

1960

January

Volume No

1995

Content

| | |
|---|-------|
| Foreign Affairs Record 1960 Volume VI JANUARY | No. 1 |
| CONTENTS | PAGE |
| COLOMBO PLAN | |
| Consultative Committee Report | 1 |
| FOREIGN AND HOME AFFAIRS | |
| President's Republic Day Broadcast | 6 |
| President's Message to Indian Nationals Abroad | 7 |
| HUNGARY | |
| Trade Agreement Extended | 8 |
| JAPAN | |
| Indo-Japanese Agreement Signed | 8 |
| Agreement on Avoidance of Double Taxation | 8 |
| JORDAN | |
| Trade Agreement Signed | 9 |
| NEPAL | |
| Nepalese Prime Minister's Visit | 9 |
| Shri Koirala's Reply | 10 |
| Shri Koirala's Speech at Farewell Banquet | 11 |
| Prime Minister Nehru's Reply | 12 |
| Press Communique | 14 |
| PAKISTAN | |
| Joint Communique on Indo-Pakistan Talks on Western Border | 15 |

Ground Rules for Border Guards 16

UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS

President Voroshilov's Visit 19
President Voroshilov's Reply 20
President Voroshilov's Speech at Farewell Banquet 21
President Rajendra Prasad's Reply 22
Joint Communique 23

YUGOSLAVIA

Trade Agreement Signed 24

MINISTRY OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS: EXTERNAL PUBLICITY DIVISION
GOVERNMENT OF INDIA

Mr. Khrushchev's Reply 55
Mr. Khrushchev's Address to
Parliament 56
Dr. Radhakrishnan's Welcome
Speech 61
Vote of Thanks by Shri Anantha-
sayanam Ayyangar 62
Joint Communique 64
Cultural Agreement Signed 65
Loan Agreement Signed 66
President Prasad's Speech at State
Banquet 151
Welcome Speech by President
Brezhnev 152
President Prasad's Speech at Band-
ung Luncheon 153
Speech by President Brezhnev 156
President Prasad's Address to Soviet
Indian Friendship Society 157
Speech by President Brezhnev 158
Indo-Soviet Agreement on oil
exploration Signed 163
President Prasad's Farewell Speech
from Moscow 165
President Prasad's Dinner Speech at
Stalinabad 165
President Prasad's Reply to Uzbek
Reception 166
President Prasad's Farewell Speech
from Tashkent 167
President Prasad's Impressions of his
Visit to Soviet Union 168
President Prasad's Farewell Mess-
ages to Soviet Leaders 169
Indo-Soviet Oil Agreement Signed 169
Instruments of Ratification Ex-
changed 212

| | |
|--|-----|
| UNITED ARAB REPUBLIC | |
| President Nasser's Visit | 90 |
| President Nasser's Reply | 91 |
| Nehru-Nasser Joint Communique | 92 |
| Trade Agreement Signed | 93 |
| Nehru-Nasser Joint Statement | 133 |
| UNITED STATES OF AMERICA | |
| Indo-U.S. Food Agreement Signed | 134 |
| Agreement on Establishment of Indian Investment Centre Signed | 163 |
| Import of U.S. Films | 170 |
| P.L. 480 Agreement Signed | 170 |
| Indo-U.S. Loan Agreements Signed | 457 |
| UNION OF SOUTH AFRICA | |
| Prime Minister's Statement on Lok Sabha Resolution on Firing in South Africa | 87 |
| Prime Minister's Statement on Lok Sabha Motion on Firing in South Africa | 89 |
| Indians in South Africa | 90 |
| Shri A.K. Sen's Statement on Subversion of Human Rights by South Africa | 129 |
| UNITED KINGDOM | |
| Agreement on Import of Films Signed | 169 |
| Indo-U.K. Credit Agreement Signed | 187 |
| Indian Immigrants in U.K. | 188 |
| Indo-U.K. Credit Agreement Signed | 457 |
| U.N.E.S.C.O. | |
| Dr. Radhakrishnan's Address to General Conference | 360 |
| YUGOSLAVIA | |
| Trade Agreement Signed | 24 |
| Cultural Agreement Signed | 93 |

MINISTRY OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS: EXTERNAL; PUBLICITY DIVISION
GOVERNMENT OF INDIA

SRI LANKA INDIA HUNGARY JAPAN JORDAN NEPAL PAKISTAN YUGOSLAVIA USA RUSSIA
UZBEKISTAN SOUTH AFRICA UNITED KINGDOM

Date : Jan 01, 1960

Volume No

1995

COLOMBO PLAN

Consultative Committee Report

The eighth annual report of the Colombo Plan Consultative Committee for 1958-59 published in New Delhi on January 7, 1960, shows that national expenditure in the Colombo Plan region increased by over (pond)770 million from œ650 million in 1954-55 to œ 1.520,8 million in 1958-59. The projected expenditure for 1951-60 is of the order of œ1,478.5 million.

The Colombo Plan, says the Report, has become a symbol of the economic aspirations of hundreds of millions of people. Its consultative technique has proved its worth and as a cooperative international association, the Colombo Plan is well designed to meet the economic needs and national desires of the member countries. It is in this context that the tasks ahead must be measured. These tasks remain essentially the same as those which were apparent at, and have been dealt with since the beginning of the Colombo Plan. The goal is to enable the free nations of the area to achieve a momentum of economic progress which will make it possible for them to go forward in self-reliant growth. The Colombo Plan area is made up of many independent countries containing more than one-fourth of the world's population and covering 1/16th of the land surface of the earth. Many countries comprising it differ geographically and in their national characteristics. They are in various stages of economic development. Each is naturally anxious to fulfil the goals as evolved through its own history, its cultural heritage and traditions and what it holds to be its national interests. Despite their varying problems, they are all striving for economic development and in this sense, their general aspirations are the same. In assessing the tasks ahead, it is necessary to keep this aspect always in perspective.

The Report goes on to say:

There was a quickened pace of economic activity in the Colombo Plan area during the past year. The rate of growth in per capita real income for the region as a whole showed signs of acceleration, although rising rates of population growth added to the difficulty of making precise estimates. Agricultural production, hampered by bad weather in 1957-58, made a notable recovery in most countries and constituted the basic element of the general economic advance. Iron, coal, Petroleum and industry in general shared in the upswing in production. Major emphasis in the area's efforts to promote economic development continued during the past year to be placed on increasing agricultural output, improving basic facilities such as roads and irrigation, and on land reclamation. Trade deficits persisted but diminished in size. A rise in both the volume and the unit price of exports, which began late in 1958 and continued through the period under review, together with a reduction in the import volume and more favourable terms of trade, provide grounds for effecting an improvement in the balance of trade in 1959. In the area as a whole, the internal financial and economic situation showed considerable strain, but the countries in the area were nevertheless able to make available more resources for development.

Substantial gains were recorded in the production of foodgrains in the area, in welcome contrast to the poor harvest in 1957-58. The improvement in output reflected not only improved weather conditions but additional acreage under cultivation, improved methods and a wider use of fertilisers. Only in a few countries did drought conditions exist and cause setbacks in production. Although tin production declined during the period under review, output of iron ore, coal and especially crude petroleum increased substantially. Production of export crops, which had lagged somewhat in 1958, experienced an upward movement early in 1959, reflecting not only improved conditions for production in the exporting countries but the higher demand for some of these products abroad. Rubber, sugar, tea, cotton and timber all shared in the improvement. A rise in industrial output, which gained strength in the latter half of 1958, was maintained through the first six months of 1959.

Improvement in world economic conditions during the period under review provided a more

favourable external environment for economic growth in the countries of the Colombo Plan area.. There was a sharp upswing in industrial production in the United States, and new high levels of economic output were achieved. There was also, a renewed and vigorous economic expansion in the other industrial countries, and last December the western European countries made their currencies convertible on external account. The increase in the gold and foreign exchange resources of these other industrial countries noted in last year's Report continued in significant amounts. These countries experienced a substantial payments surplus not only with the United States but also with the less developed countries.

1

The increased demand in the industrial countries gave a further impetus to many of the exports of the area. Indications of an expansion in international trade and of a rising trend in the export prices of many of the commodities produced in the area provided added prospects for an improvement in the international financial position of countries of the area. It was also a period in which significant increases were made in the resources of the International Monetary Fund and the International Bank. Plans were also made for the formulation for submission to member governments, of articles of agreements for an International Development Association as a new international source of funds to assist the progress of the less developed countries.

Balance of payments pressures were somewhat eased owing largely to an improvement in foreign trade. Although deficits in the trade balances of many countries of the region continued in 1958-59, they were smaller than in the previous year. Improvement began in 1958, and continued in 1959 with rising exports and a continuation of the diminishing trend in imports. For the countries of the area, exports which decreased during 1958 began to rise late in the year, and at the end of the first six months of 1959 were 10 per cent higher than in the corresponding period of 1958. Imports of capital goods were lower in most countries in 1958, although this apparently had no marked effect on the rate of investment in the area as a whole. Larger governmental assistance during the year, designed both to help maintain economic stability

and to promote development projects, continued to relieve the payments situation. Foreign private capital also contributed to this improvement.

Countries of the area continued to face the problem of establishing or maintaining an environment of internal financial stability conducive to furthering their development efforts. Budget deficits were smaller but still substantial in many countries of the area despite steps taken to reduce We imbalances. As a consequence, there was resort to heavy borrowing from the banking system, which resulted in a general upward pressure on prices and the cost of living. Towards the iniddle of 1959 a slowing down in the rate of price increases became evident as the anti-inflationary measures implemented by some governments began to take effect. Nevertheless, because of price increases during the year investment in real terms was below the level suggested by the figures of actual expenditure.

The objects of development policy are much the same throughout the area. The use of resources available for development continues to be concentrated on achieving greater and more diversified agricultural output, the provision of the underlying physical and institutional framework on which directly productive activity depends, the expansion of industries, particularly those using domestic raw materials and the creation of greater opportunities for productive, employment. These developmental efforts all involve public expenditure in some measure. As a consequence, increasing attention is being paid to the improvement of fiscal measures in order to mobilise domestic resources as efficiently as possible. Despite a general increase in internal revenues the domestic financial resources thus mobilised were still insufficient to meet public expenditure for development, a situation tending to exert continuing pressure on prices and the balance of payments.

Private enterprise in the area consists not only of large and medium-scale enterprises but also of a very wide framework of small-scale private agricultural land-holdings and cottage and other industries. It is therefore important that savings and investment at all levels should be stimulated. Private savings showed signs of increase in many countries during the reporting period, and in addition most countries have already

taken some steps to encourage private investment through financial support, technical advice and tax incentives. These measures are being continued with good effect. Further, some governments have recently adopted measures to foster voluntary investment of private capital in enterprises in which the government also participates. Through financing of basic facilities such as roads, railways and ports, governments continued to provide groundwork for the expansion of the private sector.

Foreign private investment in the countries of the Colombo Plan area remained comparatively small but continued to grow during 1958-59. Growing recognition in many countries of the contribution which this investment can make to development, particularly through the association of new capital with technical and managerial skills, is reflected in a variety of measures of encouragement. These include not only domestic measures but also agreements with capital-exporting nations designed to protect the foreign investor from losses due to inconvertibility and expropriation and to relieve him from double taxation. Further examples of successful cooperation between local and foreign private enterprises were evident during the year. Some countries in the area are giving consideration to further steps to help attract foreign capital. In

2

addition, foreign philanthropic organisations continued to receive a warm welcome and to play an active and substantial role in helping to improve the area's social and economic framework.

In all countries of the area the policies and activities relating to economic development remained under continuing review during the reporting period. For most of the 15 countries of the area this assessment was conducted against the background of published development plans and programmes covering varying periods. This appraisal was useful in applying the lessons of the past to the future. In some instances it resulted in the revision of existing plans and policies. In others it facilitated the formulation of subsequent plans and programmes. In the Philippines and Cambodia, for example, decisions were taken to extend existing plans. A second five-year plan was being formulated in Pakistan, a third five-year

plan in India and a six-year plan in Thailand. New Plans were adopted during the reporting period in Laos, Ceylon and Cambodia, the Cambodian plan to take effect early in 1960. It is also noteworthy that two new planning bodies were formed during the reporting period, the National Planning Council in Indonesia and the National Economic Board in Thailand.

Substantial gains in the production of food grains were recorded in 1958-59. Increased rice harvests were gathered in most of the countries in the Colombo Plan area, reflecting more favourable weather conditions and also additional land under cultivation, improved farming methods, and more extensive use of fertilisers. The gains in rice production were especially noticeable in rice-exporting countries of the area : the rice crop in Burma increased by 18 per cent in 1958-59 and 30 per cent in Thailand while in Viet Nam the 1958-59 rice crop was 804,000 tons above the previous year.

India's rice production rose from 24.9 million tons in 1957-58 to 29.7 million tons in 1958-59 and was a key factor in the achievement of an unusually high level of food grain output, In some other countries such as Ceylon, the more favourable rice production was also accompanied by increased output of other food grains.

A few countries of the area, however, suffered setbacks in food grain production largely as the result of drought or flood conditions. In Pakistan, production fell by about 7 per cent. the decline in rice production outweighing by far the small gain in wheat output. Malaya's rice crop fell from 495,000 tons during the 1957-58 season to 443,000 tons during the 1958-59 season, mainly due to drought. Weather conditions also adversely affected food production in Laos.

In the area as a whole, production of export crops lagged during 1958 but rose again in 1959. Lower production of rubber and sugar in 1958 was followed by rising output and exports during 1959. Tea production was well sustained in 1958 and the first half of 1959.

The decline in rubber production in 1958 mainly reflected disturbed conditions in the producing areas of Indonesia, but in that country some recovery was evident in early 1959. In

Malaya, the increased yields resulting from the replanting programme led to a 4 per cent increase in rubber productions. The high level of tea production in Ceylon in 1958-59 was primarily due to the more extensive use of fertiliser by the tea industry. Cotton production rose by 16 per cent in Pakistan. At the same time, there was a nominal decline in India. Timber production in Burma benefited by the extraction and export of green teak, which can be made available at lower cost and commands higher prices than other varieties. However, Burma and Thailand registered lower foreign exchange earnings from lumber products than in 1957.

Output of tin in the Colombo Plan area declined by almost 80 per cent in 1958. As in the previous year, the influence of world market forces and continued efforts to support price stabilisation measures under the 1953 International Tin Agreement were important factors in reducing output. In Malaya, the largest producer, production fell by 35 per cent. The decline was also apparent in Indonesia and Thailand and had adverse repercussions on employment and export earnings in both countries.

Iron ore production increased by 7 per cent in 1958, reflecting the increased tempo of world economic activity. Output in India, the largest Producer, rose by 24 per cent to 5.8 million tons, although decreases were registered in Malaya and the Philippines. The upward trend for the area as a whole continued into 1959 when Indian production attained higher levels and some recovery became evident in other iron ore producing countries.

There was a further increase in coal output during 1958; and the favourable production trend continued in 1959. Indian coal production in 1958 reached a record level of 46 million tons; these figures were maintained in early 1959. In the smaller coal-producing areas,

3

including Pakistan, Indonesia and Malaya, output was more or less maintained.

Crude Petroleum production in the area reached 22.1 million tons in 1958 or 34 per cent more than in 1957. In Indonesia, which accounted

for 16.1 million tons of the total output, petroleum extraction rose by 4 per cent, but exports declined by 2.2 million tons, reflecting in part increased domestic consumption. Burmese production continued to rise in 1958-59 ; production in the first six months of 1958-59 was 20 per cent higher than in the corresponding period of the previous year. In Pakistan production of natural gas which is of considerable importance as a source of energy, increased by 21 per cent in 1958.

Industrial output in the area of the Colombo Plan rose moderately during 1958-59 even though divergent trends were, of course, evident within industries and among countries. While output in the cement and power industries continued the rising trend reflected in previous years; production of cotton yarns and fabrics, for example, dropped off.

In India, the index of industrial production showed a 2.2 per cent increase in 1958-59, compared with a 1.7 per cent rise in, 1957-58. Pakistan's industrial output index, although somewhat erratic in its movements during 1958, resulted in a rate of overall increase higher than that attained in the previous year. Manufacturing output in the Philippines continued to rise in 1958-59, although at a somewhat slower rate than in 1957-58, and in some fields industrial output rose in Indonesia, but in both countries industry dependent on the import of materials registered decreased activity owing to the limited availability of foreign exchange. In other countries, it appeared that industrial output was unchanged or higher.

The output of electric power continued to rise throughout the region, although less rapidly than in 1957. The increase in 1958 of almost 5 per cent compares with a rise of more than 10 per cent in the previous year. The upward trend continued through the first half of 1959. Substantial production increases were registered in every country of the region with the exception of Malaya, where the demand for power fell as a result of lower tin production,

Cement production maintained the forward movement of preceding years. There was a 9 per cent increase in 1958 and added gains were registered in the first six months of 1959. A 24 per cent rate of growth was registered in the Philip-

piners and 13 per cent in Thailand. In Ceylon, production rose from 48,000 tons in 1957. to 79,000 in 1958. Some fall in output was noted in Pakistan and Malaya during the same period..

The production of cotton yarn and fabrics fell in 1958 owing to production declines in India. The decline in Indian output resulted from a fall in both internal and external demand during the year, and the carry-over of large inventories from 1957. Domestic demand appeared to recover in late 1958 and 1959, reflecting an increase in agricultural and other income, although output as a whole in early 1959 had not returned to pre-1958 levels. Slight decreases were apparent in cotton yarns and cloth production during 1958 in the Philippines and Indonesia, but in Pakistan there was an increase in 1958 and early 1959.

Steel production, which is largely confined to Pakistan and India, increased owing to the up-trend in India. Output increased by more than 5 per cent in that country, but a slight drop was recorded in Pakistan.

The volume of production for selected commodities in the area for the years 1956 to 1958 is reflected in the following table.

(Thousands or metric tons, unless otherwise stated)

| | 1956 | 1957 | 1958 |
|---------------------------------|--------|--------|--------|
| Rice | 93,172 | 83,590 | 93,188 |
| Wheat | 12,085 | 12,856 | 13,695 |
| Maize | 6,353 | 6,623 | 6,492 |
| Tobacco | 634 | 645 | n.a. |
| Tea | 539 | 551 | 580 |
| Cotton (ginned) | 1,258 | 1,270 | 1,378 |
| Sugar | 3,998 | 4,746 | 4,356 |
| Natural rubber | 1,598 | 1,611 | 1,571 |
| Iron Ore | 8,232 | 9,060 | 9,750 |
| Crude petroleum | 13,608 | 16,584 | 22,140 |
| Tin (concentrates) | 108 | 104 | 72 |
| coal | 41,736 | 45,564 | 47,492 |
| Cement | 6,802 | 7,816 | 8,491 |
| Electricity (million kwh) | 13,500 | 15,200 | 15,900 |
| Steel (ingots and castings) | 1,776 | 1,759 | 1,852 |
| Cotton yarn | 897 | 954 | 923 |
| Cotton fabrics (million metres) | 5,382 | 5,416 | 5,105 |

Many countries of the area showed increasing concern over the effect of inflationary pressures on their efforts to move towards sustainable economic growth. This concern was translated into action in several countries in an attempt to reduce these pressures and create an environment

4

more conducive to real growth. A few countries attempted to limit credit expansion by such devices as raising discount rates and bank reserve requirements and imposing general or selective credit ceilings. Measures were also taken to increase government revenues so as to reduce or eliminate budget deficits.

While in some cases these actions were reflected in the economic indicators, in many others the measures taken did not show concrete results until later in the period under review. In almost all countries of the region money supply increased during 1958-59, and in a few cases the increases were quite sharp. The expansionary effects of government operations tended in certain cases to increase the money supply despite substantial balance of payments deficits and some contraction in the private sector resulting from import restrictions. Towards the end of the period there appeared to be some tendency for the rate of increase in money supply to slacken in response to measures taken in a number of countries.

Following the trend of recent years, budget deficits were again substantial. However, a number of governments took steps to reduce the size of their deficits to cope with pressures on the balance of payments and on the level of internal prices. Many of them continued to resort to heavy borrowing from the banking system to finance the gap between revenue and expenditure despite the continued receipt of large-scale foreign assistance.

It is clear that the increases in money supply and government borrowing from the banking system have exerted a general upward pressure on prices and cost of living throughout the region. In many cases the price rises were comparatively moderate due, in part at least to generally lower costs of imported items and to government measures, such as subsidies and other

devices, to reduce the upward pressures. However, movements in consumer prices were not uniform, and there were cases in which decreases occurred and also cases of very large increases. Towards the middle of 1959 signs appeared of slowing down in the rate of price increases as the anti-inflationary measures implemented by some governments began to take effect. Wages appear to have moved in sympathy with prices and in some cases improvements in real wages have been achieved.

Although the available evidence is limited says the report there were signs in several countries of increases in the private savings.

The magnitude of private investment similarly is not always apparent from available data. Because of the predominance in the area of small private landowners and of medium and cottage size industry, the role of private investment is substantial and appears to be increasing to some extent.

Towards the close of the period under review the prospects for strengthening the internal financial position of the countries in the region were brighter.

While the value of exports from countries of the area fell during 1958, the downward movement was generally reversed late in the year and the rise in value continued during the first six months of 1959. In the Philippines, increased production and improved prices combined to produce record exports in 1958, but for other countries exports either fell or failed to show any significant increase. For the first half of 1959 the total value of exports for the area as a whole was about 10 per cent greater than for the same period in the preceding year. This improvement was particularly evident in the cases of Indonesia and Thailand where there had been noticeable deterioration in the previous year.

Export prices reflected divergent movements in 1958 but tended generally to strengthen early in 1959 as the result of accelerated economic activity in the major industrial countries. Rubber prices declined early in 1958 only to resume previous levels by the end of the year. Tin, copra and hemp gained strength throughout 1958 and sustained continuing increases through the next six months. In the second quarter of 1959 the price of copra was about 75 per cent above the average

price-for 1957 while hemp prices were about 25 per cent higher. Tea prices reflected a slight and gradual deterioration while jute prices fluctuated around 1957 levels. Rice prices, after rising early in 1958 remained relatively stable throughout that year largely because increased availabilities were met by raising demand in the area. However, some softening was evident in early 1959 as large harvests entered the market. Export prices for cotton continued to decline.

A number of countries experienced a further fall in gold and foreign exchange holdings in 1958, and the figures available for the end of June, 1959, indicate a decline in some cases and, some improvement in some others during the first half of this year. For many countries reserves were still below the level of the end of 1957. More recently there were additional signs that the downward movement in foreign reserves had been

5

reversed and further improvements appeared to be taking place in a number of countries.

Despite an improvement in a few countries in the area the terms of trade generally deteriorated further in 1958. In the following six months a number of countries were assisted by improvements in their terms of trade as the prices of their exports rose from the lower levels of 1958. Export price indices of major capital exporting countries outside the area in general showed some decline or no change in the first part of 1959, a situation which also obtained in 1958.

During 1958 there was further activity in agricultural and industrial credit and the formation of new cooperative societies. The Agricultural Bank of Pakistan granted Rs. 3.4 million in loans to farmers, supplementing the activities of the Agricultural Finance Corporation. By 30th April 1959, the latter had authorised Rs. 442 million in loans to farmers. The Pakistan Industrial Credit Investment Corporation is financing 38 projects amounting to Rs. 48.3 million and in addition has invested Rs. 30.5 million in securities and shares. Financing provided by the Reserve Bank of India to State Cooperation Banks increased to about Rs. 500 million at the end of 1958-59. In Malaya, the Central Bank of the Federation began operations.

External assistance continued to be received in various forms, including technical assistance, loans and grants and the supply of equipment and agricultural commodities. Although a precise estimate of the total value of assistance is not possible, the value of aid during 1958-59 from donor countries amounted to over \$ 1,400 million and total aid since the beginning of the Colombo Plan to over \$ 6,00 million.

During 1958-59 the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development made loans to countries in the area amounting to \$178 million. On 30th September, 1958 the total of loans to these countries amounted to \$ 935 million.

Technical assistance continued to play an important role in the economic development of the area. Since 1950 training has been afforded to over 18,000 trainees, and the services of an estimated 10,000 experts have been provided to countries in the area by members of the Colombo Plan.

SRI LANKA INDIA USA LATVIA PHILIPPINES CAMBODIA PAKISTAN THAILAND LAOS INDONESIA
BURMA RUSSIA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC

Date : Jan 01, 1960

Volume No

1995

FOREIGN AND HOME AFFAIRS

President's Republic Day Broadcast

The President, Dr. Rajendra Prasad made the following Republic Day broadcast to the nation on January 25, 1960 :

Let me greet my countrymen on the eve of the 10th Republic Day and wish them good luck and happiness in the coming year. Every year we exchange greetings on this happy occasion and felicitate one another and also rook around to see the state of the nation, its. growing economy and

its fast-developing resources. We have weighed these developments against our long-term plans and our cherished dreams to turn an underdeveloped nation of teeming millions into a prosperous State in which every citizen, assured of life's essential needs, leads a reasonably happy life. The whole machinery of the State nay, the entire resources of the nation, are being mobilised to give shape to this ideal.

Since we became free and took charge of the affairs of State we have remained mainly occupied with setting our house in order, that is to say, with dealing mostly with our internal problems, though, as is well-known, we have throughout been following a foreign policy which we have thought to be the best for India. Respecting other nations' independence, cherishing friendly feelings for all peoples, firm belief in every country's freedom to live in the manner considered best by it, to abjure violence and aggression and to work for the maintenance of world peace ... these are some of the important elements in our foreign policy. This policy which came to be known as that of peaceful co-existence has been subscribed to by good many other nations of the world.

Something has happened which threatens to strain our belief in these principles. One of our neighbours with whom our relations have throughout been friendly and who has been with us in propounding the theory of Panch Sheela, has thought it fit to encroach on our frontiers and occupy fringes on the border areas falling within Indian territory. In the face of provocation and the rising popular resentment we have continued to rely on negotiations and settle whatever dispute there be in a peaceful and friendly manner. Our

6

anxiety, however, to remain friendly and avoid resort to force has not so far evoked the desired appreciation from the other side. While hoping for the best, we have to be vigilant and united. Though our faith in peace and peaceful co-existence remains unshaken as ever, we cannot afford to ignore the fact that eternal vigilance is the price a nation pays for its freedom.

Side by side with meeting the requirements of defence necessitated by recent events, we are determined to spare no effort in implementing our big

nation-building projects. Some of these projects have already been completed or are nearing completion.

Work on others is proceeding according to schedule. During this year we had the Ganga Bridge opened to traffic, linking North Bihar and Assam with South Bihar and West Bengal. Encouraged by this remarkable feat of engineering we now propose to span the mighty Brahmaputra near Gauhati, and our Prime Minister has laid the foundation of the new bridge only this month. Work on Bhakra, Nagarjunasagar, Chambal, Neyveli and Kundah Hydro-Electric Projects continues to progress. The three major Steel Plants at Rourkela, Bhilai and Durgapur have begun functioning in part this year. These are expected to supply more than our present requirements of steel.

At one time during the year the food situation threatened to worsen, but the price level was soon brought down as a result of efforts to ease the supply situation and opening of foodgrain shops throughout the country. The situation since then has shown signs of improvement and there is reason to believe that this trend will receive further support from the present reassuring crop position and foreign imports to build up adequate reserves.

Brothers and sisters, I want you all to give - little thought to those momentous questions confronting our country. I need hardly tell you that they are receiving the best consideration at the hands of the leaders to whose care you have entrusted the affairs of the country but in democracy national questions are the concern of every citizen and everyone must apply himself or herself to them.

Once again I wish you all the best of luck and have pleasure in greeting you on this day.

USA INDIA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC

Date : Jan 01, 1960

Volume No

1995

President's Message to Indian Nationals Abroad

The President Dr. Rajendra Prasad broadcast the following message to Indian nationals abroad on the occasion of the Republic Day, January 26, 1960.

It gives me so much pleasure to greet you again, our brothers and sisters in foreign lands, on this happy occasion of the 10th anniversary of our Republic. Whatever our preoccupations at home, our thoughts often go to you and your well-being is close to our hearts. May you always prosper and bring a good name to the mother country by your good deeds and upright behaviour, is my wish and prayer.

Our Republic is today entering the eleventh year of its existence. All these years we have been up and doing, developing our material resources and trying to turn India into a land of peace, plenty and prosperity. We are well set on the road to industrialisation and have been able to implement, fully or partially several big projects we took in hand during the Second Plan period. When you come back home next, I can promise you quite a few pleasant surprises. You will find countryside electrified in many States, new roads and railways laid, new canals lacing the rural areas with their bounteous waters, three giant steel plants elected and spitting molten ore round the clock and community development and social welfare centres spread all over the land.

I know you will feel happy to see all this. But, let me tell you, it is no more than a beginning. The journey to our great destination is long and arduous. However, faith in India's destiny inspires us and the determination of our people provides the necessary sinews for the job. An undertaking like this cannot be without its own hazards and difficulties and, be sure, we are no longer strangers to them, though with God's grace we are bound to get the better of them and achieve our cherished goal.

You too, brothers and sisters, must be thinking of your country today. I would like you to think also of the high moral and spiritual ideals

from which we draw inspiration in our home and foreign policies.

Once again I wish you god-speed and good luck, wherever you are and whatever you be.

7

INDIA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC USA

Date : Jan 01, 1960

Volume No

1995

HUNGARY

Trade Agreement Extended

Letters were exchanged in New Delhi on January 13, 1960 extending the validity of the Trade Agreement between India and Hungary for a further period of six months ending June 30, 1960.

Dr. G. Oblath, Leader of the Hungarian Delegation signed on behalf of his Government and Shri K. R. F. Khilnani, Joint Secretary, Ministry of Commerce and Industry, on behalf of the Government of India.

The main items of export from India are iron ore, cotton waste, jute products, vegetable oils, raw wool, coffee and mica. Imports from Hungary are steel products, machine tools, ACSR cables and conductors, dyes and pharmaceuticals.

HUNGARY INDIA USA

Date : Jan 01, 1960

Volume No

1995

JAPAN

Indo-Japanese Agreement Signed

An agreement was signed in New Delhi on January 25, 1960 between the Governments of India and Japan for the establishment of a Prototype Production and Training Centre at Howrah in West Bengal.

Under the agreement, the Japanese Government will supply, free of cost, the plant and electricity for the Centre. The services of the requisite number of Japanese experts will also be placed at the disposal of the Government of India. Expenditure on land, buildings, Indian staff etc. will be borne by the Government of India.

The total cost of the project is estimated to be over a crore of rupees.

The Centre, which is expected to commence production early next year will undertake the development of prototypes of machines, tools and accessories for commercial exploitation by small-scale units. It will also develop special purpose machinery for assisting small scale units to improve their production techniques, besides imparting training to technicians in small industrial units, State Departments of Industries and the Central Small Scale Industries Organisation.

The agreement was signed by Shri L.K. Jha, Additional Secretary in the Ministry of Commerce & Industry, on behalf of the Government of India, and Dr. Shiroshi Nasu, the Japanese Ambassador in India, on behalf of the Government of Japan.

JAPAN INDIA USA

Date : Jan 01, 1960

Volume No

1995

JAPAN

Agreement on Avoidance of Double Taxation

An agreement for the Avoidance of Double Taxation of Income between India and Japan was signed in New Delhi on January 5, 1960 H. E. Dr. Shiroshi Nasu, Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of Japan to India and Dr. B. Gopala Reddi, Minister for Revenue & Civil Expenditure, signed on behalf of their respective Governments.

The agreement now requires to be ratified after which it will become effective in India in respect of income of the previous Years beginning on or after the first day of January of the year in which the exchange of instruments of ratification takes place.

The agreement follows talks between the Governments at official level in Tokyo in October last year when a draft agreement was initialled.

8

JAPAN INDIA USA

Date : Jan 01, 1960

Volume No

1995

JORDAN

Trade Agreement Signed

Letters were exchanged in New Delhi on January 14, 1960 embodying a trade arrangement between India and Jordan.

Syed Hajim Al-Tell, a member of the Trade Delegation from Jordan, signed on behalf of his Government, while Shri K.R.F. Khilnani, Joint Secretary, Ministry of Commerce and Industry, signed on behalf of the Government of India.

The two Governments have agreed to take all appropriate measures to promote trade between them, particularly with regard to items mentioned in the schedules appended to the letters exchanged. The trade arrangement will be valid for an initial period of one year.

The schedule of exports from India includes, besides traditional items, chemicals, pharmaceuticals, light engineering goods, electrical goods, hardware, sports goods, plastics, etc. The schedule of imports from Jordan to India includes rock phosphates, potash, gypsum, hides and skins, wool and olive oil.

