the consequences if they had continued this policy of theirs. Even when the exodus was going on, they knew that they had to deal with a man who would not mince words in dealing with them.

Yesterday I also dealt with the question of Egypt and Hungary. I tried to compare how we had adopted two standards in dealing with these problems. I would take up the next point with which the Prime Minister dealt in regard to these issues. He spoke with some warmth of the various pacts, both by the Eastern Bloc as well as by the Western Bloc. I would submit that as long as human nature will remain as it is, these pacts and blocs will last. They may totter time and again, but they will again be revived. When the Prime Minister was dealing with these pacts, we had expected that he would draw some distinction in regard to the various pacts. He dealt at length with SEATO, the Baghdad Pact, and he also said that the Warsaw Pact was a reply to SEATO and other pacts by the Western Bloc. I would submit in this connection that it would have been better if the Prime Minister had drawn a distinction between these two Pacts. Here is SEATO where a leading member of the pact is being disowned by the smaller powers in it, while there is the Warsaw Pact.....

SHRI K. S. HEGDE (Madras): You mean the Baghdad Pact.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: I am sorry; I meant the Baghdad Pact. And there is the Warsaw Pact which is a sort of stranglehold round Hungary. These two pacts cannot under any circumstances be compared. Take the case of NATO or take the case of SEATO and other pacts where the partners are free to disown any of the other members, but as far as the Warsaw Pact is concerned, no member of the pact dare disown the suzerainty and sovereignty of Moscow over them. So, between these two sets of pacts there is a very big difference, and we had expected that the Prime Minister would have at least drawn a distinction between these pacts. Similarly we see the other pacts also tottering. Take the Colombo Powers, and recently we had a meeting of the Colombo Powers and what was the result? Pakistan did not associate itself with the others. Even if it was not a pact in the sense that it is not an aggressive or defensive pact but a peace pact, it is also tottering. Therefore, it would have been much better, if the Prime Minister had drawn a distinction between the different kinds of pacts. He dealt with aggression and intervention. In regard to this question also it would have been much better, as it is difficult to appreciate the distinction between the two, if the Prime Minister had dealt with this. So far as the Western Bloc is concerned, the term used all along by us and by the Colombo Powers is 'aggression' while in regard to the Eastern Bloc, it is only 'intervention'. I would like to know which is worse. What we call aggression is, the armies of Great Britain and Israel are fighting with the armies of Egypt. It is an aggression, we are told. As regards intervention, it is, the armies of a foreign country, Russia, are fighting against the people of Hungary, not the armies of Hungary but the people of Hungary, while the Russian tanks and armoured cars are rolling over and the unarmed people, the peasants, the workers, the trade unionists etc. are being trampled over and this, our Government say, is only a mere intervention and that it is a domestic affair of Hungary. Over this latter point I dealt with yesterday.

To any man with some commonsense it will appear that this so-called intervention of Russia is worse than the aggression of Great Britain and France against Egypt. What is the result? The result is this that all along, on this question of Middle East and Hungary what we have been seeing is that all along an element of hesitancy and mental reservation was discernible in disapproval of Soviet action while there was outright condemnation of British and French action. It is a triumph for democracy that the Government was forced by pressure of public opinion to change its lukewarm and supine attitude and it is for the first time that the Indian press and Indian public opinion have gone against the policy of our Prime Minister. Originally the Prime Minister was lukewarm against the action of Soviet Russia but it is the public opinion and the Indian press which deserve the credit for changing the views of our Government and it is a real triumph for democracy. In this connection the position can be clarified only when our spokesman of the Foreign Ministry or the Prime Minister replies to the debate and he should clear two or three points which I want to raise in this connection. First of all I would like to know in unqualified terms whether this aggression from the Western Powers is excusable or the so-called intervention from the Eastern Bloc. This has not been made clear so far. Of course, now, they are veering round to the point that they are also equally to be blamed but in definite terms it has never been stated as to who is the worse culprit. They are equal culprits and I would have been happy if Mr. Bhupesh Gupta, while in his impassioned speech yesterday, would have said that whichever Party it may be, whosoever may be the culprit they should be condemned in equal terms. It is in these terms that I would like to know in reply to the debate, as to whether they are equally to be blamed or still the Eastern Bloc is less to be blamed as compared to the Western Bloc.

The second question that I would like to ask in this connection is whether the Indian Government found it

[Shri Jaswant Singh]

difficult to denounce Russia as a naked aggressor without convicting itself of having such partners to Panch Shila. Thus it is that we give the impression that we are apologetic for Soviet Union's intervention in Hungary and that we were in dubious partnership with those who trampled on the freedom of people. It is a blunt negation of sincere faith in the principles of Panch Shila.

**SHRI GOPIKRISHNA VIJAIVAR-GIYA:** Does the hon. Member think that there is some Pact of Panch Shila?

**SHRI JASWANT SINGH:** I say it is a Pact of Panch Shila in this way because the Russians were signatories to Panch Shila and now we are feeling unhappy because one of the partners to Panch Shila has behaved in this manner

The third question that I would like to be answered is whether we were careful not to annoy our partners in Panch Shila after our experience of some 5 or 6 years ago when we wanted to criticise them in regard to the so-called liberation of Tibet and Korean issue and we received a rebuff both from Russia and from China? Was it this fear that stopped us from condemning the Eastern bloc for their intervention? These are the questions which have not so far been replied to by the Foreign Ministry and the matter will be absolutely cleared if they would enlighten the country and tell us as to where we actually stand.

**MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN:** Dr. Kunzru.

**SHRI JASWANT SINGH:** I have not yet finished. I would like to have five minutes more.

We are told that our policy is of non-alignment. We meet with both the blocs and we are a sort of link between them. I would like to draw the attention of this hon. House to the events that have taken place during the last two years. Of course we are playing the host to all sorts of countries and it is a very good thing and in the words

of the Prime Minister, we are providing a link between the two Blocs when they themselves are not meeting each other. From the Eastern bloc, leaders from Russia and China visited our country last year and Mr. Chou-En Lai is actually in our country. What has been our experience? Our experience is this that we are providing forum and platform to the different ideological power Blocs to criticise each other and even to omit venom and not poison against each other only in the country but in the Parliament when they are addressing the Members of the Houses of Parliament or at Rashtrapati Bhavan in replying to the toast at banquets and at other places. It is surprising how hospitality could be abused in this manner and I don't know how the hosts might be feeling in this matter. As far as the Western countries are concerned, so far, among the important States, the Heads of the Governments or States have not visited our country and therefore we cannot say what they would have said on the platforms and forums that we may provide for them but as far as the Eastern Bloc is concerned, they have actually visited us and what has been the repercussions in the world all over when our Russian guests were here? Our relations with the U.S. were completely broken and the attitude they took even on questions like Goa had become a serious problem and the position of Kashmir also came to discussion and we were placed in a very awkward position. I have not known of any foreign country providing forums and platforms for propaganda against any other friendly country but this is actually what we are doing at this moment.

Mr. Dasappa and other friends from the other side were telling us of the position that our country has attained in international affairs and compared what it was at the time of Independence to what it is just now. We all agree that through the efforts and through the personal position of our Prime Minister and the policies that he had followed so far, the status of our country has gone sky high. There is no denying the fact but I would also like

to know from our friends as to what is the status of our country now? We are only friends of the Eastern bloc...

AN HON. MEMBER: Who told you?

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: That is what the world is saying, the public opinion and the majority of the Indian press are saying that.

(Interruptions)

It is actually because of this pressure that the Government had to change its attitude. When we are doing these things, our position is bound to be compromised and the position which we have attained will not last long and we would be only friendly with one bloc and what has been the result? Mr. Krishna Menon, who at one time, as our representative, was acceptable all over the world, because of the policy that he has to follow according to instructions from here, would not be acceptable at many places today. That is where we have come to. Therefore, to sum up I would submit that as far as Pakistan is concerned, our policy towards that country is one of over-generosity. In other words, it is a policy of weakness. We are seeing that Pakistan is arming herself to the teeth with the help of foreign countries. We have also the experience.....

12 NOON.

SHRI PERATH NARAYANAN NAIR (Kerala): Not with the help of the Eastern bloc.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: No, not with the help of the Eastern bloc, but with the help from the U.S.A. We have also the experience of seeing how miserable little Israel could run over Egypt, which was also armed to the teeth, and cover an area three times its own area, without any opposition, so to say. Also we have the experience of Japan, a small country over-running China about seven or eight years ago, a country which is nearly fifty times its own size. Therefore, I say we should not be complacent when dealing with

Pakistan. God forbid, I pray the time may not come and we may not have to see the evil day, that Pakistan with its superiority in armaments and arms may not overcome our country, but she may do us the greatest harm. She may again raid Kashmir, may devastate our Bhakra Nangal project and other places of development. Then we may be wailing before the United Nations and a cease-fire and a truce may be effected, but the result would be nothing, except great harm done to us.

Similarly, the conclusion that I draw from the second point is that so far as the Eastern and Western blocs are concerned, we have adopted double standards for judging the acts of omissions and commissions of the two blocs. And finally, whatever belief the Government and the people may have in Panch Shila what has happened recently in certain countries and to those who are signatories to the concept of Panch Shila, who are our partners in it and who accept that concept, has proved to the hilt that Panch Shila has failed nationally and internationally.

With these remarks, Sir, I support the amendment moved by my hon. friend, Shri Kishen Chand, in this House.

SHRI H. N. KUNZRU (Uttar Pradesh): Mr. Deputy Chairman, when the Prime Minister spoke yesterday, he expressed the hope that the British and French forces would be withdrawn from Egypt. The speech made by the Foreign Secretary of Britain in the House of Commons yesterday makes it happily clear that Britain and France will carry out the Resolution of the United Nations and withdraw their forces from Egypt almost unconditionally. I say 'almost' because Mr. Lloyd, the British Foreign Secretary in his speech laid stress on certain points in the Resolution passed by the U.N. It is, of course, clear that when the U.N. Forces are in occupation of the Suez Canal Zone, and when the present causes of friction between Egypt and some other countries have been removed. Mr. Hammarskjöld, the Secretary General of the United Nations will negotiate with Egypt on the

[Shri H. N. Kunzru]

basis of the U.N. Resolution. Sir, it should be a matter of great satisfaction to us that one of those things that might have seriously disturbed the peace of the world is at last in a fair way of being dealt with in such a way as to respect the sovereignty of Egypt and to give satisfaction to all those whose interests are bound up with free navigation through the Suez Canal. Let us hope that in the improved atmosphere, the negotiations that will be carried on on behalf of the U.N. with Egypt will be successful and that the ugly chapter of aggression in Egypt will be finally closed.

Sir, I should think the promise given by the British Foreign Secretary that the British forces would be withdrawn from Egypt and that Israel would go back to its territory, I mean, that it would withdraw within its own frontiers, makes it unnecessary for one to dwell any further on the British and French aggression in Egypt.

The question of Hungary, however, has not yet been settled in the same amicable manner. Though the position is not absolutely clear, yet I think we know the main facts fairly well. A great deal of discussion on Russian intervention in Hungary took place in the Inter-Parliamentary Conference that was held recently in Thailand. The Russians, while admitting the reality of the grievances of the workers and the people of Hungary, charged the Western powers with having fomented a rebellion in Hungary.

They claimed that the revolution in Hungary was the result of the manoeuvring of what they call the Horthy Fascists and counter-revolutionaries who had been encouraged by the Western Powers. As the Prime Minister said yesterday, it is inevitable whenever any big movement arises that some people who join it do not have the same ideology as the originators of the movement; yet it cannot be said that merely because of the presence of undesirable people in such a movement, the movement owes its existence to their machinations. When the revolution began there was no reason to suppose that the majority

of the people who were demonstrating against the existing conditions in Hungary were mostly Fascists and counter-revolutionaries. President Tito in his speech on the 11th November to some members of his party said that in his opinion the invitation to the Russian army to intervene in Hungarian affairs and to suppress the revolution was a fatal mistake.

SHRI K. S. HEGDE: According to "Pravda" he is also a counter-revolutionary.

SHRI H. N. KUNZRU: Well, if this argument is to be followed then the real revolutionaries will be found only in Russia. It will mean virtually the isolation of Russia and one hopes that the line of argument that has been followed by "Pravda" because of the annoyance caused to the Russian leaders by President Tito's speech does not represent the policy that they mean to follow in future. Anyhow, President Tito in his speech said that in the demonstration that took place in October he thought that it was the Communists and the youth that were probably in a majority. It was the intervention of the Russian Army at that stage that made things worse and gave further impetus to the revolution. It seems to me that the real reason for the Russian intervention in Hungary was the unwillingness of Russia to allow a non-Communist Government to be established in Hungary. This is proved by the facts that have come to light.

When Mr. Imre Nagy was Prime Minister of Hungary he promised a number of reforms amongst which were free elections and the right to establish political parties. He also promised to abolish the secret police and indeed I think he said in one of his broadcasts that the secret police had been abolished.

SHRI P. N. SAPRU (Uttar Pradesh): He also reconstituted his Cabinet to include...

SHRI H. N. KUNZRU: He also made his Government a Government of all parties. Now after his fall and

Mr. Kadar's succession as Prime Minister of Hungary, what were the steps taken by Mr. Kadar to pacify the people who, according to both Russia and to him, were suffering from real grievances? He made a number of concessions. For instance, he agreed that the abolition of compulsory teaching of Russian in schools should be done away with. He confirmed Mr. Imre Nagy's promise regarding the abolition of the secret police. But he did not agree to free elections or to the existence of more than one party in Hungary. What he offered in place of it was a Government of national unity based on the ideology of the People's Democracy. That is, he offered to establish a Government of the very kind that the people had risen against.

Now, take, Sir, another fact into consideration. The Russian Army has crushed the so-called Horthy Fascists and the counter-revolutionaries. It may therefore be supposed that the demands that were made by the workers and the youth of Hungary are no longer the same as before, but the fact is that they are putting forward the same demands. They have asked repeatedly for Mr. Imre Nagy's return, for free elections, for a free press and a newspaper of their own. It is clear therefore that the views that were expressed before the intervention of Russia represent the real wishes and feelings of the people of Hungary. No matter what intervention may have taken place in Hungarian affairs, the basis of the discontent in Hungary and the cause of the revolution that took place was the determination, not of the Horthy Fascists and the counter-revolutionaries, but of the workers including the Communist workers and the Hungarian youth, not to allow a Government of the existing type to continue. Sir, it was recently admitted by the Hungarian newspaper *Ned Zabadaj* that the Hungarian people were hostile or indifferent—these are the words of the paper—to the new regime and appealed for unity according to the Radio Budapest. Now, see what the peasants are doing. The fear was expressed by an hon. Member yesterday that if Russia had not help-

ed Hungary the landlords and capitalist would have been in control of the Government, as they were about ten years ago. Now, see what has been happening after the Horthy Fascists and the counter-revolutionaries have been wiped out of existence. It was said in the Indian papers of 2nd December that the peasants were reported to be dividing up the collectives, establishing themselves on individual farms and appropriating machinery, equipment and livestock of the collectives for their own use. It is quite clear from these facts that it can no longer be maintained that the Hungarian revolution was the work of a few persons instigated by the Western powers. Mr. Kadar has promised an early implementation of the reforms that he has promised. But it appears from the papers that the workers are not satisfied. The fact that they went on strike in spite of the Russian troops shows the strength of feeling amongst them and the dissatisfaction in the existing form of government.

Before I pass on to another subject, I should like to refer to what I think may be called the arrest of Mr. Imre Nagy and his friends, contrary it seems to the promise given by the Hungarian Government to the Yugoslav embassy. They are said to be in Rumania and to have gone there at their own request and yet it has been, I think, publicly stated over the Budapest radio on the 26th by Mr. Kadar that he did not think Mr. Imre Nagy had gone to Rumania for good. He said the Communist party and the Government had thought it better if Mr. Imre Nagy disappeared for a while. Whether the Russian Government had a hand in this or not we do not know, but I shall suppose that the Russian Government had nothing to do with this affair. But it is clear from Mr. Kadar's own broadcast that he broke his promise and that he was a party to the arrest of Mr. Imre Nagy and his companions and of sending them to Rumania. The position can still be retrieved and the Hungarian question can be settled in such a way as to satisfy the people of Hungary themselves, who after all have the right

[Shri H. N. Kunzru]  
to decide what kind of Government they would live under. Whatever the consequences of that might have been, whatever the consequences of freedom in Hungary may be, it is not for Russia or for the present Government or for any other country to decide what kind of Government Hungary should have. That is the business of the people of Hungary themselves and I hope that as Britain and France have agreed to abide by the U.N. resolution, Hungary will follow the same course. Britain and France have been accused and justly accused of having been aggressors in Egypt. But they are trying to wipe out, to free themselves from this reproach. Let the Hungarian Government now follow their example and act in such a way as to make the United Nations, of which it is a member, feel that it will be a source of strength to it in the maintenance of world peace. And the first step that Hungary can take in this matter is to allow U.N. observers to enter its territory and to see things for themselves.

In the end I should like to say a few words about Mr. Suhrawardy's recent speech. The Prime Minister of Pakistan has accused India of having been chagrined by the American help to Pakistan. Mr. Nehru's argument, he said, that Pakistan's membership of the Baghdad Pact and SEATO had altered the situation in regard to Kashmir by upsetting the balance of power in the region, was meant to hide India's chagrin and their failure to dominate Pakistan strengthened by these alliances. It seems to me that the whole speech of the Prime Minister of Pakistan is the result of chagrin—chagrin caused not by anything done by India, but by the manner in which some of its proposals were received by the Egyptian Government. It is the rebuffs. It is obvious from Mr. Suhrawardy's speech that he is smarting under the rebuffs received by him recently from President Nasser. I may add on this point that America did not refuse to give arms to India. It was open to India to get arms from America, but India refused to follow the American lead and consequently did not ask and

did not wish to ask America for military help. It cannot, therefore, be said that India was chagrined by the military help given by America to Pakistan.

Take, again, the remarks made by the Prime Minister of Pakistan with regard to Egypt. Had they come from a non-Muslim country, from the Prime Minister or the Government of a non-Muslim country, it would have been accused of anti-Muslim bias and a regular propaganda of hatred would have been carried on against it throughout the Muslim world. But let us see what the Prime Minister of the biggest Muslim State has to say with regard to the British and French invasion of Egypt. Mr. Suhrawardy said 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.

SHRI P. N. SAPRU : That has been the argument of imperialism all along.

SHRI H. N. KUNZRU: These words show that the Prime Minister of Pakistan is trying to have his revenge now on President Nasser. But he ought to realise that the real reason for disagreement between Pakistan and Egypt is not Egypt's opposition either to Mr. Suhrawardy or to his country, but to the unfortunate policy of Pakistan of running with the hare and hunting with the hounds. This policy Egypt has not been able to appreciate and it has consequently given up all hopes of receiving any real help from Pakistan in its difficulties. Sir, the Prime Minister of Pakistan has accused Indians or some sections of Indians of not having reconciled themselves to the establishment of Pakistan. But in that very speech, Sir, he, posing as the protector of the Muslims of India, described them as "my countrymen". What do these words show? They show that it is Mr. Suhrawardy himself who has not



reconciled himself to the present position of Pakistan. How could a responsible person occupying so high a position as Mr. Suhrawardy describe the citizens of another country, though they may be his co-religionists, as his countrymen? The boot is obviously on the other leg, and it is clear that it is not the people of India but Mr. Suhrawardy himself who has not given up all thought of altering the present position. His own attitude makes him suspicious of the doings of others. Let him have a clear conscience and he will then cease to entertain any fears about the doings of our countrymen.

While on this subject, Sir, I should like to say a word about Kashmir. The Prime Minister of Pakistan has more than once referred to the duty of Pakistan to champion the rights of the Muslims in Kashmir. But let us see, Sir, what rights are enjoyed by the Muslims living in that part of Kashmir which is called Azad Kashmir. Sir, the memorandum which the leaders of Azad Kashmir submitted to the Constituent Assembly of Pakistan was as damaging to the Pakistan Government as any document could be. Later on, Sir, another document was submitted by some Pakistan politicians to the Constituent Assembly of Pakistan in which also serious allegations were made about the policy of Pakistan towards the so-called Azad Kashmir. The Azad Kashmiris themselves complained openly in public meetings of the treatment they had received at the hands of the Kashmir Ministry which was appointed by the Government of Pakistan. They pointed to the so-called Kashmir enslaved and oppressed by India, pointed out the political freedom and the rights the people of that part enjoyed, and asked whether Pakistan had done anything to provide the people of Azad Kashmir with even a fraction of the rights that the people of the oppressed section of Kashmir enjoyed. It seems that after that, Sir, an all-parties conference was held which demanded political rights for the people of Azad Kashmir. It seems that the Pakistan Government at that time agreed to it but nothing has been done about it so far, and yet

Mr. Suhrawardy regards himself as the protector of the Muslims of Kashmir.

