

Weekly Notes

Hungary Again

MUCH has happened since the Hungarian tragedy to reveal that, if the Soviet Union was guilty of Intervention in Hungary, there are many other powers who live in glass houses. Interference by any Power in the internal affairs or with the sovereignty of any other Power cannot be supported. Much more reprehensible is any armed intervention by any country in any other country. These broad principles of international law and ethics are beyond dispute. But why blame Russia alone for her action in Hungary? America had much less excuse or Justification in showing her military might during the 'incident' in Formosa. Some of the implications of America's military policy or attitude to Japan have provoked resentment in the latter country. Some of those who are so vocal and combative about the Russian action in Hungary find it convenient to maintain discreet silence on, if not connive at, the British armed intervention in Oman. Not only those who live in glass houses, but even those who live in houses with many doors open should not throw stones at others.

This is what America and the sponsors of the debate on Hungary by the General Assembly of the United Nations forget. Though the debate is ostensibly on the five-nation committee's report on Hungary, it is clear that the sponsoring powers are interested in exploiting it as a "cold war manoeuvre." It is not without significance that Ceylon, a member of the five-nation committee, is reported to have expressed her intention to withdraw from the committee. Tunisia, another member, also seems to be suspicious about the ulterior motives of the sponsors of the debate. America's main motive in keeping the committee alive is, according to the *New York Times* to "keep the world continuously informed on developments in Hungary under the new puppet regime".

This may be "cold war" tactics, but it is not diplomacy. By all indications, Washington is not interested in converting the five-nation committee into a good offices commission. There would have been some justification in adopting such a policy. What purpose would be

served by the Assembly debate on Hungary or sending Prince Wan Walthayakon on a mission to Hungary? What good is likely to come out even if the Assembly passes, which is probable, a condemnatory resolution, or some such resolution in "repudiation" of the Hungarian representative at the United Nations?

Pandit Nehru is realistic in his argument that no such policy or tactics "can help the situation". New Delhi has expressed its disapproval of armed Russian intervention in Hungary to suppress a national uprising. But New Delhi does not believe that any good can come out of interested attempts to put the Soviet Union on the dock. A, wiser and diplomatic policy is called for if it is the aim of the United Nations to help initiate negotiations for an amicable arrangement of the situation in Hungary.

Second Chambers

THERE will be surprise at Parliament's concern over creating an upper house in Andhra, or for increasing the strength of the upper houses in eight other States to the neglect of wider and deeper issues that confront the country. Thinking persons are convinced that the occasion for reorganisation of States should have been seized to abolish upper houses altogether. When economy in expenditure is the urgent need. New Delhi in its wisdom, is trying to multiply and to expand legislative councils! Though the Law Minister does not deny that such a policy can only make legislation more costly, he defends it on the plea of democracy.

As upper houses are constituted in this country, it is difficult to appreciate how these institutions can function as watch-dogs of democracy. In both houses, the Congress is in a majority. In the present make-up of upper houses, it is not possible for State Councils to act as a brake on Assemblies. Even in those countries where the Upper House is differently constituted. Its utility is highly debatable. In this country, State Councils can only provide opportunities to the party in power to offer seats to its supporters.

Is this game of pure party politics worth the cost involved?

Exit for Domicile Rules

OF the various forms in which regionalism of the obnoxious variety thrives, the most difficult to tackle is that which covers public employment. That employment in the State or local services should be restricted only to those satisfying rigid domicile requirements is clearly opposed to the spirit if not the letter of the Constitution. The Bill introduced by Pandit Pant in the Lok Sabha this week seeking to repeal all existing domicile laws relating to public employment is, therefore, to be welcomed.

Equality of opportunity for employment under the State is conferred by the Constitution as a fundamental right on all citizens. A proviso to this right provides, however, that Parliament may make laws prescribing domicile requirements for such employment. It is on this clause that the present domicile restrictions are based. The new Bill seeking to remove these restrictions except for a limited period and for certain classes of employment in certain parts of the country, is also drafted under the same clause.

The effect of the Bill will be to open employment under all State Governments and local authorities to all citizens. The Bill will thus help to create conditions of a true 'Union, of States' in the country. That the Bill should have been drafted to implement a recommendation of the States Reorganisation Commission will appear as a paradox to many, who disagreed violently with its basic recommendations, but it is actually in consonance with the spirit which animated that Commission.

Can one assume that the Bill will be passed as it has been presented? It appears very likely that there will be strong opposition to it even in Parliament. There are sure to be many attempts to widen the scope of the exceptions to the general repeal of domicile legislation contemplated under it. The extent of this opposition and the strength of the pressure to amend the Bill so as to make it less effective will provide a measure of the extent to which regionalism is rampant in the country,