JORDAN INDIA USA

Date : Jan 01, 1960

Volume No

1995

NEPAL

Nepalese Prime Minister's Visit

At the invitation of the Government of India, the Nepalese Prime Minister, Shri B.P. Koirala visited India from January 17 to 31, 1960. On January 24, the Prime Minister, Shri Jawaharlal Nehru held a State Banquet in his honour at Rashtrapati Bhawan. Welcoming Prime Minister Koirala, Shri Nehru said :

Honoured Prime Minister and guests:

We have gathered here together, you know, to welcome the Prime Minister of Nepal and his colleagues and we welcome them with all our heart. But I feel some difficulty because there is a difference between an ordinary welcome and the

welcome we are according now. We ran often meet here to welcome the Presidents or Prim; Ministers of other countries, and we wish that our relations with other countries, become closer, based on cooperation and love- and we have succeeded in this a lot. But if a representative, particularly the Prime Minister of Nepal, comes, then the formalities between our two countries become superfluous. It is also not necessary to say things that are often said in respect of visitors from far off countries, because the relations between Nepal and India are age-old based on geography, religion culture, customs and so many other things. It is not something that needs to be specified. Our relationship is there, just As there is relationship between brothers, even though the brothers may sometime be a little annoyed with each other. The relationship and the love between them is inviolable. Apart from this, what happened in the past Years, has brought us closer. About son years ago, a change took place in Nepal, and apparently it affected India a lot, just as when India became free about 10 or 12 years ago, the change affected Nepal, and I think the people of Nepal were happy that India became free. Similarly when 10 years ago this change took place in Nepal, we were happy because it did not concern any foreign country and the freedom that came to Nepal was internal and a step was taken towards democracy. Quite a few difficulties were faced then, and even after that, some difficulties persisted just as there always are difficulties, whenever a step forward is taken. For sometime then you were the Prime Minister of Nepal. After that, other things happened there, and last year Nepal took another big step and democracy was even more firmly established there and you became once again the Prime Minister of Nepal. Obviously we were pleased. Even otherwise, we would have been happy because we want that there should be freedom in all the countries, both from interference. from outside and internal freedom. We want that the people should have their own government, that their rights should grow and that they are benefited. We, therefore, were happy. A few days after that, you and the King of Nepal extended me an invitation and I went there. I was happy to see the new Nepal and you and your people had extended us a welcome that we vividly remember. The relations between Nepal and India have their basis on love and culture.

Now you have come here. All these things of

the past, particularly of the last 10 years come back to me. During the last one year, the new

9

turn Nepal has taken has been mostly due to you and your colleagues. We were happy that you succeeded in that, and we congratulated you. When the relations are so close, any formal or superficial utterances seem out of place. These relations are too deep-rooted and when the roots go so deep, any happy event in our country has its effect on you and if you progress, we feel elated. If we are faced with a danger, it affects you also. If you are confronted with a threat, it affects us, and in a way, becomes our danger, just as our danger would become yours. Danger sometimes external or whatever they might be, do appear sometimes. There are some fundamental things confronting us, the advancement of our country and of our people, we are greatly concerned about. The progress we have made in the last 10 years, you can see for yourself. As it always happens, we have made mistakes, but at least, our endeavour has always been that the country should progress, the sign of which is that people should progress. I think in the last 10 years, India has progressed considerably. It would have been better, if we, could have progressed more. And now we have reached a stage where it requires even greater efforts so that we may forge ahead and what has been achieved is firmly consolidated.

You also are faced with almost similar things. There is, of course, a difference as there always is between countries. In some matters, your difficulties are greater, in others, we have greater difficulties. But the questions confronting us are in a way similar. Thus another relationship is established between us, that of solving our problems in cooperation with each other and by helping each other. From whatever point of view we may look at it, it appears that, as in the past, the future also of Nepal and India lies in cooperation with each other and moving ahead together. It is obvious that sometimes when two countries are faced with different problems, such problems have to be solved by them separately. It is the mark of a nation's freedom that it should take its own decisions and that nothing is done that would create difficulties in taking these decisions. But, as I have said, history, culture and so many things have so

moulded us together that the tie has become unbreakable. I do not think that it can be broken or weakened at someone's will.

Your visit at this time for talks to solve our common problems and also discuss problems relating to the world will, therefore, benefit both the countries. Some other benefits also may accrue from this because, in the present context, problems of any country cannot be isolated from the problems of the world at large. The most fundamental question is whether or not there should be peace in the world, because if peace is violated, then all the peoples and all the countries are engulfed in that and all our plans become worthless; more so, because war in the world of today means total destruction.

There is no doubt that the policy of Nepal as well as that of India is of peace. In other matters also, we follow similar policies. Your visit, particularly at this time, is, therefore, most auspicious. We are very happy and we heartily welcome you and your colleagues. I wish we would come closer although our relations are already so close that there is hardly any scope of their becoming closer. Even so, I would wish that our relations in the past would be further strengthened in the present so that we may help each other and, as far as possible, cooperate with each other in matters affecting the whole world.

On behalf of the Government and the people of India, I welcome you and hope that Nepal and its people would progress.

NEPAL INDIA USA MALI

Date : Jan 01, 1960

Volume No

1995

NEPAL

Shri Koirala's Reply

In his reply Prime Minister Koirala said:

Your Excellency Shri Jawaharlal Nehru and Friends:

I express my thanks to Your Excellency for this-State Banquet in my honour to-night. I am, indeed, grateful to Your Excellency for your friendly words about me expressed with the deep and hearty feelings of an intimate friend and a well-wisher. Always and in all circumstances you have shown towards me the affectionate feelings of a close friend and I have always respected them as, a symbol of your goodwill and boundless regards for my country and people. The warm welcome and respect accorded by your Government and Indian people to Their Majesties the King and Queen of Nepal and the expression of goodwill shown to the Nepalese people by the people of India on various occasions are clear manifestations of the friendly feelings of India towards Nepal.

Your contributions and leadership in the great struggle for the Indian Independence are already

10

being recalled as significant land marks of history. You have always been the symbol and the great ideal of the Indian youth and it gives me great satisfaction to be able to mention that you have also been the great author of putting India in the world context as a successful modern nation by providing the Government of the great country so Successful a leadership within so short period of time. The Indian people are, indeed, fortunate to have as their leader, a great personality like you.

The ceaseless efforts put forward by Your Excellency's farsighted leadership in the great endeavour for the establishment and promotion of world peace where nations could prosper without any fear or danger, are well known to the whole world. You have also sponsored the lofty principles of Panch Sheel and your contributions to the resolution at Bandung for ending colonisation and guaranteeing the right of sovereignty and self-determination to every Afro-Asian country are no less significant. You have always stood firm like the Himalayas for world peace and freedom of nation. All lovers of peace and-democracy are full

of praise for your great efforts in this direction.

Under your successful leadership and far-sighted democratic tradition of public welfare, the resurgence of India is taking place and it has given us great pleasure and satisfaction to observe the rapid construction and development of a new India. As a close and friendly neighbour of India, we always wish you and your country peace and prosperity and we have every hope that all your problems will find peaceful solutions.

Democratic traditions have recently been introduced in Nepal. Changing the old order by means of development in the socioeconomic sphere, we are engaged in the significant task of creating a new Nepal. Your support and assistance for our democratic progress and economic development have always been deeply appreciated by us. We can never forget the selfless and friendly co-operation we have been receiving from India for the enhancement of our various development works and projects. I have full confidence that we will continue to receive similar cooperation from you in our great endeavour to create a new Nepal. In this context it is our hope that the extent of cooperation in the technical and economic sphere between our two countries will also be further expanded.

We had, in the past, solved our problems by methods appropriate for such occasions. Today also we shall solve by mutual assistance the various problems of socioeconomic regeneration because the friendship of Nepal and India has stood firm through thick and thin and has always been complimentary to each other. India is always ready to help Nepal in her difficulties; similarly Nepal also has helped India in her hours of need. The great Himalaya is the symbol of our friendship. I am confident that the invincible, indestructible and everlasting friendly relations subsisting between our two countries will continue to further develop and prosper.

On this happy occasion on behalf of my august Sovereign, my Government, the people of Nepal and on my own I express our good wishes for the health and prosperity of His Excellency the President, Your Excellency, your Government and the people of India.

Date : Jan 01, 1960

Volume No

1995

NEPAL

Shri Koirada's Speech at Farewell Banquet

Speaking at a banquet held in honour of the Prime Minister, Shri Jawaharlal Nehru, at Ashoka Hotel on January 27, 1960, His Excellency Shri B. P. Koirala, Prime Minister of Nepal, said:

Your Excellency Shri Jawaharlal Nehru and Friends:

I am indeed very happy to welcome Your Excellency and friends here to-night and I express my heartfelt thanks to you and my friends for having so kindly graced this happy occasion by your presence. I take this opportunity also to express my deep appreciation for the natural feelings of intimacy, love and affection so spontaneously expressed throughout my visit of India.

To me, India is not a new country nor is Delhi a far away city. I have spent quite a long time in India. The Indian War of Independence was a matter of supreme inspiration to the exploited and oppressed classes of all the countries of the world. The Father of the Indian nation, Mahatma Gandhi, had given the lofty ideal of independence and self-respect not only to the people of India but to all the youth of the entire Asian Continent. A large section of the Nepalese youth had given cooperation for the independence of India and I also had the opportunity of association with you all. The independence of India is, therefore, as dear to me as to my Indian friends. For the cause of democracy in my motherland, Nepal, moral support and inspiration were also obtained from innumerable Indian friends. Hence,

of always marching together hand-in-hand for the noble cause of independence and self-dignity is both a historical and cultural reality. Our two countries have always manifested to the world the unique example of evercontinuing cordial relations subsisting among sovereign and independent nations.

Today also, in the respective democratic systems of our two countries, our goal and methods of achieving economic development and social justice are not fundamentally different. By the course of history our conditions bear a similar aspect. Any attempt, therefore, to explain or interpret the intimate relationship between brothers or among friends is rather unnatural. Such matters are self-proving and obviously natural.

For the cause of sovereignty and independence in the past, the Nepalese and the Indian people have always advanced together. Now in this revolutionary task of creating a new society also, our two countries have got to assist each other. In consideration of the fact that we are lesser-developed nations, mutual goodwill, I am sure, will prove priceless in the development of our respective countries. Your Excellency has always been a great friend and well-wisher of Nepal. We greatly appreciate your highest regards and respect for our sovereignty and independence and we are convinced that your best wishes will always be there for the promotion of the dignity and respect of Nepal.

During my present visit to India, I have observed everywhere new activities and a unique spirit of construction. I have seen a new India coming up at a quick pace, and this remarkable progress has greatly impressed me. On behalf of His Majesty's Government, the people of Nepal and on my own I express our best wishes and god-speed to your noble and unique endeavour to establish a new India of peace and plenty.

In conclusion, I propose a toast to the health and long life of Prime Minister Jawaharlal Nehru.

NEPAL INDIA USA

Date : Jan 01, 1960

Volume No

1995

NEPAL

Prime Minister Nehru's Reply

The Prime Minister, Shri Jawaharlal Nehru replied to the Nepalese Prime Minister first in Hindi and then in English.

The following is the text of his English speech :

Prime Minister, Excellencies and Friends:

You have just heard from the Prime Minister of Nepal some references to the old and new contacts between India and Nepal. It has been our good fortune in India to have friendly relations with all countries. Even sometimes when difficulties have arisen we have tried to maintain these friendly relations, and we have deliberately set before ourselves the policy of being friendly with other countries, even though we might differ from them. There is no other way I believe. At any rate, that is the policy, as you know, which we have adopted:

While that applies to all countries, I think I can say with some assurance and the great deal of, truth that our relations with Nepal have been something rather special, not of my making or anybody's making, but because of history, tradition, geography, cultural contacts and the like, and therefore, inevitably it had to be that India and Nepal should be intensely interested in each other's present and future and should grow ever closer.

In the course of the last nine or ten years many changes have come to Nepal and India. Very soon after we attained our independence and before this new change had come over Nepal or the beginnings of the change, we were anxious to reassert our friendly relations with Nepal. The then Government of Nepal was of the old

type. It was not our concern what Government another country has ; that is, we may prefer something or not, but it is entirely that country's concern what methods, what Government it has. And even thin, in those days, as most people will know, soon after our independence, we approached the Government of Nepal for a renewal, or renewed treaty of friendship, and that treaty was signed, I forget the exact date, shout ten years or eleven years ago.

A little after that, a change came over Nepal, sad the internal structure of Government underwent a considerable change. That process of change continued for some time, and in this case it took a big turn. I cannot say a final turn, but anyhow a major turn, a year or more ago when a new constitution was adopted by Nepal and His Majesty the King of Nepal promoted a new Constitution and elections took place as a result of which the party represented by the Prime Minister obtained a great majority in their

12

Parliament and naturally the leader of that Party, that is the present Prime Minister of Nepal, took up this high office.

While, as I said, it was not for us to, shall I say, desire changes in another friendly country that is entirely the business of the people of that, country, nevertheless, it is perfectly true that we welcome this change greatly, because we felt that it was the right thing for Nepal to develop on democratic lines and thereby come nearer to us in our general outlook. And so it has been that we have been close to each other broadly speaking in our broad internal outlooks and close to each other in our broad external outlooks. Whether from the national or international point of view, we have been very largely in agreement and without any effort on the part of either to influence or push the other country. By the very nature of circumstances, our past and present, our outlooks, we have largely marched in step in these national and international affairs. That itself shows how close our mutual interests are apart from our outlooks and that is bound to be so in two neighbouring countries like India and Nepal. Therefore, that is an assurance about the future also.

So, whatever may happen in the future, good fortune or even ill-fortune sometimes we stand together and share both of them and in sharing them try to help each other to share the burden and join in celebrating the victories of our internal policies which bring a growing measure of welfare to our respective peoples.

It has been a very great pleasure for us to welcome an old friend and yet a young friend to India, whom we have known for many years in various capacities and now as the Prime Minister of this democratic Government of Nepal. While thanking him for all that he has said about our country and about me, I should like to assure him of our continuing earnest good wishes for his country and people and for him personally. And so I ask Your Excellencies, Ladies and Gentlemen, to drink to the good health of the Prime Minister and the charming lady to my right.

The following is the English translation of Shri Nehru's Hindi Speech :

Mr. Prime Minister and Friends:

You have just heard the Prime Minister refer to the old and intimate relations between our two countries and you have also heard that the present Prime Minister of Nepal played a part in our fight for freedom. This fact is perhaps not known to many people. He was with us and faced with us the difficulties that came in our way and shared our joys in our success.

Though our relations have been old yet, when we fought together for the freedom of India they were further strengthened. He accepted that Mahatma Gandhi, the Father of Indian nation, did not influence India alone; he influenced Nepal also considerably. He influenced other countries as well, but Nepal in a particular way. Therefore, if one questions the relationship between Nepal and India, one only proves one's ignorance, because our relations have been formed and strengthened by history, geography, culture, way of living and to some extent by religion. Similarly there are many things in our political life also which have joined us together. Besides, there is unity between our point of view regarding the independence and progress of our countries in a democratic way. We see eye to eye on many of the external problems also. Therefore, it is apparent that

Nepal should be interested in that We do in India and India should be interested in what is done in Nepal. And more than that they should influence each other. We are confident that our old and intimate relations will not only be maintained but will grow stronger with time and it is impossible for any agency to separate us.

The Prime Minister said just now that both, of our countries were faced with similar problems. Problems of course are before the countries of the world and before the countries of Asia. The main problem before us is how to raise the standard of living of our people, to give them relief from their troubles and to make them happy and prosperous. This is our internal problem and we look at it almost in the same way. No doubt there are differences between the countries and within the countries themselves, but there are many more things to unite us than to divide us. In the international affairs also, we have more or less the same outlook. As a consequence, whenever difficulties come or dangers arise, we will look to each other to give help or to get help and thus both will be benefited. These things were there, but your present visit drew the attention of our people more towards them. You have visited India several times before, but in the capacity of the Prime Minister of Nepal it is your first visit. We are happy to find you amidst us and your visit has given us a fresh opportunity to make us aware of our old relations and to discuss our present and future problems.

You have referred to the progress which India has made during the last few years. This is true but the problem. of the progress of a country

13

always brings complications and requires hard labour and unity. One has also to keep one's eyes fixed on the ultimate goal because if we lose sight of it, then we are bewildered. We have also to keep in mind the means of achieving the ends. It will not be entirely correct to say that we are progressing on the path as shown by Mahatma Gandhi. A country's progress depends on its own strength. Sometimes we have made mistakes, we have lost sight of our goal but we always remember him and constantly remind ourselves of the path that he has shown to us and also to the other countries of the world.

You have said some nice things about me. This is just as a brother should say about a brother. I am thankful to you but you will excuse me if I say that you are like my younger brother. I love you and respect you and I have great hopes from you. There is a good deal of difference between your age and my age. You have many years of life before you to serve your country and to raise the standard of living of your people. You have a golden opportunity and I am fully confident that you will make full use of that opportunity and that will benefit not only Nepal but our country also.

In the end, I would like to assure you on behalf of the Government and the people of India and also on my own behalf, of our good wishes towards Nepal and yourself. I am sure that our relations will be further strengthened and they will prove beneficial for both of our countries.

NEPAL USA INDIA

Date : Jan 01, 1960

Volume No

1995

NEPAL

Press Communique

Shri B.P. Koirala, Prime Minister of Nepal, accompanied by the Nepalese Home Minister, Shri S.P. Upadhyaya, visited India from January 17 to 31, 1960. During their stay in the Capital, they had talks with Prime Minister Nehru and other Ministers of the Government of India on a variety of subjects. At the conclusion of the talks a Press Communique was issued in New Delhi by the Ministry of External Affairs on January 29, 1960:

The following is the full text of the Communique:

At the invitation of the Government of

India, His Excellency Shri B.P. Koirala, Prime Minister of Nepal, accompanied by Shrimati Sushila Koirala, His Excellency Shri Surya Prasad Upadhyaya, Home Minister, and senior officials of His Majesty's Government of Nepal, have been visiting India from the 17th January and will go back to Kathmandu on the 31st January, 1960.

During their tour, they have visited industrial establishments and development projects, the National Defence Academy and many other places in India. They have also been present in Delhi on the occasion of the celebrations of the Tenth Anniversary of the Republic of India. They have been welcomed everywhere with popular enthusiasm reflecting the close friendship and neighbourly relations and the community of culture and outlook subsisting between Nepal and India.

The Prime Minister and the Home Minister of Nepal have had frank and cordial discussions with the Prime Minister and other Ministers of the Government of India. The discussions covered a wide range of subjects, including the present international situation as it affects the two countries, economic and other matters affording opportunities for cooperation between His Majesty's Government of Nepal and the Government of India.

These discussions have revealed afresh a similarity of approach to international problems by the two Governments and their desire to cooperate with each other in regard to them.

The two Governments attach great importance to the furtherance of peace in the world and are determined to work to this end. They trust that the efforts being now made by the Great Powers for the lessening of world tensions and a settlement of international conflicts through peaceful methods will lead to success. The two Prime Ministers recognised that Nepal and India have a vital interest in each other's freedom, integrity, security and progress and agreed that the two Governments should maintain close consultation in matters of common interest.

The Prime Minister of India assured the Prime Minister of Nepal of the Government of India's sympathetic interest in the plans of His

Majesty's Government for the social and economic regeneration of Nepal by democratic means. The two Governments are already cooperating in schemes of economic development and they propose to continue and accelerate this co-operation.

At the request of His Majesty's Government, the Government of India have readily agreed to

14

afford financial assistance for Nepal's development programme to the extent of Rs. 14 crores. The Government of India have also undertaken to construct the East Kosi (Chatra) Canal at a cost of Rs. 3 to 4 crores. Thus, the Government of India have expressed their readiness to assist the development programmes of Nepal to the extent of Rs. 18 crores. This amount includes Rs. 4 crores out of the previous grant, which is not likely to be spent during the first plan period. It was further agreed that adequate arrangements should be made in order to coordinate and expedite the execution of projects financed under these programmes.

Advantage was taken of the presence of the Prime Minister and the Home Minister of Nepal to have a broad discussion on the terms of a new treaty to replace the existing Treaty of Trade and Commerce.

The two Governments agreed that the new treaty should provide for the separation of Nepal's foreign exchange account and the regulation by the Government of Nepal of their foreign trade. In view of the close connection between the economies of India and Nepal, the two Governments agreed to work out details which would facilitate the expansion of Nepal's trade with India and other countries and promote cooperation between India and Nepal in the field of economic development.

NEPAL INDIA USA

Date : Jan 01, 1960

Volume No

1995

Joint Communique on Indo-Pakistan Talks on Western Border

An agreement was signed in New Delhi on January 11, 1960 between India and Pakistan on their western border disputes following a ministerial-level conference held between the two countries in Delhi and Lahore from January 4 to 11, 1960.

Shri Swaran Singh, Union Minister for Irrigation and Power, and Lt. Gen. Shaikh, Minister of the Interior, Pakistan, led the delegations of their respective Governments.

At the conclusion of the conference, a joint communique was issued simultaneously from New Delhi and Karachi on January 11, 1960.

The following is the full text of the joint communique :

In pursuance of the decision taken at the India-Pakistan Minister-level Conference in October, 1959, where a number of East Pakistan-India border questions were amicably settled, a Minister-level Conference was held at Lahore, Rawalpindi and Delhi from 4th to 11th January, 1960, to discuss West Pakistan-India border questions. The Pakistan Delegation was led by Lt. General K.M. Shaikh and the Indian Delegation by Sardar Swaran Singh.

There were in all five areas of dispute in this region viz., (1) Chak Ladheke (2) Theh Sarja Marja, (3) Hussainiwala and (4) Suleimanke Headworks, and (5) Kutch-Sind Border. Of these, the first four disputes arose out of differences between the Governments of India and Pakistan regarding interpretation of the Radcliffe Award. These were settled in a spirit of mutual accommodation as detailed in para 3 below.

Pakistan gave up their claim to Chak Ladheke and India give up their claim to the three villages of Theh Sarja Maria, Rakh Hardit Singh and Pathanke. In respect of Hussainiwala Headworks it was decided that the boundary would be the district boundary between Ferozepur and

Lahore districts. A settlement was also effected in respect of Suleirnanke Headworks and an agreement about the adjustment in the district boundary was arrived at.

Both countries agreed to collect further data in respect of the dispute regarding the Kutch-Sind boundary and discussions will be held later with a view to arriving at a settlement of this dispute.

Agreement was also reached in respect of the Ground Rules which would be operative on the West Pakistan-India border.

So far as the demarcation of the boundary between West Pakistan and Punjab (India) was concerned, it was decided that top priority should be given to this work which should be completed by the end of April, 1960. It was agreed that the return of the areas in adverse possession of either country in this sector will be completed by the 15th October, 1960.

With the settlement of a large number of

15

border questions both on East Pakistan-India and West-Pakistan-India borders, yet another step has been taken by the two Governments for bringing about better and amicable neighbourly relations which the two Waders, the President of Pakistan and the Prime Minister of India, had welcomed in their meeting on 1st September, 1959.

PAKISTAN INDIA LATVIA USA

Date : Jan 01, 1960

Volume No

1995

PAKISTAN

Ground Rules for Border Guards

In pursuance of the directive given to the sub-committee these ground rules were formulated

by Lt. Gen. P. N. Thapar, GOC-in-C, Western Command (India) and Lt. Gen. Bakhtiar Rana, SQA, MC Corps, Commander, Pakistan. In their deliberations they were assisted from the Pakistan side by Brig. Said-ud-Din, Director-General, West Pakistan Rangers, Brig. Tikka Khan and Mr. M S. Koreishi, PFS, Under Secretary, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, and on the Indian side by Shri Bhagwan Singh Rosha, IPS, DIG., PAP., Brig. Gurbakhsh Singh, Shri Govardhan, IPS, IG., Rajasthan, Shri V. G. Kanetkar, IP., D.I.G., Bombay and Shri M.M. Sen, I. C. S., Deputy Secretary, Ministry of Defence. The ground rules formulated in this paper are applicable to the West Pakistan-Punjab (India), West Pakistan-Rajasthan and West Pakistan-Bombay border.

On this border the security forces of both the countries are located at some places in close proximity to each other, and to avoid any untoward incident and resulting tension, it is necessary that pending the determination of the final boundary and the exchange of territories in adverse possession of the two Governments, the security forces of the two respective countries should observe the ground rules as laid down hereinafter.

On this frontier the de facto boundary is generally known to the security forces of both sides and the local population. In case of disputes arising in any sector, regarding the de facto boundary the status quo will be maintained by the local pod commanders and a working boundary in the areas under dispute, should be decided upon by the officers mentioned in paragraph 4 above and jointly recorded in a descriptive manner and clearly identified on the ground.

This working boundary will be decided upon by the undermentioned assisted by appropriate Civil Officers :-

(i) West Pakistan/Punjab (I) Border between the Director-General, West Pakistan Rangers/rep. and the D.I.G., P.A.P.. Punjab (India)/rep.

(ii) West Pakistan/Rajasthan Border between the Director-General, West Pakistan Rangers/rep. and D.I.G., RAC/rep.

(iii) West Pakistan/Bombay Border between the Director-General, West Pakistan Rangers/

rep. and DIG., (HQ)/rep.

The de facto boundary may or may not coincide with the de jure international boundary and the observance of the defacto boundary by both sides will not commit the two Governments in any manner in respect of their de jure claim.

Neither side will have any permanent or temporary border security forces or any other armed personnel within 150 yards on either side of this de facto boundary and no picket forward posts or observation posts will be established within this area.

Notwithstanding the provisions of paragraph 6 above, both sides may,

(a) go right up to the de facto boundary in hot pursuit of an offender :

(b) send patrols within the zone specified above upto the defacto boundary, provided :

(i) each side will inform the other about the actual patrol beat or any changes thereto if it falls within 50 yards of the boundary ;

(ii) patrols are small in numbers, i.e. not exceeding a section of one and ten;

(iii) patrols invariably move with flags; and

(iv) only personal weapons are carried by the patrols (no L.M. Gs. will be carried)

(e) regain such pickets, forward posts and observation posts its are already established until the do jure boundary is finalised and return of territories under adverse possession takes place. A list of such posts on both sides will be exchanged by 1-2-60. New posts within the 150 yards belt on either side will only be established by mutual agreement.

Defensive works existing within 150 yards on either side of the de fiacto/working boundary not

included in the list mentioned in para 7(c) above must be destroyed or filled up by 15-3-1960 and reports to this effect will be exchanged by both

sides.

Notwithstanding the provisions of paragraph 6 to 8 above, in areas regarding which disputes or title. are already pending with the respective Governments for a decision the status quo inclusive of defence and security measures will be strictly maintained until such time as the de jure boundary is finalised and the return of territories in adverse possession of the two countries takes place.

It will be the duty of the border security forces on either side to prevent armed civilians entering the 300 yards stretch of the border (150 yards on either side of the working boundary).

Border security forces of both sides are charged with the responsibility of preventing smuggling in their respective areas. Therefore, it is incumbent upon them to arrest smugglers of any nationality, whether armed or unarmed, and to deal with them under the law of the land.

In the case of local population, inadvertent crossings are likely to take place along with border. The border security forces, after satisfying themselves that the crossing was done inadvertently, shall immediately return the persons concerned to the opposite commanders at officers level.

Whenever the personnel of the border forces of either country inadvertently stray across the border line information about it should be immediately conveyed to the nearest post of the other side and the personnel must be handed back without delay to their nearest post along with their arms and ammunition etc., if any, through Gazetted Officers/Upper Subordinates of both sides.

Bonafide governmental bodies e.g. survey parties, etc., whilst operating in the border area shall not be interfered with. The programme of such parties will be notified to both sides by the Government concerned-at least a month ahead. Such parties will report to the nearest post of their own country before starting the work.

Whenever any cattle are alleged to have been lifted across the border a report will be lodged with the opposite border post commander

to whom the details such as the tracks of the cattle and of the criminals involved will be handed over. The Border Post Commanders concerned will acknowledge receipt of the report and then inform the nearest Police Station in their own country who will make all efforts to recover the cattle. After recovery the cattle must be handed back immediately to the Police Officers on the opposite side.

Grazing of unattended cattle on the border shall be discouraged. In the case of stray cattle these will be returned immediately by the Border Post Commanders to their opposite numbers after having satisfied themselves that the cattle have in actual fact strayed from across the border.

The S. Ps of Border Districts will also attend where necessary the monthly border meetings for the purpose of exchange of cattle and discussing border crimes.

The duties of the Sub-centres/Wing Commanders/S. Ps and lower Commanders in their respective areas of responsibility shall be as under :-

- (a) They will maintain close liaison with their opposite numbers.
- (b) They will, by frequent visits, make themselves known to the Border Security Forces of the opposite side.
- (c) They will receive all complaints regarding border violations/tension. They will immediately hold a joint enquiry not later than 24 hours of the information report. Where this is not possible due to long distances and difficulties of communications, the joint enquiry should be held as soon as possible.
- (d) Where two border posts are situated in close proximity to each other and it is possible for them to communicate by flags, any commander who wishes to meet his counterpart, will wave a flag of the specifications given in paragraph 23 below and will proceed to the border unarmed without any escort to a pre-arranged place. The opposite commander or the senior officer on seeing the flag, will acknowledge the signal and proceed to the place of meeting also with a flag unarmed and without escort. The use of flags

shall be introduced by 15.2.1960.

Where the posts are separated by a long distance contact will be established in the following manner :-

A party consisting of 1 and 6 armed with their personal weapons for their own protection and carrying the appropriate flag will proceed to

17

the post of the other side. On arrival within 300 yards of this post, will establish a temporary base and send forward two men unarmed with the appropriate flags to make necessary contact.

(e) Nationals of both the countries, while cultivating land upto the de facto boundary of the country concerned shall not be interfered with by the border security forces of the other side.

(f) If a national of one country lays a fresh claim to land across the de facto border and takes any step in furtherance of that claim which is objected to by the other side, the two commanders will hold a joint enquiry on the spot and restrain the person from enforcing his claim until the matter is settled.

Where, due to the change in the course of a river, territory of one country is thrown on the other side, such change will NOT affect either the de jure or de facto position of the territory.

It is felt that the tension on the borders will be greatly minimised if there is close personal touch between commanders of the two border security forces and therefore the following periodic meetings are recommended:-

(a) Wing Comdrs Rangers (Pak) Monthly at the S. Ps of PAP/RAC (India) border.
Special Reserve Police,
Bombay, (India)

(b) Officers mentioned in para 4 As required above or their representatives shall also meet. These Officers will be authorised by their respective Govts. to settle the disputes on the spot as far as possible.

The military commanders shall also meet as and when the situation demands and whenever they consider it necessary.

If unfortunately, in spite of this firing occurs, the other side shall refrain from replying. The local commanders will get in touch with each other by telephone and will meet with a view to bringing about a cease-fire forthwith. After every firing incident, it is necessary for both sides to carry out a joint investigation, fix responsibility and submit their respective reports for information of their higher authorities.

In order to maintain close liaison between the border forces of the two countries, it is essential that adequate telephone and other communications are provided at various levels.

All pickets and patrols on both sides will have flags of the following description:-

| Pickets | | Patrols | |
|-------------|----------|---------|--------------|
| Pole | Cloth | Pole | Cloth |
| size 7 feet | 4*3 feet | 3 feet | 2*2 1/2 feet |

Colours India .. Orange Pakistan .. Blue

At night flags will be substituted by light signals (two red/very lights) or signal by torches as mutually arranged between the post commanders.

Whenever there is a joint enquiry by D.Cs. or Commissioners on the two sides, the respective commanders of security forces of the areas shall also attend the meeting and submit for the information of the respective higher commanders their assessment of the situation created by the particular incident.

Finally, we recommend--

(a) that the press on both sides should be persuaded to exercise restraint and not to publish exaggerated reports or material which is likely to inflame the feelings of the population on both sides. Should incorrect reports be published, contradictions at a governmental level should be issued at the earliest opportunity ;

(b) that after the de jure boundary has been finalised and the return of territories in adverse

possession has been effected these ground rules should be reviewed in order to bring them up-to-date.

| | |
|-------------------------|-----------------------|
| Sd/- | Sd/- |
| Lt. Gen. Bakhtiar Rana. | Lt. Gen. P.N. Thapar. |
| S.Q.A., M.C., | G.O.C.-in-C, |
| Corps Commander, | Western Command, |
| West Pakistan. | India |

| | |
|--------------------|--------------------|
| New Delhi | New Delhi |
| 9th January, 1960. | 9th January, 1960. |

18

PAKISTAN INDIA USA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC

Date : Jan 01, 1960

Volume No

1995

UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS

President Voroshilov's Visit

At the invitation of the Government of India His Excellency Mr.Kliment Efremovich Voroshilov, President of the U.S.S.R., paid a visit to India in January, 1960. He arrived in New Delhi on January 20 and on the same day a State, Banquet was held in his honour by the President, Dr. Rajendra Prasad at Rashtrapati Bhawan. Welcoming President Voroshilov, Dr. Prasad said :

Mr. President, Your Excellencies, Ladies and Gentlement :

It is a matter of great pleasure to have you and your distinguished colleagues in our midst. As I said this morning, we have been looking forward to this occasion and I need hardly repeat that we welcome you as the Head of a great country which through its revolution initiated a new epoch in human history. Your. nation has, despite the vicissitudes of war, made enormous strides

in the scientific and technological fields. Your scientists have conquered space and brought within the grasp of man what seemed altogether unattainable. In the field of culture and art you continue to maintain an excellence which earns you admiration from the world over.

Though we have fashioned our own revolution in a different mould our two countries have much in common. We resent, as the Union of Soviet Socialist does, a harmonious synthesis of different peoples, races, cultures and languages. In our vast land we are pledged to ensure better standards of living for our people. In our striving for world peace and understanding between nations we share with you a common purpose. We believe, Your Excellency, as your leaders do, that all efforts should be directed towards achieving a lasting peace where the fear of disastrous war is banished and man's skill and ingenuity directed to noble purposes.