Sir, I do not think that it is necessary for me to refer to any other point in Mr. Suhrawardy's speech because they were dealt with fully by the Prime Minister yesterday. The Prime Minister dealt with the Baghdad Pact so well that I do not think that it is necessary even for one who has visited the Middle East to say a word about it. Anyone who goes there for a day can see for himself how intense the dissatisfaction among the people with the Baghdad Pact is. We read in the papers yesterday that a number of religious leaders and some politicians and others had asked King Feisal not to keep the present Prime Minister of Iraq in his office. Some of those persons who signed the representation to the King of Iraq have been arrested and the Parliament of Iraq which was convened only recently has been indefinitely suspended. Now what is the reason for all this? The reason is that the people of Iraq and indeed the people of the whole of Arabia who listened to the Egyptian Radio are much more influenced by the Egyptian views than by the views of their own Governments. There are other causes too for their being against the Baghdad Pact and in favour of Egypt which in their estimation is following a policy leading to the complete liberation of the Arabs who have been dominated by the Europeans for generations. Sir, it is not the Baghdad Pact that will bring salvation to Arabia. It is only a recognition of the existing realities, a desire to live in friendship with their neighbours and the most energetic attempts to improve the economic condition of the people that will enable them to trust their own and to live in their country without any fear of outside invasion. Iraq, let me say, to its credit, has a Five Year Plan now, but let us hope that it will be implemented in the spirit in which it has been formulated. If this is done and the poor people of Iraq can feel that they have a regime which will give its first thoughts to the improvement of their condition, peace will reign throughout Iraq and a similar

[Shri H. N. Kunzru]  
policy will enable peace to reign throughout Arabia and indeed throughout the Middle East.

SHRIMATI LILAVATI MUNSHI (Rajasthan): Mr. Deputy Chairman, we are all thankful to the Prime Minister for giving us his analysis on the foreign situation, specially the situation in Egypt and Hungary. He also informed us about the false propaganda carried on by the Pakistan Prime Minister. I was fortunate to listen to his speeches in the other House and read in the newspapers some of his speeches delivered elsewhere. Our Prime Minister is an apostle of peace in this war-ridden world and the central theme of all his speeches is that if the world has to survive, it is very necessary that we should have peace in every part of the world and that all ideas of war should be abandoned by all nations. In this era of atom, war in any corner of the world is disastrous for the whole world. It is difficult to localise any war when two powerful sides are opposing each other ideologically as well as with weapons of destruction—and also they have their allies and friends and dependants. Speaking objectively, both sides are talking of peace and are preparing for war. One side wants to penetrate the different parts of the world in order to spread its ideology as well as its supremacy and its own system of government. The other side wants to retain what it has and expand its sphere of influence in order to have more material prosperity. Sir, I agree with Prof. Ranga when he said that both sides have become fanatical in opposing each other and are using their might to thwart each other. Again speaking objectively, one can say both sides are trying to exploit the underdeveloped areas of the world which legitimately do not belong to them. For us there is nothing to choose between the two except that one side is a little more human than the other. This is what I believe in spite of what Shri Bhupesh Gupta said yesterday. On one side, that is on the side of democracy, people are still free, they can voice their feelings and express their opinions and can oppose their

own government if it is going wrong, without being machine-gunned, whereas on the other side, that is on the Communist side, people can be massacred and suppressed for expressing any opinion other than the opinion of their so-called government. That is why while thinking of Egypt and Hungary, we sympathised with Egypt and did all that we could to help her effectively, whereas so far as Hungary is concerned, we are the silent spectators of that ghastly tragedy from a distance, unable to go there or even express our sympathy forcefully. Even the U.N. resolution is powerless to secure the entry of the Secretary-General into Hungary. If according to Shri Bhupesh Gupta they had nothing to hide, I do not know any reason why the Secretary-General or the other observers are not allowed to go there. Our Prime Minister has said that it is a popular movement and a popular upheaval, a movement supported by workers. There were terrible mistakes committed by the previous Communist Government and so it was very unpopular. If it is so, people should be allowed to choose their own form of government and foreign forces should be withdrawn forthwith.

Shri Bhupesh Gupta described the Hungarian people who are fighting their government as counter-revolutionaries—somebody said, 'rebels.' If the people of Hungary, after trying that so-called revolutionary government for ten years, feel that such a government has not done any good to them and want to change it, what is wrong if they do so? Then why are they called 'counter-revolutionaries'? Shri Kunzru very forcefully put forward his arguments just now and gave the history of it. So, I do not want to go into it again. Admittedly, grave mistakes were committed by the previous regime.

People of England and France are afraid of Egypt strangulating their world traffic and world trade, whereas the Communist Government of Hungary or Russia—whatever we call it—is saying that it is afraid of Hungary being free. It passes our comprehension as to how the progress

of that enormous country can be adversely affected in any way by the tiny neighbouring country, Hungary, being free. This is a dangerous argument which can be advanced by any country towards any other country. In order to safeguard its own interests, the neighbouring country should be kept in subjugation.

We have no doubt expressed our sympathy regarding Egypt and Hungary. The difference is only this that our sympathy towards Egypt is dynamic whereas our sympathy towards Hungary is passive. But we should not create the impression that we do not mind offending England and France, but we do mind offending the Communist countries. Of course, this is not true. This impression is totally wrong. But there is no denying the fact that such an impression is prevalent. Luckily for us, the big countries are not interested in having a world war. Luckily also, after many years, for the first time, the United States of America and we are in the same boat. I sincerely hope that the new friendly outlook which we are developing towards each other will last so that we may help each other in preserving world peace.

People all over the world are looking to India for efforts to maintain peace and Panch Shila. And I am sure that we will be able to justify that confidence by the policy of neutralism and non-alignment which our Prime Minister is pursuing

One can note here that the new policy of the U.S.S.R. is very confusing not only to us who are non-Communists, but to the Communists of this country as well as elsewhere. They are all bewildered. The new policy of de-Stalinising created the first confusion and now the country of workers and people butchering the workers and people of another country—their neighbour Hungary—has created another confusion. Like *Muni Ashtavakra*, everybody feels what is true—whether this is true or that is true. So long, they were made to worship Stalin who did not stop at anything. Is

the present Government of Russia by debunking Stalin walking in his footsteps? People of all countries are trying to solve this riddle. Very soon England and France are going to withdraw their forces from the Egyptian soil. I am glad that India has done a great deal for bringing about a solution and helped and has stood by a friend in need. But while talking objectively about the situation in Egypt and the Middle East, one somehow feels that the trouble in that part of the world is more on account of Israel than anything else. I personally do not know any person from Israel. My impressions are formed merely from the newspaper reports that I read. After centuries of travail and wandering, the Israelis were given a small piece of desert land to make a homeland. The Jews were massacred in many lands. The Jews were massacred many lands and Hitler tried to exterminate the whole race, but there is a tenacity in that race. It has survived every massacre, and now they have a small homeland where they want to live in peace. And from here also the countries surrounding that tiny nation want them to be uprooted. They are fighting with their backs to the wall, and one feels that they are aggressive for sheer self-defence. I am sure, if all the nations, through the U.N.O., assure the people of Israel that no harm will be done to them and their territorial integrity will be respected and guaranteed, their defiance will disappear.

There is no doubt that the sun is setting on the British Empire, and their wrong policies make them more and more unwanted in every part of the world. All their colonies and dependencies want to be free from their influence. The policy of Englishmen in South Africa is a policy of suicide and a policy which no self-respecting man or self-respecting nation can support. Sooner or later, either they shall have to be one with the Africans or they shall have to quit. There is no third way for them. At one time, the Englishmen captured nearly the whole world and made England rich by dominating the other countries or having them as their colonies. Now the

[Shrimati Lilavati Munshi]  
people of the world are getting wide awake and Asia has become resurgent, and in every country the spirit of nationalism is throbbing in the heart of men. In this century.....(*Time bell rings.*) Only two minutes, Sir.

In this century, Sir, either the world should be governed by one-world Government, or there should be a federation of all the nations of the world under which each should be free and the people of the entire world should share what mother Earth has to give to them. But till that time comes, looking at the world as it is, we have to guard our hard-won freedom. There are people across our borders who are jealous of us, and they talk of war day and night, and they are preparing for the day when they can dominate us. I agree with Shri Jaswant Singh when he says that we should not be complacent about all these things. Our Prime Minister also referred to the situation in our neighbouring country yesterday. There are other people who are trying to infiltrate into our borders because they look at us with covetous eyes. We have to keep ourselves wide awake and guard our borders. The policy of each country is changing with a change of politicians and parties in that country. We are hoping that our friends of today will always remain our friends. But at the same time, we have to be very vigilant all the same. (*Time bell rings.*) Only one word more, Sir.

Sir, our Prime Minister is going to America in search of peace and to find out ways and means for enforcing that peace. May his mission be successful so that the world may turn away from the path of war and open a new chapter for world peace. Thank you.

DR. A. R. MUDALIAR (Madras):  
Mr. Deputy Chairman, this is the first occasion when I have had an opportunity of taking part in debate on the foreign policy of this country. I do not think that the foreign policy of any country should normally have divisions of opinion according to parties or according to groups. It is a thing that is clearly kept apart from

domestic politics and domestic policies, and the strength of a country lies in the fact that its people are united as regards its foreign policy.

Sir, listening to the debate during the last few hours, I do not think that even on this occasion, though there have been some remarks, there is any vital or fundamental division of opinion as regards the foreign policy that the Prime Minister has pursued or this country has pursued during the last six or seven years.

Let me refer briefly to the topics that have been adverted to by the Prime Minister and by the hon. Members of this House. They are three. First regarding Pakistan, let me finish it very shortly; then regarding the Anglo-French aggression in Egypt, and lastly regarding the position of Hungary.

As regards Pakistan, Sir, I refer to the danger of domestic politics in some way or other making the foreign policy of a country regrettable. If there is any explanation for the manner in which the Prime Minister of Pakistan has spoken—a speech to which our Prime Minister has referred—I think it can be clearly traced to the domestic difficulties in which he and his government now find themselves. It is always easy to rouse up public passion of any country by pointing out to some danger from abroad, so that people may forget the innumerable difficulties and grievances which they have at home, and so that they may have their eyes turned towards some so-called foreign danger. And therefore, this speech of the Prime Minister of Pakistan, which is the last attempt at securing his seat—and I do not think that that seat will remain very much longer for him—need not be taken too seriously by us. But we have to make it clear, if clarity is at all needed, that India has recognised, as the Prime Minister has said, the existence of Pakistan, that in fact the Indian leaders were responsible for the creation of Pakistan, that they agreed to the proposal, and that it was a course which was agreed upon mutually by those who desired an Islamic Pakistan and those who desired India free from the

influence of those who said that they could not live on friendly terms with Indians. That is perfectly clear, and it ought to be made clear to everybody that there is no party, no group, no individual, outside that famous place to which such individual should be sent, who at any time thinks that Pakistan should be merged with India again. In fact, as the Prime Minister said, we do not want to have the tragedies and difficulties, which were already experienced and which occurred at the time of the division of this country, ever occurring again, and the foreign countries or the foreign observers, who may have their sympathy with Pakistan, should rest assured that so far as India is concerned, any attempt at trying to bring back Pakistan does not enter the minds of any of the Indians.

Sir, I should like to say one thing, having been in several foreign countries abroad, that I do feel, as I said once before, that our propaganda, our publicity, is not sufficient, that we do not have those teams of people going about, as Pakistan sends them, to preach and to propagate the fact that they are a very humble, small and minority nation side by side with a big and powerful country against whom they have to defend themselves time and again, and thereby evoke the sympathies of those who do not understand the position here and who are not in

the full know of the picture  
1 P. M. here. Let me say on this occasion that I am extremely glad and thankful that an international assembly by meeting in Delhi with representatives of over seventy or eighty countries, they have been in this country for the last nearly one month and they have seen for themselves, particularly at this critical period, how India conducts its affairs, how our Parliament reacts to various questions, how our Prime Minister and the Government of India are conducting the affairs of their country, how our newspapers are free to criticise even the most popular, and according to some, the most powerful of Prime Ministers and how democracy in action is far more evident in India than it is perhaps in any

other country. I think it is a matter for congratulation that somehow or other the convening of the conference of the UNESCO has coincided with a period of acute self-examination by ourselves of the various policies of our Government and our Prime Minister.

Sir, I do not think I need deal more with the Prime Minister of Pakistan. Let me just say one sentence about Kashmir. I was really very happy to hear the Prime Minister say that, when the question of Kashmir is taken up in the Security Council again, he would go back to the fundamental position which has been ignored by all countries, by many countries, the fundamental position which we ourselves have not emphasised continuously, that it was Pakistan who was the aggressor in Kashmir and still holds part of Kashmir territory by the force of that aggression. I think that is a basic fact to which we should revert over and over again before all the cobwebs that have grown round it over the last so many years can be swept away, before many recommendations of impartial observers and judges appointed by the United Nations themselves, are forgotten, are ignored and put aside in the interests of a certain propaganda that is being carried on. I have no doubt whatsoever that, if that fundamental question is taken up and put before the United Nations or the Security Council and we ask it squarely to face that question, the position of Kashmir will be found—what we hope it will be—to be satisfactorily settled.

Let me now come to the question of Egypt. The aggression on Egypt by the Anglo-French forces and by Israel on the other hand, has been condemned, almost universally condemned by practically all nations—why I should say by every nation—and condemned by the British nation itself. In the most severe condemnation of the British Government in the matter of its foreign policy, I do not recollect anything more severe than what has come from their own people, from Tories, from Conservatives, from Liberals, from Labour, from the intellectuals of the

[Dr. A. R. Mudaliar]

Universities of Oxford and Cambridge, from businessmen, from every type of people in the country. That they have not been able to get rid of that Government and change its policy is another matter, but it is one of the most convincing vindications of democracy that public opinion, without overthrowing the Government, has been able to get that Government on the right track again and to do what is right and just. As the Prime Minister anticipated, the Foreign Secretary of Britain in his speech last night stated that they were withdrawing without making any conditions whatsoever. And I think it is the public opinion of the world and public opinion in England itself that has brought about this result. May I say in this connection as one who has had something to do with the United Nations that it has filled my heart with joy that at least on this question the Town Hall of the World as it has been described, has been able to effectively intervene by the mere pressure of world public opinion and make a country, a powerful country, one of the Big Five, one of the permanent members of the Security Council, to undo what it had so unjustly done. I think that those who were thinking of burying the United Nations—there were some in England itself and a few even in this country—have now learnt a lesson from what has happened that the public opinion of the world after all is mightier than all the armies and munitions that you could build up in any country or in any group of countries. This is a vindication of the United Nations which fills my heart with joy and jubilation.

Now, aggression has come to an end there and I trust that the other steps will be speedily taken up, which will improve the position, but there are disturbing factors still, and I would like to refer to some of these disturbing factors. The hon. the Prime Minister referred to the various military pacts—NATO, SEATO and Baghdad Pacts. As one who took some part in the discussions when the United Nations Charter was framed, as one who parti-

cularly followed the discussions on regional pacts, it is my opinion that all these pacts are contrary both to the spirit and the letter of the United Nations Charter. The regional grouping that was thought of at that time was geographical regional grouping and not this sort of grouping where there are kangaroo jumps from one part of the world to another, and somehow or other various countries which have no geographical contiguity at all happen to come together and form a regional pact. NATO is not a regional pact. You have to jump across 3,500 miles across the Atlantic to find contiguity with some of the European nations. The Baghdad Pact is not a regional pact. Much less is SEATO a regional pact. They are all against the spirit and the letter of the charter of the United Nations. I have been one of those who have always condemned these pacts as being both illegal and improper. And nothing but misery has followed in the wake of these pacts. I trust that those who at one time thought that they could build up a security system and establish peace on the basis of these pacts will realise how futile they have been and how they are merely worsening the situation instead of promoting peace. You cannot have peace with two forces—armed neutrality as it is called—facing each other, having at any time the desire to go at each other, both the military and the political heads that are in charge of these things being equally ballicase, and I trust that that notion will be reviewed and revised in those countries so that these pacts will be given the go-by.

Now, let me say one thing about the Middle East position before I come to Hungary. The last speaker referred in a way to this. The Middle East position is full of danger and full of difficulties. There is one fundamental fact which is at the genesis of much of this trouble, as the last speaker said. The Jews have established a home in the Middle East. Whether it was a wise act or not, they have come to stay. A sovereign State has been established. It is a fundamental fact which cannot be ignored and which ought not to be ignored. So long as there is uneasiness

about the continued existence of that sovereign State, so long as there is a desire on the part of any of the countries surrounding it, that it would be better for them if it were wiped out, there can be no peace in the Middle East and I venture to think there will be no peace in the world. All the combinations and permutations of the various Powers, all the intrigues that may go on in the Mid East have their basic hypothesis in this fact. We have had something to do with the policy of some of the countries of the Mid East. It is a most difficult situation I don't deny it. Passions are aroused and passions are there and with the Arab refugees being treated as they are, those passions will grow in strength. It is a very difficult situation and yet, I venture to think that, in the larger interests of world peace, to which we are dedicated, we should do everything in our power to bring about a reconciliation of a situation with this foremost fact that a Sovereign State which has been created cannot be dissolved. I hope that our endeavours will be in that direction, though I don't, for a moment, minimise the fact that it is full of difficulties and that it will create serious complications. The path of a statesman or of a country which tries to reconcile two opposing elements is never an easy one. The path of a country or the statesman who tries to bridge a gulf between two opposing blocs and tries to interpret each to the other, thereby hoping that it will bring about a better realisation of the position of each other and a greater understanding, that path, is always a difficult one. It is not easy to bridge the gulf, as they say. I remember a great statesman, Mr. Jan Masaryk, the Foreign Minister of Czechoslovakia once saying: "We are a bridge between the East and the West. True, but you must realize that the bridge is walked over by both sides". That is exactly the position of those who try to bring about an understanding between two opposing elements and yet, the work has to be done and has to be undertaken.

Let me come to the question of Hungary and see what it is that has

been troubling us. In a speech that the hon. Prime Minister made at the opening of the session of the UNESCO, I thought he had made perfectly clear India's attitude towards the Hungarian problem. I think that was one of the earliest speeches that he had made on the question and I know that every delegation to the UNESCO Conference was happy and satisfied and congratulated the Indian delegation that the Prime Minister of India had no reservation on this question and that he had come out rightly and boldly on what the views of every country should be with reference to the situation in Hungary. Why, after that, there should be all this misunderstanding and all this criticism, I cannot understand. I listened very carefully to the speech of the Leader of the Opposition yesterday. His speech was full of epithets which flew north, east, south and west. One could hardly keep pace with the epithets that he addressed. He described the British Government and the French Government. It was full of these epithets. Now I venture to state one fact that an International Conference is not like the Lok Sabha or Rajya Sabha or any domestic Parliament. In a domestic Parliament people can afford, occasionally, especially when the Chair is a little unwary, to indulge in unparliamentary language but we must remember that in International Assemblies, the representative, the chief delegate, carries the honour, the dignity and if I might say so, the characteristic culture of the country. He is representing not himself, he is representing a country, a great country sometimes and one has to realise and remember that always. It is not as an individual that he speaks. It is as a representative of the country. I am aware, following the discussions at some of these International Conferences, that occasionally the representatives of the biggest and greatest countries use language which will not be tolerated in a domestic Parliament. It is an unhappy lapse. It has been occurring during the last three or four years particularly. There is no excuse for it in my opinion, and if they do, there is no excuse for any other member of any other country or any

[Dr. A. R. Mudaliar]

delegation, who goes in the name of that country, with all the culture behind it, to indulge in what may be called unparliamentary language. What is the need of strong language? I have listened to the Prime Minister several times. I have read his speeches very carefully during the last one month. What is the strongest phrase that our Prime Minister has used in connection with this terrible thing that has happened in Egypt? I don't recollect any phrase stronger than 'naked aggression'. Is it necessary to go further than that and call them 'brigands, gamblers' and all sorts of names? Do you help the cause? Do you strengthen your own logic? Do you make yourself still stronger because you have used these obscene phrases, if I might venture to say so?

