

# MOTION RE. INTERNATIONAL SITUATION

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

I beg to move:

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

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

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

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

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

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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



[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**Shri Kamath** (Hoshangabad): A welcome change.

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

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

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

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

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



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

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

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

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

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

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

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

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

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

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

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

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

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

want the exact figures, or what India did.

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

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

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

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

Preamble 3: as in Preamble 2; India abstained.

Preamble 4: India abstained with that Group.

Preamble 5: India abstained with the big Group.

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

Operative 1: India abstained.

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

**Shri Jawaharlal Nehru:** The whole resolution?

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

**Some Hon. Members:** We have not got copies.

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

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

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

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

The operative part is—

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

That is one.

The second is—

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

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

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

**Acharya Kripalahi:** Who else voted against?

**Shri Jawaharlal Nehru:** At what time?

**Acharya Kripalahi:** Who else voted against the whole resolution?

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

**Shri Kamath:** Asian-African Group abstained?

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**Mr. Speaker:** Motion moved:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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