Almost five years ago our Prime Minister visited the Soviet Union and a few months later we welcomed your leaders. It was the beginning of a new chapter in the history of the relations between our two nations. Our mutual relations today extend to various fields, industrial, technological, cultural and economic. Technicians and engineers from your country, working in collaboration with ours, have just completed the gigantic steel project of Bhilai which stands out as a symbol of Indo-Soviet collaboration and cooperative effort. We are grateful for the economic and technical assistance extended to us by the Soviet Union and recognise fully the value of this aid in our plans to build a better and happier India. We are glad, too, that projects like Bhilai and many others enable the people of the two countries to get together and to know and understand each other better. The many cultural and other delegations from India that have visited your country have come away enriched with experience. Our students are in your universities and institutes engaged in cultural pursuits or in learning the advanced techniques of modern science and industry. We have had opportunities to welcome to India your statesmen, men of letters, scientists, technologists, indeed people from varied occupations and many walks of life thus widening our contacts and the interests of our peoples in each

other.

Your Excellency is aware of the deep importance we attach to world peace, a cause to which your country is equally devoted. Both our governments recognize that disarmament is the key to universal peace. We have noted with special satisfaction the recent drastic reduction in the armed forces of the U.S.S.R. This augurs well for the forthcoming talks between the Great Powers, to which my Government, as well as yours, has attached much importance. Much in the world today depends on these talks and we cannot but feel that the resultant understanding will bring with it the possibility of extending to the development of large areas in Asia and Africa, the scientific knowledge, the genius and the wealth of the industrialised and advanced countries. On our own horizons we face unfortunately new problems but I can assure Your Excellency that we remain resolute and are determined to seek peaceful solutions in our traditional spirit of negotiation and conciliation.

You, Sir, soldier and statesman, noble and distinguished patriot, are travelling to India for the first time. In your brief tour of my country you will see the many facets of its life, our projects, industrial and agricultural, our attempts at building for a better and brighter future, but beyond all that you will see our fervent desire to ensure peace and happiness to our countrymen. I hope, Excellency, you and your distinguished colleagues will carry back with you in some measure the feelings of warmth and affection which our people have for you and your country.

19

INDIA USA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC

Date : Jan 01, 1960

Volume No

1995

UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS

President Voroshilov's Reply

Replying to Dr. Prasad, President Voroshilov said :

Your Excellency, Mr. President,

Your Excellency, Mr. Prime Minister,

Ladies and Gentlemen:

Allow me to thank you cordially, Mr. President, on behalf of my friends F.R. Kozlov and E.A Furtseva and all the Soviet guests for the warm welcome and kind words of greeting and friendship pronounced here. We regard this as an expression of your kind feelings towards the peoples of the Soviet Union who are true and staunch friends of the Indian people.

The friendship between the peoples of our countries is deeply rooted in the remote past. The names of Indians and Russians who promoted the strengthening of this friendship are always pronounced with affection in the Soviet Union and in India.

As you know, the peoples of our country followed the courageous struggle of the Indian people for their national liberation with close attention and sympathy. The founder and first leader of the Soviet State Vladimir Ilych Lenin, a great champion of freedom for all peoples, emphatically condemned the colonial enslavement of India and firmly believed that the heroic Indian people would break the heavy shackles of colonialism and emerge in freedom onto the broad path of independent development.

After the achievement of independence by your country and the establishment of a sovereign Indian state the barrier erected by the colonialists was removed and true neighbourly and friendly relation came into being between the Soviet Union and free India.

We admire the efforts of the esteemed Prime Minister of the Republic of India, Mr. Jawaharlal Nehru, aimed at developing friendly Soviet-Indian relations which conform to the vital interests of the Indian and Soviet peoples.

The Soviet people remember well the visits to our country of Prime Minister Nehru and Indian Vice-President (Radhakrishnan, These visits as well as the visits of Soviet statesmen to India have been highly instrumental in developing understanding and friendship between our countries.

The visit of our delegation to India at the invitation of President Prasad and the Government of India testifies to the joint desire of our states to develop still further the friendly relations and cooperation that have already become traditional.

In our view there exist good and clear prospects for this. Our relations have never been darkened by any unpleasantness. On the contrary, with every passing year they are becoming more and more profound and imbued with the spirit of complete mutual understanding and trust. Soviet Indian economic, scientific, technical and cultural ties are growing. The positions of the Soviet Union and India on many international questions and, first and foremost, on questions of peace and peaceful co-existence coincide and provide a reliable basis for cooperation between our countries in the international arena.

Life has shown, and we note this with gratification, that the relations that have so happily taken shape between our countries are exceedingly useful both to the Soviet and Indian peoples.

Strong friendship between the Soviet Union and India has acquired important international significance. The mutual support which the governments of our countries have been and are rendering one another on a number of international issues has doubtless contributed to the solution of these questions in the interests of the peace and security of all nations.

The Soviet Government believes that the further strengthening of Soviet-Indian Cooperation is a substantial factor in the relaxation of international tension and the creation of the conditions necessary for a peaceful solution of pressing international issues.

The Soviet people and the Soviet Government cherish the friendship between our countries. Soviet-Indian friendship is founded on the

common interests and on the desire of our peace-loving nations to fight actively for the peace and happiness of the nations of the world. We believe our friendship will be stable and inviolable.

The Soviet Union strives to develop friendship with all the countries of the world regarding friendship among the nations as they only correct high road of mankind's development. We are convinced that despite all the vicissitudes of history all the nations of the world will sooner or later live as one friendly family. For this reason the

20

already existing friendship between many peoples must be cherished as the apple of the eye, for it is the foundation of the happiness of future generations.

Permit me, Your Excellency Mr. President, to propose a toast to your health, to the health of esteemed Prime Minister Jawaharlal Nehru, to the health of all those present here, to strong fraternal friendship between the Soviet Union and India, to peace and to Unshakable friendship among all the nations of the world.

INDIA RUSSIA USA

Date : Jan 01, 1960

Volume No

1995

UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS

President Voroshilov's Speech at Farewell Banquet

Speaking at a State banquet held in honour of the President of India at the Ashoka Hotel on January 22, 1960, the U.S.S.R. President, His Excellency Mr. Kliment Efremovich Voroshilov said:

Your Excellency esteemed Mr. President,
Your Excellency esteemed Mr. Prime-Minister,

Dear friends :

We are happy to have this opportunity of visiting your country at the kind invitation of the President and the Government of the Republic of India, of acquainting ourselves with the Indian people, their lives, customs and traditions, and with the building of a new life.

We are wholeheartedly grateful to the citizens of the glorious capital of India, the city of Delhi for their warm welcome of our delegation and their cordial hospitality. This cordiality towards us reflects the feelings of affection of the Indian people towards the Soviet people.

Permit me once again to declare that the Soviet people also entertain profound feelings of respect towards the great Indian people and always greet the envoys of the peace-loving Republic of India with an open heart and a feeling of joy.

Our people deeply believe in the great creative forces of the Indian people who have already accomplished a great deal in the development of their national economy and culture. We are very happy over the success in the implementation of the Second Five-Year Plan. As far as possible our country is unselfishly assisting free India in the construction of her industrial enterprises, willingly sharing her achievements in science and technology. Cultural ties in the broad sense of the word are developing in the mutual interest of the Soviet Union and India.

It is noted in the Soviet Union with great gratification that the role of India in the solution of Vital international questions, and in the struggle to preserve peace is growing from year to year.

Dear friends! As to the Soviet Union from the first days of Soviet power all the activities of our Government in the field of foreign policy have been directed at one aim : to preserve and strengthen the peace and security of nations. Peace is necessary to the Soviet people for the successful building of their radiant future. Peace is necessary for India and for all the States of the East to sooner overcome the grim consequences of the colonial yoke, to develop their economy and to raise the living standard of their peoples.

Peace is the happiness of all nations in the

world and no effort should be spared in struggling for this happiness. Now that the prospects for strengthening peace have improved, the efforts of all States are necessary to finally meet the ice of the "cold war", to create such conditions for the life of mankind in which there will be no arms race, no threat of war which can bring mankind numerous disasters.

Esteemed Mr. President, in your speech yesterday you spoke about the revolutionary changes and achievements in the Soviet Union. Speaking frankly, we were pleased to hear your words. True, the heroic Soviet people succeeded in turning our country into one of the world's mightiest powers, where welfare of the working masses is constantly rising.

But, and this is especially important, compared to the recent past, the cultural level of our people has immeasurably grown and continues to grow. The Soviet Union is now a country of high and truly humane culture and advanced science led by a host of scientists whose names are known far beyond the borders of the U.S.S.R.

Today the entire world has learnt about the new achievement of Soviet science and technology; the successful launching of our experimental rocket to an area in the Pacific. The Soviet rocket flew about 12,000 kilometers with the speed of over 26,000 kilometers per hour and deviated from the target area by less than .2 kilometers from the predetermined spot. This is another important step ahead on the way

21

to harnessing outer space and studying flights toward planets of the solar system.

The socialist system has elevated millions of people to vigorous creative activities. Thanks to this, from the very lowest ranks, from the broadest masses of the people, there have already grown up and keep growing remarkably talented production organisers who have mastered their jobs. Closely rallied around their Communist Party and the Government, the Soviet people have always taken care to see that our motherland may become still more prosperous and powerful, with the life of the people becoming better, on

a higher cultural level and happier.

Our people are confident of their strength and they are firmly marching forward along the path chosen by them. Engaged in peaceful enthusiastic labour they desire to live in peace and friendship with all nations.

From the bottom of our hearts we also wish the leaders of the Republic of India and the fraternal Indian people every success in building up a free and independent India.

Dear friends, I propose a toast to our dear guests—His Excellency President Rajendra Prasad His Excellency Jawaharlal Nehru, the Prime Minister of India, the Ministers, the Deputy Ministers and all the esteemed statesmen of India present here, to the permanent and truly fraternal profound friendship between the Soviet Union and India for peace in the whole world over.

INDIA USA TOTO CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC

Date : Jan 01, 1960

Volume No

1995

UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS

President Rajendra Prasad's Reply

In his reply to President Voroshilov, Dr. Rajendra Prasad said :

Mr. President, Your Excellencies. Ladies and Gentlemen :

I am thankful to Your Excellency for the kind words you have been pleased to say about our country and our people. We have been greatly moved by the warmth and the spirit of cordiality which have prompted you since your arrival here to express such fine sentiments for the Indian people and your appreciation for whatever little we have

so far been able to achieve in the sphere of economic development and contribute to international amity and peace in the world. It is not a matter of mere formality, Mr. President, when I say that we set great value on your friendly views and your country's goodwill.

As I had occasion to say the other day, we have noticed with admiration the efforts that your Government has been lately making for stabilising and consolidating peace by ending the mist of cold war and by sponsoring the cause of disarmament by nations. Indeed, your country has already given proof of its earnestness in this direction by announcing unilateral reduction in its armed strength. Let us hope the world weary of war and anxious to get rid of the fear of armed conflict will receive this move with enthusiasm. We, at any rate, in this country would like to convey to you our appreciation of what your Government has been doing to outlaw war by strengthening the forces of peace and international understanding. Peace, in itself a positive virtue, is no longer a mere desideratum today. Its compulsion or inevitability has to be recognised if the world has to reap the fruit of the progress made in science and technology and if mankind desires to ensure its very existence.

The great advance which the U. S. S. R. has made in the field of science and technology commands today the admiration of the world. I am happy to say that this advance is not confined merely to armaments or the weapons of war. You have applied this advance to the spheres of industry, agriculture, education and so many other departments of human life. The success which you have achieved in all these spheres with the help of new techniques is indeed stupendous. You have developed the material resources of your great country in a manner which may well serve as an example to other nations. Not only that, your country is desirous of projecting its scientific attitude towards its relations with other nations. It is so gratifying for us to see in our own country the growing Indo-Soviet collaboration in the field of industry and agriculture. I hope this collaboration will continue to grow to the benefit of the peoples of our two countries.

May I convey to you, Mr. President, and through you to the great people of the U. S. S. R. our deep appreciation and great admiration for

what you have achieved and for the way you are exerting your great and massive influence in the cause of international peace and assure you of our support? I propose to you, Ladies and Gentlemen, the toast of the health of the President and the people of the U. S. S. R.

22

INDIA MALI USA

Date : Jan 01, 1960

Volume No

1995

UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS

Joint Communiqué

At the conclusion of President Voroshilov's visit to India, lasting from January 20 to February 6, 1960, the Ministry of External Affairs, Government of India, issued a Joint Communiqué in New Delhi on February 6, 1960.

The following is the text of the Communiqué

Marshal K. E. Voroshilov, Chairman of the presidium of the Supreme Soviet, U. S. S. R., Mr. F. R. Kozlov, First Vice-Chairman of the council of Ministers of the U. S. S. R., Mme. Furtseva, Deputy of the Supreme Soviet, U. S. S. R., were in India from January 20 to February 6, 1960, on a goodwill visit at the invitation of Dr. Rajendra Prasad, President of the Republic of India, and the Government of India. They were accompanied by Mr. V. V. Kuznetsov, First Deputy Minister of Foreign Affairs, U. S. S. R., Mr. N. N. Danilov, Deputy Minister of Culture, U. S. S. R., Mr. A. I. Imarnov, Minister of Culture of the Tadzhik S. S. R., Mr. V. I. Likhachov, Head of the South East Asia Division, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, U. S. S. R., Mr. V. I. Avilov, Deputy Chief of the Press Department of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, U. S. S. R., and Col. V. Ya. Chekalov.

During their travels in India, Marshal Voroshilov, Mr. Kozlov and Mme. Furtseva were accompanied by Mr. Benedictov, Ambassador of the U. S. S. R. in India, Shri K. D. Malaviya, Minister of Mines and Fuel, and Shri K. P. S. Menon, the Indian Ambassador in the U. S. S. R.

The Soviet representatives were given a warm reception by the Indian public in Delhi and in all other places which they visited. These popular demonstrations of welcome and goodwill were an expression of the regard and friendliness of the Indian people towards the people of the Soviet Union, and evoked a cordial and generous response from the Soviet visitors. The Soviet guests expressed deep thankfulness and appreciation to the Government of India and the Indian People for a warm and hearty welcome. From their side they were happy to have had the occasion to convey personally to the people and the Government of India the feelings of sincere brotherly friendship which the people and the Government of the Soviet Union have towards them.

In Delhi, Marshal K. E. Voroshilov, Mr. F. R. Kozlov, Mine. Yo. A. Furtseva and others accompanying them were present at the celebrations On the occasion of the Republic Day of India. Thereafter they made a rapid tour of the country, collectively or in groups. Besides the large cities of Calcutta, Bombay, Madras and Bangalore, their journey took them to many places of interest, including, in particular, Suratgarh, where a large mechanized State farm had been established with the aid of machinery and quipment given as a gift by the U.S.S.R.; Bhilai, where a steel plant Built with Soviet cooperation has gone into production; and Cambay, where exploration for oil is going on with Soviet technical assistance with progressively encouraging prospects. In the course of their tour, they also visited community centres and a number of industrial and other developmental, Projects. They thus had an opportunity of seeing for themselves the results of the great effort that India is making, in all fields of economic and social activity, to develop her national economy and raise the standard of living of her people as rapidly as possible.

Marsahl Voroshilov, Mr. Kozlov and Mme.

Furtseva met and had talks in a friendly, cordial atmosphere with Dr. Rajendra Prasad, President of India, Shri Jawaharlal Nehru, Prime Minister, and other members of the Government of India. Their talks with the Prime Minister covered matters of mutual interest to the two countries, including major aspects of the current international situation, and touched also on India's development plans, present as well as prospective.

Both sides expressed their gratification at the development of the relations between India and the Soviet Union in a spirit of goodwill and friendship as a result of their common adherence to the principles of peaceful coexistence and active pursuit of peace. These provide an expanding basis of co-operation between the two countries in the international field in the interest of world peace. The two countries, moreover, are united in their conviction that disputes between nations must be solved by peaceful means alone, and not by recourse to arms.

Both sides noted with satisfaction the recent trend towards a lessening of international tension, and welcomed the agreement reached on the holding of a "summit meeting" in May next. This meeting and the exchanges of visits by the leaders of the Big Powers have raised high expectations throughout the world. The Indian and the Soviet sides expressed their earnest hope that the forthcoming meeting would result in substantial progress in the solution of the problems facing the world today and thus pave the way for the achieve-

ment of further success by co-operative international effort.

Both sides stressed the importance of disarmament as an essential pre-requisite to a permanent and lasting peace and to the banishment of the fear of war. Through disarmament also lay the path to world prosperity, for the technical skills, the productive effort and the human and material resources released from the manufacture of armaments, could be diverted to peaceful purposes, and more specially to the development of countries which have lagged behind in the race towards material progress. Though discussions had been going on for years, little had been accomplished by way of advance towards an international agreement on disarmament, but the prospects seemed

more favourable at the present time than ever before. Reference was made in this context to the proposal recently put forward by Mr. N. S. Khrushchev for total and universal disarmament, and the Prime Minister of India acclaimed the proposal as a courageous and far-sighted one which demanded the close attention of all other countries. The Government of India welcome the latest substantial reduction of the armed forces of the Soviet Union as an important step towards peace.

Both sides stand for the prohibition of thermo-nuclear weapons and other means of mass destruction. Similarly, they are in favour of a very early agreement between the Great Powers possessing nuclear weapons for an immediate cessation of the tests of these weapons with effective international control, and call upon these and other powers to abstain voluntarily from carrying out such tests. In this connection, satisfaction was expressed from the Soviet side that Government of India showed commendable initiative in presenting the question of the cessation of nuclear tests at the 14th session of the U. N. General Assembly.

A review was made of the economic and cultural relations between the two countries. The trade agreement concluded last year for a five-year period, resulting in increased commercial exchanges between the two countries, the projects for the establishment of certain new industries through mutual collaboration, and the fresh credit recently offered by the Soviet Union of 1500 million roubles had helped to strengthen the economic relations between India and the Soviet Union. A similar gratifying improvement was also to be found in the sphere of cultural relations. In order however, further to develop these relations, in accordance with planned and defined ends, a cultural and scientific agreement is being concluded between the two countries.

Marshal K. E. Voroshilov, the Chairman of the Supreme Soviet, U. S. S. R., and Shri Jawaharlal Nehru, the Prime Minister of India, expressed their pleasure at having been able to meet again after the lapse of almost five years. Marshal Voroshilov, Mr. Kozlov and Mme. Furtseva and Shri Jawaharlal Nehru had an opportunity to exchange their points of view and to declare the common determination of their two countries to strive ceaselessly for world peace and

for better understanding between nations. The visit of Marshal Voroshilov, Mr. Kozlov and Mme. Furtseva and those accompanying them to India, their talks with the members of the Government of India and others, were fruitful and will further promote the understanding and friendship between India and the Soviet Union. Both sides are confident that the friendly relations existing between India and the Soviet Union will continue to strengthen and develop for the benefit of the peoples of both countries and in the interests of peace throughout the world.

USA INDIA RUSSIA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC

Date : Jan 01, 1960

Volume No

1995

YUGOSLAVU

Trade Agreement Signed

A new trade and payments agreement between India and Yugoslavia was signed in New Delhi on January 21, 1960. The Agreement will remain in force for a period of three years with effect from January 1, 1960. The Trade Agreement between the two countries, which had been concluded on March 31, 1956, had expired on December 31, 1959.

The agreement was signed by Mr. Milos Lalovic, Minister Plenipotentiary in the State Secretariat for Foreign Affairs in Yugoslavia (Leader of the Yugoslav Trade Delegation) and Shri K.B. Lall, Additional Secretary, Ministry of Commerce and Industry.

Under the agreement, payments for all commercial and non-commercial transactions between the two countries will be made in non-convertible Indian rupees and trade will be balanced on a

higher level.

Besides traditional goods, India will export to Yugoslavia items like textiles, woollen fabrics, leather manufactures, plastic goods, sports goods, linoleum, textile machinery and accessories, spectacle frames, fountain pens and light engineering goods including sewing machines.

Exports from Yugoslavia to India will mainly consist of essential machinery items like textile machinery and automatic looms, complete installations and plant, heavy chemicals, electric instruments, meters, transformers and motors, cine projectors, underground power and telephone cables, etc.

A credit agreement was also signed on January 21, 1960 under which the Government of Yugoslavia would make available to the Government of India a credit amount equivalent to U.S.\$ 40 million for purchases of capital goods, heavy electrical and other equipment and ships for the projects included in the Third Five Year Plan. The repayment of this credit will be effected through exports of Indian commodities.

The two Governments have also agreed to promote long-term possibilities of exchange of goods and collaboration between the industrial organisations of the countries.

Another agreement has also been signed for facilitating scientific and technical co-operation between the two countries.

25

INDIA YUGOSLAVIA USA RUSSIA

Date : Jan 01, 1960

February

Volume No

1995

Content

Foreign Affairs Record 1960
Volume VI FEBRUARY

No. 2

CONTENTS

PAGE

COMMONWEALTH

Shrimati Lakshmi Menon's Reply in Lok Sabha 27

FINLAND

Finnish Prime Minister's Visit 29

Dr. Sukselainen's Reply 30

FOREIGN AND HOME AFFAIRS

President's Address to Parliament 32

FRANCE

Prime Minister's Statement in Lok Sabha on Radio-active
Fall-out 37

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

Prime Minister's Statement in Lok Sabha 39

Prime Minister's Statement in Rajya Sabha 48

PAKISTAN

Prime Minister's statement in Lok Sabha on Indo-West
Pakistan Border Conference 51

PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA

Prime Minister's Statement in Lok Sabha on India-China
Relations 52

Prime Minister's Statement on alleged Chinese occupation of
Chantham Salt Mines in Ladakh 53

Prime Minister's Statement in Lok Sabha on acceptance of his
invitation by Chinese Premier 53

| | |
|--|----|
| UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS | |
| Prime Minister, Khrushchevs Visit | 55 |
| Mr. Khrushchev's Reply | 55 |
| Mr. Khrushchev's Address to Parliament | 56 |
| Dr. Radhakrishnan's Welcome Speech | 61 |
| Vote of Thanks by Shri Ananthasayanam Ayyangar | 62 |
| Joint Communique | 64 |
| Cultural Agreement Signed | 65 |
| Loan Agreement Signed | 66 |

MINISTRY OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS : EXTERNAL PUBLICITY DIVISION
GOVERNMENT OF INDIA

FINLAND UNITED KINGDOM FRANCE PAKISTAN CHINA INDIA USA

Date : Feb 01, 1960

Volume No

1995

COMMONWEALTH

Shrimati Lakshmi Menon's Reply in Lok Sabha

Replying to the discussion in the Lok Sabha on February 26, 1960 on the resolution moved by an Hon. Member of the House that India should quit the Commonwealth of Nations, the Deputy Minister of External Affairs, Shrimati Lakshmi Menon said :

Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, I must first of all apologise to you and to the House for coming late and to the mover for not being able to understand all that he has said, because of the difficulty of his language and also because of the speed with which he spoke. However, if I have mis-

understood any of the points raised by him, I hope he will forgive me.

I am confident when I say that if the mover had any idea of the nature of commonwealth relations as defined either in the Balfour Commission report of 1926 or in the latter legislation, the Statute of Westminster of 1931, I am sure he would not have sponsored such a resolution. If he had even a vague idea of the part played by India and the Indian delegation in the United Nations in order to help the deliberations and the freedom of the subject people, I am sure he would have been the first to oppose such a resolution. However, he has made a speech in which he said everything from cabbages to kings. For instance, first, he accused the Government of India of not influencing the policies of the Commonwealth, meaning thereby only the United Kingdom of course. He had asked many questions. He asked "why did we not do something to induce Britain to quit Africa? Why did we not play a more constructive role, in the case of Cyprus?" Why has the prime Minister not done something to solve all these international problems about South Africa, Algeria, etc.? This is a strange understanding of the role that a country should play in its foreign relations. He expects India to influence world opinion in a more direct and emphatic way, much more the policies of the U. K. because we happen to be in the Commonwealth. I am sure the mover, who is well-informed, was saying these things only as points in a debate and not because that he believes that such a thing could be done by any country in the world.

I come to some very definite issue raised by the various speakers. One Member from the opposition said that we are not able to advocate the cause of dependent people because we are in the Commonwealth. Another said, "What is the point in being a member of the Commonwealth when there is nothing in common between the Union of South Africa and ourselves? That answers the question. Although there is nothing in common between the Union of South Africa and ourselves, although there is complete disagreement between U. K. and us on various issues, we can still be members of the same organisation, without losing our independence and our freedom of expression of opinion.

Many of the points raised have/ been replied by Members on our side of the House. So it will be mere repetition if I go over the same ground again. For instance, the question of the India Office Library was raised. Shri Jagannatha Rao replied to it. Because of the disagreement between India and Pakistan regarding the share of the Library, a settlement is not possible. Unless this is done, it will be difficult for any major settlement to be made.

It was asked, why is it that U.K. takes joy in seeing us in our troubles ? U.K. has not done something to solve the Goa problem and so on. Sir, as a Government and as a people, we in India do not expect other people to solve our problems. During the last 12 years, we have shown enough initiative and understanding of our problems as not to seek the help of other countries to come to our aid. We have these problems and we have got also a procedure and a policy with regard to these problems. But I can understand the impatience of the opposition Members. because the opposition should be impatient. Otherwise, they will not be able to justify themselves. They must criticise the policies of the Government, not because those policies need or deserve any criticism, but because they feel one of the ways of undermining the prestige of the Government is to put in spokes into the wheel of our policy, so that we may stand condemned. If they have any human feeling or political sense, they would not have brought a resolution like this that we should quit the Commonwealth. Members have been quoting speeches made by the Prime Minister in defence of our staying in the Commonwealth. I would ask, why should we waste the precious time of the House trying to go back to things on which there has been a decision, decision not only by the Government but by the whole country. After all, when we went to the electorate last time in 1957, why did the people vote the Congress Party to power in such large numbers? It is because the electorate approved of the policies of the Government.

27

One of the policies of the Government was that we should stay in the Commonwealth.

Then the very people who oppose our membership in the Commonwealth say "Let us have a wider Commonwealth". They ask: why should it, be confined only to people who are now

members of the Commonwealth, or people who have been the former colonies and have now come to freedom ? Although they quote the Prime Minister, although they quote many other people, they fail to understand that the membership of the Commonwealth is not open to everybody. It is open only to countries or people who share the same ideals of democracy and freedom. One can ask ; why is it that the socialist countries do not seek membership of the Commonwealth ? Because, they do not share those ideals. Why is it that those countries which, although they have been colonial countries in the past, although they have been subject to the rule of British colonialism, why is it that they still prefer to remain in the Commonwealth ? Just because they feel here is a system, a political system, in which the participating members need not surrender their freedom or their loyalties for something which is imposed on them by other countries.

Now, on the question of leaving the Commonwealth the country has taken the decision to continue because it felt that it was the best way of continuing its policies and propagating, if I may use that word, its principles regarding international relations. I was rather surprised our very esteemed colleague in the opposition benches, Slid Mukerjee, saying that we have Bhilai, thanks to the help given by the socialist countries. Now I would like to ask him: what is the reason for having the Canadian reactor in India and the Commonwealth help for developing atomic energy in this country ? Is it because a socialist country has, given us some help and in order to match that the Commonwealth countries have given help ? We should try to understand facts as they are, and not try to give such a twist in order to support a particular ideology or particular loyalty. There are many things that by our association in the Commonwealth has enabled us to do. Some of the members did mention about the large number of Indian students who are studying in the United Kingdom. There are many other things. For instance, to give a specific instance, because these things have been bandied about in this house, in 1953, for instance, the United Kingdom made available 60 million pounds of its capital subscription to the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development for helping the Commonwealth countries for six years. We have also received considerable assistance from Canada and other Commonwealth

countries.

Another Hon. Member said : the Commonwealth countries are not giving us enough assistance, therefore, let us quit. Does the Hon. Member who said that mean that we should join the United States of America, because we get large financial assistance from the United States of America ? Or, does the Hon. Member mean that whosoever give assistance, we should join them ? These are funny ideas and funny suggestions which will make even a cat laugh, because there is no logic in these arguments, there is no, if I may be permitted to say so, commonsense in these arguments. First of all you say : we should not belong to an Organisation. Then you say : join an association, because you get financial assistance or quit an association because you do not get financial assistance. These are not arguments.

The reasons for our being in the Commonwealth are well-known. Because, in a changing world, it has become increasingly necessary for countries to be associated with one another, countries which share the same ideals, which have the same goals and same policies, to be associated in the same Organisation so that these ideals may be fulfilled for the common good of the member nations concerned.

Then a question was asked why the Prime Minister of England presides over these meetings and why cannot somebody else preside over the meetings. I suppose if the members have got some ideas on the subject, they might give vent to it. Most likely, in the years to come these policies and these procedures might change.

As was Pointed out, the Commonwealth is no longer a British Commonwealth. Increasingly when these dependent peoples become free, even the colour of the Commonwealth changes. It is no longer a white commonwealth. It is increasingly getting darker and darker, which means that the majority of the members of the Commonwealth, if not today, tomorrow will be more than the countries which were once dependent and which have become free and are members of the Commonwealth. It is for them to influence the policies of the Commonwealth countries so that they may be in conformity with the ideals of the United Nations Charter. After all, as was pointed out, these are intangible things. As for in-stance,

it was pointed out that when the British Premier visited India, he was completely influenced by seeing what has taken place and by meeting people here. It is not something that you can pinpoint.

28

So, this is the influence. Generally there has been a softening of the attitude and better understanding of our problems as well as the problems of other countries which he visited. These are the intangible results of such contacts. If the Hon. Members want decisions serialised and published and strict adherence to them, I think they have to seek them elsewhere and not in the Commonwealth.

Some of the arguments were answered by the people who raised them. For instance, Shri Mukerjee said that there is a lot of export of profits. Then he himself said that naturally there will be greater export of profits to Commonwealth countries because the investment of Commonwealth countries is much more than other countries. Something was said about the trade policy. If the House is interested, I might tell you, Sir, that two-fifths of the total trade of the world is the Commonwealth trade and out of that India had by way of imports 34 per cent in 1957 and 33 per cent in 1958 and by way of exports 47 per cent in 1957 and 51.76 per cent in 1958. no figure for January to October 1959 is 46 per cent. That means that we have even started exporting manufactured goods to the United Kingdom and other Commonwealth countries.

One thing more I want to say before I sit down. That is about the European Common Market. Any stick is good enough to beat the Government on the question of Commonwealth. The European Common Market is an Organisation not of the Commonwealth countries but, it is an Organisation of the European countries for, certain definite trade purposes. I really do not know how that can be brought to accuse the Government of our remaining in the Commonwealth.

These are some of the things that I wanted to say. For the rest I would like the Hon. House to note that there is nothing whatever which prevents us from quitting the Commonwealth. No compulsion is put on us as it is done in other

countries. I have had the opportunity of seeing how the socialist countries work as a block in the United Nations.

There is a question like apartheid in which a Commonwealth country is involved. We were asked as to why India does not leave the House when the question is discussed. When the apartheid question is discussed, India has not got to leave the House because India stands by the policies of the United Nations. It is the South African delegate who leaves the Assembly because he feels ashamed of what his country is doing and not because being member of the Commonwealth. Therefore, there is nothing that is compelling us to stay in the Commonwealth and nothing has compelled us so as to influence our policies by being in the Commonwealth. We can take an independent line and we have taken an independent line on all occasions, whether it is the case of the Suez or apartheid or Algeria or anything. We have taken an independent line. I do hope the Hon. Mover of the Resolution will withdraw his Resolution so that he may not feel humiliation of defeat by an overwhelming majority.

USA INDIA CYPRUS ALGERIA SOUTH AFRICA PAKISTAN UNITED KINGDOM CANADA RUSSIA

Date : Feb 01, 1960

Volume No

1995

FINLAND

Finnish Prime Minister's Visit

At the invitation of the Government of India, His Excellency Dr. V. J. Sukselainen, Prime Minister of Finland, paid a visit to India in February, 1960. On February 14, Prime Minister Nehru held a banquet in honour of the Finnish Prime Minister at Rashtrapati Bhawan.

Speaking on the occasion, Shri Nehru said:
Mr. Prime Minister, Your Excellencies, Ladies

and Gentlemen, in recent weeks we have had the privilege of welcoming here the Heads of the Governments of two great and powerful States, great in extent, great in power, great in many things. Today, we are welcoming the prime Minister of a country great in quality. It is not very small in size as some people imagine. It is quite a biggish country but its population is, I believe, about one per cent of India's population. But that country with that relatively small population has a record which certainly we, if I may say so, envy in many ways. It is a country which has faced all kinds of difficulties and trials and faced them with courage and determination and made good, if I may say so. It is a country with a very high standard of security and social welfare. It is a country with a high standard of physical culture, athletics, games and in the realm of literature also.

29

So I said that we are welcoming a country where the people are of high quality and that surely is more important than numbers which we possess in abundant measure. So there are many things in Finland and indeed in the other countries of Scandinavia which have appealed to us greatly, their far-reaching measures of social security and welfare, their democratic quality and freedom and their institutions; and so far as Finland is concerned there is a particular link or kinship if you like which has drawn us to them and that is in the realm of international affairs and foreign policy we have thought and acted more or less alike and in the same plane. We believe in trying to be friendly with all countries and not in joining any military alliances, that is, the policy of non-alignment and at the same time of friendship. That also has necessarily brought us nearer to one another.