Now, Sir, the Prime Minister of Great Britain, Sir Anthony Eden—and I may be excused when I say that I have known him for several years—in one of the earliest discussions on Egypt, referred to the President of Egypt as 'that man Nasser'. I felt a chill go down my spine when I read this phrase in the papers. If the Prime Minister could so forget himself as to use this phrase, I felt that reason had fled out of the window and judgment would soon go out of the door and that is exactly what has happened. The personal animosity that developed from that phrase, right up to the end, has been responsible for all the tragedy that has occurred and the Britishers, recalling that phrase, will find how unfortunate it was that the Prime Minister of a great country like Great Britain should have lost that delicate finesse of the diplomatic world which he was known to possess and which he did possess, for over 20 years. The spick and span Foreign Secretary, as he was through two decades, how unfortunate it was that he should have given way to personal feelings and so I venture to tell my friends that nobody who is appearing on behalf of this country in an International Assembly can afford to forget the dignity of his country, the culture of his country and cannot afford to use

words and language unnecessarily biting. It is not a college debate that we are entering into. It is for making people agree on certain causes which we feel, are elements widening them and nothing is so unhelpful than the use of strong language. This has a bearing on what I am going to say about the position in Hungary. After all, it comes to this that the Prime Minister did not use strong language in condemning what has happened in Hungary, nothing more than that. The events in Hungary are of course most unfortunate. My friend Pandit Kunzru has properly referred to it. There is one thing that I would like to refer to and that is in relation to Mr. Imre Nagy. Mr. Imre Nagy made a personal appeal to the Prime Minister. I remember reading about it in the papers. The Prime Minister said yesterday that on the assurance of the Hungarian Government Mr. Nagy came out of the Yugoslav Embassy and on his way he was arrested by the Russians and taken away. That is an eloquent fact and an eloquent fact which sufficiently describes the position of the Hungarian Government *vis-a-vis* the Soviet Government. If, on the Hungarian soil, even in the capital of Hungary, Budapest, with the Government looking on, the Soviet forces can arrest a Hungarian citizen and take him away, it does detract from the sovereignty of Hungarian Government. There has to be an explanation both from the Government of Hungary and from the Soviet Government as to how this arrest took place. I attach a great deal of value, a great deal of importance to the fact that Mr. Nagy who had sought asylum in the Yugoslav Embassy, should have been spirited away in this direction and I hope that we shall do something in this matter, especially after the personal appeal that was made by Mr. Imre Nagy to our Prime Minister to get him liberated and to get him in his usual surroundings. Sir, the happenings in Hungary are unfortunate. My friend the Leader of the Opposition tried to cloud it by saying that it is a capitalistic and landlord revolt. I think the Prime Minister has described it in the proper degree.



I would like to say in this connection that perhaps one might understand the Hungarian position much more clearly if one were to follow the events that took place during the last four or five years. There have been repeated statements by Hungarians that they are not being properly treated, complaints about forced labour, conditions which are utterly impossible to live in, complaints about the laws, the procedure, the judicial administration, of people's courts and how people were marched away and all that. Now, Sir, it is a fact and I think we must all admit that at long last the Soviet leaders have recognised the mistakes that had been made in the Stalin regime. If you analyse those mistakes as they have been described, you will find that the complaints made by the Hungarian refugees during the past three or four years, are completely justified and they are borne out by the very reforms that in the post-Stalin regime have now been inaugurated by Mr. Bulganin and Mr. Krushchev. I think that fact could be of some assistance to us in understanding the position in Hungary. It is not easy for our ambassadors to know what is going on. We had ambassadors in Moscow for a series of years. I do not know what reports they had made to the Prime Minister; but I do not know whether they had ever suggested or ever knew that the kind of things which have now been condemned by the Russian leaders themselves occurred during the regime of Stalin. Of course, there were people outside who spoke of them and others who said they did not believe them, that it was all propaganda. But most of us thought that probably there was some truth in it and now from their own mouth has come—I will not say the confession—the admission that during the Stalin regime grave injustices and great tragedies had occurred for which there was no justification. What is happening now? The criminal laws have been revised, the procedures and codes have been revised, courts have been established which were not in existence before and the semblance of a judicial trial has been given now. All this shows how difficult it is for foreign embassies

if they are cribbed, cabined and confined into a narrow space and with limitations of every kind, to know exactly what is happening in those countries. I do venture to hope that the U.N. and public opinion will make the Hungarian Government to let the Secretary General to come in, not at a later date, but at a very early date, and also other people, including Indians who can be trusted to be fair in this matter, as observers to see and discuss things.

Sir, I have done.

DR. ANUP SINGH (Punjab): Mr. Deputy Chairman, first of all I would like to commend the observation that the Prime Minister made yesterday when he said that though we may have different opinions about happenings in any part of the world, our aim should be to help avert any catastrophe and to help reduce tension between countries. I think it has been a matter of great gratification that practically all Members of this House have followed that lead and have accepted that as the proper approach, with the solitary exception of the leader of the Communist Group. But I think it is just as well to recognise that if he had followed that approach, it would be rather difficult to recognise him. So I am not really very unhappy over it.

The items that have been mostly discussed here were three, namely, Pakistan, Egypt and Hungary and I would like to say just a few words about Pakistan, to begin with. I think enough has been said about the speech of the Prime Minister of Pakistan. Whenever I hear the Pakistan leaders' speeches, and condemnation of India, I am invariably reminded of a huge big sign-post that once I saw in a very small town near Los Angeles. There a gentleman happened to be the proprietor of a very small restaurant and during the depression days—depression according to American standards, of course, in 1929,—a number of people who were known as "bums" and vagabonds, people who had no money, used to pass by and frequently they stopped at the restaurant, ordered a cup of coffee or some sandwich and then at the time of payment they

[Dr. Anup Singh]

merely shrugged their shoulders and said, "Sorry." I ain't got it". That is to say, "I haven't got any money." So the proprietor in sheer disgust had put up this sign over there "The world may owe you a living, but why pick on me?" Pakistan may have its own trouble, but why pick on India and all the time call India 'Enemy number One'?"

The second thing, Sir, that I would like to say about Pakistan's attitude towards India is that we have never presumed to sit on judgment over the acts of the Pakistan Government, her acts either within her country or outside. Pakistan has often claimed to be the champion of the Islamic bloc. But I think the best judgment and commentary on Pakistan's attitude has come from their own brethren. I am not suggesting that we should gloat over it, for we are not happy about any discord or dissensions among any countries. But Pakistan's attitude towards Egypt at the moment and the attitude of the Arab countries towards Pakistan are ample evidence that something has been and something is fundamentally wrong with the policies that Pakistan has been pursuing up till now. I think the people of Pakistan themselves will sooner or later, try to induce their leaders to re-examine the policies that they have been pursuing. As for any sinister designs on the part of India against Pakistan, I think the offer of a "no-war pact" made in perfect good faith and repeated so many times, is still open and Pakistan has consistently and repeatedly refused to accept that offer. There cannot be a clearer indication of India's purposes than this clear declaration of a no-war pact and I am sure, Sir, that that offer still holds good. Pakistan's propaganda may appear to have succeeded in some parts of the world, but I for one do not believe that there is any real substance in it. They may try to deceive the people, some people for some time, for a few days or months; but I think the people all over the world are becoming increasingly aware of India's fundamental policy which is not different towards Pakistan. And I am sure,

rather I would humbly suggest to the leaders of Pakistan that they will do well to remind themselves of the great dictum of Abraham Lincoln that you can fool a few people for some time, some of the people all the time, but you cannot fool all the people all the time. I think sooner or later they will find that that policy of theirs will not pay.

As for Egypt, Sir, we are all very happy that the British Government have finally accepted the Resolution of the U.N. and they have agreed to withdraw their forces. And it is also a matter of great satisfaction that they have agreed to withdraw their forces within a very short period. I do not want to detract anything from this great gesture, from this willingness to abide by the international decision. But I do wish that the Foreign Secretary had not made the speech that he had made the other day. I would quote his own words in which he tried to justify the invasion. He said:

"The Anglo-French action had stopped a local war. We have prevented it from spreading. The extent of Soviet penetration has been revealed. We have caused the U.N. to take action by the creation of the International Force. We have alerted the whole world to a situation of grave danger."

That to my mind comes as a very great surprise. Are we invited to believe that this unprovoked naked aggression of the British and the French had no other purpose in mind except to reveal the Russian penetration, had no other purpose except to create an international force? I am sure that nobody is going to believe it.

One more thing about this aggression and that is this. I am not one of those who believe that we should withdraw from the British Commonwealth. I think it has served a useful purpose and our free association with all the countries of the Commonwealth will continue to serve a useful purpose. But I am one of those who wish to make it very clear that we have been shock-

ed by the behaviour of the British Tory Government who did not think it proper or advisable to consult other members of the Commonwealth.

[THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI P. S. RAJAGOPAL NAIDU) in the Chair.]

I do not know about others, but India, I am sure, as the Prime Minister has told us, has had no inkling, no idea about it. Now, if this sort of thing continues, if this sort of behaviour is to be repeated, I am sure it will undermine the very basis of the British Commonwealth and the voice of those people who still believe that the Commonwealth is a useful institution will suffer and will be jeopardised.

Just a word or two about Israel. Mr. Mudaliar said that most of the troubles in that part of the world spring, and originate from the existence of Israel. He also said that a freely elected sovereign State has been set up there and it cannot be just whisked out of existence. I fully agree with it but only I feel that there is a slight over-emphasis in saying that all the troubles in that area come from the existence of Israel. That may be true and I think it is largely true of Israel *vis-a-vis* the Arab countries but there is feudalism there and there are a number of other problems, problems of social and economic backwardness, jealousies and rivalries and dissensions and discord between the Arab countries themselves. Happily now they are being bridged and those countries are coming together but I thought I would make a passing reference to the fact that the presence of Israel is not the only factor.

Secondly, I am one of those who believe that the people of Israel, the Jewish people, have suffered and suffered heavily. They have been the victim of perhaps the greatest slaughter that history has ever recorded. I do not want to go into the merits or demerits of the case or about the desirability of creating this State but it was created and I see no other solution of the problem except for both peoples, Israelis and Arabs, to bring about some kind of a rapprochement and

I think that any help that we can give in this matter or that any other country can give, should be most welcome. I also cannot help saying that Israel by its action in this particular instance—again I do not propose to go into the reasons for her resorting to force—has certainly undermined her own position. It will take a long time before the injured feelings of the Arab people are restored.

Now, just a word or two about Hungary. Mr. Bhupesh said the other day that this was a counter-revolutionary movement. I feel, Sir, from all that I have read and heard that it is not very easy, as the Prime Minister has also put it, to get a clear picture and say this is black and this is white. I have no doubt that the revolt was popular; thousands of people have been killed and other elements perhaps tried to exploit the situation for their own respective purposes. But I think the lesson to be drawn from this, at least one of the lessons as I see it, is that Communism—I am not saying anything about the theory; it has some great points in it—in practice, after ten years of complete control over the destinies of the people with the help of a very strong and powerful giant and neighbour, if the people at the very first opportunity that comes to them revolt and die by the thousands, communism in practice stands discredited.

Secondly, I see no solution of the Hungarian problem unless there is some agreement, some improvement in the relations between America and the Soviet Union. The time at my disposal is very limited, otherwise I will elaborate on it but let me say this that from sheer necessity—as the Soviet at least say—they have built a network around them of countries; call them satellites, call them dependencies but nobody denies the fact that none of these countries and there are so many countries in that area—has been free to pursue any policy unless it was approved by Russia and it met the Russian needs and necessities. The Russians claim that it is the fear of encroachment from the Western bloc. They still have fresh memories of what happened in the First World War. I was

[Dr. Anup Singh]

talking to the Soviet leaders when I was there. We might have forgotten it, it might have become dim in our memory as to what happened when certain Powers went into the Soviet territory but to the Russians Western invasion is still fresh. So long therefore as tension between these two great Powers continues I see no solution of either the Israel or the Hungarian problem in isolation. I am completely in favour of giving full rights to the Hungarians to choose their own Government and to pursue their own policy, but from the hard realistic point of view I see no possibility of such a situation developing unless America and the Soviet Union came to some agreement on the larger issues. And the larger issue as has been made out by the Americans is the difference of ideology. Here again it is a very large subject but I feel that the necessity of the day from the political point of view is somehow to have economic democracy with political freedom and I am very happy that there is a certain trend in the Soviet towards political freedom. It has not been granted but I think there is an approach to it. There is an attempt being made. There is not complete economic democracy in the West. I am not suggesting that it prevails in the Soviet but the need of our age is somehow to bring about economic equality and freedom while preserving political and civic freedom. That is the basic thing in political theory and I do hope that as time goes by both these countries will move in that direction. And in this connection the visit of our Prime Minister to America, I do hope, will bring about certain results when he will be in a position to speak from the Asian point of view, from the point of view of a country which has tried to steer the middle path and never deviated from it, no matter what the rebuff and abuses were, and if some kind of an understanding can be brought about between the American people—the American Government I mean—and the Indian Government or rather if some improvement in the relationship

could be brought about, that would be a very happy thing.

Lastly, let me say that the action of the United States Government on the Egyptian problem, to my mind, at least, was commendable. I do not think it will serve any purpose, as Mr. Bhupesh tried to put it, to say that there is the sinister hand of the American imperialists in the Egyptian issue. I think we, as a people who are dedicated to peace and who have declared that we have *amimus* or ill-will towards none and goodwill towards all, should try to commend those good things done by any country and denounce—as we do denounce—anything which we feel is wrong. I think that the American attitude during this Egyptian crisis is commendable and we should say so.

Finally, I come to the position of the British Labour Party. I think they also deserve our hearty congratulations. During all these dark dismal days the British Labour Party, as Mr. Mudaliar has said, has gone even further than the critics of the British Government elsewhere and if these progressive forces, wherever they happen to be, come together and speak in a collective and joint vein, that will definitely serve the cause of peace.

Finally, to come back to Hungary, let me say just one thing which slipped my mind, that is, the latest resolution as was read out, at least in part, by the Prime Minister is rather unhappy. I particularly noted the reference to the Hungarian Government as the 'Hungarian authorities'. And immediately my mind went back to Korea; when I was there, we faced a similar situation. Here we were members of the United Nations Commission in South Korea trying to get in touch with North Korea which had a communist regime brought up under the auspices or under the inspiration and guidance of the Soviets. These two zones were cut off from each other, not even on speaking terms. The U.N. Secretariat in all their communications tried to insist that we refer to them only as the North Korean authorities

and not as Government I for one—and I am not revealing any secret—took the stand that we must refer to them as the North Korean Government, whether we like it or not. That Government has been established, that Government was recognised by at least six or seven countries. We may have nothing to do with its character, but while we are trying to get in touch with them, so that the South and the North Koreans could meet together, we cannot make this distinction of South Korean Government and North Korean authorities. The result was that no sooner these communications reached them than they bounced back to us, not even acknowledged, much less accepted, because they knew that we were referring to them as the authorities. Finally, when the danger of war came nearer and nearer and we all began to get very perturbed over it, it was unanimously decided—if I recall well—by the members of the U.N. Commission that, from now on we refer to them as the North Korean Government precisely on par with South Korea. And I am rather surprised that after that very unhappy, very vivid experience, the members of the United Nations—and some of them happened to be on that Commission—should now again follow the same old pattern which was rejected and found to be utterly wrong and shortsighted—to refer to this Government as the ‘authorities’. With these few words, I support the motion.

SHRIMATI K. BHARATHI (Kerala): Mr. Vice-Chairman, we are discussing the present international situation and the policy of the Government of India in relation thereto at a time when the world stands disillusioned about the ushering in of a new era based on moral values. The future seems to be dark and filled with insecurity and full of evil portends. Hitler and Mussolini were considered to be the embodiment of all that was evil. They represented the ‘barbarism’ latent in man. Might was right to them and all they did was right in their eyes. When they were defeated and crushed, we thought, at least I thought, that an era of decent and civilised

existence was dawning. India’s Panch Shila seemed to be most popular among all nations. It was very fashionable to adorn oneself in the latest cut of Panch Shila and parade in the comity of nations, as pillars of peace. But now we find that the Panch Shila is being discarded like a torn evening costume. Again, the law of the jungle—where might is right—seems to come to the forefront, Mussolini seems to be reborn in Sir Anthony Eden and Hitler’s Spirit seems to guide the Soviet leaders. I can compare the British attack on Egypt only to the so called civilising process of Mussolini in Abyssinia. As much as Mussolini made Abyssinia civilised with aerial bombing and poisoning, Sir Anthony Eden did spread the message of peace in Egyptian soil with bombs and machineguns. It is indeed a strange way, a strange demonstration of maintaining peace between Egypt and Israel! If Sir Anthony Eden was trying to check the waning British influence and the waxing Soviet grip in the Middle East, there is no doubt that he has acted in a foolish manner. It is a childish gamble to risk one’s own dignity to gain minor material ends. Sir Anthony Eden has not only endangered world peace, he has served a severe blow to British prestige itself. Not only has he ruined the cause of Britain, he has opened the flood gates of Soviet influence by his rash and thoughtless act. Sir, what is happening in Syria now? I do not hesitate to say that every British bomb that did burst in Egypt is a mighty propaganda for the Soviets. The attack on Egypt is uncivilised, undiplomatic and utterly ruinous to the cause of Britain itself. So, the whole world including a vast number of Britishers endorsed the prompt and forthright condemnation of the Anglo-French attack on Egypt.

One can fully understand the moral indignation that demands our breaking away from the British Commonwealth. But I think India’s present attitude is the better and sane way of approach to the problem. India should not act in a rash way as if we are hostile to the British people, even while we oppose and condemn their attack on Egypt.

[Shrimati K. Bharathi]

India remaining within the Commonwealth and at the same time condemning their naked aggression in Egypt will have greater moral force than her breaking away and then condemning it from outside. Perhaps our breaking away can be an indication of our righteous indignation and strong resentment. But our remaining within the Commonwealth and condemning has greater practical value. It will strengthen the hands of the other members of the Commonwealth who condemn this act. Further, it will strengthen the sane and sober elements in British who are already up against Sir Anthony Eden's barbaric attack on Egypt.

Then, Sir, if the British attack on Egypt is parallel to the Italian attack on Abyssinia, the Russian policy in east Europe is on all fours with Hitler's tactics. Under the shadow of the local Nazi parties, we know how Hitler marched into the east European countries. We know how Hitler liquidated his opponents ruthlessly calling them the stooges of the West. Following in the footsteps of Hitler, Stalin established the Soviet hegemony in east Europe. Now, Stalin's successors maintain his empire with the same ruthlessness, with the same callousness with which Stalin maintained it. In spite of nine years of searching and scrupulous elimination of all anti-Soviet elements, we find that there are yet enough left to threaten the overthrow of the Communist overlords. No amount of propaganda could hide that fact. The unfortunate people of the East European countries cannot change their Governments either by ballots or by bullets. They cannot change their governments by ballots because free elections are denied to them. In fact the Vice-President of East Germany confessed that free elections in East Germany will sweep the Communist Party into the dustbin. Nor can these unfortunate people change their governments by bullets because the overwhelming might of the Soviet military machine will crush any effort on that line. That was demonstrated in East Germany in June 1953 and it is being

demonstrated in the most diabolic way in Hungary now. The news that reach us will put even Hitler to shame. Let alone the reported slaughter of children, what about the slaughter of Red Cross personnel and the prevention of the removal of the wounded from the streets and the alleged mass deportations?

Sir, the fact that peasants, workers and students revolted under untold repressions and privations has been accepted on all hands. When they were denied a free forum in the shape of democratic institutions, they had to revolt. And the price they paid for the revolt, justified even in the eyes of Kadar, is thousands and thousands massacred. Sir, the intervention of the Soviet troops is sought to be justified on the ground of counter revolutionary forces and fascist elements taking control of the revolution. Even if it is so, is it the armed might of Russia which should decide whether the forces are counter revolutionary or fascist or is it the people of Hungary?—I ask.

Anyway, Sir, it is clear that, whether the forces of counter revolution or fascism were there, they had the backing of the people, they had the backing of the peasants, workers and the intelligentsia. For whom is a revolution or a counter-revolution? Is it for the people of Hungary or for a handful of Russian stooges? Russia calls whomsoever it dislikes as fascist. Did it not call Marshall Tito a fascist till yesterday? Are we sure of what it will call him tomorrow?

Sir, what happened in Hungary is very disturbing. If the Russian stooges and the Soviet armed might are to sit in judgement over revolution and counter-revolution, over fascism and democracy, I am afraid, where will we be?

There is no doubt that the armed intervention in Hungary was inhuman. It was an outrage in human decency. And so rightly have we condemned it, though in soft and cautious terms because we are not intimidated of the actual happenings there.

In this world context, Sir, I am afraid India cannot entirely depend upon Panch Shila and moral forces. We have to be fully aware of the danger that surrounds us. The role that puny little Israel played may be played by our belligerent neighbour at the instance of some power. Of course we have to be morally right, but we have to keep our armed might as well.