I remember well when nearly three years ago I visited this delightful country and had a very warm welcome from the Government and from you, Sir, Mr. Prime Minister and from the people. And now that you have come here this long distance we all are very happy both because you have come and because you represent this country which we admire so much. My only sorrow is you did not bring Madam with you whom we would have liked very much to welcome here.

I have said there is an element of kinship in many things, our thinking, our ideas, our actions,

even though obviously we differ greatly, differ in geography, in climate. You have come here from the depth of winter in Finland, where you have long dark days and darker nights, suddenly to the full warmth of the Indian sun. The brightness and the warmth and the difference must be very considerable. I hope this change will be pleasant and not too much of a burden.

We are passing through in these days all over the world all kinds of critical situations and at the same time the air is full of certain hopes for a better outcome of our present difficulties. India and perhaps, if I may say so, with all respect Finland also, cannot play a big game in world affairs, but I think every country can help in what we consider the right forces or steps towards peace, towards friendly relations and towards an ending of this cold war atmosphere which has been so harmful to the world. And so at this period when there is a strong element of hope I hope that good will come out of the coming talks between some great powers; some good which will lead to further lessening of tension and further co-operation and less of fear and apprehension. We can send our best wishes to them for this outcome and in our own way wherever the opportunity comes to us help in bringing about that process.

So, Mr. Prime Minister, I should like to offer you on behalf of my Government and people and on my own personal behalf a warm welcome to you to this country and when you go back I hope you will convey our friendly greetings and good wishes to your people and Government. I ask You Excellencies, Ladies and Gentlemen, to drink to the good health of the Prime Minister of Finland.

FINLAND INDIA UNITED KINGDOM USA PERU

Date : Feb 01, 1960

Volume No

1995

FINLAND

Replying to Prime Minister Nehru, Dr. Sukselainen said

I should like to take this opportunity to express to the Government of India and to you personally, Mr. Prime Minister, my heartfelt gratitude for the invitation to visit your country which you so very kindly have extended to my wife and myself. I regard this invitation as a great honour not only to me personally but to my country as a whole. I wish to say once again how sorry we are that my wife could not accept your kind invitation. She herself was extremely disappointed, and she has asked me to convey to you Mr. Prime Minister, her gratitude for your invitation.

Mr. Prime Minister, in Finland we retain a happy memory of your visit to us in the summer of 1957. In spite of its briefness your stay was of great interest to my country. It brought India closer to the consciousness of the Finns and caused an increased interest in your country and its people. The geographical distance between our countries seemed to get smaller and lose its meaning.

We follow in Finland with increasing awareness the work which is being done in India in the economic and social fields to the benefit of your country and its people. I am particularly pleased to have now the opportunity to get personally acquainted with your country.

Although the distance in space between our two countries is great, they have got considerably closer to each other during the last few years. Your visit to Finland, Mr. Prime Minister, has

30

been of great importance in achieving this. Shortly before my departure for India we had the honour to receive in Finland your esteemed Vice-president, Dr. Radhakrishnan. His visit, by further developing friendly relations, formed an additional link in the chain which connects our countries closer with each other. We were sincerely

glad over his visit to us.

The trade between our countries is so far comparatively modest although it has shown a slight increase during the years 1956 to 1958. I sincerely hope that this rising tendency in our mutual trade will continue and that it will benefit both countries.

In the summer of 1957 an agreement was signed between Finland and India on technical co-operation. In compliance with the same agreement we had the pleasure of seeing 4 Indian foresters studying in Finland in different Research Institutes.

Although a country short of capital, Finland remains ready, within the bounds of her possibilities, to examine ways and means of further participating in this type of co-operation which is being carried out both within the framework of United Nations and on a bilateral basis and which has brought with it such beneficial and encouraging experiences.

Both your visit to Finland as well as of your Vice-President as well as the exchange of delegations and the increase in trade between our countries are to me a manifest and most satisfying indication of the continued development of friendly relations between our countries and our peoples. I hope that by my visit to your great country I shall be able to further this development.

I have so far only touched on certain bilateral relations between our countries. These, however, are not the only ones connecting us. Our two Countries often have the same kind of approach to international problems. We both strive towards the Achievement of confidence between the nations of the world; we both try to avoid anything that might cause or promote conflicts and disputes between nations. We wish to work for that which dispels conflicts and misunderstanding.

We have on many occasions found that Finland and India have adopted the same attitude towards important questions of international collaboration, both on the basis of their own standpoint and conviction. At the General Assembly of the United Nations we have both taken the same position on many important issues, among them the questions on the prohibition of nuclear weapons and on disarmament.

In our attitude towards different international questions we can thus find many converging points. It seems to me a source of hope and confidence that so distant and different countries as Finland and India have reached the same conclusions showing spiritual similarity.

The achievement of international confidence after so many years of distrust is no easy task. Distrust and apprehension arise suddenly, like a flash, but much painstaking work is needed to disperse them. Trust between nations grows only slowly and gradually, step by step. We Finns know this from our own history. Mutual confidence is an essentially important factor in building a foundation for friendly relations between nations.

This object-the return of trust between nations-is also a fundamental condition in solving a problem which at the present time all peoples and responsible politicians grapple with; I mean the problem of disarmament. The development of peaceful relations between nations depends largely on the progress made in the field of disarmament. Every step, however small, towards complete disarmament must be regarded as a valuable contribution towards that permanent state of peace between nations which mankind has long yearned for. I feel convinced that the people of both Finland and India, sharing the feelings of other nations, eagerly hope that the spirit of conciliation and understanding at present prevailing between the great powers, might overcome any adversity it may encounter, remove the distrust and fear which still prevails and bring a feeling of security to the peoples of the world.

I should finally like to thank the Government of India for their kindness in asking me to come to this country and see for myself. It was a great experience to me to go this afternoon to a village. I have always known that I have a very short neck and today I noticed that my neck was much shorter because of the kindness and friendliness of the villagers. When the twentieth laurel was put round my neck, my neck did not show at all. I rejoiced with these nice and kind people. I shall always remember this visit. I wish to raise my glass to the mutual collaboration between India and Finland and particularly to the foremost realizer, Prime Minister Nehru.

Date : Feb 01, 1960

Volume No

1995

FOREIGN AND HOME AFFAIRS

President's Address to Parliament

The President, Dr. Rajendra Prasad, delivered an address to Indian Parliament. on February 8, 1960.

The following is the full text of his address:

Members of Parliament,

Once again, it is my privilege to welcome you to your labours in a new session of Parliament.

In the year we leave behind, my Government and our people had been engaged, more than ever before in their endeavours in nation-building. The needs and achievements in economic and social advance are understood by our people, in town and village in increasing measure, as basic and vital to the improvement of their conditions and standards of living and as important to their daily lives.

The incursions into parts of the territory of the Union of India, across our traditional and well understood borders, by elements of Chinese forces have, however, deeply distressed our people and evoked legitimate and widespread resentment. They impose a greater strain on our resources and our nation-building endeavours. We regret and deplore these developments on our border. They have resulted from the disregard by China of the application of the principles, which it had been mutually agreed between us, should govern our relations. My Government have taken prompt and calculated measures, both defensive and diplomatic, to meet the threat to

our sovereignty.

My Government I particularly deplore the unilateral Use of force by our neighbour on our common frontier, where, no military units of the Union were functioning. This is a breach of faith; but we may not lose faith in the principles which we regard as basic in the relations between nations.

Members of Parliament : You have been kept informed by the release, from time to time of the correspondence between my Prime Minister and the Prime Minister of China, of the respective positions of our two countries in this matter. My Government have made it clear, beyond doubt, that they seek a peaceful approach in the settlement of outstanding matters. They have also stated and reiterated, equally clearly, that they will not accept the course, or the results of unilateral action or decisions, taken by China. My Government, therefore, pursues a policy both of a peaceful approach, by negotiation under appropriate conditions, and of being determined and ready to defend our country.

This and the weight of world public opinion which is adverse to her action should, we hope, persuade China sooner than later to come to agreements in regard to our common frontiers which for long have been well established by treaties, custom and usage. Thus and thus alone, can friendly relations with our great neighbour which my Government and our people desire, become a reality and endure for our common good. The actions taken and the policy pursued by my Government, it may be hoped, will be adequate to convince China of both our policy and our determination.

Members of Parliament: I have referred at some length to the situation that has developed on our border and to the consequences and problems thereof. I need hardly say that in doing so I have reiterated the sentiments of our entire country and our people and their determination to defend our territory. Defence, however, is effective only with national unity and strength. Our economic and industrial advance, the speeding of our production and our plans to greater endeavour and larger and speedier results which will enable the country to make available to itself the means and the resources for modern defense

and, at the same time, help the nation to become strong and disciplined, can alone render her secure.

Distressing as these Sino-Indian border developments have been, we may not, and we do not, relax our efforts for the planned development of our economy and our country. In point of fact, because of this situation, my Government are taking steps, to speed, up further, organise and streamline our economic development.

The work on the preparation of the frame and the outline of the Third Five Year Plan with its longer perspective and, higher targets is making good progress. The objective of the Third Five Year Plan is to seek almost to double the national income, taking 1950-51 as the basic level. and to pay much greater attention to agricultural production and to our food requirements, to heavy machine building and to the development of basic resources

32

such as steel, fuel and power. Small-scale and rural industries, the speedier and healthy development of our rural economy, and the healthy relationship between rural areas and industrial centres are among the main aims, of the Plan.

The Third Five Year Plan represents a critical period in our national development. It aims at making our economy more self-reliant and capable of increasing and generating resources for its further and larger development. It calls for sustained efforts and endurance of our people. Thus, our Third Plan will keep well in view, both its own development aspects as well as the requirements and the perspective of the Fourth Plan to follow. While we are grateful for external aid and loans, as necessary in the present stage of our development, we should, in our own interests, in consideration of those who have been our good and generous friends, and the needs of the under-developed areas of the world, strive to shed our dependence.

The country's foreign exchange position while it shows no deterioration, remains more or less unchanged. My Government, therefore, pursue a policy to create a more favourable balance of trade and to earn more foreign

exchange by strict control over imports and efforts to increase exports. It will be the endeavour of my Government to conserve our foreign resources and add to the volume of our invisible exports in which there still exist unutilised a vast and increasing field.

Our industrial production shows a pronounced upward trend, and for the first ten months of the year, an increase of over ten points has been recorded from 138 to 149.3, over the last year's figures. This is an all-round increase to which all industries have contributed, but special mention may be made of the rise in the output of metallurgical industries. The three steel plants at Rourkela, Bhilai and Durgapur have gone into production in 1959. There has been a fifty per cent increase in the production of pig iron and a somewhat lower, though considerable, increase in the output of steel.

The iron and steel output would help to advance the Heavy Machine, building projects. My Government have already sanctioned a number of machine building and other projects for the Third Five, Year Plan. These include the doubling of the Heavy Machinery Project at Ranchi and the steel production at Bhilai, the expansion of the Heavy. Electrical Project at Bhopal, a number of new projects for power fertiliser plants and heavy machine tools.

The Chemical Industry has also witnessed appreciable advance. An Intermediates plant to provide the basic raw materials for the manufacture of dye stuffs, drugs explosives and plastics is being established.

The endeavours of our Railway Organisation to attain self-sufficiency in regard to essential equipment have enabled it not only to meet all the requirements of steam locomotives, coaches, wagons, signalling and lighting equipment, but also to yield a surplus for export.

Mining activities in the public. sector have increased considerably. The Geological Survey of India has been expanded to undertake search and intensive investigation in virgin areas in minerals essential to our expanding economy.

A Statutory Oil and Natural Gas Commission has been established. The search for and dis-

covery of oil in different parts of the country continues. Sixty oil wells have been drilled in Nahorkatiya for the production of crude oil required for the two State-owned Refineries in Assam. and Bihar and the construction of the Refinery in Assam is in progress.

My Government have entered into an agreement with the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics for the supply of equipment for the construction of the Refinery at Barauni in Bihar.

My Government are alive to the requirement of scientists, technicians and technologists for our expanding economy measures are being taken to step up progressively the output in these cadres and to provide increasingly better career opportunities and a higher status for the. old and new entrants, In our developing economy there are ever growing opportunities of service in the fields, which are so important to our planned development on modern lines.

Our Atomic Energy Organisation has recorded commendable progress. Increased production of isotopes, the fabrication of fuel elements, the Uranium Metal Plant at Trombay, the extraction of Plutonium from the used fuel elements and the mining of Uranium are among the achievements of this Organisation. The preliminary work for the setting up of the first Nuclear Power Station is well in hand. The Uranium which is sought to be mined in Bihar will supply sufficient raw material to feed the first Nuclear Power Station.

An additional tonnage, of one lakh gross,

33

was added to the Indian Merchant Fleet. A National Shipping Board and a statutory non lapsing Shipping Development Fund have been established. Indian shipping, which has suffered many handicaps in the pre-independence period will continue to receive all possible assistance in its modernisation and development. My Government is fully aware of the place of the Merchant Navy in our economy, in the conservation and earning of foreign exchange and in its auxiliary and reserve roles in the defence of our long sea coast.

The Code of discipline evolved in 1958 has improved the climate of industrial relations in the country and created more favourable conditions, for the maintenance of industrial peace and increase of efficiency. Compared to the previous year there has been an appreciable reduction in the loss of man days of work in 1959.

The Employees State Insurance Scheme has been extended to further areas and now covers about fourteen and a half lakhs of factory workers, while medical care under the Scheme has been extended to about twelve lakhs of members of the workers' families.

In the field of national education, the teaching of science subjects, expansion of girls' education and the training of women teachers have made good progress and are gathering momentum. All eligible college students belonging to scheduled castes and scheduled tribes are receiving stipends.

Advance in the production of food is vital to the sustenance, expansion and strength of our economy. Foodgrains production attained a record level of 73.5 million tons and cash crops also recorded satisfactory yields resulting in the overall increase in the Index of Agricultural Production to 131.0, an increase of 14.3 per cent over the previous record in 1957-58. We cannot however, feel satisfied, much less complacent, about the food production in our country. Each year, we are obliged to import considerable quantities of foodgrains for consumption and for reserve stocks, causing great stress on our slender foreign exchange resources and rendering our economy far from self-reliant. Our production per acre falls short of the yields in many of the countries of Asia, Europe or America. My Government are giving greater attention to the increased production of fertilisers and to the supply of good seeds. It is, however, by better cultivation, avoidance of waste through pests, better animal husbandry, the advance of co-operation both in production and in marketing and by the determination of the people to be self-reliant, that individual and national prosperity can be achieved.

To enable greater participation in the conduct of affairs and the development of our economy by the people of the country as a whole

my Government have encouraged schemes of devolution of authority to statutory institutions of the people at the basic level of our great and growing democracy. This scheme of "Panchayati Raj" has already been inaugurated in Rajasthan and in Andhra Pradesh and is making progress in other States. To make the working of the "Panchayati Raj" efficient, a comprehensive programme of training non-officials of all categories has been undertaken.

Defence production has made satisfactory progress. Plans of expansion in this field, both of production and of capacity, are under consideration and will be progressively implemented.

My Government have taken steps to expand the National Cadet Corps in the coming year and to form units of nursing and auxiliary services for girls. The Territorial Army and the Lok Sabayak Sena will also be expanded in numbers, and certain changes introduced in regard to their training and reserve liabilities.

A number of measures for the improvement of the conditions of service in the various categories in the Armed Forces have been implemented.

The re-settlement of ex-servicemen and the utilisation of the reservoir of disciplined manpower that they provide are continually engaging the attention of my Government. Schemes of technical and vocational training and guidance and of self-help by co-operatives are promoted. Welfare and resettlement of ex-servicemen are integral to defence considerations and provide a necessary incentive and a legitimate measure of hope and security for those who serve the Armed Forces.

Members of Parliament are aware that in the proclamation issued in relation to the State of Kerala on the 31st of July, 1959, which was approved by resolutions passed by the Lok Sabha and the Rajya Sabha, it was provided that the general election for constituting a new legislative Assembly for that State shall be held as soon as possible. The general election accordingly held and polling took place in the entire State on February 1, the number of voters exercising their franchise being one of the highest recorded in any election. The

Production will be revoked and the normal constitutional machinery restored in the State shortly.

Parliament decided during the last session to extend the safeguards provided in the Constitution for the reservation of seats for members of the Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes in the Lok Sabha and the State Legislatures by a further period of ten years and the Constitution (Eighth Amendment) Act embodying this decision has received my assent. Government also propose to appoint a Commission as required under Article 339 of the Constitution to examine and report on the administration of the Scheduled Areas and the welfare of the Scheduled Tribes in the States.

Sixty-three Bills were passed by Parliament in 1959. Fifteen Bills are pending before you. My Government intend to introduce a number of legislative proposals both by way of Bills and amendments. Such proposals will include :-

The Atomic Energy Bill;
The Indian Telegraph (Amendment) Bill
The Agricultural Produce (Development and Warehousing) Corporation Bill ;
The Forward Contracts (Regulation) Amendment Bill ;
The Indian Patents and Designs Bill
The Employees' Provident Fund (Amendment) Bill ;
The Dock Workers (Regulation of Employment) Bill ;
The Plantation Labour (Amendment) Bill;
The Central Maternity Benefit Bill;
The Indian Sale of Goods (Amendment) Bill;
The Religious Trusts Bill;
The Two-Member Constituencies (Abolition) Bill ; and
The Payment of Wages (Amendment) Bill.

My Government also propose to introduce a bill for the reorganisation of the present Bombay State and to reconstitute it as two separate States.

My Government have already announced their decisions on the major recommendations of the Pay Commission. The other recommendations are under their active consideration. The

additional commitments on account of the pay, allowances and pensionary charges alone are estimated to be about thirty-one crores per annum, in respect of the Services directly covered by the Jagannadha Das Commission Enquiry.

A statement of the estimated Receipts and Expenditure of the Government of India for the financial year 1960-61 will be laid before you.

My Government note with gratification the relaxation in world tensions and the prospect of high level meetings of the Heads of Governments for the promotion of World Disarmament and Peace. The initiative of great statesmen, notably the President of the United States of America and the Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the Soviet Union, deserve the attention and appreciation of our country and people. My Government, while welcoming the continuance of the voluntary unilateral suspension of nuclear test explosions and the increasing endeavours of both the United States of America and the Soviet Union to solve this problem, reiterate their view that the testing of weapons of mass destruction should be abandoned.

We welcome these trends and the direct contacts between the leaders of the Great Powers and wish success to their efforts, which we feel assured are inspired with sincere desire to halt the armaments race and for world peace.

We also welcome wholeheartedly, in the midst of the awesome growth of armaments and the fear and the passions from which they spring and on which they rest, the newer development of the projection of the picture of a warless world, wherein nations will not only lay down their arms, but reject war as a method of settling disputes and devote their energies and resources to building a peaceful world.

Devoted as my Government and people are to world peace and co-operation, they are determined to adhere to a peaceful approach and the policy of Non-alignment, to both of which our country stands fully committed by history and outlook; faith and conduct, and by the overwhelming desires and convictions of our people. Parliament has expressly endorsed this policy on several occasions.

I have had the privilege and pleasure of visiting Cambodia, the Republic of Vietnam, the Democratic Republic of Vietnam, Laos and Ceylon, and to receive the generous welcome and joyous greetings of their Governments and peoples.

I was happy to welcome to our Capital the President of the United States of America, and later the President of the Soviet Union, who in their persons represent not only the greatness and power of their countries, but also the fervent desires of their peoples for world peace. We are

35

looking forward to the visit of the Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the Soviet Union, Mr. Khrushchev, another messenger of peace in the world today. The goodwill and moral support of this country will be behind the efforts of these two great countries, and those of others, in full measures in their search for Disarmament and Peace.

My Government were glad to welcome the Prime Ministers of Afghanistan, Australia, Cambodia, Ghana, Nepal and Sweden. We look forward to the visits of President Nasser of the United Arab Republic, His Majesty the King of Morocco and the Prime Minister of Finland.

The Vice-President visited the Philippines, Norway, Sweden, Denmark and Finland, receiving cordial welcome from the Governments and the people there.

My Prime Minister visited Afghanistan, Iran and Nepal, and was welcomed with an abundance of goodwill.

The exchange of visits of my Prime Minister and the Prime Minister of Nepal has further strengthened the bonds of affinity and friendship and proclaimed the desire and determination for co-operation in the interests of our two countries.

Our relations with Commonwealth countries and our participation at various Commonwealth gatherings have served to create greater understanding of our internal and external policies and, in an appreciable measure, served also to assist

our economic development.

I am happy to note that further agreements have been reached with Pakistan in regard to our boundary disputes. It is the hope of my Government that these agreements with Pakistan will lead to a successful delimitation of our boundaries along our frontiers with our neighbour with whom we have always desired to remain in friendly relations.

Progress has also been made in regard to the settlement of financial issues pending between India and Pakistan, and it is hoped that the long-standing canal waters dispute will be settled soon. I welcome these developments which bring promise of closer relations between our two countries.

The Government and the people of India were deeply grieved and shocked to learn of the assassination of the Prime Minister of Ceylon, the late S.W.R.D. Bandaranaike, on September 25, 1959. He was a great friend of India and visited us several times. Our heartfelt sympathies went out to the Government and people of Ceylon, as well as to Mrs. Bandaranaike and her children.

In the United Nations, our delegation reflected the deep feelings of our people in regard to the problem of the liberation of colonial countries and, more particularly, in regard to Algeria. In the sustained struggle of the Algerian people for their national independence.

We welcome the independence of the Cameroons, till recently under French administration. We look forward to the emergence to nationhood in the coming years of several other colonial areas in Africa.

The policy of apartheid, pursued by the Government of the Union of South Africa, inflicts untold suffering and indignity on the majority of the people who are subjects of that Government. These include large numbers of people of Indian origin. This policy constitutes a violation of Human Rights under the Charter of the United Nations, and it has again met with overwhelming disapproval by the United Nations in the last session of the General Assembly.

My Government have decided to exchange diplomatic representatives with Cuba, Venezuela and Colombia in South America and Guinea in Africa.

Members of Parliament : I have placed before you the main events and achievements and our concerns of the past year. I have also projected before you some of the great tasks and burdens that are in front of us. They must engage your dedicated attention. Your understanding and co-operation, in regard to problems of our economic planning, the defence of our country and our contribution to world peace, are required by our Government and people in increasing measure. Thus will Parliament fulfil its historic role in our Constitution.

We have celebrated this year the tenth anniversary of our young Republic. Our Constitution which we gave unto ourselves, wherein all power and authority are based upon and spring from the people, has endured and grown in strength. The policies and achievements of my Government and of our people have strengthened our democracy and continue to, import into it economic and social content in increasing measure.

36

We are fortunate in the historic background that our national struggle developed and the inspiration that the life and example of the Father Nation gave to us. In this eleventh year of our young Republic, we may look back as well as forward. with pride and confidence, though not with complacency. The tasks ahead of us are stupendous. They call for constant vigilance, greater determination and discipline and a sense of purpose both among our people and in our administration. This alone will make our democracy a reality in terms of the masses of our people.

Our vast resources and the qualities of our people have become engaged in the tremendous tasks of construction and progress that lie ahead of us, In these, the quality of our administration into which must be imported an ever-increasing sense of urgency, rationalisation of procedures, the emergence and development of greater confidence at all levels, and the avoidance of waste of manpower and time, must be an urgent

consideration.

It will continue to be the constant endeavour of my Government to initiate and further, efforts and plans to bridge the gaps between the time of formulation of policies and their implementation, to enable our people to participate at all levels in our economic and social developments, and for them to feel a sense of function and dignity which Independence has brought to us.

My Government seeks to uphold the dignity and independence of our land and people, to promote our unity and social well-being, and to build a democratic and socialist society in which progress is sought and attained by peaceful means and by consent.

Members of Parliament: I bid you to Your labours in this new session and wish you all success. I earnestly trust that wisdom and tolerance and a spirit of cooperative endeavour will guide you. May your labours bear fruit for the good of our country and people and the world whom we are all privileged to serve.

ITALY INDIA CHINA USA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC PERU CAMBODIA VIETNAM LAOS
AFGHANISTAN AUSTRALIA GHANA NEPAL SWEDEN FINLAND MOROCCO PHILIPPINES DENMARK
NORWAY IRAN PAKISTAN ALGERIA CAMEROON SOUTH AFRICA CUBA VENEZUELA COLOMBIA
GUINEA

Date : Feb 01, 1960

Volume No

1995

FRANCE

Prime Minister's Statement in Lok Sabha on Radio-Active Fall-out.

The Prime Minister, Shri Jawaharlal Nehru made the following Statement in the Lok Sabha on February 19, 1960 regarding the apprehended fear of radio-active fall-out over India from the French atomic explosion in the Sahara :

Sir, as Hon. Members of Parliament had expressed some anxiety about the consequences

of the testing of an atomic device by the French Government on February 13, 1960 at Reganne in the Sahara, I requested Dr. Homi Bhabha, Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, to send information about the possible fall-out in India. He has sent a note dealing with the fall-out in India from atomic tests during the last few years.

In regard to the recent French atomic test, he has pointed out that the radioactive cloud will probably take some days to pass over India. So far no increase in the radio-activity of the atmosphere from this test has been observed. If any such increase takes place within the next few days it will certainly be observed. In his opinion, it is not to be expected that the fall-out will be anywhere near the danger level.

The note from Dr. Bhabha runs as follows:-
The USSR, the USA and Britain have been testing nuclear weapons for the last few years. The United States conducted their tests in Bikini, Marshal Islands, Johnston Islands and Nevada; the Soviet Union conducted their tests in Siberia, Southern USSR and the Arctic regions; Britain conducted their tests in Christmas Islands, Maralinga Islands, Monte Bello and Woomera in Australia. It is estimated that about 50 Hydrogen bombs and about 200 atomic bombs have been exploded so far.

In order to keep a close watch on the radio-active contamination of air, water, foodstuffs and soil, the Atomic Energy Commission of India has set up 30 sampling stations in India from which milk samples are collected for analysis of radio-active fission products, such as cesium 437 and strontium-90 resulting from the nuclear tests.

In addition, 7 permanent monitoring stations have been set up in Srinagar, Delhi, Calcutta, Nagpur, Bombay, Bangalore and Ootacamund to cover the

On receiving a request from the Government of Sikkim, a permanent monitoring station has been set up at Gangtok, Sikkim, recently. The dust collected from the air is continuously being sent from these stations to Trombay for analysis. In addition, rainwater samples from these stations are also being received regularly at Trombay for measurement of the radio-active content. With this network of monitoring stations, the Atomic Energy Commission is able to keep a very close watch on the levels of radio-active contamination caused by nuclear weapon tests. The measurements so far made by us have definitely proved that the contamination of the air, water, foodstuffs and vegetation is increasing gradually comparing to the normal background levels that should exist in these materials. The activity level of strontium-90 in human child bone is about 1 micro microcurie/gram of calcium, whereas the maximum permissible level according to the International Commission on Radiological Protection is about 10 micro microcurie/gram of calcium. The strontium level in milk has gone up to as much as 6 micro microcuries/gram of calcium, whereas the maximum permissible level is considered to be about 50 micro-microcuries/gram. In air, the maximum activity observed so far is about 9 micro microcuries/cubic meter, whereas the maximum permissible level is 100 micro microcuries/cubic meter.

It can be concluded from the data Collected so far that the levels of radio activity in various materials is on the increase, but that these levels are still much below the maximum permissible levels considered to be harmless to the population.

The french atomic device which was tested on February 13, 1960, at 11-30 a.m. (Indian Standard Time) at Reganne, Sahara, is supposed to have an explosive power equivalent to 20,000 tons of TNT. The radio-active cloud from this test

could rise to a maximum height of 50,000 to 60,000 feet in the troposphere. It has been reported that this cloud is moving around the globe with the general circulation of the atmosphere. It should take three to four days for the cloud to pass over India. So far, we have not observed any increase in the radio-activity of the atmosphere from this test, but if any takes place within the next few days, it will certainly be observed.

The French testing site is not particularly near India compared with the Soviet testing sites in Central Asia. However, the French testing site in the Sahara is in the Indian latitude range, and it is not unlikely that the radio-active cloud will pass over India.

If the cloud passes over India along its circuit around the globe we may expect a small increase in radio-activity for a few days. However, the magnitude of this activity is not expected to be of any great significance in comparison with the radio-active fall-out that we are still receiving from past tests. The fall-out from the past tests is due to the storage of radio-activity from the hydrogen bomb tests in the stratosphere. This comes slowly to earth over a period of years. It is expected that radio-activity from the French atomic tests will come down to the ground within 40 or 50 days.

In case radio-active dust is washed down by rain to the ground, the levels of activity on the ground and in the atmosphere may increase considerably. Rain is one of the well-known meteorological agents for washing down radio-activity to the ground from the atmosphere. However, it may be presumed that the increase in radioactivity will not be of such a value as will be dangerous to the population. As soon as any anomalies are detected, the Prime Minister will be informed. There is absolutely no cause for alarm in India.

That is the end of his note.

The Indian Atomic Energy Establishment has been carrying out careful tests in India of air-borne fall-out and has been reporting them to the United Nations Scientific Committee on the effects of atomic radiation. Four such reports, which have been presented to the United Nations, have been placed in the library of Parliament for reference. Those are-

38

Measurement of cesium-137 in Indian and foreign milk;

Measurement on the ground deposition of fission products from nuclear test explosions ;

Air-borne fall-out measurements in India; and

Strontium-90 in milk and human bone in India.

FRANCE INDIA USA AUSTRALIA MALI CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC

Date : Feb 01, 1960

Volume No

1995

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

Prime Minister's Statement in Lok Sabha

Prime Minister Nehru made the following statement in the Lok Sabha on February 22, 1960 while replying to discussions on matters relating to foreign affairs : -

Mr. Speaker, Sir, this subject has been under debate in this House for a full week and a large number of Members have spoken on it, some in favour of the motion and some in opposition to it. There are, I believe, about 240 amendments tabled; and, in the course of discussion, a large number of subjects have been touched upon. But,

by and large, it may be said that this discussion has been almost a discussion on foreign affairs; and in regard to foreign affairs too, rather limited to our border issues with China, and even that has been further limited to the invitation I have issued to Premier Chou En-lai in this connection. Therefore, Sir, I think, perhaps, it would be better for me also to concentrate on a few of the important issues raised more important points raised—rather than perambulate over the whole field of these 240 amendments.

I do not deny that some of the other matters which have been mentioned in this House in the course of the debate are important from certain points of view; but, I cannot, within any limited space of time deal with these scores of matters. Now, therefore, I shall begin by dealing with this very important issue relating to foreign affairs relating to our border, relating to the intrusion of Chinese forces on our territory and recent steps which we have taken in regard to this matter.

The way this debate has been conducted, and some of the statements made in this debate, have raised other matters too in relation to this particular subject. That is to say, it has been said by Hon. Members—I only repeat—that there has been a change. Not only a change of reversal of policy has been advanced; but, rather it has been said that the Government, and particularly I suppose I as being the Foreign Minister, have been unfair to Parliament. and have not been quite honest, that we are dying down, we have surrendered, we have submitted to some kind of national humiliation. It has even been said that there is no instance in history like this and our sincerity has been doubted. That, of course, raises the matter on to a different level from the criticism of a certain policy. I hope to deal with that criticism, but I wish to point out, at the commencement, that if the Government is charged as it has been charged by some Hon. Members opposite, with submitting to anything that may be considered "national humiliation" or "surrender", then it is a matter of the highest importance for this House and this country to be clear about.

No Government which even remotely is responsible for anything that may be considered "national humiliation" is deserving of continuing as a Government. No Foreign Minister or Prime Minister who is even indirectly connected with

anything which means dishonour to India in any respect has any business to continue in his office. Therefore, it is a matter of very serious import what the view of this House and of the country is on this subject.

Now, may I add something which was not said in this House in this connection and which is reported in this morning's papers by the press? I do not wish, normally, to quote from the Press without verification, but as I have to speak on this subject now, and it is relevant, I am taking the liberty to refer to this matter. It is a report of a speech by one of the respected Members of this House, of the Opposition side, Acharya Kripalani, who, it is said that India had been "betrayed by, leaders of the present Government". Further, it is stated, he has said: "How can we do anything when our honour is in the hands of dishonourable people?".

Now, Sir, that is a clear charge, and if there is, as I said, even any remote justification for that Charge, then, it is not for me to stand up here and take the time of the House but to retire to my shell and leave it to others who ate more honourable to conduct the affairs of this country. I know

39

that our respected friend, Acharya Kripalani, sometimes allows his words to run away with him; sometimes he says things which he might perhaps regret later, and I do not know if this was one of his outbursts at the spur of the moment or a definite charge after thought. But even a thing like this said at the spur of the moment from a person in his position has implications of a far-reaching character, and no Government, nor can this House treat this matter as a light utterance said at the spur of the moment. Sir, it is no matter of joy to me to refer to this, coming from an old colleague, but the House, I hope, will appreciate that to be charged with dishonourable motives and to be charged to be parties to "national humiliation" is something that is very painful. Individuals apart, there are people in this House, many of them, who have spent a good part of their lives, in trying to uphold the honour and freedom of India, and if in the afternoon of their lives they are told that they have betrayed the honour of India and submitted to humiliation their country, which they sought to serve with such ability and

strength as they had, then the matter goes beyond parliamentary debate into some other field.

It will hardly be suitable or fitting for me to stand up before this House and claim its indulgence for a defence of my motives or honour. After, broadly, 50 years of being connected in some form or other with India's service, if that kind of charge can, be made, well, it is open to anyone to make it and it is open to anyone to believe it. I do not propose to say anything about it.