Thank you.

SHRI LALCHAND HIRACHAND DOSHI (Mysore): Sir, the excellent exposition that the hon. Prime Minister gave of the international situation and of India's part in condemning the aggression that the Anglo-French forces have committed in Egypt and which the Soviet Government have made in Hungary deserves congratulations. He has in clear terms condemned those aggressions. The Anglo-French aggression in Egypt has been condemned by all because it was an unwarranted interference in an independent country where these powers had no business to interfere. Negotiations were in progress for an amicable settlement of the outstanding Suez Canal problem, and everyone felt that the efforts of the Government of the United States and those of the United Nations would succeed in maintaining peace in that area. While this aggression was being committed, simultaneously another aggression was started in Eastern Europe by a country which has always shouted from house-tops that it stands for democracy, for the freedom of the people, and yet it has committed a kind of aggression which the world can never tolerate. Sir, if we compare these two aggressions, in Egypt there was a question where the Suez Canal had become an international nerve centre of international economic problems. The Egyptian Government nationalised the Suez Canal and decided to interfere with the free movement of trade through the Canal. At least those who were interested in the free use of the Suez Canal were afraid of it. France and Great Britain were particularly

interested because on international trade depended their own safety and prosperity. Their aggression was limited to the limited area of Suez Canal, while the whole territory of Egypt was left untouched. On the other hand in Hungary the people of Hungary demanded freedom, demanded democratic rule which was denied by their Government, and a foreign Government went there with all its might to put down these people who had no arms, no strength except their right of 2 P.M. living in the country and their right of self-government.

It was an aggression—not only economic aggression, but complete subjugation of the whole nation. I am surprised how any people can defend this kind of aggression. And it is very right that the Indian Government have condemned both these aggressions. The Soviet Government, when its representative, its Prime Minister, visited this country, accepted Panch Shila principles and yet even twelve months had not passed when it had sent its army with all its strength to another nation for bringing it under its complete control. It had consigned the principles of Panch Shila by which it had promised to stand to the waste paper basket. Sir, this condemnation by our Prime Minister is equally shared by the Government of the United States of America. They condemned the anglo-French aggression in Egypt even though it meant temporarily the creation of misunderstanding with their own colleagues. However, they stood by the principles which they have been advocating through the United Nations and in their policies towards various countries. Both these countries deserve the gratitude of the world for their efforts in trying to maintain peace in the world.

But, Sir, sometimes, a sort of misunderstanding is created that we are not sufficiently strong in our condemnation of the aggression of the Soviet Government or of the policies followed by them in Eastern Europe as well as in other Far East countries. From the statements that our Prime Minis-

[Shri Lalchand Hirachand Doshi] ter made yesterday and previously, that sort of misunderstanding will certainly be wiped out. But the fact remains that whatever faith we may put in the utterances of these Communist countries, it is difficult to trust them. Today, they will give you certain assurances; they will sign certain documents and before that ink has dried, they will tear those documents off. Sir, what do we find about in China? Chinese control of Tibet is nothing short of colonialism. What right has China to grab Tibet? I have never known of the existence of any treaty between them—some say that there was some treaty. There are thousands of treaties which the Western countries have made with regard to Asian countries. Have they ever depended upon those treaties? There is no justification whatsoever for China to go to Tibet and control it. We have not raised our voice sufficiently loud in that connection. The matter should have been taken to the United Nations. We have not done that. Now, having got Tibet under their control, I am afraid China is still going ahead trying to establish its influence in Nepal. I hope it will not succeed in that. We shall be vigilant enough to advise the Nepalese Government of the dangers that lie in that. With all the platitudes that we hear from these Communist countries, you can never be sure as to what they will talk and what they will do. And one must be very careful in formulating one's policy with regard to these people. It may not sound of aggression at present so far as Nepal is concerned. But I have no doubt in my mind that by going into Tibet and taking control of the Tibetan territory, China has transgressed the present ideas of democracy and Panch Shila because Tibet had never invited China. Tibet had to accept Chinese rule because it was helpless.

Sir, I am not in hundred per cent. agreement with certain remarks of the Prime Minister about Pakistan. It has been suggested that it is not our intention to unite with Pakistan. Well, so far as I am concerned I have no objection to uniting with Pakistan if Pakistan and its people wish to unite

with my country—with India. Before partition, we have lived together. We did not want to part with Pakistan. Yet, certain mischievous propaganda carried the elements to such a pitch that there was no alternative for the Congress leaders and the country but to accept this partition. If tomorrow, due to the stupid policy followed by the Government of Pakistan, the people of Pakistan desire to reunite with India willingly and with satisfaction, I do not see any reason why India should refuse to unite with Pakistan.

SHRI H. C. DASAPPA (Mysore): And then again you raise the problem of dividing the country if somebody creates trouble.

SHRI LALCHAND HIRACHAND DOSHI: We will face the problem then as we were prepared to face the problem of the division of Gujarat and Maharashtra from the Bombay State. Sir, it was a small problem within the country. Yet, feelings between Gujarat and Maharashtra were roused to such a pitch that everybody in the Bombay State was very afraid as to what length that would be carried.

*(Time bell rings.)*

Sir, I do not know if any time limit has been fixed.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI P. S. RAJAGOPAL NAIDU): Yes, the time limit of 15 minutes has been fixed. That was mentioned by the Deputy Chairman yesterday. That is so far as the Congress Party is concerned.

SHRI LALCHAND HIRACHAND DOSHI: All right, Sir.

In the international politics, Sir, sentiments had reached a very high pitch, but Parliament took the lead and came to the conclusion that such a sort of thinking between the two groups of the same State was undesirable from the point of view of the country's interests, and they came to the conclusion that the two groups shall remain together in their own interests as well as in the interests of the country. Who knows that tomorrow, in the interests of peace,



even the U.N.O. may come forward and say "Look here, all these differences between India and Pakistan are nauseating and irritating to the peace of the world, and it is therefore better if you patch up your differences and come together." That may also happen, and the people of India and Pakistan may feel that their differences are not desirable in the interests of the prosperity of the two countries, and therefore there is no reason why they should not agree to unite. The greater we are, the more desirable it is for us . . . . .

**SHRI H. C. DASAPPA:** Sir, that is not the question at issue.

**SHRI LALCHAND HIRACHAND DOSHI:** Sir, I may be allowed to carry on, and it is no use interrupting me like that. I am just giving my expression to the different feelings.

Sir, therefore I feel that there has been aggression from two sources, and in the interests of peace and security such aggression must be condemned without any reservation. Our foreign policy should be so decided as not to allow certain countries to try to increase their influence in certain other neighbouring areas, whereby there might be danger to our own country.

**SHRI P. N. SAPRU:** Mr. Vice-Chairman, I think I would be right in saying that so far as the broad lines of our foreign policy are concerned, they have the unanimous, or I should say, the near-unanimous approval of this House, because I noticed that Mr. Jaswant Singh had some hesitation and doubts regarding them. Sir, the main architect of this policy has been our great Prime Minister, and it is of the essence of this policy that we should be opposed to military pacts, alliances and military bases. We are opposed to the SEATO, we are opposed to the Baghdad Pact; we do not like the Warsaw Pact, and we do not like the NATO. These pacts, in our opinion, heighten the fear complex from which the nations of the world are suffering. They bring or they tend to bring war—either global war or local wars—nearer. And therefore,

Sir, our stand regarding these pacts has been firm and clear. It is only in collective security that the world can find salvation.

Sir, it should be remembered that we are pursuing a policy of constructive peace and of non-alignment in this insane world of rival ideologies, and it is inevitable that occasion should arise when our attitude towards particular problems may be misunderstood by the countries who take us or who would like to take us for granted. That, Mr. Vice-Chairman, is a consideration which should not worry us, because what is right is right, and if we are doing the right thing, it does not at all matter what others think of us. The important thing is that we should explain our position clearly and the world should know exactly where we stand, so that there may be no misunderstandings about our attitude.

Now, Sir, the Prime Minister, in the great speech which he made yesterday, referred to the difficulties in the matter of voting in the United Nations on resolutions which have very often a propaganda character about them. There are 79 Members of the United Nations, and each one of them has its own views. Now, the procedure of the United Nations makes it possible for a delegation to explain its vote even after the vote has been recorded. I think it would be a good thing—and I hope that that practice is being followed—to emphasise on our delegations that it is necessary that they should, as far as possible, follow this procedure of explaining their votes. I also think, Sir, that it is necessary for our purposes to have good publicity departments both at the United Nations and in the other countries of the world. My experience on the other hand is that our publicity organisation is very weak, and that indeed it needs to be strengthened and reorganised very much.

Now, Mr. Vice-Chairman, I would like to refer to the three main subjects which were dealt with by the Prime Minister in his speech. The first is Egypt. I am glad that Britain and France have at long last declared their

[Shri Lalchand Hirachand Doshi]

intention to withdraw their troops from Egyptian frontiers. I hope, Sir, that they will do this speedily. But I cannot help feeling that the speech which Mr. Kishen Chand of the Praja Socialist Party made yesterday was rather an unfortunate speech. He seemed almost to apologise for the Anglo-French intervention in Egypt, and he seemed to suggest that our diplomacy in regard to Egypt had been a bad one. Now, Mr. Vice-Chairman, what are the facts in regard to the Egyptian situation? Col. Nasser, for certain reasons, of which he could be the only judge, decided to nationalise what was a commercial concern. Remember that this canal agreement was a commercial agreement. He decided to nationalise a commercial concern. He had a perfect right to do so. He may have been right or he may have been wrong—I am not going into that—in doing it overnight. We have no right to sit in judgement over him. This upset completely the balance of the British Prime Minister. He compared Mr. Nasser to Hitler but forgot that Mr. Nasser did not have the resources of Hitler; he compared him to Mussolini but forgot that he did not have the meanness of Mussolini. He compared him to a gangster. After using all that language in the British House of Commons, he invited Mr. Nasser to a conference in London. Mr. Nasser would indeed have been lacking in a sense of dignity and in self-respect if he had responded to the invitation of the British Prime Minister to visit him in his country. The London conference met. At that Conference Sir Anthony Eden found that there was a good deal of opposition to his plan. Eighteen out of the 22 members agreed that the principle of nationalisation could not and should not be attacked and they came to use some sort of a vague understanding on 'internationalisation'. Then an attempt at a second conference was made to put teeth in the canal users' association. Mr. Dulles did not fall in line with Sir Anthony Eden and Britain thereafter went to the security Council. Then it struck the socialist Prime Minister of France, M. Mollet, that

what has been happening in Algeria was inspired by Egypt and he was determined to retain Algeria for France. France is fighting the battle of the white races all over Africa. He encouraged Israel to commit aggression. Immediately after this was done Britain and France intervened. Allegations have been made in the American press that France helped Israel with materials and various other things to attack Egypt. Then appeared on the scene these saintly powers—France and Britain,—saying that in the interests of preventing a wider war, in the interests of rousing the conscience of the United Nations and the Security Council to the urgency of the Middle East problem, they were intervening in Egypt regardless of their obligations to the Commonwealth, regardless of their obligations to the U.N. I call that mean, despicable conduct unworthy of the Prime Ministers of great countries, unworthy of a highly civilised people like the British. It is vastly to the credit of the British people, to the leaders of the British Labour and the British Liberal Party and also vastly to the credit of an independent and virile press, papers like the *New Statesman and Nation*, the *Manchester Guardian*, the *Nows Chronicle* that they all should have condemned this aggression not on grounds of mere expediency but also on moral grounds. They were horrified that Britain who had taken a lead in initiating a new policy in colonial matters in Asia should in the twentieth century be reverting to the days of Hastings and Clive in Asia and reviving the memories of Imperialist aggression.

Mr. Kishen Chand was wrong in thinking or in suggesting that our plan was no ridiculous as to merit no consideration by anybody. I happen to be a reader of the British press, and if he will refer to an article in *The Spectator*, which is a Conservative paper, of August 22, he will find that the leading article there specifically refers to the Indian plan with approval. The Indian plan met with a good response from Mr. Gaitskell. If you examine the six principles which were enunciated by the Security Coun-

cil as a basis for negotiations, you will find that those six principles very much followed the lines of settlement which had been indicated by us.

SHRI H. C. DASAPPA: Mr. Kishen Chand is just coming.

SHRI P. N. SAPRU: It is open to Mr. Kishen Chand to be more imperialist than the imperialists themselves. Before he blames the Indian plan, I would very much like him to study the plan carefully. I venture to think that what Great Britain and France asked for was not internationalisation for the purpose of the canal being run in an efficient manner. They were not concerned so much with the operational efficiency of the canal; they wanted an excuse to re-enter the canal zone which Britain had vacated in 1954. In these circumstances, had it not been for the clear stand taken by the opposition parties in England, one would have felt that there was not much use in remaining in this Commonwealth. But I think that our relationship with the Commonwealth depends upon something different from these day to day occurrences or differences. Therefore I do not agree with Mr. Bhupesh Gupta that any case has been made out for quitting the Commonwealth.

I come now to the question of Hungary. I confess that I am one of those who feel that the conduct of the Soviet Union in Hungary has not been of a character to merit any approval at our hands. I would have liked our Communist friends to read what some of the Communists of other countries are saying. I read only yesterday that the pro-peace group led by the French Communist Party wanted the withdrawal of the Soviet troops and it supported the proposal that there should be no pacts and alliances. In Hungary shocking things have happened. The Russian case is that there have been no deportations. Then, why do they not allow the U. N. Observers to go there? Why do they not allow the Secretary General to go there? The presumption in law against a party who does not produce a document

which he is under an obligation to do is that, if it is produced, it would be against him. I think that that presumption would apply in this case also. The international law on the point is a little complicated, but irrespective of any question of what the international law on the subject is or is not, I think it is wrong for foreign troops to intervene in civil strife. This almost looked like a civil war, and whether the Hungarians who were revolting were antifascists or counter-revolutionaries was an immaterial matter. The big question is this that a nation has the right to determine its own destiny and I think that the Soviet people should realise this fundamental fact.

*(Time bell rings)*

Sir, I will take about five minutes more.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI P. S. RAJAGOPAL NAIDU): Please be brief.

SHRI P. N. SAPRU: I will be very brief. Therefore I don't think that we can support the Russian Government in this matter. We regret the action that the Kadar and Russian Government have taken in regard to ex-Premier Nagy. He seems to have been spirited away to Rumania. That is not a decent way of doing things. Our moral sympathies in this matter go out to the people of Hungary and we must judge these issues from the moral standpoint. *(Interruption.)* It has been said that we are not supporting the people of Hungary. It has been said that we are not as firm in our denunciation of Russian action in Hungary as we are in regard to Egypt. It is inevitable that as an Asian power we should react more strongly against things which happen in Asia than against things which happen in Europe. I make no apologies for any such supposed differentiation on our part.

Let me, Mr. Vice-Chairman, before winding up, say a few words about Pakistan. I have read the speech of the Pakistan Prime Minister with

[Shri P. N. Sapru] amusement. The Prime Minister of Pakistan has never been known to be a man of very strict principles. An Indian paper said that he would know how to stick to the office. Now he got into the office with the help of progressive groups in Pakistan. He is betraying those groups and he has conjured up visions as to what we would do if Pakistan did not have the Baghdad Pact Powers to support her. He also talked of Kashmir. We have no apologies to offer for our Kashmir policy. Not we, but Pakistan is the aggressor in Kashmir and that is a fact which is completely ignored by Pakistani spokesmen. We know that our administration of Kashmir is a good and clean one and that the people of Kashmir, like that administration and are happy with that. There was the testimony of Lord Attlee the other day and other friends have testified to that fact but what about the administration of their part of Kashmir. Pakistanis never talk of their administration of their part of Kashmir. It is said, Mr. Vice-Chairman, that we would like to swallow up Pakistan. Pakistan would be a big morsel to swallow up but we have in any case no desire to swallow her up.

(Interruptions)

SHRI K. S. HEGDE: And a bad bone too.

SHRI P. N. SAPRU: I would like to say this and I say it because a reference was made by one of the speakers here to this point. We would not like to re-unite with Pakistan even if Pakistan offered re-union. We are a secular State here. We are very proud of that fact and we would like the secular character of our democracy to be maintained. We have no ill-will against Pakistan. We think that we cannot conquer hatred by hatred. You can only conquer it by love. That is the message which was given to us by our great Master and it is in that spirit that our policy towards Pakistan or for the matter of that, towards any country, is being formulated by our great and noble Prime Minister. Thank you.

SHRI K. S. HEGDE: Mr. Vice-Chairman, after we had our last foreign affairs debate, many things have happened in the world. Events have moved in very quick succession. From about 1954 we were all hoping that the cold war phase has disappeared and the world has settled down for an era of peace and progress. The indications were in that direction but unfortunately from about the beginning of this year things have taken an extremely bad turn. It is unnecessary to find out the causes of the present trouble. The hon. Prime Minister yesterday had analysed the factors that have led up to this trouble and it needs no repetition but we have got to take note of the serious things that are taking place. There has been an uncalled for aggression in Egypt. Events in Hungary have been extremely painful and we are repeatedly treated to outbursts from Pakistan.

Let me first deal with Pakistan, as it concerns us possibly most. The Prime Minister of Pakistan has told the country that so far as Pakistan is concerned it is no more in danger of any aggression on the part of India and he does not expect any aggression from India in one part of the speech, of course contradicting the earlier portion, but at the same time he said that he was willing to have pacts and more pacts with a view to strengthening himself to assert his claims to Kashmir and in other disputes with India like the canal water claims. I would like to underline this statement. In this very context he said that the Muslims of India are his countrymen. I want this House to piece together these different statement and see what exactly the picture that is presented to us. In this context, will you kindly remember what Mr. Kasim Rizvi said some time earlier before the integration of Hyderabad? He used language similar to this. He said: "The Bay of Bengal shall lick the feet of the Nizam and we shall plant the Nizam's flag in the Red Fort and the Indian Muslims shall rise in revolt in support of this." The language used by Mr. Suhrawardy looks like having been borrowed from Mr. Kasim Rizvi and Mr. Suhra-

wardy's potentialities for mischief is not unknown. Of course human memory is short but we will remember with regret the episodes that have taken place in Calcutta and we shall also remember the frequent visits paid by Mr. Suhrawardy to Goa in the recent past. But that does not change our course of conduct and rightly too. In spite of all this provocation the Government of India is willing and anxious to have a good neighbourly feeling. In their difficulties we gave them a gift of 500 tons of rice. We loaned them 2,000 tons of rice and at a time when they did not pay us back the money we loaned them and did not pay the amounts that are due to us in regard to supply of canal waters. But we must still hope against hope that we will conquer evil by good. That is the message that our Master has left to us and we shall still insist on that. Mr. Suhrawardy or no Mr. Suhrawardy, we shall continue to be friendly with Pakistan, whether Pakistan likes to be friendly with us or not.

Turning our attention to Egypt, there has been a serious state of affairs. Since about the beginning of this century Britain has not placed itself in such a wrong position as it has done this time. It had just repeated the exploits of Clive and Warren Hastings as one of the speakers earlier said. But I would not accuse the British nation. It is a strange but a pleasing phenomenon to find that in a country which is at war with another country, a good section, if not the majority, of the people asserting themselves on the side of morality and on the side of a righteous cause. It is a lesson in democracy. I have greater respect for the British people today than I had probably a few months back. The errors and commissions of the Eden Government are strongly condemned by not merely the Labour Party, but by the Liberal Party and several other influential sections in that country. Probably they have done it more than anybody else anywhere else. And that is the surest indication of a healthy democracy in a country. If there is a justification for our continuing in the Commonwealth—and there are many—this is more than

sufficient for our associating ourselves with a people who are proud of their democracy, who are proud of their national self respect. I am sorry that Britain, of all countries, should have been a party to this nefarious activity in a way, and I am glad that the Foreign Secretary yesterday has announced the unconditional withdrawal of troops and I hope there will be no more trouble created either in Syria or other places, at any rate Britain and France have several imperialistic interests in the Middle East and they are not able to free themselves from those difficulties of their own. But they must see the march of events and adjust themselves to modern conditions and modern circumstances.