Now, Sir, it is said that I have been unfair to Parliament, that I did not say anything about this to the Rajya Sabha, I did not say anything about this invitation and this was not mentioned in the President's address. First of all, may I say, as the House well knows, that the President's address is a statement of policy of the Government? It should be remembered. It is the Government that is responsible for it, and it is not right or proper for our respected President's name to be brought in in debates like this. If the President's address has anything wrong in, it or objectionable in it, it is the Government to blame not the President, and it is open to Hon. Members to criticise or condemn Government because there is some such statement in it which they disapprove of. I am venturing to say that it should be realised because nobody has criticised the President, but the President's name is brought into the picture and, incidentally or accidentally, it becomes a subject of controversy-it is not right.

Secondly, Sir. I propose to give some dates, because it seemed to me that some people had in their mind that we have been juggling about with dates or with one occurrence following the other and trying to suppress the facts, sometime in the Rajya Sabha debate or in the President's Address. Now, apart from what I am going to say, I hope the House realises that it would be extraordinarily folly for me to say something and to say something else a week later or five days later. It is ridiculous. I could not consciously be guilty of it; of course, I might make a mistake or something. I could not, according to all the canons of propriety and diplomatic procedure, say something in this House or the other or refer to it in the President's Address, when that matter has not borne fruit by delivery of a letter to the person to whom it was addressed. I could not do it. It is highly improper. I tried my very best to get these procedures

through of sending a reply so that I should be in time to place these papers on the first day this House met, the Parliament met. Unfortunately, there were delays right through. A good part of the month of January we worked on the subject, and the result of our labours is embodied in the note that was presented to the Chinese Government earlier this month. Many people were involved in these labours. The month of January was a very heavy month for us. In the middle of the month, there was the Congress Session and other things happened and then came the Republic Day celebrations and in the course of these celebrations, eminent guests came here. There was Marshal Voroshilov; there was the Prime Minister of Nepal; there was, later of course, Mr. Khrushchev and then the Prime Minister of Finland. It was a very heavy month for us and I was very anxious to expedite this matter. It required a great deal of investigation-Dot to justify our claims to ourselves-but to state the facts in an organised way so as to bring conviction to any person who read them, and, we hope, even to the mind of the Chinese Government. The result of that was the note. That was considered. As Foreign Minister I had naturally to consider it on several occasions. Later, it was put up before the Foreign Affairs Committee of the Cabinet which considered it at length on several occasions. Having considered and finalised that note, the question arose about the answer I should give because the Chinese note contained a repetition of the invitation to Premier Chou En-lai for us to meet. We gave thought to it and we came to the conclusion not to refer to it as such in that note because it was thought, after considering the whole case from our point of view, that a separate Utter should be sent. Now all this was finalised-the note was finalised-round about 31st January and about the same time it was decided to have this letter sent. It was considered by the Foreign

Affairs Committee of the Cabinet. I do not exactly know the date but it is immaterial. Within those two or three days all the papers were ready together. Naturally, they were parts of the same process of consideration and decisions and I signed that letter on the 5th February. I was not going to sign the other paper because it was going to be signed by our Ambassador, prior to delivery to the Chinese Government. We can of course have

sent that note and letter by telegram but then we thought it better that the Ambassador should deliver it himself and therefore, the Ambassador had to take it from here. It was given to the Ambassador and he ultimately took it and the matter was finished so far as I was concerned on the 5th of February. The Ambassador took it- I am not quite sure; I think he went for a brief visit to Madras for a day or so and he came back and took it-on the 8th and he left Delhi on the 9th and delivered this letter on the 12th in Peking -the note and the letter. Therefore, the note is dated the date of delivery although in actual fact this was a single transaction. In fact, the note preceded in a sense the letter. If you read that letter itself, you will see that it refers to the note because it was going to accompany it. Now the letter is dated the 5th and the note the 12th because it was signed there but it emerged from here at the same time.

Some people imagine that this was some kind of a very deep diplomacy, good or bad, so as to Arrange the dates in such manner, before Mr. Khrushchev's visit or overlapping it or something like that. I confess that I am not so clever in these matters. I was anxious that this should be, as I said, finished before Parliament met and I might place all these papers before this House and the other. But the decision that it should not be sent by telegram but rather the Ambassador should himself take it inevitably involved a few days delay to reach there. This House met-on the 8th February. That very morning our Ambassador took it from us and we gave him a few days to reach and he delivered it. The moment we know he had delivered it the Prime Minister of China was not available and it was as a matter of fact delivered to the Foreign Minister because we did not wish to lose time-we placed it, on Monday next, before this House and the other.

I might mention another thing here. Mr. Khrushchev was coming here a little later ; I think he arrived on the 11th of this month and MY first talks with him were on the 12th. It had absolutely no relation to this matter. of delivery or writing ; it had been previously considered and settled. In the last few weeks we have had the privilege and honour of welcoming. very distinguished and very important leaders, world leaders-President Eisenhower, Mr. Khrushchev; Marshal Voroshilov, Prime Minister of our

neighbour country Nepal, and the Prime Minister of Finland, All kinds of speculations appear in the newspapers as to what I discussed with President Eisenhower or later, with Mr. Khrushchev. Now obviously, I cannot, in answer to questions here or elsewhere, give out the content of confidential talks ; it will be impossible for any talks to take place with other leaders if those talks were reported in this way, publicly. Nevertheless, I shall go some distance, to some extent, in telling House about the approach I made to these talks, not the content of the talks.

For instance, I had many hours talks with President Eisenhower and naturally we discussed a large number of questions beginning always with the world situation, the prospects of the summit meeting, disarmament, lessening or tension in the world and going on to individual areas of the world and discussing them. Fortunately for us, we have no problem with the United States to discuss ; we have no problems with the Soviet Union to discuss, no controversies or problems. So we discussed broad issues.

I was asked the moment President Eisenhower went away. Did you ask him help for the Five-Year Plan ? These matters are being discussed by our representatives with the representatives of other countries and of the United States. They are more or less public matters. But so far as I am concerned, I thought it highly improper that I should embarrass our distinguished guest by asking him to do this or that for us. That is not my way of approaching these questions. And although some people did not perhaps believe it-it is a fact that we discussed everything including our Five-Year Plans-I did not ask him precisely and definitely to come and help us. He knows exactly our needs. At that moment it was not the right thing for me to do. It is a minor matter because we have understood ; he understood me and I understood him. I do not normally, go about making demands, especially from distinguished guests who come here.

So also with Mr. Khrushchev. Our talks lasted-I do not know-for three or four hours or may be it was more than that : five hours altogether, and we discussed every subject within our ken. Again, we start all our talks always nowadays with the summit, what is going to happen there, with disarmament, the prospects of

disarmament for the reduction of world tension, plus, both with President Eisenhower and Mr. Khrushchev, the tremendous revolutionary

41

upheavals happening in Africa, a most important thing in the world today, and with other world questions with which we are not directly related but we are related because they affect the world.

People thought no doubt that I would talk at length with Mr. Khrushchev about our troubles with China and that I would appeal to him or beg of him or request him to come to our help or bring pressure on China. I am rather surprised that people should think so. At any rate, that is not my idea of diplomacy or of treating a distinguished guest in this way. As a matter of world survey and our own problems, I did refer to our border troubles, with him, and very briefly in half a dozen sentences perhaps. I told him that this is our case; it is all for your information. Because I felt that not to refer to it was itself wrong when we were discussing our problems. But I did not ask him to do this or that for us: I did not ask him to bring pressures to bear. That, I thought was none of my business. It is for them to consider what they are going to do and how they are going to do it. There the matter ended. It was a brief talk on this subject, may be lasting a few minutes.

The only thing that I can say about these talks is this. Whether it was President Eisenhower or whether it was Mr. Khrushchev, they were good enough to be exceedingly friendly to India, to us, and to our aims and objectives. That is all that I wanted and it would have been embarrassing for me, -and for the other party, -to try to push questions to either of them and demand an answer. That is not the way, I think, the right way, to behave. So, this question of our answer to the Chinese Government had no relation to Mr. Khrushchev. It so happened that the answer had been sent three or four days before. Naturally the letter and the note had already gone, and it was delivered just about that time.

I should like to refer to another matter. In the course of the criticism, some Hon. Members referred, and referred repeatedly particularly to one item, --to the failure of our diplomats to

China and the failure of our defence, not now, but in the last ten years I would wish that our diplomatic personnel were not mentioned in this way in our debates. They cannot of course say anything nor indeed can we say very much or lay on the Table of the House all as to what were the reports that they send or not. It is not quite fair. I would however say this : that broadly speaking, persons in our diplomatic service, more especially our senior diplomats, have a very high position in the diplomatic world. They compare very favourably with their brother diplomats from other countries. They are respected everywhere respected not merely because they convey messages from us-anybody can do it-but because the men of worth, of understanding, understanding our point of view and understanding the other point of view, and they have done great service to us.

I would say this. So far as China is concerned, because we have always attached great importance to the relations of India and China, we have sent our seniormost and best men there. It is a record of our highest class men going there. One of them who was there at a crucial moment of the change of Government there, with the success of the revolution, is now a Member of Parliament. The ones who went before him or after, especially after, have been our senior and experienced diplomats, and we are very grateful to them for the very fine work they have done in exceedingly difficult circumstances.

So far as our defence is concerned, that is a larger issue. But during this period of ten years or so that have elapsed, the responsibility of defence for anything that has happened is of the smallest. In fact, it is not at all their responsibility. Whatever basic policies we have followed are the responsibilities of the Government, or, to limit them still further, they are the responsibilities of the Foreign Minister and the Prime Minister; if you like, of the Foreign Affairs Committee of the Cabinet. But in the final analysis, certainly they are responsibilities of the Foreign Minister and the Prime Minister. Therefore, while this House is completely justified in criticising the Foreign Minister on the ground of policy, I do not think it is quite fair to drag in others who had no responsibility and no immediate contact with that policy.

Now, one thing has surprised me; that in the course of this long debate, reference has been made so often to this letter of invitation. I do not remember-I may be wrong of course-any Hon. Member referring to the long note which accompanied that letter. The note was, as I said, dated the 12th February, and signed by the Ambassador on that date. The letter contains no policy. It is the note that contains the policy of the Government of India in regard to this affair. It is a long note which took weeks of consideration, hard thinking, revision, etc. and finalising. No reference was made to it. You talked about reversal of policy; you talked about national humiliation and all that. But the paper that contains that policy was not referred to at all in this House. It was a carefully drafted document and that has been set aside, and the mere fact

42

taken that we have invited Premier Chou-En-lai. It seems to be very odd. That letter was just a kind of addendum to the note. It is the note that contains the policy, that contains our clear enunciation of where the Government of India stands in this matter. My point is when you talk about policy, so far as policy is concerned, it is contained in that note and note only. You may object to my invitation if you like. That is a matter of opinion, but it has nothing to do with policy. Surely one should say whether one agrees with the policy laid down in the note or not. As I said, it may be a wrong step, in the opinion of some Members, that I invited the Chinese Premier. Criticise it if you like, but that is not a step of policy. One must distinguish between these two things.

Now, I should like to refer to another matter. They have said that I have gone back on what I have said. I do not wish to weary the House by quoting what I have said previously on this occasion, but because this charge has been made so much I am compelled to do it. Broadly speaking I have always said--not only about Premier Chou En-lai, but everybody-- that I am always prepared to meet anybody, subject to convenience, subject to something; but, I shall never say 'no'. Of course, sometimes a meeting may be more desirable and sometimes less desirable, but I never say 'no' to a meeting, because that is the training I have had throughout my lifetime.

I have always distinguished between adhering to a policy and refusing to deal with the opponent or the enemy. If I have faith in myself, my people and my policy, I can meet anybody and discuss it. It is only people who lack faith in themselves who dare not talk about something to somebody when they dislike. Politics is not a matter of likes and dislikes: If you dislike somebody's face, you would not see him. We represent great Countries. When one country is faced with conflict or possible conflict with another country, it is no good condemning this country or that country. A people and a country should never be condemned. I lay it down as a proposition. Its Policy may go wrong; its Government may be opposed, but we should never condemn a whole people. That is one of the basic things that I learnt. We never—some people might have in the opposition benches—condemned the British people throughout our long struggle. We made them—we did not condemn them—and we fought friends with them when the time came.

I have proceeded on this basis always and more specially in this particular case of India and China, which raises world issues of enormous significance, two mighty countries in Asia facing each other, in conflict with each other, having this tremendous dispute which, as I said, previously, may not be a matter of weeks or months, but may be a matter of years and generations if necessary. These are big things, because neither China can put us down nor can we put down China. It is patent. If that is so, one has to proceed thinking, not of short exhibitions of temper, but on the long-term basis, how we are to maintain our honour, dignity, integrity and everything that courts for us, and yet always, keep the door open for some way out of this conflict. It may take years before you can pass through that door or anybody else can, but it should never be closed. That is my experience from such history as I have learnt and such experience as I have gathered.

I have met many of the great leaders—political and other—of the world and tried to learn from them. I have read some books also about this subject and most of all, during the last half a century. I have lived through historic epochs. To no small extent, many Hon. Members here and I have ourselves been actors in the great drama of India. So, with such experience as we have

got, we have to face issues. We have to face an issue today of a greater magnitude than any we have faced previously. It is not casual talk I am indulging in, because as I said, in the context of history, two of the biggest countries of Asia and of the world, I say have come face to face with each other, angrily face to face with each other. What are going to be the consequences? I do not know I cannot peep into history, into the future. But I do know that when such a thing occurs, it requires, all the wisdom, all the strength and perseverance of a nation to face such a contingency. I have pleaded for that wisdom and at the same time, tact and patience.

What have I said about this matter previously? Hon. Members quoting my previous statements have said that I would meet him when a meeting would bear fruit. Even there, I never denied that I will not meet him. I said on the 5th November:

"This business of meeting. My general approach, our general approach, again if I may refer to my dim and distant Gandhian past,—is always to meet, always to discuss, to avoid strong language, but to be prepared always for strong action in so far as one can be prepared, and above all avoid, getting excited and afraid."

With all respect, I would venture to present

43

then sentiments of mine to some Hon. Members opposite.

Then, on the 16th November, I wrote to Premier Chou En-lai

"I am always ready to meet and discuss with Your Excellency the outstanding differences between our countries and explore avenues of friendly settlement .. It is necessary, therefore, that some preliminary steps are taken and the foundation for our discussions laid."

On that very day, 16th November, I spoke in the Lok Sabha as follows

"Premier Chou En-lai also suggested in

his letter that the Prime Ministers might bold talks in the immediate future to discuss the boundary question and other outstanding issues between the two countries. I have always expressed my willingness to discuss any matter in dispute. But, if such a meeting is to bear fruit, as we want it to, we should first concentrate our immediate efforts at reaching an interim understanding, as suggested."

So, I should like the House to observe that at no time have I said that I will not meet. It always depends on certain circumstances, in a changing situation.

On the 27th November, I said in the Lok Sabha :

"It is true that, much as one might desire a meeting, that meeting itself, unless it is held under proper circumstances or a proper atmosphere, with some kind of background and preparation, may lead to nothing. It may fail; it may do harm. It is a matter of judgment. It is true that any such meeting which has the faintest resemblance to carry in out the behests of another party is absolutely, wrong. I do not wish to delay anything. I am not trying to escape from, the very idea of a meeting. I want it. I welcome it as early as possible, but there must be some preparation, some ground for it."

In the Rajya Sabha, I said on the 22nd December :

"The point that is brought out throughout that letter (the letter of Premier Chou En-lai) is a strong desire to meet. So far as I am concerned, whenever the time comes, whenever it is suitable, I shall avail myself of that opportunity, because the issues are too serious for any other course to be adopted."

In my reply to Premier Chou En-lai on the 21st December, I said:

"I am always ready to meet and discuss

with Your Excellency the outstanding differences between our countries and explore the avenues of settlement. How can we, Mr. Prime Minister, reach an agreement on principles when there is such complete disagreement about the facts ? I would, therefore, prefer to wait for your promised reply to my letter of September 26 and our note of November 4, before we discuss what should be the next step. I wish to add that it is entirely impossible for me to proceed to Rangoon or any other place within the next few days."

Then, at a Press Conference, on the 8th January a question was asked to me

"Do you project a meeting between yourself and Chou En-lai at some date near enough ?"

The answer was:

"I am not projecting the meeting at present, but I cannot rule it out. It depends on circumstances because, as I said, we do not, I hope, act in terms of closing any doors which would help. I don't rule it out at all but, at the present moment, that, is not in view."

That is to say, the meeting. I was asked further about the conditions for a meeting. My reply was:

"I don't think it will be proper for me to lay down conditions 1, 2, 3 and 4, this must be done, this kind of thing. When two countries take up those rigid attitudes then any question of considering a matter becomes difficult. All kinds of things happen. National prestige is involved, apart from other things."

Finally, a straight question :

44

"Does it follow that you would be prepared to meet Mr. Chou En-lai unconditionally ?"

My answer:

"It means, first of all, that I am prepared to meet anybody in the wide world. There is nobody whom I am not prepared to meet. That is number one. The second is, one wants to meet people when one thinks that the meeting will produce results, good results, and not bad results. These are the two main considerations. One does not rush to a meeting simply because a meeting is talked about. A meeting may be mistimed, misjudged and, therefore, produce bad results. On the other hand, if there is any chance of a good result, a meeting should be agreed to.

So, it is difficult for me to say precisely when, where and under what conditions, a meeting might take place, but I cannot rule it out."

Here is a series of quotations from what I have said in the Lok Sabha in the Rajya Sabha and the press conference, and you will see the same stream of thought running in my mind—never refuse the meeting and try to get the meeting in the best of circumstances, as good circumstances as possible, and consider from time to time whether it is more desirable or less desirable.

When Premier Chou-En-lai invited me to meet him within a week or so at Rangoon, apart from the physical difficulty of my going to Rangoon I reacted against this proposal—I did not like it—for a variety of reasons. I did not quite see why I should go to Rangoon or anywhere else for that meeting but, above all, I did not like this, well, shall I say, short period "come next week" business, and above all, the invitation to the meeting was contained in a document, in a letter which laid down the Chinese view point, and it wanted some principles etc. settled so as to meet to discuss some principles. Now if I had accepted that meeting it would not have committed me, of course, to anything, but the background was the Chinese letter to me. That would have been the background, although I was not committed to it. I wanted to clear that up. I was not going to him with that document, because I did not agree with that document, and I wanted to wait, as I have said, for a subsequent longer letter in

reply to my letter of September 24th. That is why I said "I shall consider this question later". So, when the letter and other papers came and was considered this and we drafted a reply to be sent, we felt-I felt and my colleagues in the Cabinet Committee felt-that since we have discussed this for a considerable time, it would be desirable in the balance to propose a meeting in India between Premier Chou En-lai and myself. Now, my letter to him does not commit him to anything, that is our case, just as his letter has not committed me. But it does make a difference on the basis "after this letter we meet", a considerable difference, to my meeting after his letter.

Shri Nehru said: What I said was this. I should like to explain myself. Some Hon. Members I am not referring to Hon. Members of the opposition, but certainly some individuals here are so passionately committed to the cold war attitude. That is what I call a vested interest that is, this cold war attitude, for instance, Shri Masani and I, I regret to say, are further -removed than two human-beings can be, I thought, in thought. Shri Masani dislikes any kind of a step taken by any country, not by India alone, which -might reduce tension. You see it is a basic attitude. While I proceed with this, I will say this. It is not a question of vested interest of property and money but of mental commitment to certain ideologies. Now, for instance, take another vested interest of the other kind, that is, of the Communist Party. They quite fail to understand a national movement, a national feeling, a national upsurge in the country. That is what I meant. This cold war attitude, I think, not only now but always is a wrong attitude.

I am making a general statement that the cold war approach is always and, I say, inevitably a wrong approach whatever happens. That does not mean weakening in meeting an opponent or an enemy. of course, not. But that mental attitude towards cold war is the one basic lesson that I, and I hope others, learnt from Gandhiji. I do not mean to say that I have Octed up to that lesson always. That is my feeling. But I do believe that that is a right attitude when dealing with individuals, groups or nations. More particularly when you have to deal with the conflicts of big nations that attitude has very far reaching consequences. When you have to think of that in the context of the world today you

have to be very careful. Any man with the least sense of responsibility should realise this attitude, which increases tension, bitterness and hatred, is not a good attitude. It may end ultimately in the destruction of the world and so on. So I was venturing to say that this mental attitude is wrong. It may be honestly held. I do not say that people who indulge in cold war are dishonest. But it

45

is an attitude which comes in, the way, apart from its being basically wrong, because the cold war is based on violence and hatred. The hatred may be justified in the sense that the other party may be wrong. But nevertheless it is a wrong attitude.

Secondly, apart from being a wrong attitude, it closes one's mind and prevents considering a changing situation as it changes. We have got a fix mind which was fixed, let us say, five or ten years ago. The situation may change but we apply the same canons of interpretation to it. So, I would venture to say that in regard to these border issues if this House approves of the note that we have sent that is the policy. That is the policy note. I take it, if I understand it, that people do approve it. I am not quite sure of Hon. Members of the Communist Party as to whether they approve it or not. I do not know because their approach is somewhat different. But there it is.

The Communist Party has been carrying on a big propaganda that the two Prime Ministers must meet. If there is anything which would prevent any meeting it is that propaganda of theirs so far as I am concerned, because it is obvious-that their objective in their propaganda is something entirely different from my proposal. They are trying to hide, if I may use the word without disrespect, their opinions and feelings on this subject, not to express them clearly enough-some of them, not all -- by shouting, "Let the two Prime Ministers meet". Then they need not say anything about the question. But it is not on that basis or on that argument that I have proceeded. After all, I have, to explain.

I do not know if this meeting will take place. I hope it will. But anyhow I thought it my duty and in the Committee my colleagues thought it

our duty to take this step. We took it after full consideration of its consequences. Then if we took that step people objected to it saying, "What? You say that he will be our honoured guest." What else, may I ask? How else can we treat anybody whom we invite to this country? How else? Here again comes that cold war mentality of hatred. No reason, no logic, no graciousness. In the meantime things are said here which, if I may say so, bring little credit to India. It brings little credit to India to say these things, which could be repeated, about the leaders of great nations with whom we may be in conflict. How do we speak of those leaders?

May I say that I have just now said that we must never speak ill of a whole people. So also, we, must not speak ill of the leaders who represent those people. For the moment they are not individuals. They represent those people. I may be a person with many failings and you may condemn me. You may do many things. But I feel sure that even those who have not a particular soft corner for me will resent if any outsider insulted me, the Prime Minister of India, because then I become a symbol of this Parliament of India apart from my failing. So, others are also symbols and something should not be said which bars any consideration of any problem, which closes people's mind and which brings in too much passion and anger. That is all that I have to submit. That does not mean our not criticising the policy of another Government or opposing it or fighting it. I think it was some Hon. Members who talked about forming a block of South Eastern Asian countries, of Burma, Ceylon, Indonesia and India. I do not know if this is some kind of revival of the old idea of a third force. Whatever it may be, I should like the House to consider that this kind of thing means nothing at all. First of all, I am happy to say, we are in the closest friendly relations with these countries, with Nepal, Burma, Indonesia, Ceylon etc. This kind of reference to other countries in this fashion is often found rather irritating by those countries as if we want to drag them into something. They do not like it. They are independent countries, very friendly to us often with common interests. But the moment any element comes in "Oh! they want to exercise some pressure on us. Oh! They are in trouble; they want our help"-whatever it may be-there is this element of, making them do some-

thing which they may not like to do. That is never a right approach to any country, if I know anything about relations between two countries. There are all kinds of pressures—pressures of all countries, on our country, on their countries. To imagine that they would yield to some pressure, is not correct. They have to judge according to their situations, internal and external policies. The main thing that we aim at is friendly relations, co-operative relations and I am glad that we have lot them.

I do not wish to say much regarding defence, that is, the border question. We have already informed the House that we have to adopt in regard to defence not only a short view, the immediate dangers, to protect ourselves, but the long view also. We cannot exhaust our energy. our strength, in some short view and have nothing left for the long view. So, both views have to be taken, and undoubtedly they involve burdens on us, and I am sure the House will agree to our carrying those burdens because, after all, the

46

basic policy of every country, the basic foreign policy of every country is to protect itself; other policies come later, I have talked about various approaches to foreign policy, but the basic approach of foreign policy is always to guard the interests of the country, other things follow it. Of course, we want to guard those interests, not in a narrow way, not in that type of ultra-nationalist way which does not look at the world, but we want that to fit in with world developments and world peace and all that; and in fact, in the long run it is those world interests that also come to our help. So, looking at defence from this point of view, it is not for me to tell you, and I cannot tell you, what exact steps we take on our borders, because that kind of thing is not said in the public, but we are taking all the necessary steps available to us on our borders. We are trying to build roads, airports etc., whatever it may be.

I think it was Shri Bhakt Darshan who again repeated this business of foreign aircraft flying over our territory. I believe he said that some ex-servicemen, ex-soldiers had told him so. Now, I can assure him that our Air Force is very vigilant in this matter, and our Air Force has

assured us that no such thing has happened. Apart from the fact that our own aircraft are flying frequently there, it is very difficult for an average man to distinguish aircraft at 30,000 feet;-no doubt, it is 30 to 40 thousand feet-- Apart from that, this is a route by which the Soviet service flies to India twice or three times a week, I forget how often-the TU 104-and they see the strange thing coming. Apart from that, when Mr. Voroshilov and Mr. Khrushchev came here, there were so many flights in that connection to bring them, their parties. to bring things for them, take back things, constant flights, and therefore they probably mistook this for some kind of foreign, enemy aircraft which was intruding on. our air space.

I need not say much about the situation in the Naga Hills Tuensang Division. I think that certainly it is infinitely better than it has been in the past. Nevertheless, it is true that sporadic troubles take place and it is exceedingly difficult to put an end to them. But the major improvement there is not more or less of this kind of sporadic trouble, but a change, I think, in the mind of the Naga people, which is the real, basic, helpful thing that is happening, and I hope that will bear fruit.

Now, I should like this House to consider our problems in that large context of the world. We never forget the world, we are too closely knit to it to separate ourselves, and in the world today the major thing that is happening is this approach of the leaders of rival countries trying to find a way out, trying to go ahead with disarmament and solve or lessen the tension which exists. This is of a tremendous significance because, if this is not done and if the world continues in any other way, then all our problems will be solved by vast destruction which is not the destruction of war, but practically, if these atomic and nuclear weapons are used, is a curse on the world from which it cannot recover even-this atomic radiation spreading out and creeping everywhere. Therefore, these are of the utmost importance, and therefore we should endeavour in our own way to help. We cannot do very much, we are not among the World Powers in the sense of military prowess or financial prowess, nevertheless it so happens that we have gained some prestige in the world as a people, as a country which is devoted to peace, and that is one reason also why the problems affect us, whether

they are of Pakistan, whether they are of China. We have to face these problems bravely, we have to face them with strength, not giving in, not surrendering, but we have always to remember that our language and approach fits in with the temper of the world which aims towards peace today. So, we have today to look at it in this big way.

One of the big things that is happening today in the World, one of the very big things, is the revolutionary ferment in Africa. Recently we had this French atomic test in the Sahara. Well, it is a deplorable thing I think, deplorable by itself, deplorable because it begins another series of atomic tests and we must regret it, and we have tried our best, and the United Nations, indeed, have expressed themselves previously against it. But far bigger than this French atomic test in Africa is what the people of Africa are doing today, rising up, sometimes rightly, sometimes wrongly if you like, but nevertheless in a state of tremendous up-heaval. That is what is happening. and it is obvious that so far as we are concerned. our hearts and our good wishes must go out to them in this tremendous upheaval.

In this connection, all kinds of new problems will arise in Africa affecting the world. One of the biggest problems has been the racial problem. The House knows how the South African Union Governemene has fixed its policy on the basis of racial discrimination and a master race and apartheid etc. We have suffered, the people of Indian descent have suffered from it, but far more the Africans have suffered from it. Now, what is going to happen in Africa when the greater part of Africa consists of independent nations standing

47

on, their dignity, not accepting in the slightest degree any kind of racial discrimination, well, the future will show. But obviously, things will not remain as they are today.

In this connection, may I say that I welcome the recent statement made by the Prime Minister of the United Kingdom, Mr. Macmillan, addressing the two Houses of Parliament in Cape Town. It was, in so far as policy is concerned about racial discrimination, a clear and forthright statement. Naturally we feel strongly about this, and

I earnestly hope that what Mr. Macmillan has said will be the firm policy in all the countries over which Britain holds sway.

I would wish that some of the leaders of the African people who are in detention or in prison, leaders of note, leaders of influence without whom no settlement can be made, are released, because unless they are released there can be no settlement of these problems.

Then I would say just a word about Goa. The first thing is that I should like to assure the House. because there appears to be some misapprehension, that we are going to take no steps which in any sense might prejudice the liberation of the Goan people. We have been, to some extent, rather restrained from taking any further steps, because we have been waiting, to some extent, for the decision of the World Court. The problem before the World Court has nothing to do directly with Goa ; it has to do with Nager Haveli. Nevertheless, it has been a restraining factor, in our consideration of this important problem. That decision, I hope, will come within a month or so.

USA CHINA INDIA NEPAL FINLAND CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC BURMA INDONESIA
PAKISTAN SOUTH AFRICA

Date : Feb 01, 1960

Volume No

1995

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

Prime Minister's Statement in Rajya Sabha

The Prime Minister, Shri Jawaharlal Nehru, made a statement in the Rajya Sabha on February 12, 1960, in reply to a discussion on the President's Address to Parliament.

In the course of his statement the Prime Minister referred to various subjects, both national and international. While speaking of

international affairs Shri Nehru made particular reference to India-China and India-Pakistan border disputes.

Referring to Pakistan Prime Minister Nehru said : One Hon. Member talked about-this is not the border-our cringing and appeasing Pakistan, cringing everywhere. Now, I am prepared to admit that I am not so gallant and brave as the Hon. Member, but I have doubts about his conclusions and his wisdom nevertheless. If his idea of governing the country or dealing with another country is to go about bravely, striking about or waving a sword, a lathi or a fist, that is not my idea, and that is not, I believe, the idea of any person versed in these affairs. How are we to deal with these matters when such remarks are made which represents. state of mind which will get this country into indignity and disgrace all over the place ? "Cringing to Pakistan" -- I do not know what he calls "Cringing to Pakistan". If he says being friendly to Pakistan is cringing to her, then I am going to be friendly to Pakistan. This is our policy. But being friendly does not mean giving in in principle or showing any infirmity about dealing with important matters.

Because I am referring to Pakistan, may I say that I am happy about the border agreements and we shall endeavour to go on trying to widen the sphere of co-operation and agreement ? But again I say that it does not mean our forgetting our responsibilities and the vital interests of the nation.

The other day, Field-Marshal Ayub Khan mentioned something about-what is it-mutual defence or common defence or some such thing. He has referred to this matter on many occasions and almost every time with a different emphasis and in a different context. I pointed out that we would be very happy to cooperate in an ever-increasing measure with Pakistan but the difficulties about this common defence were very serious. One was that defence is closely allied to foreign policy and so far as I know, our outlook on foreign policy was very different-Pakistan's and ours--and even if we removed our problems and went, even then, unless some changes occurred in our minds, our policy would be different.

Secondly, in practice, I did not quite see what this would mean and so on and so forth. Lately Field-Marshal Ayub Khan has pointed out more or less clearly what he means by common defence. He means-he has said clearly-that this can come only after the Kashmir question is settled in his favour. So you will observe-I am not criticising him-that this common defence was not the real issue at all but something else-the Kashmir issue-and more or less on the plea of common defence or whatever it was, this was raised. You see, that itself shows the complica-

48

tion of the matter. One cannot deal with these major matters affecting the country's interests, which we have been carrying on for 10 years, in this way. We get into a fright about something and talk about common defence. I am pointing out how these points are entangled. You cannot isolate them. I said that the foreign policies were different. The evidence of them may be that Pakistan has preferred to join some military alliances--SEATO, CENTO and may be some others. That is merely an evidence of it, which is a clear evidence, while we do not wish to join any alliance of that type but it is deeper than that. The whole approach is different. I have found often in the criticisms made, even in the course of this debate by Hon. Members, of our Policy, whether it relates to China or whether it relates to Pakistan or whether it relates to any other place, going to the back of it, there is either a complete disagreement or a misunderstanding as to what the policy of non-alignment is. There is that basic misunderstanding. Even though sometimes they may talk 'Yes, non-alignment is good', they really do not understand it. Indeed our policy is something more than non-alignment. Non-alignment is a negative thing. Ours is a positive policy, I hope a positive policy of friendship and trying to gain the goodwill of other countries while firmly adhering to our principles. Non-alignment is one basic expression of it but only a part of it. Hon. Members opposite seem to imagine that foreign policy consists in threats to other countries and in other manoeuvres like tying oneself to others, etc. One Hon. Member was displeased that we have not formed some kind of joint military or other alliance with Indonesia, Burma and Nepal. Then, again one or two odd Members- expressed their regret that

we allowed circumstance to arise which led to the recent border agreement between Burma and China. It is very extraordinary. We should not come in the way, according to him, of that agreement. So far as I am concerned, I welcome that agreement as I welcome every settlement of a difficult problem. I might say that agreement is more or less on the line of some such agreement 2 or 3 years ago. It is not a sudden development. It is a gradual development. Why it was not done in these 2 or 3 years and why it has come about now is another matter but it was basically agreed between the Burmese Government and the Government of China two or three years ago and the Government of Burma was good enough to keep us informed 2 or 3 years ago and later of many of these developments. There has been not the slightest difficulty in our relations with Burma over this issue or any other issue and we have been glad that they have come to this agreement because one matter less in conflict is good for them and good for the world.