Sir, I would like to give my utmost attention to things that have happened in Hungary. We had been told repeatedly that all was well within Russia. But the moment Stalin disappeared from the field, an ugly picture was presented to the world and many of the things that were said in the past and denied by the Russian leaders, were admitted to be true at this stage. That itself was a revelation and a shocking thing to the world at large. But it did not stop there. Immediately there were troubles in East Germany and a few days later there was trouble in Poland. In the Polish trouble, a certain amount of repression was used. But there, better counsel prevailed in the end and world opinion to that extent was successful. The Russian leaders compromised with the Polish leaders. Similar things happened in Hungary and probably a similar arrangement would have come about. But unfortunately at that time the British invasion of Egypt took place. There was a very good cartoon published by the "Indian Express" of Madras. I do not know how many hon. Members had seen it. It was a very illustrative one. The two Russian leaders are shown in it as having murdered Hungary, with their hands stained with blood, and one of them whispers to the other, "Let us go to the Canal and wash it off." To some extent, this was a true representation

[Shri K. S. Hegde]

of the situation that existed in Hungary. There was no gainsaying the fact that the movement in Hungary was a voluntary, spontaneous one. It was a movement of oppressed people. It was a movement by people who wanted a government of their own, who did not want foreigners in their country. There is equally no denying the fact that the present regime in Hungary does not represent the majority will of that country. That is so far as we can read from a distance. Many of these things will have to be inferred. We have no access to true facts. The explanation, possibly, as to why we thought at one stage that this dispute was an internal dispute lies in the fact that all the facts, all the full facts, were not in our possession. Otherwise we would never have considered this an internal affair or a domestic concern. It is totally against our own conception. We have never considered the South African Government's treatment of the people of Indian origin or of the Africans as a domestic concern, as something which is only within their jurisdiction. We have never considered the affairs in Togoland or in Cyprus as a matter of only domestic concern. We would not have considered events that had taken place in Hungary as a matter of domestic concern had we the full facts in our possession. But right from the beginning the Prime Minister asserted and showed our sympathy to the oppressed people of Hungary. His recent speech at the UNESCO was a unique one. In his speech in the Lok Sabha and also in his speech here that he made yesterday, he has made our position very clear. There was a certain amount of misunderstanding about our votes in the U.N. As one who had been in the U.N. for a term, I know exactly the difficulties. The Resolutions that are brought have many facets and it is extremely difficult to distinguish one from the other. As such if you vote for it, then you vote against certain things which we consider fundamental. If we vote against it, then we are condemned as not being true to our professions. At the same time, we possibly could

have explained our position much better than what we did at one stage, had we all the facts.

[MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN in the Chair.]

But it is to the credit of the Indian Government that it has come out and made known our position absolutely clear, that our sympathies are with Hungary just as our sympathies are with Egypt. So the Government of India, along with the other Governments have taken a leading part in mobilising world opinion against aggression. We can take some credit, modestly of course, for the subsequent events that have taken place in Egypt. Had it not been for our initiative and the initiative of several other countries, probably things could not have happened as quickly as they have done. The world acknowledges it. If Switzerland proposed the conference of the Five Powers and invited India, it was not because Switzerland had very close relations with India. It was simply because it recognised the fact that India is one of the countries which has played a leading role in bringing about peace in the world. There are many nations in the world which acknowledge and appreciate the role that we have played and today the position that India occupies in the councils of the world is something which everyone is proud of in this country and for which everyone is grateful to the hon. the Prime Minister. We can only say that we entirely agree with the foreign policy of India and we extend to it our support to the fullest possible extent.

**श्री गोपीकृष्ण विजयवर्गीय :** उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, हमारे प्रधान मंत्री जी, जो कि विदेश मंत्री भी हैं, उन्होंने कल जो भाषण दिया था उसके विषय में हम सब विचार कर रहे हैं। मेरे ख्याल से तो उनका भाषण पूर्णतया संतोषजनक है और बहुत से विरोधी दल के सदस्यों ने उसकी जो आलोचनाएं की हैं, वे कोई ठीक आधार नहीं रखतीं। आज से ही नहीं बल्कि पिछले पच्चीस, तीस वर्षों से जब से पंडित जी ने राष्ट्रीय क्षेत्र में कदम रखा है वे हमारे देश की वैदेशिक नीति के संबंध में जो विचार देते रहे हैं वे हमारी वैदेशिक नीति के आधार हैं और उसके कारण ही हमारा देश आज संसार में काफी प्रतिष्ठा प्राप्त कर चुका है।

यह बात बिलकुल सही है कि आज हम दो संसार के लड़ने वाले कैम्पों के बीच में जो एक दूसरे के विरुद्ध खड़े हैं, अपने को पाते हैं। हम किसी भी कैम्प में नहीं जाना चाहते। हम तटस्थ भी नहीं हैं कि जिसमें यह समझा जाय कि संसार में जो कुछ हो रहा है उसके प्रति हम उदासीन हों, किन्तु हम अपने को शांति के प्रयत्नों की तरफ लगाना चाहते हैं। आज जो घटनाएं ईजिप्ट में और हंगरी में हुई हैं उनके प्रति हमारी जो नीति है वह यही है कि संसार में युद्ध न बढ़े और किसी प्रकार से उन देशों के मार्ग में आने वाली कठिनाइयों का समाधान हो जाय। मेरा ख्याल है कि हमारी नीति इन दोनों देशों के प्रति सफल रही है। इन दोनों देशों की घटनाओं के विषय में हमारे विरोधी दल के सदस्यों ने जो बातें कही हैं और जो आक्षेप लगाये हैं कि हम हंगरी के बारे में कुछ नरम रहे हैं और हमने अपनी नीति साफ नहीं रखी, बल्कि कुछ सदस्यों ने लोक सभा में यह भी कहा था कि हमको लगभग एक हफ्ता लगा कि हम सही बात हंगरी के बारे में कह सकें, तो मैं समझता हूँ कि यह सब गलत है। भारत में जो हम लोग यहां मौजूद हैं, हम देख रहे हैं कि जब हंगरी की घटनाओं के विषय में भारत के अखबारों में खबरें निकलीं उसके बाद तुरंत ही हमारे प्रधान मंत्री जी का यूनेस्को में पहले पहल भाषण हुआ, और उसमें उन्होंने जहां ईजिप्ट की घटनाओं की निन्दा की वहां उन्होंने हंगरी के विषय में भी साफ साफ कहा कि हम इसका हरगिज समर्थन नहीं कर सकते और हम दोनों जगह जो एग्जेशन हुआ है उसको बुरा समझते हैं। इसलिये यह जो आलोचना विरोधी सदस्यों ने की है, मैं समझता हूँ कि अपने पार्टी के मतलबों को सिद्ध करने के लिये ज्यादा की है बनिस्वत इसके कि वे कुछ तथ्य कहते। मैं आपको यह बतलाना चाहता हूँ कि हमारे व्ही० के० कृष्णा मेनन ने भी बड़ा ही अच्छा भाषण यू० एन० एसेम्बली में दिया था और उसकी कटिंग मेरे पास है। इस बात को उन्होंने अपने यू० एन० ओ० के भाषण में साफ तौर से कहा था कि हमारा यह मूलभूत विचार है कि हम हरगिज पसंद नहीं करते कि बाहरी फौजें हंगरी में रहे और हंगरी की ही तरह ईजिप्ट में भी रहें। दूसरी बात जो उन्होंने कही वह यह है कि हंगरी के लोगों को, जैसे और भी किसी देश के लोगों को, अपनी इच्छा के अनुसार अपनी गवर्नमेंट निर्माण करने का अधिकार है वैसे ही उन लोगों को भी है और एशिया की वहां अपनी जबरदस्ती करने का कोई अधिकार नहीं है। मैं आपको सिर्फ थोड़े से मैं इस

विषय के ऊपर बतलाना चाहता हूँ कि श्री व्ही० के० कृष्णा मेनन ने क्या सिद्धांत रखे थे :

• "We have to recognise the fact that the Hungarian people should have a Government which is responsive to its national aspirations and dedicated to its independence and well-being."

यह बात उन्होंने उस समय कही :

"Therefore we are not by our abstention proclaiming our unconcern or lack of interest in this matter."

इसी तरह से उन्होंने यह भी बतलाया :

"We would like to see the position where foreign forces are withdrawn from every country—whether they be called bases, contingents, parts of alliances or the conditions to which my colleague from Ceylon has referred."

तो जो उनकी मूलभूत बात थी, जो उनका बुनियादी उमूल था हंगरी के बारे में, वह हिन्दुस्तान का बुनियादी दृष्टिकोण है और वह यह है कि हंगरी में रशिया ने जो बर्ताव किया और अपनी जबरदस्ती की उसको हम कोई मुनासिब कार्य-वाही नहीं समझ सकते। जहां तक श्री कृष्णा मेनन के एटीटयूड का सवाल है कि उन्होंने यू० एन० ओ० में गवर्नमेंट आफ इंडिया की नीति के खिलाफ कोई बात कही है, यह बात मेरे ख्याल से निराधार बैठती है। हंगरी की घटना के विषय में और ईजिप्ट की घटना के विषय में कोई फर्क हो या न हो, लेकिन इसमें जो थोड़ा फर्क मेरी दृष्टि में आता है वह मैं आपको बतलाना चाहता हूँ। जब मैंने देखा कि हमारे बहुत से विरोधी सदस्य-गण अपनी राय उस प्रोपेगेंड पर कायम करते हैं जो प्रोपेगेंडा अक्सर वैस्टर्न प्रेस की तरफ से किया जाता है—ईजिप्ट की घटनाओं को ढकने के लिये हंगरी की घटना की ओर इशारा किया जाता है कि दूसरा पक्ष क्या कर रहा है, तो इस बात को दृष्टि में रखते हुए कि हंगरी के विषय में हम एक तरफा फैसला न दे दें बल्कि दोनों तरफ की बात कहें, मैंने यह सोचा कि श्री शेपिलोव, जो कि यू० एन० जनरल एसेम्बली में रशियन रिप्र-जेंटेटिव है, उन्होंने जो भाषण हंगरी के विषय में दिया उसका थोड़ा अंश आपको पढ़कर सुनाऊँ। यह भाषण हिन्दुस्तान टाइम्स में छपा है जो हमारे एक इन्लाइटेंड पूजीपति, सेठ बिड़ला जी का निकाला हुआ है। तो मि० शेपिलोव ने वहां जो बात कही थी उसकी तरफ हमारा ध्यान जाना चाहिये और उसमें वहां जो घटनाएं हुई उनकी

[श्री गोपीकृष्ण विजयवर्गीय]

तरफ देखिये कि रशिया ने पहले वहां अपनी फौजें रखीं फिर हटा लीं और सोवियत फौजों के हटते ही वहां क्या हुआ:

“What happened next? No sooner had the Soviet forces left Budapest than the reactionary forces discarded their mask and began massacring democratic leaders of Hungary and upright Hungarian patriots. In these difficult days for Hungary the fascists were hanging upright patriots on lamp-posts in Budapest. They broke into hospitals and shot the wounded. They smashed up factories, set alight theatres and museums. After the rebels had set alight the National Museum in Budapest they machine-gunned firemen and soldiers who tried to save the artistic treasures in the museums. As in the cursed Hitler days the streets of Budapest were lit up by the illboding fire of stakes on which bodies of Hungarian patriots drenched in kerosene were burnt . . .”

तो ये चीजें वहां पर हुई। एक दफा रशिया ने अपनी फौजें हटा लीं, फिर उसके बाद इस तरह की घटनाएं हुईं और बाहर से, वैस्टर्न जर्मनी से और दूसरी जगहों से हथियारबंद लोग भी वहां आ गए। हंगरी में अगर झगड़ा जनता में ही आपस में होता या ईजिप्ट की घटना न होती तो शायद है कि सोवियत रशिया वहां इतना अत्याचार नहीं करता क्योंकि अत्याचारी तो वे हैं ही जो कि वहां की गवर्नमेंट पर, वहां की जनता पर जबर्दस्ती कब्जा किये हैं, और इस बात को मान कर हम चल रहे हैं। तो वहां जो फर्क है वह मैंने आपको बतलाया। मैं आपको भारत वर्ष से एक मिसाल देना चाहता हूं। भारतवर्ष में हम अपनी पंचवर्षीय योजना बना रहे हैं, और हम लोग अपने देश को समाजवादी ढांचे की तरफ ले जा रहे हैं, अपने ढंग से, न कि रशिया के ढंग से या चीन के ढंग से। भारतवर्ष अपने ढंग से, डिमोक्रेटिक तरीके से उस दिशा की ओर जा रहा है। लेकिन हमारे यहां देश के राजे, रईस, जागीरदार, भूमिपति, पूंजीपति, अगर ये लोग कभी देश में एक विद्रोह खड़ा कर दें, और हमारे देश में बहुत सी ताकतें हैं जो चाहती हैं कि नेहरू गवर्नमेंट को कमजोर किया जाय, ऐसी संस्थाएं हैं जो बाहर के पैसे से हमारे देश में चल रही हैं और कहती हैं कि हमारी फ्री इंटरप्राइज हैं,

जैसे डिमोक्रेटिक रिसर्च इंस्टीट्यूट है, तो अगर ये विद्रोह खड़ा करें और झगड़ा मचायें तो आप कैसे फर्क करेंगे। हमारे एक मि० भसानी हैं जो पहले कभी प्रसिद्ध आदमी थे, उन्होंने भाषण दिया कि सोशलिज्म को लाना डिक्टेटरशिप को, आथेरिटेरियन गवर्नमेंट को लाना है और वह डिमोक्रेसी के खिलाफ हैं। हमारे हिन्दुस्तान में अलग अलग लायलिटी के लोग हैं, वे कभी भी विद्रोह कर सकते हैं। हमारे यहां आर० एस० एस० की संस्था है जो कहती है कि हमें पोलिटिक्स में भाग लेना नहीं है। लेकिन वे करते क्या हैं, वे एक प्राइवेट आरमी तैयार कर रहे हैं, हिन्दुस्तान में विद्रोह कराने की तरफ उनकी नजर है तो मैं यह कहता हूं कि अगर हमारे देश में भी ऐसी कोई घटना हुई और हमारी पंचवर्षीय योजना और दूसरी लोक कल्याणकारी योजना को उखाड़ने के लिये अगर ये जागीरदार, जमींदार, भूमिपति वगैरा विद्रोह करें तो उसमें और सामान्य विद्रोह में आप फर्क करेंगे या नहीं। उसी तरह से अगर हंगरी में जो विद्रोह हुआ है उसमें बाहरी लोगों का प्रसंग न होता तो स्थिति कोई दूसरी ही होती। इस विषय से संबद्ध पैराग्राफ में श्री शोपीलोव के भाषण से पढ़ कर सुनाता हूं। हम कोई एकतरफा फैसला न कर लें इसलिये दूसरी तरफ की रिपोर्ट को भी हमें पढ़ना चाहिये। तो उसमें आगे बतलाया है:

“It is significant, for instance, that the American Senate resolved last year to include into the Congressional records a document containing a detailed plan of subversive actions against the socialist States. This plan envisaged, among other things, the training of special personnel for guiding the resistance movement, for propaganda, subversive activities and infiltration into those countries. The sponsor of the plan, Mr. David Sarnoff, wrote that a network of schools and universities was needed to educate cold war personnel. The purpose was not education in the literary sense of the word but special training for the intellectual, technical, intelligence and other needs of ideological and psychological warfare. A kind of political warfare academy could be set up.”

हंगरी में जो हुआ वह एक ग्री प्लान्ड योजना के अनुसार हुआ। लेकिन वहां पर जो घटना हुई



उसके बारे में हमने, हमारी गवर्नमेंट ने, हमारे प्रधान मंत्री जी ने शुरू से ही इस बात को साफ साफ जाहिर किया कि उसका कतई समर्थन नहीं कर सकते। हंगरी में जो हुआ वह भी एक कंप्लीकेटेड चीज है, वह सादी घटना नहीं है। दोनों तरफ की बातों में फर्क करना जरूरी है, इस बात को हम सब को समझ लेना चाहिये।

जहां तक हमारे प्राइम मिनिस्टर साहब ने नीति निर्धारित की, जिस पर हमारा देश चल रहा है, उससे हमारे देश की ताकत बढ़ी है और इज्जत बढ़ी है। हम हंगरी को भी माफ नहीं कर सकते, सोवियट रशिया को भी माफ नहीं कर सकते जो कि उसने हंगरी में ल आयाद किया। ब्रिटिश गवर्नमेंट और फ्रेंच गवर्नमेंट के बारे में और भी मेम्बरो ने काफी माफ तौर से कहा है। दोनों सरकारें अपनी अपनी फौजें हटा भी रही हैं। इजराइल का क्या हाल है, यह मालूम नहीं है। अभी खतरे का अड्डा इजराइल भी बना हुआ है, इस पर भी हमको ध्यान देने की जरूरत है। पाकिस्तान के विषय में ज्यादा कहने की आवश्यकता नहीं है क्योंकि उस पर प्रधान मंत्री जी ने जो कुछ कहा वह काफी साफ है। हमारा कोई बुरा इरादा पाकिस्तान के खिलाफ नहीं है, लेकिन अगर पाकिस्तान खाहमखाह अपनी नीतियों से गिरता चला जाता है तो उसका कोई इलाज हम लोगों के पास नहीं है।

हम भारतवर्ष में इस बात को अकसर सोचते हैं कि यहां भी ऐसी ताकतें हैं कि जो हमारे लक्ष्य "समाजवादी ढांचे" के खिलाफ काम करती रहती हैं और नाम स्वतंत्रता और फ्रीडम का लेती हैं, लेकिन वे मालदारों को ज्यादा मालदार बनाने की आजादी और गरीबों का ज्यादा शोषण करने की आजादी को ज्यादा चाहते हैं बनिस्बत इसके कि सारा देश एक लोक कल्याणकारी ढंग से समाजवादी ढांचे की ओर जाय और हम अपने देश को मजबूत बनायें। हमारे यहां प्रतिक्रियावादी ताकतें काफी हैं। इसलिये वे इस बात का ज्यादा हवाला देते हैं कि हंगरी में क्या हुआ।

अंत में यू० एन० ओ० में हमारे प्रतिनिधि श्री कृष्णा मेनन ने जिस प्रकार अपना कार्य किया और हमारे प्रधान मंत्री जी ने अपने भाषण में जो कुछ कहा है उसका मैं पूर्ण समर्थन करता हूँ।

3 P.M.

PROF. HUMAYUN KABIR (West Bengal): Mr. Deputy Chairman, I have had the good fortune of visiting during the current year Japan, the United Kingdom, the U.S.A. and the U.S.S.R. These are countries very far flung not only in distance, but also in their ideologies. But one thing which I noticed in every one of these countries was the high regard for India and everywhere I felt proud to be an Indian citizen. I have no doubt in my mind that this good feeling towards India, in all these diverse countries, is very largely due to India's foreign policy and also the contribution which India's Prime Minister has made not only to the advancement of India but to the creation of better feelings among peoples throughout the world. If I may so describe, I would call the policy which India has been following not one of neutrality, but one of non-alignment with any power bloc. India has not been neutral; whenever any moral issues have been raised, India has expressed her voice in no uncertain terms. But she certainly has refused to align herself with any particular alignment of power in the world and the Prime Minister in his speech yesterday made it very clear that all these alignments for power, all these pacts do not serve even the ends for which they are intended.

I said a moment ago that wherever I have travelled during the current year and before, I have found very high regard for India and her people and I am proud to be an Indian citizen. I would apply the same remarks even to the people of Pakistan and I would make a distinction between the Government and the people of Pakistan. I had the good fortune of visiting both the western and eastern wings of Pakistan in 1954 and wherever I went I found a warmth of feeling for India which was in strange contrast to the attitude which the official spokesmen of Pakistan very often adopt towards India. For the people of India and for India's Prime Minister I found great admiration and regard among the common people of Pakistan.

[Prof. Humayun Kabir]

I do not intend to discuss in detail Mr. Suhrawardy's speech for various reasons. For one thing, the Prime Minister has dealt with the speech of the Prime Minister of Pakistan in a manner which leaves little else for anybody to say. And this morning Pandit Kunzru also discussed it in detail. Besides, in the brief time allotted to me, I could not, even if I wished, discuss it fully, but this I would say. I have known Mr. Suhrawardy for a long number of years. In fact, in a sense my public life began in opposition to Mr. Suhrawardy and till he left this country I have always been a critic of his and always been one of those who have fought against the policies for which Mr. Suhrawardy stood. He has left this country, I cannot deny the fact that he is a very able man and it was my hope, when he became the Prime Minister of Pakistan, that perhaps he would turn over a new leaf. All his ambitions have now been fulfilled. There is nothing more he could hope for. He is already the Prime Minister of Pakistan and it would have been for him, I think, a glorious day if he had taken advantage of the position he has attained and worked for greater friendship between India and Pakistan. I have no doubt in my mind that a Prime Minister of Pakistan will be the most successful Prime Minister of Pakistan if he works for friendship with India. The people of Pakistan want friendship with India. The geography, the history and the cultural bonds between the two countries are such that without such friendship Pakistan cannot prosper. I have often said to friends in Pakistan that we in India may have our progress retarded if there is an unfriendly Pakistan. It will be retarded but it will not be stopped. In spite of an unfriendly Pakistan India will progress and has been progressing. In fact the progress which India has made in the last seven or eight years bears comparison with similar progress by any country anywhere in the world. I think, in fact, our achievement in certain respects is probably greater than that of any other country during the same period. I have always told these friends in Pakistan

that if Pakistan wants to progress she must be friendly with India and any unfriendly attitude towards India will retard her progress. We will flourish in spite of Pakistan. Pakistan cannot flourish unless Pakistan adopts a more friendly attitude towards India.