So I would like this House to keep in consideration the context in which things are happening to-day. Naturally we function in our corner of the world, in India. Naturally we are concerned with everything that affects India's interest the border, this, that and the other—apart from the internal policies and planning. Nevertheless all these things are directly or indirectly connected with world happenings and we live to-day in an age of the most amazing revolutions in everything. What is happening in Africa to-day is an astounding revolution. The whole of Africa or large parts of it are shedding their colonial status with an amazing rapidity. No one knows what is happening but here is a live movement shaking the world to some extent or will shake the world. In Asia we have seen all kinds of things happening and among the other things that have happened, has been what has happened in our country and what has happened in China; the two major happenings, in Asia, in India and China, are great developments. Look at these things in this vast field of revolutionary changes in Asia, Africa and all over the world. Then there are the technological changes and scientific changes which are really changing the way people think about these matters. Some people think that even biological changes are coming to the human race, I do not know. But there is no doubt about it that basic changes have been coming in the last

150 years or 200 years. The industrial revolution has powerfully changed the living conditions, life, the context and the content of life in a part of the world which is industrially and technologically advanced. Now these processes are going on in India. Those processes, in a different sense, are going on in China. Now worlds are being created. In India we are on the way to technological maturity. It may take 5 years, it may take 10 years or it may take 15 years but we are on that way and we are going pretty fast. There can be no doubt, about it, whether our policies are right or wrong, that we have set India on the course of technological changes or industrial revolution. There is no doubt about it. Nobody can stop it. We cannot stop it, nobody can. We may get into difficulties. Take again the approach to education which in the ultimate analysis is one of the greatest liberating forces in the country. That is what is happening, all these revolutionary happenings. And in all the revolutionary happenings these two giants of Asia, India and China, come into major conflict. It is a very serious thing for us, for China, for Asia and the world. It is not a small thing, not a light thing to be talked about lightly and for Hon. Members to suggest "Issue an ultimatum". We are not dealing with a minor matter, of a trade

49

union issuing an ultimatum that they will strike if their demands are not fulfilled. Two major countries are concerned, two essentially powerful countries. The power may be greater on one side or less, but essentially two powerful countries, geographically placed against each other.

We feel and we think and the President has given expression to it, that China has not behaved properly to us. We have been let down in many ways. You may, if you like, say that our policy was such that we permitted them to do so. You may do that, though I do not myself see how any policy could have made any major difference. any policy of ours, I mean. However, you may say so. If that is so, we are in error, we are guilty of it. But the major thing is we feel that we have been letdown, that injury has been caused to our principles, and indeed, to our frontiers. And we have to face that situation, face it with the right policy, face it with the right strength, face it, as every one knows-and that is the result of a right policy-with a measure of unity etc. Now, no

doubt, so far as strength is concerned, we should try to build up our strength and utilise it to defend our frontiers. And so far as policy is concerned, that should support it. But I venture to say that we should always aim at peaceful settlements. Peaceful settlement does not mean appeasement, the giving in to anything that we consider wrong. I do not understand why it should be thought that there are only two policies, one of ignoble submission and the other vulgar aggression in the world. I do not understand this, as if there is no civilised approach to a problem left, but only weak surrender or the uncivilised approach of a brawling and shouting. Surely we have to and I hope we shall function in a more civilised way, adhering to our principles, adding to our might, to our strength, and yet functioning in a civilised way, realising that what we are doing today may have effect for generations to come, in this changing revolutionary world. That has been our policy.

We are accused repeatedly that we hide things. The fact is-and I have spoken about it in this House and elsewhere previously-that there is nothing that we have hidden from Parliament, from the country, except if you like, the fact of what happened in the Aksai Chin area about which we got confirmation in October 1958, when we immediately wrote to the Chinese Government when we found that a road had been built there in the northern Aksai Chin area. We wrote to the Chinese Government and we were corresponding for a few months when the Tibetan rebellion took place.

Replying to a question as to when the Government first got the information about the building of the road through Aksai China the Prime Minister said: Our first information was from some very rough Chinese maps which we saw in a magazine and on a very small scale which did not give precise information but which drew our attention to this. Thereafter we sent some of our people there to find out and it took them six months to go there and come back. It was round about October that we wrote, may be September or October 1958 when we got their report. Immediately after, within a week or ten days, we wrote to the Chinese Government. This correspondence went on till early in 1959 came the Tibetan rebellion.

Now, I am prepared to accept that it would

have been better to have placed all this before the, House, all that we had discovered at that time. But we thought it better to correspond and find out exactly what was the position. Apart from this particular incident, there is absolutely no basis for any person to say that we were keeping facts from this House. It would be foolish for us to keep back facts. It is true that in diplomatic matters we do not come with every move, every letter, every message, to newspapers or to this House. It is true you cannot conduct diplomacy or any kind of foreign relations on that basis. But in this particular matter, it has come to this, that we have placed every letter, every fact about this before the House in various White Papers. And I may inform the House that we have just very recently addressed a communication to the Chinese Government in reply to their last letter and in due course that would also be placed before the House.

It is not for me, it would be unbecoming of me to talk rashly about the brave steps that we are going to take and what we are going to do. That is not the normal language of responsible people speaking for a Government. But I have said it before and I may repeat it. However, I need not repeat what the President has said so well in his Address. Look at the President's Address. Mr. Bhupesh Gupta, I believe, did not like one or two phrases in it. What the President says, if you would be good enough to read it again, does not lack in firmness anywhere. It is a firm statement of India's position in this matter, at the same time laying stress on our desire for friendly settlements. Friendly settlement does not mean giving up basic principles or a basic interest. Nevertheless it is and should be our function and that of every government to try for friendly settlements, because there is no alternative to it. It is all very well saying-you go and do this or that. But there is no alternative in

50

India, in Germany, in France, in America or Asia there is no alternative to friendly settlement. A friendly settlement may take a long time and that friendly settlement may be upset by the opposition party and war may begin. That is a different matter, because, every kind of folly might be committed and we should be prepared to meet every contingency like that. But the only reason-

able approach is to be firm in your position and try as far as possible to reach settlements in a friendly way. The President has said quite firmly what our position is, about our deep sorrow at what we consider a breach of faith from a country with whom we have been friendly, with whom we had concluded an agreement laying down the very principles which are talked about so much, about Panch Sheel. Nevertheless our desire is for peaceful settlement.

Let it be understood quite clearly that though we talk about friendly settlement, I see no ground whatever at the present moment, no bridge between the Chinese position and ours. That is to say, our present positions are such that there is no room for negotiations on that basis. There is nothing to negotiate at present. It may arise later, I don't know.

To say that we would not have anything to do with them or to issue an ultimatum to them is not wisdom or statesmanship. That kind of thing is not done by responsible mature countries. It is only the people who talk without acting up to their talk later on who may do that kind of thing. That would be a thing almost entirely opposed to all that we have done in the past in regard to foreign policy and the like.

May I just mention one thing ? Perhaps the House knows that we have prepared an atlas of the India-China frontier and copies of this atlas have been placed in the library of Parliament and I think a copy each has been sent to the leaders of the principal parties in Parliament for their convenience.

USA CHINA INDIA PAKISTAN CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC BURMA INDONESIA NEPAL FRANCE GERMANY

Date : Feb 01, 1960

Volume No

1995

PAKISTAN

The Prime Minister, Shri Jawaharlal Nehru made the following statement in the Lok Sabha on February 9, 1960 on the results of the Minister-level Indo-West Pakistan Border Conference :

As the House is aware, the Government of India and Pakistan agreed in October, 1959, that a Minister-level Conference should be held to consider disputes on the Indo-West Pakistan border, to devise procedures for effective prevention and control of border incidents and to expedite demarcation of boundaries on this border.

This Conference was held from 4th to 11th January, 1960. India was represented at this Conference by Sardar Swaran Singh, Minister for Steel, Mines and Fuel and Pakistan by Lt.-General K.M. Shaikh, Minister for the Interior. Discussions were held at Lahore on the 4th and 5th January, at Rawalpindi on the 6th January, and at Delhi from the 7th January onwards.

I am placing on the Table of the House the following documents which embody the agreements reached at this Conference :

(i) Copy of the Joint Communique issued by the Governments of India and Pakistan on the 11th January, 1960, and,

(ii) Copy of the Agreed Decisions and Procedures, together with enclosures, including the Ground Rules to be observed by both sides to maintain peaceful conditions on the Indo-West Pakistan border.

The Conference arrived at mutually agreed interpretations of the Radcliffe Award in respect of four disputes on the Punjab (India)-West Pakistan border. These are :

(a) Area of the Hussainiwala Head-works:

It was agreed that the Indo-Pakistan

boundary. in this area should be the pre-partition-boundary between Ferozepur and Lahore districts.

(b) Area of the Suleimanke Headworks:

It was agreed that an adjustment should be made in the pre-partition boundary

51

of Ferozepur and Montgomery districts, in consideration of the fact that the Headworks had been awarded by Sir Cyril Radcliffe to Pakistan. Measures for mutual cooperation in the maintenance of the Left Marginal Bund were also agreed to.

(c) Chak Ladheke

The Government of Pakistan dropped their claim to this area.

(d) The villages of Theh Sarja Marja, Rakh Hardit Singh and Pathanke :

The Government of India dropped their claim to these villages.

As regards the dispute raised by Pakistan in respect of Kutch (India)-Sind (Pakistan) boundary, it was agreed that both Governments would collect additional data and hold further discussions at a later date.

It was also agreed that ground demarcation operations on some 70 miles of the Punjab (India)-West Pakistan border, which yet remain undemarcated, should be completed by the end of April 1960, and that return of all areas in adverse possession of either Government in this sector should be completed by 15th October, 1960.

I am happy to inform the House that these settlements, like the settlements reached at the October, 1959 conference, were reached in a spirit of mutual accommodation and all border disputes arising out of the Radcliffe Awards have now been settled.

Volume No

1995

PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA

Prime Minister's Statement in Lok Sabha on India-China Relations

The Prime Minister, Shri Jawaharlal Nehru, made a statement in the Lok Sabha on February 16, 1960 in reply to an adjournment motion.

The following is the full text of his statement:

I am sorry, Sir, that Hon. Members have a feeling of any kind of reversal of policy. So far as I am concerned and my Government is concerned, there has been no reversal, and the identical line of approach which we have followed and which has been expressed in the President's Address is expressed in the note to the Chinese Government.

The Hon. Member, Shri Ashoka Mehta, quoted from something I had said, that a meeting will not be in these conditions fruitful. I have not here in front of me whatever I have said, either in this House or in the other House or in a Press Conference or anywhere. I have always taken up the position that it is our policy to meet anybody and everybody in order to find a way. That is the general proposition in which I have been trained for the last 40 years, and I do not think, certainly, it will be right for me, and I do not think it will be right for this House to accept any kind of policy which refuses to meet and discuss. That is the broad approach to every problem in which most of us have been trained in the past and we followed it with those whom we struggled against and we fought against.

Apart from that, Sir, the question is what our position in a particular matter is. Now, in this particular matter, when the Chinese Prime Minister invited me to meet him within, I think,

seven or eight days at Rangoon, I pointed out that in that way the meeting will serve no purpose and, anyhow, I could not go there. I agreed, and I have been repeating it several times in this House, that I am always prepared to meet when it is proved, as the Hon. Member has pointed out, that it will lead to some fruitful results. Now, when we consider all these developments, recent developments, it took us a long time, naturally, to find out the various facts, historical and others and there was some delay-I was very anxious that that reply of mine, of the Government, to the Chinese Government should be in the possession of the House as soon as it met. But, unfortunately, there was some delay, because we could not, the reply itself was prepared about the end of the last month. We decided that it would be better for the Ambassador himself to take it rather than for us to telegraph it; and therefore, there was some delay. I could not place it right at the beginning of the session or even earlier. There was about a week's delay.

Another fact, if you permit me to mention, is this, a curious misunderstanding. The letter that

52

have addressed to the Chinese Premier is, I think, dated 5th February, while the note is dated, I think, 12th February. Obviously, Hon. Members will realise that the letter was dated the day I signed it. The note which had been prepared before the letter,-obviously it is part of the letter-had to be dated when it was being delivered in Peking. So, it was dated a few days later, but the note came earlier. I had to wait-I could not help it-till it was delivered before I could place it before the House. As soon as I got the news that it was delivered, immediately I placed it on the Table of the House. This was done yesterday.

Now, the only question for this House to consider is whether there has been any reversal of the policy. I submit that there has been no reversal so far as my mind is concerned and so far as we are concerned. We have been considering this matter and we came to the conclusion: we sent this letter and that letter, it should be remembered, is a part or a necessary complement of the long note we have sent, where we have firmly and clearly stated what our policy in these matters

is. We find that having regard to all the circumstances we should not rule out the possibility of meeting-not, if I may submit, of negotiating on that basis and I have said in that note which is part of these documents-and we cannot rule out this meeting from both the points of view, of our past policy and present policy and other large considerations.

So, I submit there is no such reversal. Anyhow, these matters, I admit, are important and vital and this House should have every chance of discussing them. They are, in fact, possibly being discussed even in connection with the President's Address. Possibly they might be discussed later also. I would be glad to have the assistance of this House in all these matters. They are too vital to be passed through in this way. It does not, I submit, give rise to an adjournment motion.

CHINA INDIA USA

Date : Feb 01, 1960

Volume No

1995

PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA

Prime Minister's Statement on alleged Chinese Occupation of Chantham Salt Mines in Ladakh

The Prime Minister, Shri Jawaharlal Nehru, made a statement in the Lok Sabha on February 22, 1960 in reply to an adjournment motion. He said :

I do not think there is any contradiction. In this motion for adjournment itself, reference is made to the denial by the Jammu and Kashmir Government and the statement made by the External Affairs Ministry. The External Affairs Ministry made the statement after receipt of information from the Government of Jammu and Kashmir and such other sources as they have here. They have both denied them.

The Hon. Member talked about some

Chinese in the guise of Buddhist monks going to this particular area. That has been denied. The particular area he referred to is roughly 150 miles in the heart of our territory. So there is no question of border incursion. Nobody can say that some distinguished persons may not go there. I cannot suddenly deny it, that somewhere in the mountainous area one or two disguised persons are there. But, our information is, no such thing has happened; and it is based on information received from the Jammu and Kashmir Government who are dealing with this matter. I have before me a letter from the Chief Minister, and, I think, he made a statement in his Assembly yesterday or the day before yesterday on this very subject. So, I do not quite know what more I am to add except one thing that even the climate today is against any such thing happening. It is practically difficult. In the light of the cold weather people wandering about there is exceedingly unlikely. But, as I said, factually it has been denied by the Jammu and Kashmir Government on the information at their disposal.

CHINA USA PERU

Date : Feb 01, 1960

Volume No

1995

PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA

Prime Minister's Statement In Lok Sabha on acceptance of his invitation Chinese Premier

The Prime Minister, Shri Jawaharlal Nehru, made the following statement in the Lok Sabha on February 29, 1960 while laying on the Table of the House a copy of a letter dated 26th February, 1960, received by him from H. E. Mr. Chou En-lai, Premier of the State Council of the People's Republic of China:

I beg to lay on the Table of the House a copy of the letter dated 26th February, 1960 received by me from Premier Chou En-Jai.

This letter has already appeared in the public press this morning, and it was at the instance of the Chinese Embassy here. I thought that before we handed it over to the Press, I should place it before Parliament, and fortunately there was no delay involved.

53

In this letter, as will be noticed, my invitation to Premier Chou En-Jai to come to India for talks has been accepted. I had suggested the second half of March. He has said that the month of April would suit him better. So far as we are concerned, we are equally agreeable to the month of April, and we shall proceed to get a definite date fixed as soon as possible. I am likely to leave India about the end of April, possibly on the 30th April, to attend the Commonwealth Prime Ministers' Conference. That will not come in the way, that is the very last day of April. So, I hope that a definite date will be fixed for this for Premier Chou En-lai to come here for these talks, and I feel sure that when he comes here, he will receive the courtesy and hospitality which India always gives to distinguished guests.

An Hon. Member : Since we are here in a democracy where Parliament must always be supreme, could the Prime Minister suggest to the foreign Embassies stationed in Delhi that whenever such letters are received, they should show the courtesy of Parliament being informed first and then issue to the press.

The Prime Minister: This is an extraordinary proposal. It has nothing to do with the supremacy of Parliament. Even if I had given it to the press, there will be no discourtesy to Parliament. I felt it was proper for me to bring it here, but it is not merely a question of the Chinese Embassy doing it here. The letter was no doubt, issued in Peking to the Chinese press and other foreign agencies.

It appeared, I am told, in the broadcasts from London last evening. So, it becomes world news immediately, and for me to ask the Chinese Embassy here to wait for our Parliament would be rather extraordinary. As a matter of fact, I might say that our own All India Radio people who knew about this yesterday asked me if they

could give it in their 9 o'clock news. I said:
"You better not. I should like to place it before
Parliament first." I could tell them that, but I
cannot control the BBC and all the world agencies.

The following is the English translation of the
letter dated February 26, 1960 from the Chinese
Prime Minister, Mr. Chou En-lai to Prime Minister
Nehru :

Dear Mr. Prime Minister,

I thank your Excellency for your letter of
February 5, 1960 which was brought here on
February 12 by Indian Ambassador to China Mr.
Parthasarathi. At the same time, the reply to the
note of December 26, 1959 of the Ministry of
Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China
made by the Indian Embassy in China on the
instructions of the Indian Government was also
delivered by Mr. Parthasarathi to our Ministry of
Foreign Affairs. The reply note of the Indian
Embassy will be answered by the Chinese Ministry
of Foreign Affairs after studying it.

You have in your letter agreed to the sugges-
tion of the Chinese Government and myself for
the holding of a meeting between the Premiers of
China and India in the immediate future so as to
explore avenues which may lead to a peaceful
settlement of the boundary issue, and invited me
to visit Delhi in the latter half of March. I express
to you my deep gratitude for your friendly invita-
tion. The Chinese Government has consistently held
that the friendship between the Chinese and Indian
peoples is eternal, that it is necessary and entirely
possible to settle the boundary issue between the
two countries in a friendly and peaceful manner,
and that the two countries must not waver in
their common desire for a peaceful settlement
of the boundary issue on account of tempo-
rary differences of opinion and certain un-
fortunate and unexpected incidents. The Chinese
Government, therefore takes a positive attitude
towards the forthcoming meeting and has con-
fidence in it. As to myself, needless to say, I am
very glad of the opportunity of once again visiting
the capital of great India, meeting the great Indian
people fighting for the prosperity, strength and
progress of their motherland and for world peace,
and seeing you as well as other friends whose
acquaintance I had the honour of making during
my last visits. I particularly hope to see the dark
clouds hovering between our two countries dispers-

ed through our joint efforts, so that the long-standing friendly relations between the two countries may be consolidated and developed.

Owing to reasons in connection with state affairs, I shall come to your country in April. The specific date will be discussed and decided upon through diplomatic channels.

With kind regards,

Chou En-lai,
Premier of the State Council of
the People's Republic of China

His Excellency Mr. Jawaharlal Nehru,
Prime Minister of the Republic of India, New Delhi.

54

CHINA USA INDIA UNITED KINGDOM

Date : Feb 01, 1960

Volume No

1995

UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS

Prime Minister Khrushchev's Visit

At the invitation of the Government of India Mr. N.S. Khrushchev, Chairman of the Council of the U.S.S.R., paid a visit to India from February, 11 to 16, 1960. On February 11, a State Banquet was held in honour of the Soviet Prime Minister at Rashtrapati Bhawan.

Welcoming Mr. Khrushchev, the President Dr. Rajendra Prasad said :

It is a matter of great pleasure for us to welcome in our midst this evening His Excellency Mr. Nikita S. Khrushchev, Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the Soviet Union. We recollect with great satisfaction the deep impression which your visit to our country 4 years ago

made on our people. As a result of that visit and our Prime Minister's visit to your country, India and the Soviet Union have ever tended to come closer to each other. It is indeed gratifying to see the feeling of understanding and mutual appreciation of each other's ideals, aspirations and requirements grow with the passage of time. Our mutual exchanges have not been confined to the economic and industrial field only, Our two countries have exchanged several cultural delegations as well.

Time was when it was customary to raise monuments in stone or brick and mortar to keep the memory of big events alive. Valuable as those monuments are in their own way, it seems to me that the real monuments of the modern era are going to be the new industries and the progress made in economic and other spheres of human endeavour among nations on the basis of collaboration, goodwill and mutual help. The far-reaching discoveries of science and the modern inventions will go down in history only as a one-sided development of man unless these developments bring home to human society the fact that the world is, after all, one family of which the various nations are members. For ages thinkers and idealists have dwelt on this concept. But what has so far been said figuratively now holds good realistically. The conquest of distance and the availability of better and quicker means of communications have led to closer contacts among the peoples of various nations. This development must be followed by greater understanding and tolerance among nations, so that all differences and disputes among them can be settled through negotiation and any resort to force is outlawed.

May I on this occasion felicitate Your Excellency for your efforts which have so greatly contributed to the relaxation in world tensions and which have led in no inconsiderable measure to the holding of high-level meetings of the Heads of Governments for the promotion of world disarmament and peace ? We have said it earlier and I would like to reiterate it tonight that the people of our country appreciate your initiative in this direction. We welcome these trends and the direct contacts between the leaders of the Great Powers and wish success to their efforts, which, we feel assured, are inspired by the sincere desire to halt the armament race and strengthen the

forces of world peace.

We are thankful to Your Excellency for having come here in response to our invitation and it gives me great pleasure to welcome you in the name of this country and on behalf of our Government. May your efforts for better understanding among nations and for the establishment of enduring peace in the world bear fruit and may the great advances made in recent years in science and technology prove to be for the happiness and the prosperity of man and the human society. This is our wish and our prayer.

USA INDIA

Date : Feb 01, 1960

Volume No

1995

UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS

Mr. Khrushchev's Reply

Replying to President Prasad, Mr. Khrushchev said :

Esteemed President, ladies and gentlemen, I was deeply touched by the words addressed towards my country, my Government and my people by the President of India. We highly appreciate the friendly relations which have been established between our country and the Republic of India. Our two countries have much in common. Even though the principles upon which our States are built differ, this should in no way prevent the development of friendly relations between our peoples and between our Governments, for we have a common goal.

We highly appreciate the fact that India espouses friendship and peace between all nations, irrespective of their political systems.

We are deeply appreciative of the relations being established between our country and India, between our States, our Government and our people. On all international questions in the United Nations, for instance on questions concerning strengthening of peace and friendship, we do not differ and this we appreciate highly. Knowing and feeling the policies that are pursued by your Government, which is headed by the esteemed Prime Minister Nehru, I trust that the friendship and co-operation between our countries will continue in the future. The relations that we have established between our countries are good relations based on co-operation and mutual assistance.

We actually won by our efforts successes in industrialisation. Our people suffered tremendous hardships to create a powerful industry. But the peoples of the Soviet Union consciously agreed to these hardships for they understood that it was only if an industry were created in their country—first and foremost heavy industry and better means of production—that the Soviet Union could survive and develop and achieve the goals that had been set by the Revolution. We therefore specially hold dear and we so easily understand the aspirations of India, to establish her own industry. We sympathise with these desires, and indeed we ourselves are imbued with the desire to build industry. It is only on the basis of this desire that we have achieved such tremendous results. Therefore, we willingly share our experience in this field as well as our material gains with you. It is a source of gratification that we are able to render this useful aid in order to help India create her industry. It is also particularly gratifying to hear how warmly and how highly you appreciate this aid.

The Soviet Union understands and sympathises with this noble desire of India to create and develop her own industry, her culture and her economy. We understand this and will do our utmost to assist India to promote still further her economy.

I also highly appreciate the kind words addressed to the Soviet Union in regard to the struggle of our country for peace. We would truly spare no efforts in the struggle to ensure a stable peace. But peace cannot come simply by appeals and urges. What is needed is the fight for peace and that we are doing. I am looking ahead with confidence for the situation that has taken shape in the correlation of forces in the

world today if you look at it from the point of view of existence of two camps. The situation in this correlation of forces is such that it can only be a mad man who would start a war to solve arguments, for war in modern conditions would mean a disaster for both sides. The question can of course arise that this disaster would be different. For one side it would be greater and for the other side perhaps lesser. One side would lose more and the other side would lose less. But we must not approach such matters from a commercial standpoint as to who stands to lose more or less.

What is most important to remember is that a modern war would mean terrible hardships, terrible destruction, for the entire world. We are doing all in our power to avert and prevent such a catastrophe. We are doing all in our power to achieve complete disarmament so as to reduce world armaments and to release huge material wealth which could be channelled for raising the well-being of all peoples.

We in the Soviet Union highly appreciate the role that India is playing in the struggle for peace, the role that the Indian Government and particularly the head of the Indian Government, the esteemed Mr. Nehru, is playing. On the question of the struggle for peace, the positions of both India and the Soviet Union coincide. This fact certainly serves to strengthen the friendly relations and mutual co-operation between our two countries.

USA INDIA

Date : Feb 01, 1960

Volume No

1995

UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS

Mr. Khrushchev's Address to Parliament

Mr. N. S. Khrushchev, Chairman of the

Council of Ministers of the U.S.S.R., delivered an address to the members of Parliament on February 11, 1960.

The following is the text of his, address

Esteemed Mr. Chairman :

Esteemed Members of Parliament

Allow me, first of all, to express my thanks for the opportunity afforded to me to speak in the Parliament of the Republic of India. I consider this to be a great honour for me personally and an expression of the profound friendly feelings which our two peoples entertain for each other.

Only four years have elapsed since I first had the privilege to speak before the Parliament of India. Four years is a short period of time if measured in terms of the life of nations and states. But this four year period can, in its significance, contend with whole decades even in this eventful

56

century,

During the past four years the forces standing for peace and peaceful co-existence between countries with different social systems have grown immeasurably. A certain relaxation of international tension has been achieved as a result of the tireless and selfless efforts of the nations. The peoples, and even those political leaders and statesmen who hold opposing ideological views are becoming ever more aware of the indisputable truth that peaceful co-existence of states is a historical fact, a vital necessity arising from the present stage of the development of human society. The principles of "Pancha Shila" have forced their way in history owing, in a considerable measure, to the efforts of peace-loving India.

We are strongly convinced that it is on the basis of the principles of peaceful co-existence that all international issues should be settled. And this means that the way out should be sought through negotiations based on equality, and not through pressure and diktat.

The consolidation of peace is not an easy task since in some states influential forces are still

active, who are interested in the continuation of the armaments, race, in arresting the incipient relaxation of international tension and in fanning the "cold war" anew. These forces have no intention of laying down their arms, of giving up their efforts. The activities of these forces are especially dangerous in our time-the time of unprecedented scientific and technical achievements.

Indeed, by the might of his intellect and technological know-how man has now made his way into the infinite vastness of outer space. Man's deeds seem to be outstripping imagination although the latter always ought to be in the lead.

Put to the service of man, the atom can work miracles-it can combat the most dangerous diseases, radically transform agriculture, introduce new technological processes which were inconceivable before, not to mention the fact that the atom harnessed by man is becoming a gigantic source of energy on earth.

There is an ancient oriental legend about a genie which was accidentally let out of the bottle and then refused to obey man. But now man has learned much, he has grown stronger and, having harnessed the energy of the atom, he must keep it securely under his control.

For science has created not only atomic power plants and space rockets it has also created hydrogen bombs and inter-continental ballistic missiles for war purposes capable of delivering a nuclear warhead to any point on our planet. No one who would wish to start a war to-day could count on impunity. If some advocates of the "positions of strength" policy could formerly hope that in the event of a war unleashed by them they themselves could sit snug, these hopes have now become empty illusions.

The past four years have also seen many changes in the countries of Asia, which, by pursuing their independent national foreign policies, have substantially consolidated their sovereignty and noticeably advanced their national economies.

We can easily foresee the time when the countries of Asia which only yesterday were oppressed colonies will be among the most advanced nations of the world in the field of national economy and culture. Like unbound Prometheus, the peoples

of Asia and Africa are straightening their mighty shoulders starting to build a new life for themselves.

The Soviet people sincerely rejoice in the achievements and radiant prospects of the independent national development of the countries of Asia. We also rejoice at the successes achieved in their struggle for liberation by the peoples of Africa who have awakened and ever more actively wage their struggle against the rule of the colonialists. The Soviet people wish the peoples of Africa fresh successes in this noble cause.

We are glad that the peoples of Latin America are also upholding ever more resolutely their national and economic independence and are struggling against foreign enslavement whatever disguise it assumes. Our sympathy has always been and will continue to be on the side of countries like Cuba which is actively defending her national and economic independence.

The Soviet Union has always rendered and is willing to render in future friendly and disinterested assistance and support to all countries in their struggle for freedom and independence, against age-old economic backwardness.

Naturally, one should not measure with the same stick all the industrially developed countries. It should be borne in mind that some highly developed countries attained economic welfare and high living standards by the oppression and plundering of colonial peoples. And indeed the lack of development in the countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America is the reason why some Western countries succeeded in their development. It

57

would only be fair if these Western countries, would now return to their former colonies at least a part of the plunder.

As for the Soviet Union, our wealth, our industry have been created in a historically short period of time owing to the strenuous efforts of all our people. While we have no surplus capital, we are, nevertheless, rendering ever increasing assistance to those countries which need it. Hundreds of industrial enterprises as well as power stations are now being built in a number of under

developed countries with the assistance of the USSR. We wish to see these countries stand on their own feet, build up their own industry capable of producing not only consumer goods but capital goods as well. This would facilitate the establishment of a national industrial base and accelerate economic progress in the under-developed countries. We believe that any countries striving to consolidate its independence should develop its national industry, its economy, in order to improve the living standards of the people and develop its culture.

In helping the economic advance of under-developed countries, the Soviet Union renders assistance primarily in the form of credit and loans on most favourable terms. We get no profit out of it because we cannot and do not want to enrich ourselves at the expense of the countries whom we assist. We are guided by the sincere desire to help in every possible way the peoples of former colonial countries to achieve genuine economic independence as soon as possible and to raise substantially their living standards. It is understandable that on this fair basis the cooperation between the USSR and the economically underdeveloped countries has been making steady progress and, we hope, it will continue to do so.

In your country for whose people we, the Soviet people, entertain the best feelings, enterprises of iron and steel industry, heavy machine-building, mining, oil, and pharmaceutical industries, a thermal power station and an optical glass-plant are being constructed with the help of the Soviet Union, it also helps to carry out exploratory drilling for oil and other kinds of work. The Bhilai Iron and Steel Plant, the firstling of Indo-Soviet economic co-operation, is now producing an ever increasing quantity of steel and pig iron of which the Indian economy is in such a need, and it has become an enterprise with a complete cycle of production.

The Bhilai Iron and Steel Plant is a symbol of Soviet-Indian friendship. I was told that Mr. P. Dani, Chief Engineer of the Plant, had, compared the Bhilai plant with a sprout which would grow up into a mighty tree of India's industry. Indeed, it is a good sprout, its roots have struck deep into Indian soil and we are happy that the Soviet people have made their friendly contribution to this great enterprise.

Extensive creative ties enriching our two countries have been established and are developing ; we can only wish that in the future things will develop in the same way. May each sprout develop into a mighty tree of Indo-Soviet friendship ! May the friendship between our two countries be as strong as the metal produced at the Bhilai Iron and Steel Plant !

The economic co-operation between countries, which have embarked on the road of independent development, and the Soviet Union has become one of the major factors in the industrialization of economically under-developed countries. In the process of fulfilling its Seven-Year Plan of economic development which provides for a further upsurge of the national economy, our country will be able to allocate an ever-increasing amount of material resources for aid to other countries, including the Republic of India.

The Soviet people rejoice in the achievements pinned by the Republic of India for the past decade. By our own experience, we know very well how difficult it is to overcome economic backwardness and to build up modern industry which constitutes the basis of the independence of any state.

The Soviet people have created their own first-class industry, scored big successes in the development of agriculture and achieved great progress in science and culture. Now it is generally recognized that the Soviet Union holds second place in the world for the volume of industrial production, and in a number of branches of science and technology it occupies leading positions. The Soviet earth satellites, sputniks, our space rockets-one of which became the first artificial planet of the solar system, the second brought a Soviet pennant to the moon and the third made it possible to photograph the invisible side of the moon-all this constitutes a convincing proof of a high level of development achieved by industry, science and technology in our country.

Recently, powerful intercontinental ballistic rockets were successfully tested and this was a magnificent new achievement by Soviet scientists which confirmed the Soviet Union's vast possibilities in the solution of most complicated scientific and technological problems of our time.

At present, our country is engaged in implementing the grand Seven-Year Plan. We have completed the first year of the plan with good results. Last year's industrial output in excess of the plan was bigger than that of old Russia for the whole of 1913. Our economic successes are the result of the active work by all our people inspired by the ideal of establishing the most equitable and perfect society in the world.