That is why I have always been anxious that the undoubted friendship of the common man in Pakistan towards India should find expression in the policies and the administration of that country. I have also sometimes said that it is a misfortune that in Pakistan there should be such a divergence between the administration and the people. Nowhere else in the world today is there perhaps such a wide conflict between what the people of Pakistan want and what the Government of Pakistan is doing. The Prime Minister yesterday referred and today Pandit Kunzru also mentioned the speech which Mr. Suhrawardy made in regard to Egypt. I do not think there would be anybody in Pakistan who would support Mr. Suhrawardy in the statement he has made about Egypt. And if we maintain our attitude of friendliness towards Pakistan, I have no doubt in my mind that very soon a time will come when the people of Pakistan will adopt towards India the same attitude, the same attitude of friendship regardless of what the Government of Pakistan may do. We have already heard powerful voices in Pakistan. The Awami-League and its President, Moulana Bhasani has expressed in no unmistakable terms what the attitude of Pakistan ought to be to India. On the one occasion when there was a free expression of opinion in Pakistan during the elections in 1954, the people of East Bengal made it absolutely clear what their attitude towards India was. During that election, the parties which stood for unfriendly relations with India, parties which stood for hostility to India were literally wiped out. I do not know of any other record in history where a party in power using all the paraphernalia of Government machinery, with all the power of religious appeal secured three per cent. of the votes and about three per cent. of seats.

**SHRI N. R. MALKANI:** Why this exodus now?

**PROF. HUMAYUN KABIR:** I am coming to that in a moment. Therefore, I would say the people of Pakistan are not unfriendly to India. The Government—to the misfortune of Pakistan and I think to our misfortune also—have not been friendly. And if we could cash into reality this friendly feeling of the people of Pakistan, many of the problems would be solved. Just now, an hon. friend asked, what about the exodus from Pakistan. I regard that as evidence of the complete failure of the policies which the administration in Pakistan has been following till now. I do not know if hon. Members are aware that among the vast number of people who are coming from East Bengal to West Bengal today, there are many who are Muslims. I am told that there are Muslims who have even come under feigned names. They have come because the economic conditions in East Bengal are such, the conditions of employment and prospects are such that they have been forced to leave that area and come to West Bengal. That is one of the reasons. I do not say that is the only reason. Of course, the official attitude of the Government of Pakistan has been one of the main factors why this sort of exodus has happened.

I will not also discuss Kashmir because what has been said about Kashmir in this House is ample and there is no doubt whatever that Pakistan was an aggressor. I have always felt that till there is a Government in Pakistan properly elected, a popular, representative Government in Pakistan, the problem of Kashmir can never be settled. I have always felt that it is, again a misfortune that in Pakistan there have been a series of administrations, administrations which have come through court intrigues, but not a popularly representative Government. When a general election takes place in Pakistan—in east and west—it is my hope that the people of Pakistan will speak in unmistakable voice and that West Pakistan will demonstrate in the

same way as East Pakistan has done that it is only in friendship with India that the future of Pakistan lies.

I said a little while ago that wherever I have gone I have found the greatest friendship for India and India's foreign policy and India's Prime Minister and I would apply that to Pakistan also. I would also say that all the neighbours of India—Burma, Nepal, China and Ceylon—are friendly with us. If India had any but the friendliest attitude towards all her neighbours, why should all these countries be so friendly with us and consult us in all matters which concern our common interests? If Pakistan says that India and all these countries are out of step, one is reminded of the story of the soldier in a regiment who said that the whole regiment was marching out of step and that he alone was keeping proper time. That is actually the situation so far as India and her neighbours are concerned. All her neighbours are in line with India's policy, or shall I say, we have a common policy. It is not a case of the neighbours of India being in line with India's policy, but the attitude, the ideals and the policy which India follows are such that all these neighbouring countries find it to their interest to co-operate and agree with India. Pakistan alone has not agreed, and I therefore have no option but to say that Pakistan is like that soldier who thought that he alone was marching in proper time and the whole regiment was out of step.

Also there is a feeling in some quarters in Pakistan—and the Prime Minister made very pointed reference to it—that India has not accepted the partition of the sub-continent. As one of those who fought against partition till the very end I would say that whatever may have been the situation in 1947, today there is no demand in India, no desire in India for any cancellation of that partition. As speaker after speaker in this House has said, as the Prime Minister himself said yesterday, the cancellation of that partition would simply mean that India would be burdened with certain areas

[Prof. Humayun Kabir]  
 which have made no progress in the last seven or eight years, where enormous economic difficulties remain unsolved, where enormous problems of political and social adjustments have not been faced, and to that extent India's progress would be retarded. I certainly want more friendly relations with Pakistan but as a separate State. There is no question of India trying to impose her will on Pakistan, for the policy of India has been, as will be evident in all the transactions of her foreign policy, that she has accepted democracy internally, she has accepted democracy externally. If the people of Pakistan have elected to be separate, if they have wanted to go away from India, there is no reason whatsoever why India should want to cancel that partition. It is because of this belief in democracy that India has taken up a particular attitude on the questions of Hungary and Egypt. In both cases, it is the right of the people to choose the form of Government they want which India has accepted; and if India is willing to accept that principle in the case of countries like Hungary and Egypt, there is no reason whatever why India should not accept the same principle so far as Pakistan is concerned. Therefore, I have no doubt in my mind and the leaders of Pakistan themselves know that there is no aggressive intent whatever from India's side. As speaker after speaker has today said, even though there have been indications from the Pakistan Government, that have at times been suspicious from the side of India there has always been an attempt to go as far as possible, and sometimes a little beyond, in order to meet the wishes and needs of Pakistan, I do not regret it. There are one or two Members who said in this House that India should follow, what they call, a stronger policy towards Pakistan. I do not believe in such policy, I believe that the generous policy which under the leadership of the Prime Minister this country has been following is the only right policy in the relationship between India and Pakistan, and if we follow that generous policy, the people of Pakistan who have come to realise that

their true interests lie in friendship with India will one day assert themselves, perhaps sooner than we think today.

I have also felt that if we could only have two measures, they would help in solving the problem of the migration of people from East Pakistan. Last summer there was a suggestion, and the Prime Minister accepted that suggestion, that there might be goodwill missions from India to Pakistan. Unfortunately the Government of Pakistan did not accept that suggestion. Nevertheless I would say that there is always room for this exchange of goodwill missions and they can do a lot of good. Two things, I believe, are responsible for the unrest in East Pakistan. One is the introduction of the passport and the visa. The other is the economic deterioration in East Bengal for which lack of free trade between the two Bengals is largely responsible. I am aware that it was not India which introduced the passport or the visa. It was Pakistan which took the first step and India followed. But I would even at this stage appeal to the Prime Minister that, if this question is taken up again and at least the visa could be abolished, there will be better relations between the two countries. So far as free trade between the two countries is concerned in terms of the Nehru-Liaquat Pact, if this could be realised, that would also help in easing the situation which has today developed and there would, I feel, be an immediate effect on the migration of people from East Bengal.

Sir, I had intended to say something about Egypt and Hungary also, but in view of the very short time at my disposal I do not think I will be able to do so except very briefly. So far as Egypt is concerned the Prime Minister has spoken in terms which are not only the voice of India but one might say he has reflected the conscience of mankind. It is a happy sign that the pressure, external and internal has made the British Government change its attitude. I think we should pay a tribute to the British people also. The British people have acted in a way

during the situation which reflects credit to their democratic traditions, even though the British Government acted in a manner which violated all the principles for which Britain has stood. It was a case where there was not a chorus, as my friend Shri Bhupesh Gupta has said regarding Hungary. In the case of the British public it was not a chorus but there were divergent voices and these voices have ultimately prevailed. It is our hope that in accordance with the statement which has been made today that the British and French troops will be soon withdrawn, they will be soon withdrawn. As the Prime Minister said yesterday, when they came it did not take much time. If they could come so quickly, why should not they go away equally quickly?

So far as Hungary is concerned, in the very short time available, it is not possible for me to go into any discussion of the issue, but I would only like to submit one thing. In one sense there are of course great differences between Egypt and Hungary. In one case it was an act of naked aggression from outside powers. In the other case there was some kind of internal commotion, and a power which was already stationed there intervened in the civil strife. But basically, I would submit, Sir, that the issue is the same in both the instances. The issue is the right of the people to have the type of government that they like and the right or otherwise of a great power to dictate what type of government shall obtain in a weaker country. After all, the anger of Britain against Egypt is that the Government of Egypt does not fall in line with them. There have been statements, pamphlets were distributed in Cairo, that if President Nasser's Government was changed, immediately the British Government could come to terms with Egypt. In other words, there was an attempt by outside powers to try to say what type of government shall prevail in Egypt. Basically this was the issue in Hungary also—the attempt of an outside power to try to say what type of government shall prevail in that country.

Sir, since my time is already up, I will conclude by saying that India's foreign policy which is against alignment with any power bloc, which has very rightly kept clear of all these military pacts and alliances, has been amply vindicated. If one goes to different countries throughout the world, one will find that their former suspicion and distrust, and sometimes their confusion and bewilderment, about India's foreign policy is largely absent today. People understand and appreciate our policy, and even where they differ, they do see that India has a stand of her own, and that stand is for peace, for goodwill among nations, for a programme to heal the wounds and not to add to the conflicts which rage in the world.

**SHRI B. C. GHOSE (West Bengal):**  
I am happy, Sir, that the debate in this House has not confined itself to a discussion only—thanks to the Prime Minister of Pakistan—of the Hungarian and Egyptian issues, although certainly they are the most outstanding issues at the moment and deserve our serious consideration. It is necessary also that we should not neglect affairs near at home, and I am glad that the Prime Minister put the Kashmir case in relation to India so ably yesterday. The main fact, the essential fact, is that of aggression by Pakistan in Kashmir, a fact which is often forgotten conveniently not only by Pakistan which is understandable, not only by certain foreign countries which is also understandable, but it is often forgotten by people within India also which is very unfortunate. The Prime Minister said yesterday that the policy of moderation and the fact that we had given up strong positions in our anxiety to come to a peaceful settlement instead of concentrating all the time on the fundamental issue of the aggression by Pakistan in Kashmir has not been quite satisfactory to India. It has reacted against our national interest and it is time that we stated the essential facts of the situation and restated them. There is, however, one aspect of the question to which I should like to draw your attention and about which I should seek

[Shri B. C. Ghose]  
an answer from the Prime Minister. When the Kashmir Constitution was being framed and the issue was raised in the United Nations Assembly, the Prime Minister stated that our representative there said that it was the right of the Kashmiri people to frame their own Constitution and that we had also, so far as we in this country were concerned, encouraged that process. But he also added that whatever was done by the Kashmir Government could not bind the Government of India which is quite understandable. I believe this is what he stated yesterday:

“With respect to any undertakings we have given, we shall stand by them. Any action in Kashmir will not come in the way of them. The other matters may come in the way.”

I hope, Sir, that the Prime Minister will say today categorically that other matters have come in the way. A lot of things have happened since this assurance was given in the United Nations Assembly. A Constitution has been framed there. Eight years have gone by. Plans for development have been taken in hand. There have been schemes executed for the economic betterment of the people of that State. Links have been forged and all those cannot be upset today because, I am sure, if any attempt was made in any way to even test that situation, great upheavals will arise which will affect not only the relations between peoples, but also the development programme of this country. And therefore, I hope that the Prime Minister will give us a categorical assurance that there will be no going back from what has been done so far.

Another point which I should like to bring to your notice now that the Prime Minister is going to the United States of America is this. I have nothing to say about Pakistan's own policy about military pacts and the Prime Minister has made that point very clear. But when military assistance was given to Pakistan, it was said on behalf of the United States Government that no such equipment would ever be

used in any contingency against India. If ever they were to be used against India in any aggressive action, then there would be speedy action by the United States. Now, Sir, we know how the equipment which was supplied to France and Great Britain had been used. Have they not been used for aggressive purposes? What have the United States done in that matter? What is the value of such assurances? Not that the United States would change their policy or anything like that. But I believe that this aspect of their policy requires emphasising.

Before I go on to Egypt and Hungary, I should like, for a moment, to refer to an issue which we are liable to forget, namely, Goa. Where do we stand in regard to Goa? Last year, I believe, we had a discussion in this House. We indulged in heroics. We said that Goa was a part of India. Nothing could cut out Goa from India. What has happened since then? Many months have gone by. Have we achieved any progress in that matter, namely the integration of Goa with India? A lot of our citizens—martyrs—are rotting in Goa jails. What are we doing to end their incarceration? I should like to know from the Prime Minister something about what has happened in the intervening months in regard to Goa. Or does he still feel that time is on our side and if we just sit still Goa will come back to India?

Now, I come to Egypt and Hungary. I have first to refer to certain observations of the Prime Minister in the other House which, I am extremely sorry to say, I consider to be unbecoming of a person who is the Prime Minister of this great country and about whom my friend, Shri Bhupesh Gupta, spoke so feelingly, eloquently and in such glowing terms yesterday. He imputed motives to certain parties which said certain things about Hungary. He said that we are being influenced by certain documents which were circulated by certain organisations and that we were irresponsible people who pass resolutions and then go to bed. I ask: What will an Opposition party do if it will not pass resolutions? What can even

the Government of India do but condemn actions that they disapprove of? The Prime Minister found fault with our policy and has said that we are influenced by what is circulated by what is called 'The Democratic Research Society' about whom he was very caustic.

Sir, I must confess that I read all the materials that come to me, whether they are of the Democratic Research Society or they are materials supplied by that Tass organization or by the Chinese Embassy or by any other Embassy. And I think it is right that we should read all the information that comes to our possession. I hold no brief for the Democratic Research Society. But I understand that it is a body on which there are eminent members of the Congress. I believe that it has an Executive Committee on which Congress Ministers are represented. And there is also an esteemed Member of this House on the Executive Committee, who sits on the opposite benches. I believe that the Democratic Research Society has said that it is prepared to show in confidence the sources from which it gets its funds and it says that the source is the same as that from which Congress gets its funds. It is not for me to say anything. It is for the Prime Minister to examine that situation and say if he still feels that this is an organisation which is not national or which is being supported or assisted by other countries or organisations whatever it may be.

And then, the Prime Minister said also in the other House:

"The Praja-Socialist Party is forgetting Egypt and talks about Hungary alone. The time devoted to Hungary and Egypt can be calculated from the speeches of the Praja-Socialist Members here. It is not merely the time, but the stress that Members lay on each subject."

What is the implication, Sir? If we are discussing here the policy of the Government of India and if there is an item of that policy with which we agree, shall we devote all our time to that aspect of the policy or shall we

devote most of our time to explaining our position with regard to the item on which we are not in agreement? We have completely and wholly supported the Government of India's policy in regard to Egypt.

SHRI H. C. DASAPPA: Not so your Mr. Kishen Chand.

SHRI B. C. GHOSE: There are the resolutions of the party. What Mr. Kishen Chand may say does not represent the party. What the party resolution says represents the party. May I remind my hon. friend, Mr. Dasappa, of one thing? We find that many speeches from the Members on the opposite benches do not always represent the Congress policy.

AN. HON. MEMBER: Democratic principles.

SHRI B. C. GHOSE: As I was going to say, Sir, so far as the policy towards Egypt is concerned, we agree completely with the Government of India. Our spokesmen have said that not only do we agree that Great Britain and France which are the aggressors should evacuate Egypt forthwith, compensate Egypt for the damage done to her, but also that, if Britain and France do not agree to abide by the resolution of the United Nations, then sanctions—economic and other sanctions—should be taken against them. Not only that, I will go further and say this for the benefit of my friends to the right that . . .

SHRI H. C. DASAPPA: Always to the left.

SHRI B. C. GHOSE: . . . to my Communist friends that we condemn the action of Israel which is run by a Socialist Government. We condemned their action and said that they have committed an act of aggression in Egypt. Whatever may be the grouses, that they may have against Egypt, they should have gone to the United Nations. And not only that, we hang down our heads in shame that it was a Socialist Government in France which was responsible for this aggression. We say all that. But the Prime

[Shri B. C. Ghose]

Minister should not think that we forgot Egypt. We have not forgotten Egypt. But we devoted more attention and time to Hungary because that was a question on which we found that our Prime Minister was wobbling and faltering.

SHRI G. RANGA: Not on the 19th. It was after the 19th. Did the speech delivered on the 19th display any kind of wobbling?

SHRI B. C. GHOSE: We do not say that the speech of the 19th displayed any wobbling. The Prime Minister's argument referred to what we had been doing until then. I ask the Prime Minister to say as to whether our spokesman in the other House differed in any material sense from the speech delivered even in regard to Hungary in the other House.

In any case, Sir, what I was saying was this. In regard to Hungary, at a time when the Prime Minister had faltered and hesitated, at a time when our spokesman and his roving Ambassador were either equating events in Hungary to events in Ahmedabad or Bombay, or appeared to be the victims of some pique in New York, and at a time when our international prestige was at stake, I take a little pride and say that at that time it was through the voice of our Party, however feeble it may be, that the conscience of India was speaking, and that it was we, however small our efforts may have been, that had been trying to uphold the dignity and honour of this country, just as the British Labour Party was upholding the dignity and honour of the British people at that time of crisis when their Government had committed an act of aggression against Egypt. Sir, although it is merely a *post mortem* examination, yet it has some value. What was it that we had taken objection to? Here Dr. Ramaswami Mudaliar stated today that at the UNESCO Conference the Prime Minister delivered a speech which made everything clear. I agree. If that was the end of the matter, there would have been no trouble at all. But after that the Prime Minister has also

spoken at the A.I.C.C. meeting, and our representative at the U.N. did certain things which I can assure the Prime Minister had greatly agitated people in foreign countries. They told us—it is not that I am saying anything, but they told us—that “We do not understand this policy of the Government of India. It does not seem to us to be quite unbiassed and in accordance with the principles of Panch Shila.” Now what was wrong about it? We voted against one Resolution and also in regard to another Resolution which was being voted part by part we abstained in regard to that part which wanted that Soviet troops should be withdrawn from the Hungarian soil. Now the Prime Minister has said in the other House something which I cannot understand. He said that the Indian vote had to be taken against the context in which the Resolution was discussed. I understand the context. Then he said that it was obvious that the whole thing had a political motive. It might have a political motive, but when the Resolution was being voted part by part, we could have made our position quite clear. It was quite right that we voted against that part of the Resolution which said that there should be elections held under U.N. observers or under U.N. auspices. It was quite right. But it has been the policy of the Government of India generally that no foreign troops should be stationed in any country. If that is our policy, then what harm could there have been in voting in favour of a Resolution which wanted nothing more than that? That is why, Sir, we felt that the Government of India's policy was not all the time thoroughly consistent, and that gave occasion to foreigners to say that we had departed from our right course of action.

Now, Sir, with regard to Hungary, I would like to say a few words in relation to what my esteemed friend, Shri Bhupesh Gupta, said yesterday. He, of course, admitted that the previous Hungarian Government had done many things which were bad, and that the people had a legitimate grievance against that Government. But when it



came to the question of Soviet intervention in Hungary, he sought, to my mind, to justify it by saying that otherwise counter-revolutionary forces would have gained supremacy in the country, and it was right that the Soviet troops should have intervened. Now, Sir, on that point there is, I believe, some fundamental difference, because if we analyse that statement, it would amount to saying that if any country should rightly or wrongly choose a course of action which is against what my friend would call a socialist pattern, then even by force it would be right to establish that system of society. I am a socialist myself, and I would certainly like every country to be a socialist country. But I do not subscribe to the point of view that a country must be made socialist by force of arms. That is probably where we draw a line. But when I have said that, I shall be doing less than justice, if I do not also concede that there is a very welcome change in the attitude and tone of the Communist Party in this country.

Sir, I would refer you for a moment to a letter which Shri Ajoy Ghosh had written in reply to a letter which was written to him by Shri Jayaprakash Narayan. Now I must concede that I was very much struck by the tone and the attitude displayed in that letter. It is for the first time that I find that a Communist is wanting to reason or to argue and not merely to assert something whether right or wrong (*Interruption.*) I am saying that it is a welcome sign.

AN HON. MEMBER: And I hope not the last.

SHRI B. C. GHOSE: I hope not the last also. Shri Ajoy Ghosh went on saying that even on the Hungarian issue there could be an honest difference of opinion. That to come from a Communist, I believe, is a great step forward, and I hope and trust that that advance in their thought will continue and that reasoning will have a place in their arguments, and

they might be gradually persuaded to agree that the democratic process is the best.

Now, Sir, in regard to the Hungarian situation what we feel is this. Even though there might have been a danger of counter-revolution, the Soviet troops had no justification to be in Hungary. Our position I should like to state in the words of a correspondent of the Daily Worker who, I believe, has been repudiated later on, and I also believe that he has seceded from the Communist Party—I am not quite sure. He was in Hungary reporting for the Daily Worker. But he says that his despatches have not been published. This is what he says, and this has appeared in the 'New Statesman and Nation' in a recent issue. He was asked: "Was there any danger of counter-revolution or not?" He said: "There was. But the Stalinists put their faith in T54 tanks and a four-day bombardment of Budapest; they support the export of socialism in high-explosive form. I preferred and still prefer to put my faith in the Hungarian people." I believe that is also the refrain of what Marshal Tito said at Pulu. He said:

"The Soviet Union deems that it could come to awkward consequences, if they completely abandon these countries, namely, the East-European countries, and granted them, say, a status such as Yugoslavia has; they fear that in such countries it could then come to a victory of reactionary forces. In other words, they have not confidence in the internal revolutionary forces of these countries. In my opinion, this is wrong and the root of all the subsequent mistakes lies in the insufficient confidence in the socialist forces of these peoples."

When my friends raise the slogan that socialism is in danger, I am reminded of the cry 'Islam in danger', and I dislike all these cries. Let us put our faith in the people, and I am, sure they will always prefer democracy and the socialist way.

SHRI TRILOCHAN DUTTA (Jammu and Kashmir): Mr. Deputy Chairman, the amount of unanimity

[Shri Trilochan Dutta]  
that exists in this country today regarding our foreign policy is unique indeed. There is no parallel to it in any other country today even including England which is called the birth-place of parliamentary democracy, and France and America. It has been eminently reflected during the debate in this House where speaker after speaker has risen to lend his support and the support of this Parliament to the foreign policy of this country and our great Prime Minister. Some stalwarts of the Opposition have no doubt brought out points of difference here and there, but they are very minor, and I believe, perhaps necessitated by the requirements of democracy and democratic conventions. In the main I believe that so far as broader policies are concerned, they are at one with our Prime Minister; rather I should say that today the whole country solidly stands behind the Prime Minister at least so far as his foreign policy is concerned.

And why should not our country solidly support our present foreign policy? After all, we see before our eyes that it has paid dividends. It has resulted in a reduction of the severity of the cold war, in the prevention of World War, and in the strengthening of the forces of peace. Internally, I should say that a strange faith and self-confidence are today found among the Indian people. One of the greatest achievements of our Prime Minister and his foreign policy has been that today the citizen of India feels himself equal to the citizen of any other country. The sort of inferiority complex that we used to feel during the old days of imperialist rule here no longer exists.

But while giving all the praise that our foreign policy deserves, I believe we should not become complacent about the grave dangers that exist today. The situation is grave; I should say rather that there is an intensification of the cold war. Today there are many international problems, but they have been relegated to the background because of two or three major problems which confront us and the world. Many hon. Members including our

Prime Minister have discussed in great detail those dangers. No. 1 is the Anglo-French aggression in Egypt; No. 2 is the situation in Hungary, and No. 3 is the strange attitude that has been taken up by the authorities in Pakistan so far as India is concerned, particularly in reference to Kashmir.

I have no time, neither have I the desire, to say much so far as Hungary or the situation in Egypt is concerned. Other speakers have done full justice from their respective points of view to those two issues. I would only say and I want to express my wholehearted support to the basic standpoint of India so far as those two issues are concerned which is that in accordance with the United Nations Charter every people, every country, has the right to have the sort of Government which is responsive to the aspirations of the people. We want that the people in Egypt should be left free to choose the type of Government that they want. It is not for Mr. Eden to say that he wants to get rid of "that man Nasser"; neither is it for Russia or anybody else to say that they would impose a particular man or a particular type of regime on the people of Hungary.

As a resident of Kashmir, I want to say a few words. The idea of my standing up to speak is that. I want to say a few words about Pakistan and the Kashmir situation. The House knows that India's policy towards Pakistan has been very very unambiguous. Right from the start, we have wished well of our neighbour, who are our own flesh and blood, and tried in all respects to heal the wounds of partition with all the forbearance at our command. But much to our disappointment, some ill-fate has consistently dogged Pakistan. Pakistan as a sovereign country has the inalienable right to frame its own policies according to its own lights, but we have watched with great concern that her internal and external policies have been a failure, and have caused great suffering not only to the people of Pakistan but to the people of India and to the Middle East and the whole Muslim world. Prime Ministers have come in Pakistan and Prime Ministers

have gone, but sadly enough there has been no control on the incompetence and inconsistencies of their policies. And to cap it all, my regret is that all these failures and all these misfortunes are blamed on India.

Now here comes Mr. Suhrawardy who wants to out-Prime Minister all the Prime Ministers of Pakistan who preceded him. In his recent statement which has been reported in the newspapers, he has directed all his fire against India. He has said that Pakistan must stick to SEATO and Baghdad Pacts and that, left to himself, he would have more pacts to defend Pakistan's rights. He listed Kashmir as one of his rights.

Now, let us examine Pakistan's conduct in and her rights on Kashmir which, I declare here and now, we, the people of Kashmir, most emphatically repudiate. We have repudiated those claims with our own blood. The whole history of Kashmir culminating in Pakistani aggression on Kashmir belies that claim. I would say, as my friends Mr. Ghose and even Pandit Kunzru pointed out, that we should not lose sight of the basic facts of the situation. Just as Mr. Ghose said if the fundamental facts of the Kashmir situation are lost sight of in Pakistan or in some other countries, that is understandable but it would be very painful if the memory of the people of India were to be blurred as to the basic facts of the Kashmir situation or the people here were to feel that Pakistan has a strong case in any manner. What our Prime Minister said in his speech yesterday is correct. It is we, who have stuck to our pledges and it is Pakistan which has consistently refused to carry out all the commitments that it has entered into so far as Kashmir is concerned.

Let us take the basic facts or I should say the facts in a chronological order. On the 15th August 1947 the country was partitioned. Somehow the then Kashmir Government, did not decide the question of their accession before that date. Instead, the Kashmir Government offered to enter into a Standstill Agreement both with the Dominions of India and Pakistan.

Pakistan entered into a Standstill Agreement with the Kashmir Government. But look at the conduct. Even after entering into a Standstill Agreement with Kashmir, the first step they took was to impose economic blockade on Kashmir. The railway lines to the State passed through Pakistan. The two routes lay through Pakistan and I remember very distinctly what amount of difficulty the people of Jammu and Kashmir had to face because of the fact that all the inflow of essential commodities was stopped by Pakistan. They wanted to starve us, to demoralise us, into submission, into surrendering to Pakistan. When that failed, their military aggression came. In October 1947 an attack was launched on Kashmir. The marauders came and they brought death and devastation to the people of Kashmir. Towns and villages of Jammu and Kashmir were sacked and people were massacred, irrespective of whether they were Hindus or Muslims. The people of Kashmir rose to a man against this aggression and without any arms, they defended their sovereignty, they defended their honour, against heavily armed raiders who included amongst them not only Pakistani army people but Pakistani nationals who had been duly trained and armed by the Pakistan Government. In this critical situation, the legally constituted Government of Jammu and Kashmir, headed by the Maharaja sent a fervent appeal to the Government of India requesting them to accept the accession of Jammu and Kashmir to India and defend the State against the treacherous aggression. The Maharaja offered to sign the Instrument of Accession. There was naturally much discussion and hesitation, here, because of the difference between the approach of the Congress or the Government of India and the leaders in Pakistan in these matters. Right from the start, Pandit Nehru and the Congress leadership and the democratic forces in India had stated that it was the people of a certain Princely State that had the right to express their opinion, as to whether they wanted to accede to one dominion or the other. So far as Mr. Jinnah or the Muslim League leadership was

[Shri Trilochan Dutta]  
 concerned and Mr. Jinnah stated this clearly in one of his statements, they refused to recognise the right of the people of a State to decide as to whether they wanted to join one dominion or the other. He said that all the legal authority in this regard vested in the ruler of that State. So, it was in pursuance of their basic policy, that the Government of India said "We accept the accession because Kashmir has been the victim of aggression and we must go to the aid of the people but after law and order has been restored, we will have an expression of the free will of the people as to whether they endorse this accession or not."

*(Time bell rings)*

Just two minutes more I will take, Sir. When Kashmir acceded to India and India accepted the accession, this is what the Governor-General of India, in a letter dated October 27, 1947, addressed to the Ruler of Kashmir, said:

"It is my Government's wish that as soon as law and order have been restored in Kashmir and its soil cleared of the invader, the question of the State's accession should be settled by a reference to the people."

I want the House to mark the words 'as soon as'. Just as the Prime Minister said, the conditions which had to be observed by Pakistan before the free exercise of the will of the people of Kashmir was obtained have not been fulfilled by Pakistan. They have refused to withdraw their armies from the soil of Jammu and Kashmir.

So far as the accession issue is concerned, the UNCIP in their Resolutions of August 13, 1948 and January 5, 1949, in most unambiguous terms, accepted the legal aspect of the accession of the State of Jammu and Kashmir to India and in that very context the Resolution of 13th August 1948 says:

"Pakistan must withdraw its armed forces from the soil of Jammu and Kashmir".

The UNCIP in most clear terms, branded Pakistan as an aggressor. Sir Owen Dixon, who was the Chairman of the U.N. Commission said on 5th September 1950:

"When the frontier of the State of Jammu and Kashmir was crossed.. by the hostile elements, it was contrary to international law and when in May 1948 units of the regular Pakistan forces moved into the territory of the State, that too was inconsistent with international law."

So far as the United Nations is concerned, they have branded Pakistan as the aggressor and I would wholeheartedly support the Prime Minister in his stand that when Pakistan carries out its threat of taking the Kashmir issue to the Security Council, we will bring in the ABC of the Kashmir question which is, that we will insist on the U.N. reaffirming its verdict that Pakistan is the aggressor in Kashmir.

*(Time bell rings)*

I would only conclude by saying this. The Prime Minister referred to the Constituent Assembly and the Constitution that has been recently framed in Jammu and Kashmir. He had 4 P.M. referred to what Shri B. N.

Rau had stated in the Security Council, that Kashmir had every right to frame its own Constitution, but that India will not be necessarily bound by the verdict of the Constituent Assembly. Now, as the Prime Minister himself said, much has happened since then. Material changes have taken place in the situation itself. After long, long waiting, the people of Kashmir decided to frame their own constitution and to decide their own future, and the duly constituted Constituent Assembly of Jammu and Kashmir has very recently completed the framing of the Constitution. In that Constitution they have laid down that the State of Jammu and Kashmir permanently accedes to India. Changes in the other articles of the Constitution can be brought about in accordance with the usual practice; but so far as this basic issue of accession is concerned, it has been decided and clearly laid down in that Constitution.

that particular article *e.g.* the one pertaining to the accession of the State to India cannot be changed. That is the freely expressed opinion of the people of Jammu and Kashmir and I would call upon the Government of India to bring that verdict of the people of Jammu and Kashmir to this Parliament for its ratification and I would call upon this Parliament to duly accept the verdict of the people of Jammu and Kashmir. The people of Jammu and Kashmir have always stood with India. They have undergone sufferings. They had faced the marauders and in every manner they have lived up to their faith in India. It is not for India or for this Parliament to refuse to accept that—I should say—request of the people of Kashmir, to accept them permanently, as brothers in this Great Fraternity, as part and parcel of this Great Country, India.

**THE PRIME MINISTER AND MINISTER FOR EXTERNAL AFFAIRS (SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU):** Mr. Deputy Chairman, may I, to begin with, respectfully express my appreciation of the level of debate in this House on this motion which I proposed yesterday? Certainly I have profited by it and I am sure a wider circle of people outside this House will also profit by it, because the questions before us are really complicated and they concern matters which cannot easily be dealt with in a phrase or a slogan. It is all for the good, therefore, that various aspects of these questions are put so that to some extent people might be enabled to get a right perspective.

May I, right at the beginning, also refer to what the hon. Member, Mr. Bimal Ghose, said about my imputing motives to people? I hope I have not done so. I do not think I have done so and so far as I remember, what I said in the Lok Sabha was that some people are influenced and swept away by, well, propagandist activities. In fact we have been swept away or influenced. We are influenced, but influenced to what extent is another matter. But that is not imputing a

motive to anybody. It is merely saying that we have not, perhaps, been on the alert, or not careful enough to retain our foothold in regard to any particular matter. I referred to certain organisations and I mentioned that there are in India a number of organisations often going under rather attractive names, of freedom and democracy, but whose purpose appears to be propagandist rather than a search for truth, rather than, I would even say, a passion for freedom or democracy. Now, it is open to any organisation to do propaganda or pursue any line of action. There is freedom in this country for that to be done. I cannot object to that, although I may disagree with them. But it is necessary for us to be reminded that some of these are organisations whose membership contains many estimable persons, as the hon. Member himself says, some Ministers, Congress members, Members of Parliament and others, and estimable members of the Socialist Party. It is true that they are there. I am not quite sure that all of them often realise or have realised in the past, that perhaps the basic purpose is rather propaganda and not so much as search for truth or democracy or freedom. That is my view and I cannot impose it on others. We know also that there are organisations going by the name of, well, literary or artistic or cultural organisations, which essentially want to do propaganda under the guise of literature or culture or dancing or singing. That is so. It is open to them to do it. But I do not want to be deluded by it. I want to know where I stand and then I can accept them, enjoying their dancing, singing etc. also, without being misled by them. That is my main point.

Another thing, if I may say so with respect is that it is the right not only of the Opposition but of anybody in the country, and even the duty, to criticise the Government. I do not object to it at all. But sometimes, the criticism seems to me to be not only wide of the mark, but well, very much ill-advised and perhaps not quite decorous, if I may use the word, and sometimes very personal. Indeed, the

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]  
 other day in an English newspaper of repute, it was stated that among the various activities in India, the one activity which is very popular, most popular, is the criticism of Government, including not only by their opponents, but by their own members. I think the *Manchester Guardian* had an article by one of its correspondents to that effect. It said, it is astonishing what the Government puts up with in the shape of criticism in this country. Well, I do not mind that at all. But when I retaliate in more or less moderate language, then there is a huc and cry. Then I am told that I am not fair to the other party.

This does surprise me. After all, many of us here, certainly I, we have had some experience in the past of the smell of battle, and if we indulge in a few strokes here and there, or in a battle of debates, use some language which is rather pointed, why should people talk about motives? If I may say so, it is not quite fair for some people to talk from a high moral plane to us and not expect us to reply to them. It is not fair. Either we speak on the political plane to each other or, if you like, on the moral plane to each other. If we are good enough to speak from that plane. But this mixture of the political plane with high morality, does not seem to me to be very becoming. Anyhow, this conception that the Government is there or the Members of the Government are there, to be hit and sat upon, without their replying, appears to me to be a wrong conception.

In the famous fables of La Fontaine in French there is a couplet:

Cet animal est tres mechant:

Quand on l'attaque, il se defend.

It means: This animal is wicked; when any person attacks it, it presumes to defend itself. Therefore I invite friends opposite not only to oppose but certainly to criticise Government's activities—and I think it is essential that they should be criticised—but also I

beg them to accept criticism too or replies to that criticism and be prepared for that.

Now, before I go on to any particular subject, there is a certain larger perspective that I should like to place before the House. The hon. Mr. Bimal Ghose expressed his surprise and pleasure at the fact that he found in a document issued by a leading Communist an attempt to reason. He said that he hoped this will continue. Well, there has been something much more than that, as he knows, and that is, for the past many months or more, a repeated confession of past errors and past mistakes. That is something even more than reason. Now, if grave mistakes had been committed once, there is no particular reason why they might not be committed here and now even though the language used in justification of the here and now may be stout language. It was stout language previously too and yet it is admitted now that it has covered up numerous mistakes for which people had to suffer later. In the case of Hungary if one thing is admitted by everybody concerned, it is this that very serious and very grave mistakes were committed in Hungary in the past—I do not know, for how many years—till recently. President Tito of Yugoslavia, who is so situated both by experience and by geography as to be able to form an opinion which deserves notice—whether you agree with it or not—in a very long speech delivered last month dealt with this past of that area, the many mistakes, and pointed out that it was the continuation of those wrong policies that brought about this situation in Hungary. So that what we see today is undoubtedly a major change happening not only in outward policies which are sometimes clouded by words but something deeper in the minds of men and I have no doubt, even before the events of the last few months, quite considerable changes in thinking have taken place in the Soviet Union. In the other Communist countries of Eastern Europe, there were obstructions and difficulties in the way of their self-fulfilment, if you like, and hence this has arisen. Now there is one side of the

picture, which is called the process of democratisation or liberalisation and which process of course I presume that practically every Member of this House would welcome. He may think it is going too fast or too slow but he would welcome that because this huge gap;—I am not for the moment thinking of the particular merits or demerits of the process—that process was helpful in reducing the gap which separated the world into two major or various parts. It made it easier to keep out of this terrible climate of cold war that had persisted during the last ten or eleven years. That was one side of it. On the other side also there were many movements visible which went towards the lessening of that cold war. That is to say, gradually people were getting a little tired of living on slogans; whether they were Communist slogans or anti-Communist slogans, it led them nowhere. There was coming a progressive realisation that this will not solve any problem. It was patent, looking at it from the political or military plane, that these great countries or great blocs of countries were just not going to be liquidated neither was going to liquidate the other without being liquidated itself—that war would not settle this business. If war would not settle it, then some other way must be found, other than war. The way other than war could not be cold war because cold war itself kept up the atmosphere and climate of war and prevented any approach and might at any time develop into war. Therefore cold war too in theory was discarded, not in practice so much, but people realised that it did not help. And so all this thinking and ferment in people's minds went on everywhere. Now, we in India—I do not mean to say the Government or the Congress Party but generally speaking we in India—are situated a little more favourably than many other countries in considering these matters, not because we are more clever or virtuous but because we are not swept away by these passions so much, pro-Communist or anti-Communist. Therefore we can keep our feet on the ground to some extent. We may have our sympathies this way or that way; that is a different matter. We

may have our convictions but we are at least devoid of the tremendous passions of some of the protagonists of the cold war, this side or that side. Therefore we can look at things perhaps in a clear perspective and the fact that we have adopted a policy of non-alignment—of course, it is non-alignment; I do not know why Prof. Kabir asked for it to be called non-alignment; it is there; that is what we call it; we do not call it neutrality; neutrality is a completely wrong word in this connection—that does not mean that we have not got views of our own on various problems. But it means that we are not going to be pushed hither and thither by other countries. As far as possible we would not allow ourselves to be swept by gusts of passion, Communist, pro-Communist or anti-Communist, but try to find our own way according to the light of our own reason and try at the same time to keep friendly relations with the rest of the world. So, that is our approach and I believe that that approach told; it did good to us and it enabled us to serve other countries or other situations at a time when it became rather difficult to find a suitable unaligned or uncommitted country. Also, whatever Governments might or might not feel about it, I would say even Governments progressively appreciated our attitude; even Governments which were themselves committed strongly to this side or that appreciated our attitude progressively. But quite apart from them, I have no doubt at all in my mind that peoples in every country appreciated it very greatly, not, again, because India was specially virtuous or specially clever, not that, but because these people in every country hunger for some way out of this deadlock and this cold war. They wanted not to be suppressed all the time by these slogans and cries this way or that way. They were tired of it. They saw no hope in it. And they felt that a country like India—and there are other countries too—did suggest some kind of a way out of this tangle. Now, these processes, not because of India but because of the natural evolution of events, have been bringing about changes—whether it is in the

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]  
Soviet Union, whether it is in the East European countries or West European countries or the United States of America, everywhere. In brief, people began to think that way, not giving up their basic convictions but feeling that that was not the way to set things right. We welcomed that. Now, when these crises arose in Egypt or in Hungary—apart from judging the crisis as it was, condemnation or disapproval—in whatever we did or said, always at the back of our mind was this: what will help the basic objective we have? We were gravely shocked at these events. What shocked us more than the events or what alarmed us was, are these things going to come in the way of that process of development—whether it was in the Soviet Union or the United States or England or France or anywhere. That was a major thing—the various forces in the world gradually coming together and the big gap getting less and less. Now, this alarmed us that this was a setback, and while we condemned or expressed our disapproval, always we were thinking, let us not do something which encourages this setback, which puts an end to those progressive or liberalising tendencies that are functioning. And that conditioned our behaviour to some extent.