Various fables about the Soviet Union are still being spread in the West to the effect that our country allegedly has no democracy, no individual freedoms. Some people even lower themselves to the absurd allegation that there practically exists slave labour in the Soviet Union. But can a country with no freedom for its people, with no democracy, and with the oppression of the individual so successfully develop her economy and culture?

We believe that the supreme right of man that secures freedom is the right to work, to secure life today and tomorrow, his liberation from the dreadful threat of unemployment and poverty. The highest manifestation of individual freedom, the guarantee of the rights of man, is his liberation from exploitation by those who concentrate in their hands the means of production, factories, mills, banks, houses, land and natural resources and use all this for their personal enrichment.

To work for your ownself and for the society, and not for the exploiters—in this we see genuine social justice, the realization of mankind's eternal dream, the manifestation of humanism.

In the Soviet Union, every citizen possesses the real right to work, to rest to social security in old age and in case of disablement and the right to education. Our people have no fear of unemployment, everyone is afforded ample opportunities to reveal his creative forces and abilities.

The opponents of socialism allege that there is no democracy in the Soviet Union because there is only one political party, the party of communists. True, we have only one party. Why? The

explanation lies in the monolithic character of our society, in the fact that exploiting classes and exploitation of man by man have long become a thing of the past in our country. Neither have we any intermediate social groups or strata with special class interests. The Soviet society is a society of working people : workers, peasants and People's intelligentsia united by the same interests and by the same goal. The interests of the Soviet people are expressed and protected by one party, the Communist Party. That is why there are no other parties in our country.

Why do several parties exist in a bourgeois society? Because there the society is divided into classes. Some of them own the means of production while the others possess only their own hands with which they labour. That is why the class of capitalists has its own party, landlords have also a party of their own, the working class establishes its own political party, the working peasantry oppressed by landlords is also forced to organize, to work out their means of struggle, to establish their own party. Petty bourgeoisie, in defence against monopoly capital, is compelled to establish its own political organizations, the intelligentsia also seeks to have its political organisations in order to protect its interests. These are the processes at work in a society consisting of various classes and social strata and that is the reason for the existence of a multi-party system.

As to the democratic principles of state administration, I can tell you that there is not a single country of bourgeois democracy where the people take such an active part in the solution of problems of the state as in the Soviet Union. In our country an ever greater number of functions exercised by the state are transferred to public organisations and local authorities. For example, we have recently abolished the all-Union Ministry of Internal Affairs and its functions have been entrusted to local authorities.

Another fact which testifies to the unity of our people and the democratic nature of the Soviet system is that in recent years there have been no cases of people being brought to trial for political motives. Owing to the rise in the material and cultural standards of the people, the growth of their consciousness and the wide participation of our public in preventing infringements of the law,

the number of offences in the Soviet Union is steadily going down and there is a sharp decrease in the number of criminal cases in courts.

In recent years, the Soviet Union has carried through a number of important measures aimed at further developing the democratic foundations of our state; the rights of the Union Republics and local Soviets have been extended, major changes have been effected in the management of our industry, agriculture and public education and the role of our trade unions and other public organisations has been enhanced. That is why we are witnessing such a powerful upsurge in the Soviet Union's economy and culture and the

59

growth of political and labour activity on the part of the masses.

Ladies and gentlemen,

We express a sincere hope that the co-operation between our countries in the field of economy will further develop successfully and fill with joy the hearts of all friends of peace and true civilization.

More than four years ago, when I was in India for the first time, speaking in Bombay I suggested that the relations between the Soviet Union and India constitute an example of peaceful co-existence and co-operation. Now that the life provides us with such vivid examples of the fruitful co-operation between the USSR and India in their peaceful constructive activities for the good of our peoples and for the benefit of peace, I am very glad to reaffirm my statement.

The enhanced prestige of the Republic of India and of her leaders and the prestige of the Prime Minister Mr. Nehru, spring from the policy of neutrality pursued by the Indian Government, from the policy of non-participation in military blocs. That is a source of wisdom and strength.

Prevailing conditions compelled the Soviet Union and other countries of the socialist camp to set as a counterbalance to the aggressive military alignments of the imperialist states a military alliance known as the Warsaw treaty. But we have repeatedly declared as we do it now

that we would be happy to liquidate all military blocs since they lead not to friendship among nations but to the aggravation of international relations.

We acclaim India's peaceful policy, the policy of non-participation in blocs.

For our part, we are doing our utmost to bring about the liquidation of the "cold-war", the creation of an atmosphere of confidence between states, the abolition of military blocs, the disbandment of all national armies and armed forces; we want to see peace and friendship among nations reigning all over the world. Our two countries stand for peace and against the cold war".

The most radical way to prevent war, to remove the threat of war, is general and complete disarmament. As you are aware, a plan for such general and complete disarmament was put forward by the Soviet Union before the United Nations last September.

We attach great importance to the fact that the 14th session of the U. N. General Assembly unanimously adopted a resolution approving the idea of general and complete disarmament. Talks are now to take place on general and complete disarmament between the powers, and let me assure you that the Soviet Union will do everything in its power to ensure that the talks result in working out and signing a treaty on general and complete disarmament. We are prepared for such disarmament, with the establishment of strict control. The solution of the problem now depends on the Western powers.

The implementation of a general and complete disarmament programme would no doubt usher in a new stage in the development of human society; a world without wars, without the nuclear and rocket armaments race.

A lasting peace under conditions of general and complete disarmament would have the most beneficial effect upon the lives of peoples all over the world without exception. It would make it possible to utilize all the world's available resources for a fuller satisfaction of people's material and cultural needs, and would open up immense opportunities for all-round progress of man-

kind.

The establishment of a lasting peace on earth would be a powerful incentive to eliminate resolutely poverty and backwardness, starvation and disease, ignorance and intellectual backwardness, which have been the sinister companions of mankind throughout ages.

According to the estimates of United Nations experts, the underdeveloped countries need to invest annually some 14 billion dollars in their economics in order to overcome, within a short period, their backwardness compared with the leading industrial powers, whereas the arms race devours annually some 100 billion dollars. Will it not be possible to allocate out of the 100 billion dollars-which, with general and complete disarmament, will be snatched from the forces of destruction-fifteen or even twenty billion dollars for the solution of the world historic problem of saving hundreds of millions of people from poverty and starvation ?

We hope that the forthcoming meeting of the Heads of Government of the U.S.S.R. the U.S.A Great Britain and France, which has now been agreed upon, will show a constructive approach to the settlement of the major international problems and, primarily, the disarmament problem.

60

The Soviet Government is determined to achieve the implementation of general and complete disarmament and it desires to facilitate the attainment of an international agreement on this question. With this end in view our Government systematically, from year to year, reduces military appropriations in the budget of the Soviet Union. In the last four years alone the unilateral reductions of the Soviet armed forces totalled 2,140,000 Men.

On January 15 the Supreme Soviet of the U.S.S.R adopted "The Law on Another Substantial Reduction of the Armed Forces of the U.S.S.R." The armed forces of the Soviet Union are being further reduced by 1,200,000 men i.e. one-third. After this reduction our armed forces will total 2,423,000 men, i.e. it will be below the level suggested in 1956 by the Western powers

themselves for the armed forces of the U.S.S.R and the U.S.A. after the first stage of disarmament. As you see, the Soviet Union decided to reduce its armed forces to an even greater extent than had been suggested by the Western powers, and it did so unilaterally.

Reducing our armed forces once again we say to the Western countries : let us reach agreement on disarmament, let us do our best to prevent war, let us compete in the reduction of armed forces and armaments and in the liquidation of the means of warfare and not in building them up.

We, Soviet people, hope that the parliaments and governments of other countries and, first and foremost, of those possessing the greatest military might will follow our example and will also cut their armed forces, thereby facilitating the implementation of general and complete disarmament.

Ladies and gentlemen,

Grand and joyous vistas open up before humanity. Peace and happiness can and should become the destiny of all people on earth. But to achieve that mankind should be delivered from the nightmare of the armaments race, people should be able to breathe in to the full the fresh air of peace. For this reason, peace and friendship should govern the relations among all nations, same as they govern the relations between the Soviet Union and the Republic of India.

We realize with gratification that in the great struggle for securing a durable peace for all people on earth the Soviet Union and India have common interests. The Soviet people highly appreciate India's contribution to the attainment of this noble goal. We consider that the efforts of India and other peace-loving states aimed at the speediest cessation of atomic and hydrogen weapons tests for all time are very important. We hope that further efforts of all peace-loving countries and people will make it possible in the near future to overcome completely the resistance of the forces which impede the settlement of this problem and seek to continue to poison the atmosphere of our planet with radioactive fall-out from experimental nuclear tests.

Concluding my speech, I would like to express

the confidence that co-operation between our two countries in the common struggle for peace, for general and complete disarmament will in future be even closer and more fruitful. It is my profound belief that the forces of reason, the forces of peace will finally triumph over the forces of war and will secure for mankind a happy and bright future in conditions of a durable peace and progress.

Long live peace on earth !

May the great friendship between India and the Soviet Union live and prosper !

Thank you, ladies and gentlemen, for your attention.

USA INDIA ITALY CUBA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC RUSSIA POLAND FRANCE

Date : Feb 01, 1960

Volume No

1995

UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS

Dr. Radhakrishnan's Welcome Speech

Welcoming the Soviet Prime Minister, Mr. N. S. Khrushchev on behalf of the Members of Parliament, Dr. S. Radhakrishnan, Chairman of the Rajya Sabha, said:

Mr. Prime Minister, Your Excellencies, Members of Parliament, Ladies and Gentlemen :

I have the great honour today to extend a very cordial welcome to the Prime Minister of the Soviet Union on behalf of this Parliament and the people this Parliament represents. We had the honour of receiving him in this Hall and listening to him in November, 1955. Today we welcome him not only as the Prime Minister of the Soviet Union, but as a courageous fighter for world peace.

The achievements of the Soviet Union in the realms of science, technology and engineering

61

have been very impressive-supersonic flights, atomic fission and science of rocketry. But great achievements carry great responsibilities. Strength and power should be accompanied by humility and humanity.

We are, therefore, delighted to know that the Soviet Prime Minister made a great and powerful address to the United Nations Assembly last October, pledging for a phased multilateral disarmament. He also spoke to his Parliament on the 14th of January about the same theme. He knows, as many others do, that any kind of conflict in the present nuclear age will mean general destruction. It is essential to realise that the fate of nations is inseparably tied up. That is why he has been pleading so earnestly and passionately for disarmament. The will to power makes us adopt an attitude of either dominating or passing out. The will to peace helps us to live with one another in freedom and friendship. He recognises that the economic well-being of all nations is an essential condition for a stable peace.

In that very speech which he made last January, he argued that if disarmament is adopted great funds will be released which could be utilised for the purpose of the development of under-developed countries. We recognise, and with great thanks, the assistance which the Soviet Union has rendered to us with regard to our industrial development, especially in the matter of basic industries.

Science in a world which is without war can do marvels. We can dredge seas, melt rocks, make deserts bloom, remove hunger, disease and poverty from the face of the earth.

All that is necessary is that we must be friendly to each other and eliminate war in the world. Economic exploitation, political subjection, racial discrimination, have been the great causes of war. In trying to eliminate them, the Soviet Premier may rest assured that he will have the wholehearted cooperation of the Indian Government and the Indian people.

With his great power, imagination and initiative, he is going to the summit conference which will be held in the month of May. I have no doubt he will try to remove suspicions and misunderstandings, restore confidence, establish friendship as much as one individual can do so far as that conference is concerned.

A great novelist of the Soviet Union, Turgenev-in those days it was not Soviet Union, it was Russia-said: "Man can understand everything, he can understand how the ether vibrates, what is happening in the Sun, but why another man blows his nose in a different way from mine, he cannot understand." In other words, it is essential for us to understand that whatever our particular ways of life and attitudes may be, we are fundamentally human. We must recognise humanity, and humanity is variable. It is not of a single track; it has got different forms which it assumes. What is necessary today for the Great Powers is to recognise this basic humanity and try to live together as friends.

In the attempt to build a secure civilisation where individuals will breathe freely and nations will live decently, he has our complete co-operation. In industrial matters, in cultural matters, in the matter of consolidating peace, in all those matters, our objectives are identical with those of the Soviet Union. Therefore. when we are working for social welfare, for individual freedom and dignity and for the consolidation of peace, the Soviet Premier and the people of the Soviet Union may rest assured that they will get our full co-operation. In years to come, our relationship will get stronger, closer and we can look forward to a better world, a world without wars.

I now request you, my dear Prime Minister, to address this gathering.

USA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC INDIA RUSSIA

Date : Feb 01, 1960

Volume No

1995

Vote of Thanks by Shri Ananthasayanam Ayyangar

Extending a vote of thanks to the Soviet Prime Minister, Mr. N. S. Khrushchev after he addressed the Parliament, Shri Ananthasayanam Ayyangar, Speaker of the Lok Sabha, said:

Your Excellency, Mr. Vice-President, Mr. Prime Minister and friends, on behalf of the Members of Parliament, it is my pleasant duty to tender our grateful thanks to Your Excellency for the excellent address you have given to us this evening.

Last time you came here four years ago, you came as a visitor, this time as a friend and when you come next time, you will be a relation. Within the last four years, you were soon charged with the administration of your great country and have made it one of the most, if not the most, highly industrialised and scientific countries in the world. You have now undertaken to extend the

62

benefits of that science and of that industry to all humanity. May you live a hundred years full of health and cheer to complete your task on this globe.

For the first time, you had the courage to say boldly from the United Nations that there must be total disarmament, not partial disarmament, and followed up that advice by unilaterally reducing your Army, as you have just narrated. I wish that that advice and that example may be followed as quickly as possible by other nations in the world.

You have also tried to establish that mere negative disarmament alone is not useful, that whenever disputes arise in future they must be decided not by resort to war but by peaceful negotiations so that there may be no wars in future.

You are aware and everyone of us is aware that all seeds of conflict arise in the hearts of men before they take final shape in external

warfare etc. All disarmament may take place and all armaments may be thrown into the gulf but, so long as enmity and hatred persist in the hearts of men they may be regenerated the moment the forces of peace become weak.

I am extremely happy to inform you that in our country and culture we have tried to address ourselves to cleansing the hearts and removing all the seeds of conflict from the hearts and to bring about love between man and man, to substitute cooperation for competition, to substitute love for hatred and harmony in Place of discord in all human relations.

The struggle for existence, the survival of the fittest and the strong oppressing the weak are the laws of the jungle. Man has progressed enormously; he can fly today to the top of the skies; dive deep into the bottom of the sea and run on the surface of the globe at break-neck speed. But, so long as the same vestiges of animal life, the struggle for existence etc, continue, he will be only a grand animal.

I am exceedingly happy that you are trying to bring about a revision by your own conduct in Your own country to see to it that permanent peace is brought forward on the surface of the globe. We are one with you. It is not only today. If You go back to the history of the past, the apostle of peace, Lord Buddha was born in our country. He was followed not merely by a saint but by an Emperor who was actually ruling the country, and substituted the law of force by the force of law in human relations. This dates back to 2500 years. And we have got that symbol-that is the chakra, which you find as our emblem. That is the Dharma Chakra, the force of law as against the law of force. We still follow that.

In more recent times-I may remind you to show that we are absolutely wedded to the principle of nonviolence and peace. It has become an article of faith with us-this is the manner in which we won freedom from the mightiest Empire the world has ever seen, over which the Sun never sets. We, fought that battle without shedding a single drop of blood; and we won freedom.

If there are doubting Thomases who doubt our creed of non-violence and truth they may look

at these and be satisfied that we are wedded to truth.

More recently, as you have been generous to recognise, our Prime Minister wanted to extend the era of peace to international relations also by emphasising the principle of Panch sheel.

We do not want Sputniks. You are our Sputnik and you are going round the world, this globe, with the mission of peace. May your mission succeed. All that we can say is that we do not want these missiles and others. We want goodwill and love among all nations. While you are going round and you are trying to make the Summit Conference a success, I do not want to strike a discordant note. It is rather unfortunate that our erstwhile friend has started aggression against our northern territory. Whatever he may do, in spite of provocation our Prime Minister has pledged himself not to deflect from the path of peaceful negotiation. I am sure that he will succeed in the long run, and better sense will prevail.

Your President was with us recently. He was such a lovable figure. We all liked him immensely. He brought Russia and India closer. Your visit now has brought India and Russia closer still.

Your, stay here this time will only be for four or five days. I am glad you have extended it by one day. That is not enough for our country. If you had gone round this time you would have seen how much we have progressed. You are aware that any link which is not industrially and economically great may break the chain for the whole universe. We are trying to put ourselves, up with the aid of friends like yourself and the goodwill of others.

63

I wish you come again, spend some more days here and go round the country. You may rest assured that when you go back you go back with the goodwill of 400 million people of our country who are wedded to peace and who want to increase with the years the friendship between our two great countries for the common good of humanity and ultimately see to it that Peace reigns on earth, competition gives place to co-operation, love takes the place

of hatred and harmony takes the place of discord
in all human relations.

I wish you godspeed.

USA RUSSIA INDIA

Date : Feb 01, 1960

Volume No

1995

UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS

Joint Communique

At the conclusion of the Soviet Prime Minister, Mr. Khrushchev's six-day visit to India a Joint Communique was issued by the Government of India on February 16, 1960.

The following is the full text of the Communique :

At the invitation of the Government of India Mr. N. S. Khrushchev, Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the U.S.S.R., paid a visit to India from February 11 to 16, 1960. He was accompanied by Mr. A. A. Gromyko, Foreign Minister, Mr. N. A. Mikhailov Minister of Culture, Mr. G. A. Zhukov, Chairman of the Committee for Cultural Relations, Mr. S. A. Skachkov, Chairman of the Committee for External Economic Relations, Mr. T. U. Uljabayev, Deputy of the Supreme Soviet of the U.S.S.R., Mrs. T. A. Tairova, Foreign Minister of the Azerbaijan Soviet Socialist Republic, Mr. A. M. Markov, Member of the Board of the Ministry of Public Health of the U.S.S.R., and Mr. I. A. Benediktov, Ambassador of the U.S.S.R. in India.

In Delhi and in the other places which he visited, Mr. Khrushchev was accorded by the public a warm and friendly reception which was impressive for the degree of popular enthusiasm which it displayed. These manifestations of goodwill were alike a tribute to a world statesman who has laboured devotedly in the cause of peace and an expression of the happy relations that exist

between India and the Soviet Union and the peoples of the two countries.

During his stay in Delhi Mr. Khrushchev addressed Members of the Indian Parliament, visited the World Agriculture Fair attended a Civic Reception held in his honour by the city of Delhi. and fulfilled other public engagements. He later visited Suratgarh and Bhilai, both symbols of Indo-Soviet co-operation, one in the agricultural and the other in the industrial field. The success of these two enterprises has been a source of gratification to both countries, and augurs well for the future of economic co-operation between the two countries. His visits to these two centres gave Mr. Khrushchev a vivid impression both of the magnitude of the task upon which India is engaged and of the pace at which she is moving forward to the attainment of the immediate objectives of her developmental plans.

Mr. Khrushchev met and conferred with the President, the Vice-President, the Prime Minister and other members of the Government of India. His talks with the Prime Minister, held in a friendly and cordial atmosphere, covered a wide range of subjects in the international sphere as well as specific matters of mutual concern to the two countries.

The two Prime Ministers noted with much satisfaction the recent favourable trends in world affairs leading to a marked lessening of international tensions. This improvement is due in no small measure to the personal initiative and coordinated effort of the leaders of the Great Powers, notably Mr. Khrushchev, Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the U.S.S.R., and Mr. Eisenhower, President of the U.S.A. The direct contacts which have been established between them and are being developed through interchange of visits have been a valuable factor in promoting international understanding, and have facilitated the welcome agreement to hold a meeting, at the highest level, of the leaders of U.S.S.R., U.S.A., U.K. and France in May next. The hopes of all men of peace are centred on this and similar meetings, and it is the ardent wish of all men that the efforts of the leaders of the Great Powers will meet with a full measure of success. For her part, India gladly pledges her goodwill and moral support for these continuing and sustained efforts towards peace.

The Prime Minister of India repeated his appreciation of Mr. Khrushchev's proposals for total disarmament. In Indian eyes they were, in essence, a call for the application of the principle of non-violence to the solution of international problems. The interest which these proposals roused in all countries, and particularly in the United Nations, was a reflection not merely of man's moral sense but his acute awareness of the

64

dangers of a nuclear war. The two Prime Ministers reaffirmed their stand regarding the prohibition of thermonuclear weapons and other means of mass destruction. They also expressed the hope that the first step, namely, the cessation of nuclear tests, would be taken by the Great Powers in the spirit, and on the lines, of the resolution which it was India's privilege to introduce at the last session of the General Assembly. Not only nuclear weapons, but conventional armaments too are a heavy drain on human progress. The latest reduction of Armed Forces in the Soviet Union, following similar reductions in the recent past was recognised by India as a notable contribution towards the fulfilment of the age-old dream of turning swords into ploughshares.

In his talk with Prime Minister, Shri Jawaharlal Nehru and other Indian statesmen, Mr. N. S. Khrushchev, Chairman of the Council of Ministers, expressed his high appreciation of India's policy of non-alignment and non-participation in military alliances. He stressed the fact that this policy was greatly respected in the Soviet Union. The Soviet Government was convinced that by pursuing this policy India and her Prime Minister personally were making a substantial contribution to the maintenance and consolidation of world peace. Mr. Khrushchev wished the Government and the people of India success in pursuing this policy and emphasised the fact that joint efforts by the Soviet Union and India in defence of peace would continue to be an important factor contributing to the lessening of international tension and the development of international cooperation.

As between India and the Soviet Union, at no time have their mutual relations rested on a mere basis of friendship and understand-

ing than now. Their common allegiance to the principles of peaceful co-existence and their common determination to assist towards the establishment of lasting peace have brought them closer together and have progressively enlarged the area of beneficent co-operation between them in the United Nations and elsewhere. The two countries share the conviction that the remarkable advance now being made in science and technology, in which the Soviet Union has taken a leading part, would little serve the cause of humanity unless the world were rid of the haunting spectre of war and the foundations were laid of an enduring peace. Disarmament, amity between nations, the rapid development of these regions of the world which have long endured poverty and neglect—these alone are the true deterrents to war. The Prime Ministers expressed their faith that to the creation of these conditions, upon which depended to so great an extent the prospects of the peaceful progress of mankind, it would be the endeavour of both their countries to make their fullest contribution.

The Prime Ministers were glad to observe that the relations between the two countries were no less close in the economic and cultural spheres. Economic and technical collaboration between India and the Soviet Union embraces a wide variety of projects : the Bhilai steel plant, which has gone into production and whose original capacity is now being more than doubled; the machine building plant at Ranchi; the power plant at Neyveli; the Korba coal project; the two million ton refinery at Barauni; oil exploration and others. To the credits already granted, the Soviet Union has recently added a new one of 1,500 million roubles. An agreement was signed during Mr. Khrushchev's stay in Delhi as to the utilization of this credit for major projects to be included in the Third Plan. So was also, for the first time, a cultural, scientific and technological agreement between the two countries.

Mr. Khrushchev was last in India in December 1955. Since then much has happened affecting the Indian as well as the world scene. His present visit has afforded Mr. Khrushchev an opportunity of seeing for himself, or obtaining first-hand information on the results of the efforts which India is making, in all spheres of developmental activities, to improve the lot of the Indian people and ensure for them a higher and ever in-

creasing standard of living. The visit has also given the two Prime Ministers the opportunity, to which they have long looked forward, of renewing their friendship and for personal discussions on the many matters that claim their common interest. The meeting between the heads of Government of India and the U.S.S.R. and the talks they have had, more particularly those on a personal level, have been profitable to them both; and to the new chapter in Indo-Soviet relations which opened with the visit of the Prime Minister of India to the Soviet Union in June 1955 has been added a significant page, recording a notable step forward in the consolidation of the cordial and friendly relations between the two countries.

USA INDIA UNITED KINGDOM AZERBAIJAN FRANCE

Date : Feb 01, 1960

Volume No

1995

UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS

Cultural Agreement Signed

A Cultural Agreement between India and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics was signed in

65

New Delhi on February 12, 1960. The agreement aims at strengthening ties of existing friendship and promoting further understanding and closer co-operation in the fields of culture, science, education, art and technology etc., between the two countries.

His Excellency Mr. G. A. Zhukov, Chairman of the Committee of Ministers of the U.S.S.R. for Cultural Relations with Foreign Countries, signed the Agreement on behalf of the Union of the Soviet Socialist Republics, and Dr. Humayun Kabir, Union Minister of Scientific Research & Cultural Affairs, signed on behalf of the Republic

of India.

The Cultural Agreement consists of eight Articles and will come into force on the date of exchange of the Instruments of Ratification which shall take place at Moscow in the near future.

Under the Agreement, the two Governments desire to promote mutual cultural exchange, stimulate co-operation and support the development of relations between the educational, scientific, technological, cultural, sporting, athletic and research institutions ; mutual visits and participation in congresses and conferences organised by the Parties; reciprocal visits of specialists, educationists, artists, scientists, research workers, athletes, coaches and sportsmen ; exchange of professors, teachers of institutes and universities, scientists, workers of art ; organising lectures and lecture courses ; exchange of students on scholarship basis ; carrying out joint research work in the fields representing mutual interests ; promoting mutual exchange of tourists ; exchange of cultural, educational, scientific and technical experiences ; arranging educational, art, scientific and technological exhibitions and expositions etc. ; showing documentary films and newsreels and promoting mutual purchases and demonstration of feature films ; exchange of radio and TV programmes ; exchange of books and translations ; exchange of educational, cultural, scientific and technical documentation, material, equipment ; providing facilities for training, study, carrying out research work and specialisation in the educational, cultural and technical institutions of the two countries ; recognition of diplomas and degrees in the various arts, educational, scientific, technical and research institutions of the two countries. The agreement also envisages the setting up of a joint Indo-Soviet Committee for coordinating and implementation of the provisions of the Agreement and shall meet alternately at New Delhi and Moscow at least once a year.

The present Agreement is the tenth in the series of Cultural Agreements signed by India since 1951. The earlier Agreements were signed with Turkey, Iraq, Indonesia, Japan, Iran, Poland, Rumania, United Arab Republic and Czechoslovakia.

INDIA UNITED KINGDOM USA RUSSIA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC INDONESIA IRAN IRAQ
JAPAN POLAND TURKEY NORWAY

Date : Feb 01, 1960

Volume No

1995

UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS

Loan Agreement Signed

An agreement between the Governments of India and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics was signed in New Delhi on February 12, 1960. The agreement covered the new credit of 1500 million roubles which was recently offered by the U.S.S.R. and accepted by the Government of India.

The Prime Minister of India, Shri Jawaharlal Nehru and the Soviet Prime Minister, Mr. N. S. Khrushchev were present at the signing ceremony.

The agreement signed today sets out the list of projects and the details of the technical collaboration covering these projects.

The agreement was signed on behalf of the Government of India by Shri S. S. Khera, Secretary to the Government of India and Chairman of the Negotiating Committee which was specially constituted to deal with this credit, and on behalf of the Government of the USSR by Mr. S. A. Skachkov, Chairman of the State Committee of Foreign Economic Relations of the U.S.S.R. Council of Ministers.

The two Governments have agreed that the new credit shall be utilised for the expansion of the following enterprises :

- (1) Expansion of the Bhilai Steel Works and its ancillary facilities, so as to increase its capacity to 2.5 million tons of steel per year.
- (2) Expansion of the Heavy Machinery Plant at Ranchi (Bihar) to its design capacity of 80,000 tons per year.
- (3) Mining machinery plant ; expansion and

diversification.

(4) Completion of the oil refinery at Barauni (Bihar).

(5) Manufacture of heavy electrical equipment.

66

(6) Manufacture of precision instruments.

(7) Exploration, development and production of oil and gas by the Oil & Natural Gas Commission in Cambay and in other areas.

(8) Expansion of the capacity of the Neyveli Power Plant (Madras) from 250,000 K.W. to 400,000 K.W.

(9) Expansion of the Korba Thermal Power Station (Madhya Pradesh) by the addition of 200,000 K.W. installed capacity.

(10) A new thermal power station at Singrauli (Uttar Pradesh) with a capacity of 250,000 K.W.

67

INDIA USA RUSSIA

Date : Feb 01, 1960

March

Volume No

1995

Content

CONTENTS

| | |
|---|----|
| BULGARIA | |
| Trade Agreement Signed | 69 |
| CHILE | |
| Trade Agreement Signed | 69 |
| CZECHOSLOVAKIA | |
| Letters Exchanged | 69 |
| DENMARK | |
| Instruments of Ratification Exchanged | 70 |
| GREECE | |
| Trade Agreement Extended | 70 |
| INDIA IN THE UNITED NATIONS | |
| Shri C.S. Jha's Statement in Security Council on South Africa | 71 |
| INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS | |
| Prime Minister's Statement in Lok Sabha | 80 |
| JAPAN | |
| Agreement with Japanese firm Signed | 83 |
| NORWAY | |
| Instruments of Ratification Exchanged | 84 |
| PAKISTAN | |
| Shri Hafiz Mohd. Ibrahim's Statement on Canal Waters Dispute | 84 |
| Joint Communique on Trade Talks | 85 |
| Pakistani Stamps Showing Indian Territory | 86 |
| RUMANIA | |
| Letters Exchanged | 86 |
| UNION OF SOUTH AFRICA | |
| Prime Minister's Statement on Lok Sabha Resolution on Firing | |
| in South Africa | 87 |
| Prime Minister's Statement on Lok Sabha Motion on Firing | |
| in South Africa | 89 |
| Indians in South Africa | 90 |
| UNITED ARAB REPUBLIC | |
| President Nasser's Visit | 90 |

| | |
|-------------------------------|----|
| President Nasser's Reply | 91 |
| Nehru-Nasser Joint Communique | 92 |
| Trade Agreement Signed | 93 |
| YUGOSLAVIA | |
| Cultural Agreement Signed | 93 |

MINISTRY OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS: EXTERNAL PUBLICITY DIVISION
GOVERNMENT OF INDIA

BULGARIA CHILE NORWAY SLOVAKIA DENMARK GREECE INDIA JAPAN PAKISTAN SOUTH
AFRICA YUGOSLAVIA

Date : Mar 01, 1960

Volume No

1995

BULGARIA

Trade Agreement Signed

A new Trade and Payments Agreement between India and Bulgaria was signed in New Delhi on March 3, 1960. The Agreement will be valid from January 1, 1960 and will be in force for a period of three years. The Trade Agreement concluded on April 18, 1956 between the two countries had expired on December 31 last.

Under the new Agreement, payments for all commercial and non-commercial transactions will be made in non-convertible Indian Rupees, and trade will be balanced on a higher level.

Shri K. R. F. Khilnani, Joint Secretary, Ministry of Commerce and Industry, signed the Agreement on behalf of the Government of India while Mr. Ivan Popove, Director, Ministry of Foreign Trade, and Leader of the Trade Delegation from Bulgaria, signed on behalf of his Government.

India will import from Bulgaria machinery of various kinds, electric generators and electric conducting equipment, diesel mine locomotives,

electric motors, laboratory instruments including electro-medical instruments, caustic soda, soda ash, antibiotics, chemicals including tanning materials, raw silk, photographic paper, etc.

Apart from traditional items like tea, coffee, spices, vegetable oils, shellac, processed and semi-processed hides and skins and cashewnuts, India will also export sewing machines, sports goods, plastic goods, light engineering goods, ropes for ships, medicinal drugs and herbs, pharmaceuticals, cotton textiles and hosiery, leather manufactures, woollen textiles and woollen hosiery, jute and coir products, handicrafts and handlooms, films (exposed), etc.

Indian exports to Bulgaria during the 11 months ended November 1959 were valued at Rs. 24 lakhs. Imports from Bulgaria during the corresponding period were also of the same order. In 1958, imports from and exports to Bulgaria were of the order of Rs. 7 lakhs each way.

BULGARIA INDIA USA RUSSIA

Date : Mar 01, 1960

Volume No

1995

CHILE

Trade Agreement Signed

A new Trade Agreement was signed on March 10, 1960 at San Tiago between India and Chile replacing the earlier agreement of 1956.

The new agreement, which would be valid up to the end of 1962, envisages import by India of 75,000 tons of Chilean nitrate during the next three years. Chile is expected to take larger quantities of jute manufactures, tea and coir products.

The other important items included in the schedule of imports from Chile are sulphur, copper (raw), lead and newsprint. The main items included in the schedule of Indian exports to Chile are tea, jute manufactures, coir products, shellac, light engineering goods, cotton textiles, paraffin wax, vegetable oils, sports goods and hosiery.

India's imports from Chile in 1958 amounted to Rs. 17 lakhs. Exports to Chile were valued at Rs. 97 lakhs. During the first eleven months of 1959, imports from Chile were of the order of Rs. 75 lakhs, while exports from India to Chile amounted to Rs. 82 lakhs.

CHILE INDIA RUSSIA

Date : Mar 01, 1960

Volume No

1995

CZECHOSLOVAKIA

Letters Exchanged

Negotiations for a trade arrangement between India and, Czechoslovakia for the year 1960 concluded in New Delhi on March 2, 1960. Letters were exchanged between Shri K. R. F. Khilnani,
69

Joint Secretary, Ministry of Commerce and Industry and Mr. L. Pesl, Commercial Counsellor of the Czechoslovak Embassy in India, embodying the trade arrangements.