It is a little difficult for me to discuss internal happenings in countries, whether it is America or England or the Soviet Union or China, but any hon. Member who has at all studied these matters will see the changes all over occurring, of ferment and change, taking place, whether it is in the so-called capitalist countries or the communist countries or others. You can see it from China to Peru, if I may say so, to use an old phrase. So, this consideration has always to be borne in mind if you want to keep the entire picture before you. How can you help the forces going towards some kind of a settlement in Europe? Now, the attack on Egypt, the Israeli attack to begin with, immediately followed by the Anglo-French attack, came as a great shock to us, because apart from its inherent wrongness, it was something entirely opposed to the whole

current as we thought ought to go. It was undoubtedly and absolutely a reversal to pure colonial methods. There is no doubt about it. Now, it may be due, of course, to various fears and apprehensions in the mind of the United Kingdom Government. They might lose their oil, they might lose their influence in the Middle East; whatever it was, no doubt there were some reasons which had appeared to them to be adequate. Even before the set-back, all that argument—for two months or more about the Suez Canal, after the nationalisation of the Suez Canal—was an extraordinary argument and we expressed ourselves clearly and forcefully on many occasions in regard to that. Then came this attack at a moment when just almost on that very day of the attack, they were supposed to meet and talk in terms of their resolution in the Security Council. It was an amazing thing. And if by any chance it had succeeded, it would have been a disaster. We know that it would not have succeeded. Before success came there would have been a world war and the arguments advanced—I shall perhaps deal with that a little later—about the objectives of this having been more or less achieved, seem to me really very extraordinary. However, then came Hungary,—of course, not then; they overlapped rather. The Hungarian thing gradually grew up towards the end of October and November. Now, of course, I am not comparing the two in terms of badness. The two were essentially different. They represent different types of things, though equally bad. But they were different and different problems were involved in both. Above all, the question in Hungary—apart from this killing that took place—as in Poland was whether these processes of democratisation and liberalisation should continue in a stable and peaceful way and gradually bring about the changes desired by the people of the country or whether any attempt should be made perhaps to speed them—may be they stumble and fall down and bring greater conflicts in their train. There was that danger all the time. In Poland they escaped that danger because of the leadership of the country and



because of various other factors. I imagine that in Hungary they would have escaped that danger also if exactly at that time the Anglo-French invasion had not come in the other place. That is guesswork, of course; I do not know. It is a possibility. But somehow that upset the apple cart in many places and led to conflict in a big way and intervention by the Soviet force. Now, let us try to understand the position.

**SHRI H. N. KUNZRU:** May I ask the Prime Minister whether as a matter of fact it is correct to say that what happened in Egypt affected the situation in Hungary? I seek this information only for my enlightenment. The Hungarian trouble started earlier. The invasion of Egypt came about eight or nine days later and the First Secretary of the Communist Party, Mr. Erno Gero, had already asked for the intervention of the Russian troops in the Hungarian revolution. Is it factually correct to say that happened?

**SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU:** I have got the hon. Member's point. May I answer that in the little time I have got? These things were overlapping right through October. The original trouble in Hungary,—in a sense, conflict—took place on the 3rd October. This led in the next two or three days to conflict, shooting, killing and something. It led later to the withdrawal of the Soviet forces and declaration on the 30th October,—a declaration of policy of the Soviet Government which, considering everything, was a satisfactory and hopeful declaration. Now, the curious point is that three days after that they returned. Now, I cannot go into the whole position. Hon. Members will remember that on the 3rd November, I think it was that date, Mr. Bulganin issued his famous warning to the various countries involved. We received that too, not as a warning to us but for information. I remember we got it at about eight o'clock in the evening. And I confess we were rather alarmed at that, seeing the prospects. And we sat up till a very late hour in the night, with the senior officers of our External Affairs

Ministry, considering all papers and evolving a reply for Mr. Bulganin, which was sent that night, in the small hours. Of course, war seemed to be very near. It is difficult to disentangle all these things, because the situation was developing even before the Anglo-French attack. We know now that people had been asked, even Americans had been asked to go out of Egypt. Several days before British nationals had also been asked to leave. However, I cannot lay down these things as something which I can prove. I am merely putting something before the House as to how action and reaction takes place in these matters. There can be no doubt that the Soviet Government, when it indulged in the second sending back of troops into Hungary, must have realised—because they are highly intelligent people—that it would go against them in world opinion, that they would be criticised and condemned by many people. Why then did they do it? I do not know, I cannot go behind their minds. But according to them there must have been some very strong reasons; it may be fear, it may be apprehension, whatever that may be, because the whole system of Europe in the last ten years has been built up in a balancing of armies and armaments, and there is this cold war, there is the boundary of the cold war, what is called the "Iron Curtain" and what not. Now one of the basic facts of the situation in Europe has been, when you consider disarmament or anything else, the fear of German rearmament. There is all over Eastern Europe, whether you go to Czechoslovakia or Hungary or Poland or the Soviet Union, this overriding fear of German rearmament. Twice in our generation German armies have roamed over these countries and brought infinite destruction. It may be that in some of these countries there might be two rival fears as they are because of past history, fear of Germany and fear of Russia. But there it is. There is undoubtedly in every country of Eastern Europe fear of German rearmament because they know that in the science of war as in industry Germany is top-ranking, and once they get built up a huge war

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]  
 machine nobody quite knows what it might do. That is governing the situation. NATO comes into existence to begin with—and they may be justified—I do not know if anyone criticised them at the time. Then questions of German rearmament come in. Then Germany joins NATO. All this produces the fear complex elsewhere. Then the Warsaw Treaty comes in trying to balance each other. Now the problem presumably arose that this balance was going to be upset by what was happening, the apprehension was there. The problem no longer remained—I am trying to analyse—of the freedom of Hungary or anybody but of the survival of nations in a great war. Or it might be that because of all this, whether it was in Egypt or Hungary or elsewhere, war came into the picture, and no country wants to take risks in war. They risk unpopularity but not security. I am trying to analyse it; I do not know if my analysis is true or not, but I am trying to put a wider picture before the House. The other day it was said on behalf of the Soviet Union “we will withdraw all our forces from every other country. You withdraw yours from every other country, you stationed them there.” I agree that that is not an adequate justification for what they have done in Hungary, for keeping their forces there. But there is something in it. “Let everybody withdraw, let every country go its own way. Why should we on one side become weak from the point of view of any future conflict?” So, this is the background of these events. But behind that background again, all these forces are at work, these liberalising forces, as much in the Soviet Union as in any other country. Today take Poland, for instance. Poland is on very friendly terms with the Soviet Union, but Poland is a different country from what it was a year ago, there is no doubt about it, absolutely different. Anybody who goes there can see it. Even for the first time the Polish representative at the United Nations votes separately and differently. That shows how these forces that are working in these countries are going in the right direction. Now un-

fortunately that did not take place in Hungary and the terrible tragedy occurred there, and everyone of the Members here has expressed and feels very deep sympathy with the Hungarian people because they have gone through hell. It is a terrible thing and it makes little difference whether there are some people there who might be called subversive elements or not, some people there who are anti-socialists or not. There is very little difference. There probably were, I have no doubt there were. I have no doubt that people came from outside to encourage them, in fact we have evidence of it, but basically and fundamentally in Hungary it was a great popular rising. That is the basic thing. Others joined it, and this was suppressed—it has been suppressed now in a military sense, not in any other sense; even now the trade unions and the workers and others are well disciplined and are putting forth their demands, political demands, and they continue to do so; they are not at all put down. Right from the beginning when the Hungarian question came up before us, for some days I was not quite clear. We laid down two elements of our policy in regard to it: that the Soviet forces should withdraw, and that the Hungarian people should be left to fashion their own destiny—right from the beginning. The leader of our delegation at the U. N. said that repeatedly, and I said it here too. The only thing we did not do at that time was to go into a long disquisition about it and particularly to condemn the Soviet Union or any other country at that stage, because we did not wish to do so before we had facts, etc., and also because there was a sudden wave, a passionate wave, of condemnation everywhere, and we wanted to stick to our feet and not be swept away by it—and that passionate wave was justified, but it was caused not only by the fact of the story of Hungary but as a reaction to Egypt: that is to say, people had felt, so many people in England and elsewhere, so humiliated by what happened in Egypt that they felt relieved that they could curse somebody else and not be themselves the guilty party. This was a psychological change in the situation, and everything

that could be said regarding Hungary was justified. But it appeared to us that an attempt was made almost to suppress the Egyptian problem in the U.N., to push it aside and replace it by the Hungarian problem. We wanted to resist that, not in any sense to push aside the Hungarian problem but to keep the Egyptian problem to the fore all the time, and we succeeded in doing that. There was this danger of the Egyptian problem being pushed aside because people felt strongly about Hungary—it was right that they should feel that way—but there was that political motive, not in the people who felt it but in the authorities who wanted rather to push aside the people's mind from the Egyptian problem which had exercised them so much. Now we wanted to resist that. This has nothing to do with our opinion about Hungary. But we wanted to resist this movement to push out the Egyptian problem from people's minds. It was really pushed out.

Now, Shri Bimal Ghose referred to that resolution on Hungary—the one which has been much argued about. It is quite right that he objected to our representative abstaining from voting on a certain clause of that resolution which said that the Soviet troops should go out. Now, I have not got the resolution here; I cannot find it immediately. But if you read the speech that our representative delivered and published in the press and circulated—it is a fairly long speech—you will find that throughout that speech, the stress laid by him was on the evacuation of the Soviet troops on the people of Hungary deciding their future. He was stating our policy in the speech in the United Nations. But as I said before in the context of that resolution and the phrasing of this, I do not approve of this particular phrasing. Therefore, I shall abstain. But we stand for it. There is no doubt about this statement being repeatedly made as to what we stand for—that is, the withdrawal of the Soviet troops.

SHRI B. C. GHOSE: There is nothing wrong in the phrase.

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: Mr. Ghose, I have not got it with me. You cannot get out of certain atmosphere the whole thing. But the only thing is to read the speech. This kind of voting takes place because of the time there and it may be that one has to decide so many times in the course of the day and night as to how to vote in the particular circumstance prevailing there. We are not surrounded by that environment or that circumstance, the effect of this or that. People have to judge on the spot making clear their own position almost immediately. I am quite sure. I do not know if the hon. Member has read that speech. When I read it, I found it a very powerful argument indeed. That clause was adopted. And I should like to say—because in spite of having tried to clear the subject the other day, I find there is some element of confusion or doubt about this matter—that earlier our representative, or the leader of our delegation, Mr. Krishna Menon, and we have been in close touch with each other. He knows thoroughly what our policy is and how our mind works. We are discussing these matters repeatedly and he represents it with complete accuracy and precision. And whatever he has done there—naturally it was not possible for him to refer to us on every vote—has been done in accordance with our wishes. After all, he is not only the leader of the delegation, but he is also an important member of our Cabinet. He knows the mind of the Government. He is part of the Government. And so, I am surprised that some people talk without trying even to find out what is happening. I do not blame them—to some extent—because they do not have the material. But still a responsible person does not jump into the fray without knowing what the effects of it are.

An hon. Member, Mr. Sapru, said that we do not give publicity. Well, he is right.

SHRI P. N. SAPRU: I did not say that we do not give publicity. I said that our publicity might be better.

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: We do not give adequate publicity. All

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru] right. Well, partially he is right. But publicity of what? These are the emergency sessions of the United Nations sitting all night and day. Everybody is exhausted there. We get a report; we get reports several times a day. But we did not have the actual figures of voting, etc. immediately. They came to us four or five days later. And in the meanwhile, we were caught up and surpassed by a lot of publicity on the other side. That is perfectly true. However that is unfortunate.

May I just briefly say what the Hungarian position is now? The Hungarian Government has now said that they have invited the Secretary General of the United Nations to visit Hungary, the date of his visit to be fixed in consultation with the Hungarian Minister for Foreign Affairs in New York. He will visit as the Chief Executive of the United Nations, with no terms of reference. That is the point. *(Cheers.)* I am not telling something new. That has appeared in the morning newspapers. You seem to think that I am reading out something new. Maybe, the language is slightly different.

The point is that they do not want him to go there in pursuance of a United Nations resolution, but as the Chief Executive of the United Nations. They said, "You can come; and fix a date with our Foreign Minister," while they have categorically refused to admit any United Nations observer saying that this is an infringement of their sovereignty and that there are already 500 or 600 newspapermen there. Well, I am sorry that they did not go much further and did not admit the observers because in this matter, it is not a question of sovereignty that is involved: it is really a question of the good name of a country when such charges are made—the charge, apart from others, being about these deportations. Now, we have been told—we have been given solemn assurances—that there have been no deportations.

SHRI K. S. HEGDE: Have you received any report from Mr. Khosla in that connection?

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: What can poor Khosla say about deportations? He does not watch these things. Nobody can. He can only report on popular rumours about so and so. He went to the Government. The Government denied it solemnly. "No, it is not true. We will show you that it is completely wrong." The Soviet Government denies it with solemn assurances. What is wanted today? In the circumstances existing, the right thing is, let the Secretary General go there; let the United Nations observers go there and let them see and report. But we know undoubtedly that one fact stands out and that is the treatment given to Mr. Nagy. I do not see how in any way it can possibly be explained away. I think it is a shocking thing that has happened to him.

PROF. HUMAYUN KABIR: There was a report that the President of the Workers' Council in Budapest also has been arrested yesterday or this morning.

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: Maybe, many people have been arrested, I suppose. But here, as the hon. Dr. Kunzru and others pointed out, apart from other things—this question of an assurance being given to him and that assurance being broken or the Hungarian Government being not able to give him protection or whatever it was—this fact stands out. And I do hope that he will go back soon to Hungary if he likes to go back. In spite of these facts, in spite of all these tragic events that have occurred, I do not believe that the processes to which I have referred—those of liberalising—have stopped or are going to be reversed.

In fact, two major facts stand out. One is that any attempt to bring back colonialism is doomed to failure. The strong country tries it on a weaker country. Colonialism exists in many places in the world still. It is true. But bringing it back from where it has gone, I think it is quite clear, cannot be done in the future. The second thing is—I think it is equally clear—that communism, or if you like, social-

ism, cannot ultimately be imposed by force. I entirely agree with Mr. Bimal Ghose—whatever his opinions or mine may be—that if I try to impose socialism on another country, well, that ceases to have any virtue, obviously. And this attempt, however well-meaning people might have considered it, to make people good socialists by force has failed. If we look at this picture again from a different perspective, we find that the feeling of nationalism is still a very powerful feeling. Maybe, in a country like the Soviet Union—I am not judging it, I am merely mentioning it casually—the feeling of socialism and nationalism may be combined giving strength to the country; or may be, in a country like China, it is a combined feeling giving strength to the country. But where you separate the two, then it is not easy to suppress nationalism. It just comes up, and it will come up, as it has come up in Hungary. I do not think the nationalist movement in Hungary was anti-socialistic. I do not think so, although there may have been probably some anti-socialist elements in it. But there was no reason to think that it was anti-socialistic. And there is no doubt that the dominating urge was for freedom.

Now, reference has been made to Mr. Selwyn Lloyd's statement which appeared in the newspapers today. Naturally, we welcome his statement in so far as he says that the Anglo-French troops will be withdrawn rapidly, though no date has been mentioned. But I must confess that when I read his whole speech carefully, I was distressed somewhat by the many statements that he has made. Well, perhaps he has to justify all that has happened, and he still makes out that by the Anglo-French action that they took, they conferred enormous benefits on humanity—the language is mine, not his—that is to say, they prevented a world war and they prevented all kinds of things and they prevented a much worse disaster happening. Now I need not say all that, but I regret that this wrong conception still holds his mind. He says that they took great care to minimise casualties and damage. Last night I saw some photographs of Port

Said, and they brought home to me the horror of war. A good part of Port Said and huge fine buildings were all in ruins and large areas were all in ruins. And probably all was not due to bombardment, but to burning as well, because when incendiary bombs are thrown, fire starts and a good part of the city is burnt down. But the fact is that damage in Port Said is very very great, both human and to the city. And once you start this kind of thing, you cannot limit it. Mr. Selwyn Lloyd goes on to say that the situation was deteriorating and it was one sooner or later likely to lead to a war. Why? I cannot imagine it. In fact, the situation was well in hand, and they were going to meet together to decide about the Suez Canal when this happened. Secondly he says that by their timely action they not only rapidly halted local hostilities but forestalled the development of a general war. I just do not understand this. And then he says that their second purpose was to interpose a force to prevent the resumption of fighting. Now I want to make one thing perfectly clear, because he lays great stress on this. The United Nations has now put a force there, and we made it perfectly clear when we sent our detachment that we were not going there as a kind of continuation of the Anglo-French force, but we were going there because the Government of Egypt had agreed to our going there. And we also told them that we would remain there only so long as the Egyptian Government was agreeable, and in any case this was not in continuation of that Anglo-French force and we were not going to seize hold of the Suez Canal, but we were sent there more or less to keep ourselves on the borders—the cease-fire line.

Well, there is another, and rather odd fact that Mr. Selwyn Lloyd mentions. First of all he says "I believe we shall reach an agreement . . ." That is about the future of the Suez Canal. He says that he believes that there will be an agreement providing adequate guarantee that the six requirements—six principles—will be met. "Her Majesty's Government, of course,

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru] adhere to their view as expressed in the Resolution voted on by the Security Council on the 13th October with regard to the 18-Power proposals." Now this is a most amazing remark to make. The 18-Power proposals are as dead as mutton—cold mutton—and talking about or going back to these 18-Power proposals, which were made and which were also rejected before all this fighting and bombardment arose, seems to be quite amazing. As a matter of fact, the whole background of the Middle-East situation has changed because of this upheaval and fighting. It is not particularly easy to go back at all. Naturally, so far as we are concerned, we have felt, and we feel today also, that the very first step that is to be taken is the withdrawal of the Anglo-French and Israeli forces. After that step only one can take up other questions. We are anxious, and most anxious, that the Canal should be cleared. It should resume its functions for the good of everybody, for the good of Egypt and for the good of everybody. But we just cannot discuss or take up these matters effectively till this first matter is finally settled, not by a declaration, but actually by the fact of withdrawal. Then alone we can consider these other matters and deal with them.

Then, much has been said about Pakistan. There is just one thing that I should like to remind the House about. Mr. Suhrawardy talks about an invasion from India or India wanting to do this or that to Pakistan. The House will remember that four years ago, or maybe, five years ago, I offered a no-war declaration to guarantee that neither country would go to war and each country would settle these problems peacefully, and even if there is no settlement, they would never go to war with each other. But they never accepted that offer. That offer still holds good. And I went a step further and I said that even though Pakistan did not accept that declaration, I, on behalf of India, made that declaration that I would not go to war with Pakistan unless we were attacked, because after all we

have to defend ourselves. So, I cannot imagine really what this type of propaganda that is being carried on by Mr. Suhrawardy actually means. I fear that it is a prelude possibly to some little trouble. The House may remember, or perhaps may have forgotten, that Goa is a special protege of Mr. Suhrawardy. He visited Goa and 5 P.M. he visited Lisbon etc. in this connection. I have no right to object. He is a lawyer, a practising lawyer, and he had every right, as a lawyer, to be briefed by anybody. Now, he is Prime Minister. The whole attitude of Pakistan, apart from Mr. Suhrawardy, in regard to Goa—well it is difficult to explain except to say that they dislike India so much that they want to injure India wherever and however they can. Then, some hon. Members read out his speech or statement in regard to Egypt. Now, all the Bandung conference, the Colombo Powers' declaration—all of that goes by the board if Mr. Suhrawardy's policy is the policy to be pursued by Pakistan.

Mr. Bimal Ghose said something about the United States' military help to Pakistan. It is certainly true that the U.S.A. declared very firmly that any help they would give must be on condition that it was not used against India and that presumably Pakistan gave that assurance, but the fact is that from the statement of Mr. Suhrawardy he seems to think that those arms can be used against India if he so chooses.

Now, Mr. Bimal Ghose asked me about Goa. I am afraid I cannot give him a very satisfactory reply except to say that so far as our thinking goes, we have no doubt that Goa must and will have to come to India, but if he asks for any date, I cannot tell him. If he asks me whether there is any change of policy, I cannot help him; there may be slight changes. The fact is of course that Goa cannot just be isolated from all these big problems that we are discussing. It comes in somehow. It is not a simple thing that can be dealt with separately, but it is a matter of deep sorrow for us that