The main items of imports into India from Czechoslovakia are capital goods, machinery, machine tools, agricultural tractors, diesel locomotives and paper. India's exports to Czechoslovakia are jute and coir manufactures, handicraft products, de-oiled cakes, tinned fish and prawns, vegetable oils, engineering goods, iron and manganese ore, mica, shellac, pig iron, chemicals

and pharmaceuticals.

India's trade with Czechoslovakia is governed by the Trade Agreement which was signed in September 1957. This Agreement was extended by a Protocol in May 1959 and is valid up to the end of this year.

The volume of trade between the two countries during the first eleven months of the last year was of the order of Rs. 740 lakhs.

NORWAY SLOVAKIA INDIA USA RUSSIA

Date : Mar 01, 1960

Volume No

1995

DENMARK

Instruments of Ratification Exchanged

Instruments ratifying the Agreement for Avoidance of Double Taxation of Income between India and Denmark, which had been signed at Governmental level at Copenhagen on September 16, 1959, were exchanged in New Delhi on March 9, 1960 by Mr. Arne Bogh Andersen, Ambassador of Denmark and Shri E. S. Krishna-moorti, Chairman of the Central Board of Revenue, Ministry of Finance. A Notification under Section 49A of the Income Tax Act has also been issued in a Gazette of India Extraordinary. With the completion of these formalities the Agreement will come into force in both the countries.

The Agreement provides for taxation of industrial and commercial profits, dividends, interest, royalties and pensions only by the country in which the source of the income is located. Relief from double taxation is thus provided for by an ab initio segregation of the areas of taxation.

The Agreement will be effective in India for

and from the assessment year beginning on the 1st day of April, 1959.

DENMARK INDIA MALI USA

Date : Mar 01, 1960

Volume No

1995

GREECE

Trade Agreement Extended

Letters were exchanged in New Delhi on March 2, 1960 between Shri K.R.F. Khilnani, Joint Secretary, Ministry of Commerce and Industry, and Mr. Nicholas Hadji Vassiliou, Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the Government of Greece in India, extending the validity of the Trade Agreement between the two countries up to the end of this year.

The Trade Agreement, which was signed on February 14, 1958, expired on December 31, 1959.

Under the letters exchanged today, sugar has been added to the list of Indian commodities available for export to Greece.

The volume of trade between India and Greece amounted to Rs. 51 lakhs in 1957, Rs. 83 lakhs in 1958 and Rs. 33 lakhs during January. November, 1959.

Indian exports to Greece are gums and lac, cotton waste, raw hemp, coir fibres, spices, mica, fibres for brushes and brooms jute manufactures and coir yarn.

India's imports from Greece are figs, gums and resins.

GREECE INDIA USA RUSSIA

Date : Mar 01, 1960

Volume No

1995

INDIA IN THE UNITED NATIONS

Shri C.S. Jha's Statement in Security Council on South Africa

Shri C. S. Jha, India's Permanent Representative to the United Nations, made a statement in the Security Council on March 30, 1960, in the debate on the situation in the Union of South Africa.

The following is the text of the statement :

Mr. President,

I should like first of all to express the deep appreciation of my delegation to the Security Council for its courtesy in inviting us to participate in the discussion on the matter which India and twenty-eight other nations have brought to the urgent attention of the Security Council.

At this stage I would like to confine my statement to what I might call the substantive aspects of this question. That is to say, I should like to elaborate on the approach of my Government to this question, on the *raison d'être* of our complaint to the Security Council, and I would seek permission at a later appropriate stage to speak in more detail on the question of competence and any other question that may arise in the course of the discussion.

The substance of the matter is clearly embodied in our letter (S/4279 and Add. 1) to the Security Council. That letter is brief. We believe that the brevity of the communication was appropriate in view of the fact that all members of the Security Council are equally aware of the facts of the grave situation that has been caused by the mass killings of peaceful demonstrators in the Union of South Africa and share the concern

of all of us. The issues and dangers posed by the incidents and developments of a few days ago transcend the considerations of geographical location or political ideologies and alignments, and threaten to engulf us all in enormous tragedy and impending catastrophe.

May I be permitted, Mr. President, to restate the facts of the situation that my Government has thought fit to bring to the notice of this august and important body. A week ago, at Sharpeville, near Vereeniging in South Africa, a crowd of 20,000 peaceful and unarmed demonstrators were mercilessly fired upon by sub-machine guns and other automatic weapons. Official South African figures gave at first 72 persons as dead and 184 injured, but unofficial sources place the number of dead and injured much higher. I should add that the latest official version of the casualty figures which appear in this morning's papers places the number of dead at 89 and the injured at 257. The same day—that is, on 21 March—at Langa, a crowd of African demonstrators protesting against unjust and racially discriminatory pass laws was fired upon, and two persons were killed. These events were the tragic culmination of mass demonstrations throughout South Africa on the same day. According to The Times of London, of 22 March :

"On the 21st March, thousands of Africans in the main townships reported at police stations without passes. They queued up to have their names taken and will appear in court under the pass laws later this week."

I may add, in parentheses, that this is a well-known technique of non-violent non-co-operation and passive resistance perfected by Mahatma Gandhi, architect of Indian freedom, with which we in India are familiar and which is being increasingly adopted by downtrodden people everywhere.

According to The Times of London, again of 22 March: "During the day a squadron of Sabre jets swooped over the heads of the thousands of demonstrators in several townships". And further, describing what happened at Vereeniging, The Times goes on to say :

"Quite suddenly there were bursts of

firing, chiefly from Sten guns, and the mob scattered, leaving about 80 people sprawled on the ground in a growing pool of blood ... Mr. Charles Channon, a press photographer with long war experience, described the scene as the bloodiest he had ever seen."

As if this was not enough to show the merciless and callous attitude of the Government of the Union of South Africa, according to The New York Times of 22 March, and I quote :

"A senior police official said : `I do not know how many we have shot. If they do these things, they must learn the hard way."

And even after all this, the Prime Minister
71

of the Union of South Africa, Dr. Verwoerd, spoke in the South African Parliament on 22 March in the following strain :

"These disturbances were a periodic phenomenon and had nothing to do with poverty and low wages His (the Prime Minister's) first duty was to thank the South African police on behalf of the House and the people for the courageous, efficient way they handled the situation... The police at times found it difficult to control themselves, but they had done so in an exemplary manner."

Some control indeed. However, I do not wish to comment on this.

On 25 March, the South African Government issued a statement in London saying that in Monday's 21 March demonstrations in which police opened fire on Africans, the Africans "shot first and the police were forced to fire in self-defence to avoid even more tragic results." According to factual information now available," the statement goes on, "the disturbances resulted from a planned demonstration of about 20,000 natives in which demonstrators attacked the police with assorted weapons including firearms." This statement, which seeks to refute the allegation that the demonstrations were peaceful, is clearly an after-thought. It was issued four days

after the event.

Let us go back to The Times of London, of 22 March which, referring to the incidents at Vereeniging, says :

"... there was shooting in the morning in which one African was killed and another was wounded. The police then brought out armoured cars and the official story said that there was some stoning of the armoured cars."

There was no mention of any firing of shots by the demonstrators. No story published in the major newspapers after, the incidents refers to any injuries to policemen, though the latest official version available in this morning's papers talks of seventeen policemen injured. The nature and extent of their injuries are not stated, and it took nearly a week, or perhaps more than a week, to find out that seventeen policemen had been injured. The Times' story states :

"...the police had brought a dozen armoured vehicles to the police station and there was a large crowd near the police station shouting 'Africa, Africa.' Suddenly" -and this is an important expression --"there were bursts of firing, chiefly from Sten guns, and the mob scattered, leaving about 80 people sprawled on the ground in a pool of blood."

It is clear that the South African Government's allegation that the demonstrators fired shots at the police, to put it mildly, is only self-exculpatory, in view of the rising tide of world opinion.

Here, if I may, I should like to digress a little in the context of the statement that was made by the representative of the Union of South Africa this morning, in which he gave a very different picture of what has happened. About half an hour ago, I received a telegram from the Secretary-General of the African National Congress, which reads as follows :

"Deputy President African National Congress Oliver Tambo left South Africa to appear in person Security Council riot situation,"

Dr. Tambo has evidently not arrived, but I am sure that when he comes here-and if he petitions the Security Council, and the Security Council in its wisdom grants him a hearing-he will have a very different story to tell. I thought I ought to mention this, because we have had a one-sided version from the representative of the Union of South Africa, which version is not corroborated by the newspapers published in this country or in other countries.

Anybody who chanced to see the National Broadcasting Company's television programme on Sunday last will have at once been convinced of the remarkably peaceful and disciplined nature of the demonstrations by the thousands of Africans. It is unbelievable that such a crowd should have fired on the police or indulged in any violent action. Even taking the worst view, supposing a few stones were thrown at the armoured cars by some people in the crowd, that does not change the peaceful character of the demonstrations. Does that for a moment justify the merciless firing on the demonstrators by sub-machine guns and other automatic weapons to such an extent that nearly 80 people lost their lives and over 200 were injured ?

It is clear, Mr. President, to my delegation, as it should indeed be to the members of the Security Council, that for daring to defy the laws the South African Government were deter-

72

mined to teach the demonstrators a lesson by the naked use of force, of which the flying of Sabre jets over the demonstrating crowds and the use of armoured cars and machine guns are conclusive evidence.

I may add here that according to the same NBC television report, such of the demonstrators at Vereeniging as had escaped death and were arrested were taken from the fire to the frying pan : they were sentenced to whipping from eight to ten strokes each.

According to newspaper reports, during the nation wide observance of mourning by Africans in South Africa two days ago, although the demonstrations were by and large peaceful, at

some places and in some instances there were clashes between the police and the demonstrators. However regrettable this may be-and you very well know, Mr. President, that my delegation is against the use of violence by anybody in any form-the eruption of some violence during nationwide demonstrations of this kind was inevitable as a reaction to the Government's action on 21 March and their repressive regulations subsequently enacted banning the processions and meetings almost throughout Africa. Violence breeds violence; that is the danger in all such situations, and if it is a fact that the Government of the Union of South Africa now finds the African population in an angry and violent mood, they can lay the blame squarely on their own shoulders.

As a matter of fact, Mr. President, Africans are determined to vindicate their rights; they are resorting en masse to passive resistance. The Government of the Union of South Africa shows determination by word and by deed to suppress all agitation against racially discriminatory and segregationist laws in a manner tantamount to massacre of innocent persons whose only crime is the colour in which they were made the image of God, and that they dare protest non-violently and peacefully and even, in many instances, silently against laws which deny them the fundamental human rights and relegate them to the position of criminals and prisoners in their own homeland.

The menace of the situation has indeed mounted up to the point of wholesale and open conflict. South Africa has indeed become a cauldron of racial hatred and violence. News has just been received of a crowd of peaceful African demonstrators 30,000 strong, before the South African Parliament in Capetown, and a large number of armed forces having been called out. All over South Africa demonstrations and actions by the police are continuing.

When I say all this, Mr. President, I would like to assure you and the members of the Council that our hearts really go out in sorrow, and sympathy not only to the Africans but to all people in South Africa.

According to newspaper reports, many white people of South Africa, no doubt without any objection from the Government, are arming

themselves to the teeth. They are buying guns and ammunition in hundreds; the acquisition and possession of same, be it noted, is prohibited to the African people of South Africa.

You have thus, Mr. President, a situation replete with all the ingredients of a terrible explosion—the determination of the African people to vindicate their fundamental rights, and in doing so to sacrifice their lives; the determination of the Government to maintain its racial policies, even if that means killing hundreds of Africans; the determination of the white people of South Africa to use arms if necessary against the Africans to preserve their privileged position of a master race which their leaders in and out of Government have deluded them into believing; and last but not least, the anger and humiliation felt by hundreds of millions of people on the African continent and by non-white peoples everywhere. Who can then blame us for seeking the intervention of the Security Council to prevent such an explosion ?

Mr. President, the situation would be dangerous enough if the consequences of the racial explosion could be confined to the borders of South Africa. It is our contention that even then the United Nations organs, including the Security Council, would be competent to take cognisance of the situation as a potential cause of international friction, and recommend remedial action. The gravity of the situation, however, is greatly multiplied because of its international ramifications.

International opinion both within and outside the United Nations recognizes that the racial problem, particularly in Africa, is now a concern of the entire international community. The intensity and the sustained character of the concern shown on this question by the United Nations since 1946, when India brought to the attention of the General Assembly the "Question of Treatment of Indians in South Africa", the fact that racial discrimination anywhere and particularly in South Africa stirs to the innermost depths

tremendous masses of men, not only on the continent of Africa but elsewhere too, the emergence of a strong sense of African nationalism and Afri-

can personality which is not prepared to tolerate the slightest manifestation of racialism and assumption of superiority by any other people-these are among the most striking events of our time. These are now a part of the ethos of the United Nations and represent currents and forces which the world can only ignore at its peril.

The shooting down of large numbers of unarmed men and women would have been regrettable in any case; world opinion was bound to be moved by the killing of peaceful and defenceless demonstrators. But the killings in South Africa do not stand out in isolation. They are intimately concerned with and are indeed a culmination of the cult of racism in South Africa which the United Nations has deplored and condemned over the years. The events in South Africa can no longer be an exercise in academic discussion on human rights. They cut much deeper than that; and if international peace has any relation to the state of feeling of millions of people inhabiting vast geographical areas in Africa and Asia-and may I add here that they constitute well above half the world's population-it is clear that seen against the background of the current forces in Africa they constitute a serious threat to international peace and have grave potentialities for international friction. Peace does not mean mere avoidance of war; the threat to international peace does not merely connote a threatening war situation as between two or more nations. Any issue which threatens to divide humanity as deeply as the present one is a threat to international peace.

Here, if, I may digress a moment, I must point out that the interpretation given by the representative of South Africa-whom I do not see, to my great regret and misfortune, at the table, but I hope he will hear my voice somewhere-that there are no two parties in the present dispute facing each other for a war, is much too narrow and unacceptable and does not conform to the concepts embodied in the Charter. Let me remind our South African colleague of what a great countryman of his, and one of the architects of the Charter, Prime Minister Field Marshal Smuts, said in San Francisco. I quote excerpts from Field Marshal Smuts' statement :

"The new Charter should not be a mere legalistic document for the prevention of

war. It would suggest that the Charter should contain at its very outset and in its preamble, a declaration of human rights and of the common faith which has sustained the Allied peoples in their bitter and prolonged struggle for the vindication of these rights and that faith..."

"Let us, in this new Charter of humanity, give expression to this faith in us, and thus proclaim to the world and to posterity that this was not a mere brute struggle of force between the nations but that for us, behind the mortal struggle, was the moral struggle, was the vision of the ideal, the faith in justice and the resolve to vindicate the fundamental rights of man, and on that basis to found a better, freer world for the future..."

"The peace we are striving for, and are taking such pains to safeguard, is a peace of justice and honour and fair-dealing as between man and man, as between nation and nation. No other peace would be worth the sacrifices we have made and are prepared to make again and the heavy responsibilities we are prepared to take under the Charter."

This, I submit, is the true spirit of the Charter and this is the background of faith and high moral principles against which we must interpret not only Article 34 but every other Article of the Charter. I have taken the liberty of quoting this statement to show that the contention that there must be two Parties armed with guns or sticks, or whatever it may be, facing each other for an open conflict, as the only situation in which Article 34 applies, is totally irrelevant and unacceptable.

The situation in the Union of South Africa has grave implications not only for Africa but for the rest of the world. Not only will it lead to racial bitterness and conflict in Africa, but it will create feelings of antagonism in all non-European countries and might violently upset the balance of adjustment in multi-racial societies. I am sure, Mr. President, it is not necessary for me to elaborate further on these obvious conclusions. Already international friction has been generated between

the Union of South Africa and many other countries because of its racial policies; and as the members of the Security Council know, as far back as 1946, India felt compelled to sever economic relations, and later to close its diplomatic mission in South Africa. Already the strongest feelings have been roused and there have been demands by the public and in the press in African countries for reprisals, and even

74

intervention, to save their kith and kin in South Africa from massacre. The countries which are members of the Security Council and the statesman who represent them here should be fully aware of the explosive potentialities of the situation, and we hope that they will recognize the danger and apply remedial action.

World opinion at any time and during any period of history, Mr. President, can only be gauged by expressions of opinion of leaders of governments and leaders of public opinion and newspapers, and at the United Nations, I hope you will grant me the indulgence to place before the Council samples of such opinion which are germane to the issue before the Council. I can do no better than quote from the statement made by the Prime Minister of India in the Indian Parliament a few days ago. This, I need hardly say, can be taken, without a shadow of doubt, as an expression of the feelings and emotions of 400 million people of India, without distinction as to race, religion, creed or colour. Speaking before the Indian Parliament on 23 March, Mr. Nehru deplored the large scale killings near Capetown in South Africa which he said, "had shocked the conscience of the world, more particularly, the people of Asia and Africa". The Prime Minister of India remarked: "Hundreds of millions of people of Asia and Africa could never accept the spirit behind the large-scale killing—the spirit of racial mastery, the spirit of authoritarianism and segregation, etc." Mr. Nehru continued, and I quote again :

"Of course this is, as far as we know a special happening that will almost affect the course of history. Here is Africa at the present moment in a resurgent, proud and defiant mood after long centuries of suppression. Many coun-

tries have become independent and many (others) will become independent. On the other side, there is this picture of people (in South Africa) who are practically prisoners—a whole nation excepting some groups who have settled down from Europe—although they are fully entitled to citizenship." "This kind of culmination of all these events", remarked Mr. Nehru, "leads to certain conclusions in the minds of people that this is not an end of the episode but the prelude to the future".

If I may say so in humility, Mr. President, the events that have happened in South Africa since that statement was made amply prove what Mr. Nehru said.

The Indian Parliament on 28 March, after a debate which was marked by dignity and moderation, and yet with a deep sense of the seriousness of the situation, adopted the following resolution :

"This House deplures and records its deep sorrow at the tragic incidents which have occurred at Sharpeville and in Langa township near Capetown in South Africa on March 21, 1960, resulting in the death of a large number of Africans from police firings. It stands its deep sympathy to the Africans the death of a large number of Africans who have suffered from this firing and from the policy of racial discrimination and suppression of the African people in (heir own homeland."

Speaking on the resolution, the Prime Minister of India said that the racial policies of the Nazi regime under which the Nazis claimed the right not only to suppress but to exterminate a race they considered sub-human, were being adopted and openly proclaimed in South Africa and reminded the Parliament that that policy eventually led to the World War. Mr. Nehru further said that such a policy was dividing now and would divide even more humanity into two large differing and conflicting sections. It would be something worse than even the World War.

It is well-known to members of the Security

Council that Governments all over the world have reacted strongly against the present incidents and have expressed grave concern. The United States Government, which is usually cautious in making such statements, had this to say. I apologise to you, Mr. President, because you quoted this statement at our earlier meeting, but I should like to quote it again because it is a very important statement.

"The United States deplores violence in all its forms and hopes that the African people of South Africa will be able to obtain redress for their legitimate grievances by peaceful means. While the United States, as a matter of practice, does not ordinarily comment on the internal affairs of governments, with which it enjoys normal relations, it cannot help but regret the tragic loss of life resulting from the measures taken against the demonstrators in South Africa."

Another great Power, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, has, according to Tass, its

75

official news agency, authorized the following statement :

"The policy of discrimination practised by the South African authorities with regard to (he peoples of Africa and Asia cannot but arouse legitimate indignation as it leads to gross violations of the elementary rights of man, to glaring acts of violence, to the fanning of racial hatreds and hostility and jeopardizes peace on the African continent."

The people of the United Kingdom, yet another great Power, have been gravely agitated by the recent deplorable events in South Africa, so much so that the United Kingdom Government felt bound to give expression to such concern in the Parliament, which adopted a resolution expressing sympathy with all the peoples of South Africa.

The Prime Minister of Canada has, in a statement in the Canadian Parliament, deplored the development of a situation which has given

rise to such tragic violence and loss of life in South Africa. He added that he was aware that there existed in Canada a profound current of anxiety about methods used by the South African Government to quell African demonstrators. The Government of New Zealand has similarly reacted to the recent incidents in South Africa.

According to the official organ of the Vatican, Osservatore-Romano : "There are no reasons or extenuating circumstances for the shootings." His Holiness the Pope is reported to have given expression to his regret and has characterized the happenings in South Africa as un-Christian.

The Government of Liberia, which may be taken to know the mind of the African people, has issued the following statement :

"The Government of Liberia most seriously deprecates and abhors this systematic, cold-blooded and ruthless murder and vile slaughter of helpless Africans. The Government of Liberia is greatly mortified and most chagrined by this unconscionable and remorseless action and attitude of the South African people."

I apologize to the representative of Liberia.

Mr. Awolowo, Opposition Leader in the House of Representatives in Lagos, urged the Federal Government of Nigeria on 24 March to "repatriate all white South Africans living in Nigeria and to sever all trade relations with South Africa. The Prime Minister of Nigeria has also sent a telegram to the Prime Minister of the United Kingdom expressing great concern at the events in South Africa.

The Prime Minister of Malaya has expressed his country's concern and indignation at the inhuman brutality of the South African Government. The Indonesian Government has termed the shootings "barbarous acts" and has called "on the whole world to put a halt to these mass murders and to, abolish racial discrimination wherever it occurs."

The following editorial comments of the New York Herald Tribune of 24 March and the New York Times of 26 March are typical of the

reactions of responsible newspapers throughout the world.

Says the New York Herald Tribune of 24 March :

"If it was obvious that the harsh injustice of the South African Government must sooner or later exhaust the stoic patience of the Negroes of the Union, nothing can mitigate the appalling tragedy caused by the recent events there. The massacres-they are no less-of defenceless and downtrodden human beings must stand strongly condemned by international opinion.

"Almost as frightening is the attitude which the South African whites continue blindly to maintain. They are reaping a whirlwind whose existence, either in political or moral terms, they do not even recognize."

The following is an extract from the editorial of the New York Times of 26 March

"...the Verwoerd Government and the South African whites would be foolish if they underestimated the sense of shock and horror that has gone around the world since Monday's terrible incident. There have been protests almost everywhere, including the unusual reproof from the United States State Department.

"South Africa has to live with the rest of the world and her people have to live with their own consciences. The policy

76

of apartheid is leading South Africa to isolation and unending strife. An open debate on a world stage like the Security Council might help convince some South Africans they are heading for a national catastrophe."

It is well to remember that these expressions of public opinion are not isolated or sudden reactions to the very tragic losses of life caused a few days ago in South Africa. Throughout the

last decade, the nations represented at the United Nations have realized and given expression to the sense of danger and disquiet and to their concern at the relentless policies of apartheid and racial discrimination followed in South Africa.

I do not want to burden the Council with a long list of quotations from statements made in the General Assembly during the consideration of the items concerning the racial policies of the Government of the Union of South Africa. It is sufficient to say that delegation after delegation from every geographical area of the world has given warning of the grave consequences of such policies and their inevitable culmination in an explosive situation endangering international peace and security. And today all the twenty-nine nations of Asia and Africa represented at the United Nations have, in their grave concern and with full sense of responsibility, approached the Security Council for remedial action.

I apologize for having taken the time of the Security Council to put together this large cross-section of views and opinion expressing the gravest concern at the events in the Union of South Africa. When Members of the United Nations, including the big Powers, the world Press, the official organs of Governments, and leaders of public opinion all over the world give expression to their grave concern at the situation in South Africa and deplore the recent killings, I submit that that fact by itself, Mr. President, leaving aside the feelings and emotions that these events have roused in Africa and in Asia shows that the situation in South Africa might lead to international friction and constitutes a danger to international peace and security.

What are the laws against which Africans demonstrated on 21 March? Under the so-called pass laws every African, who has attained the age of sixteen years, has to carry a reference book. A reference book is not merely an identity card—there are many countries in which identity cards are required on a non-discriminatory basis—it is more; it is a booklet of about fifty pages which the Africans alone have to carry. Without such a reference book the African cannot be in or seek work in any urban area or other areas. Any policeman may at any time call upon an African who has attained the age of sixteen years to produce his reference book. Failure to

do so is a criminal offence and makes him liable to a fine of (pond) 10 or imprisonment of a month.

According to The New York Times despatch of 27 March :

"The pass system was adopted many Years ago to control movements of Africans and to confine them to various areas unless permission was granted for them to go elsewhere. For example, passes have been used to limit the number of Africans moving from rural to urban areas to seek work.

"Passes at present in use contain about fifty pages in which are recorded such information as employment, arrests and tax payments, as well as vital statistics and the photograph and home address of the holder. Each month the employer of an African must sign his pass or the African can be arrested and, in many cases, sent to an African reserve.

"In recent years failure to have valid passes in their possession has meant for many Africans harsh treatment by the police, summary hearings in the courts, loss of employment and great humiliation. The extension of the pass laws to women in the last two years has aroused the African community."

The despatch goes on :

"One important effect of the order is that it will end the notorious farm labour system. This provided that Africans found guilty, at the rate of hundreds weekly, of violations of the pass laws or other minor offences were given the alternative of paying cash fines or serving several months working on private farms designated by the Minister of Justice. Most could not pay the fines."

As the New York Times despatch says :

"In many parts of South Africa, farmers built jails at their own expense from which they could draw Africans convicted of pass offences."

Let me quote, Mr. President, from the editorial of The London Times of 22 March 1960, under the caption "Coming Home to Roost". Speaking of the pass laws, The Times says :

"They are the visible signs of a highly complicated and frankly tyrannical network of control. A feature of it that has aroused special bitterness is that it exposes African women to summary arrest and to detention in prison, while their children may be uncared for at home.

The London Times goes on to say :

"The principle on which these restrictions are based is that Africans count in terms of labour regulations as interchangeable units rather than as human beings. In practice an African who becomes unemployed in one place, where he is entitled by length of residence to remain, dare not take a job outside it for fear of losing his right to be in any urban area."

It is such laws, Mr. President, against which the Africans demonstrated on 21 March ; and these are laws and regulations enacted by a Parliament and by a Government in which the over all million non-white people including Asians, the Coloured and the African people of South Africa, have no right of representation. I submit that these millions of people of South Africa deserve every encouragement and support of the members of the Security Council in their just struggle.

According to the latest newspaper reports, the South African Government has suspended operation of the pass laws. The suspension has taken the form of an announcement by the police that Africans would not be arrested for failure to carry the passes. There has been, however, no abrogation of the pass laws. These remain on the Statute Book in all their ugliness, epitomizing the extreme racial policies of the South African Government, and the suspension itself, the Minister of Justice, Mr. Erasmus, has empha-

sized, is only temporary. If a temporary suspension has been brought about, it is because of the inability of the South African industries to continue their operations without the hundreds of thousands of cheap African labour who are resorting to passive resistance by staying in their homes. As a matter of fact, while on the one hand, there has been a temporary suspension of the pass regulations, on the other, the South African Government has put a wholesale ban on public meetings practically throughout the Union. In addition to the twenty-four major cities and towns in which the ban was imposed on 24 March and while on the one hand the enforcement of the pass laws was being temporarily suspended, on the other, public meetings were banned in forty nine magisterial districts and the Government is at the same time undertaking emergency legislation in the South African Parliament to outlaw the national political organizations of the Africans and of the people of Indian origin. There is thus no change in the policies of the South African Government and, as The New York Times correspondent reports from Johannesburg on 26 March, "the situation continues to be potentially explosive". The truth of this statement has been more than proved by the happenings during the last three days.

Mr. President, the pass laws are not the only manifestly oppressive, discriminatory and segregatory laws in the Union of South Africa; they are but part of a whole complex of the policy of Apartheid, the intent and effect of which is to practise the most thorough-going racial oppression and discrimination the world has ever known. I do not wish to burden the Council with enumeration of the various facets of this policy. They are well-known to the Council. Let me cite a few examples which will give an idea of the atmosphere and the conditions in which Africans live in the Union of South Africa. These, let me add, are relevant to the issues we have brought before the Security Council as background to the situation that has arisen in South Africa.

No African is entitled as of right to acquire freehold title to and anywhere in South Africa, nor is it the intention of the present Government ever to grant such right to the African, even in his own reserves-the Union Government has said so clearly in the Tomlinson Report, U. G. No. 61 of 1955.

Any policeman is entitled, without warrant, to enter and search, "at any reasonable time of the day or night", premises in a town on which he has reason to suspect that an African boy eighteen years of age is committing the criminal offence of residing with his father without having the necessary permission to do so-Government Notification No. 804 dated 13 June 1958 read with Act No. 25 of 1945 as amended, Section 10 (1) (c).

If an Indian-or a Coloured or an African-sits on a bench in a public park, the bench being set apart for the exclusive use of white persons,

78

by way of protest against the Apartheid laws, he commits a criminal offence and is liable to a fine not exceeding three hundred pounds, or to imprisonment not exceeding three years, or to a whipping not exceeding ten strokes, or to both such fine and such imprisonment, or to both such fine and such whipping, or to both such imprisonment and such whipping-Criminal Law Amendment Act No. 8 of 1953, Section 1, read with Act No. 49 of 1953 Section 2 (2).

In a township established for occupation by Africans in 1957, any policeman may, whenever he wishes, for any reason whatsoever, to inspect the dwelling occupied by a resident of the township, enter that dwelling at any time of the day or night-Government Notification 61 of 1958, Section 8, Evaton Native Township.

No African, lawfully residing in a town by virtue of a permit issued to him, is entitled as of right, to have his wife and children residing with him-Natives (Urban Areas Consolidation) Act No. 25 of 1945 as amended, Section 10 (1).

No school for the education of African children may be conducted by a church, unless the school is registered, and the Minister of Native Affairs has an unfettered discretion to refuse to register it if he believes that the establishment of such a school is not in the interests of the African people-as if the establishment of a school could ever be against the interest of children belonging to any race. (Bantu Education Act No. 47 of 1953 as amended, Section 9 .

I could go on endlessly in this fashion, but it is not my intention to do so. I have narrated these facts only to show that the pass laws themselves are only a facet of the whole structure of Apartheid. It is sufficient to say that in South Africa there is discrimination against the non-white people "from the cradle to the grave", as someone has put it. The structure of Apartheid enmeshes the African in every walk of life and makes South Africa a semi-prison house for the millions of its African population.

I should like, Mr. President, to add that any reference to the white people or the racial policies of South Africa should not be understood to include the entire European population of South Africa. There are many among them who deplore Apartheid, and the churches, both Catholic and Anglican, and many other religious organizations, have condemned in no ambiguous terms the policy of Apartheid and the recent mass killings in South Africa. They seem, however, to be a very small minority whose voice is drowned by the blatant and noisy racialism of others in South Africa. All honour and credit to them, and I am sure theirs is the voice of hope for South Africa and the voice of justice and peace. In the language of Shakespeare, "Thus shines a good deed in a naughty world".

Mr. President, my Government, with a full sense of responsibility and realization of the seriousness of the situation in South Africa and its potentialities for plunging the world in racial bitterness and conflict, is among the countries which have approached the Security Council. We know that this situation arises from certain internal policies and actions of the South African Government. We are as zealous of maintaining the internal independence of any other country as we are in maintaining our own. But the events in South Africa, Mr. President, because of their nature and their origin, and because of their ramifications and implications, have gone far beyond the point of being purely an internal affair. They are now a matter of grave concern for the whole world and for the United Nations.

We stand by Article 2 (7) of the Charter, but we do not agree that Article 2 (7) can be a cover for acts which amount to a patent violation of the Charter, whether it be an Article in Chapter

IX or in any other Chapter of the United Nations Charter. Events which cause world-wide concern which have potentialities for international friction and disharmony, and which are directly opposed to the spirit and letter of the Charter, cannot be brought within the straitjacket of Article 2 (7).

I would like to add here, further, that my Government is not motivated by any feelings of hostility towards the South Africans. We feel strongly on this whole situation of racial discrimination. Year after year we have brought this matter before the United Nations, and if we have brought the present situation in South Africa before the Security Council now, that is only because we are gravely perturbed about the explosive possibilities of that situation.

I would like to say to the Council that they have faced many issues ; many situations endangering international peace have been discussed by them but none of the issues brought before the Council measures up in extent and in far-reaching implications to the danger to international peace posed by the situation in South Africa. It has been said that the seeds of war lie in the minds of men. How well has the UNESCO put it in the preamble to its constitution :

"That since wars begin in the minds of

79

men, it is in the minds of men that the defences of peace must be constructed."

The mind, Mr. President, is far stronger than matter ; far stronger, indeed, than the most powerful nuclear weapon ; and it is the minds of men that have been deeply stirred on the continent of Africa and elsewhere by the large scale killings and ruthless and violent suppression of the African people by the Union of South Africa in pursuit of racial policies which are totally contrary to the Charter of the United Nations. The cult of the master race, which is being Practised in all its nakedness in South Africa, is a dangerous one. One has only to look back on the history of our own times, thirty years ago or less. Those who ignored the racial policies, the cult of racism and race superiority practised in Hitler's Germany did so at the cost of a World War. Let not the same mistake be committed again. The

Security Council owes it to itself and to humanity to pool the wisdom and statesmanship of its members and to act and act decisively to save the world from grave danger of a conflagration.

INDIA SOUTH AFRICA USA UNITED KINGDOM CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC CANADA NEW ZEALAND OMAN LIBERIA NIGER NIGERIA INDONESIA GERMANY

Date : Mar 01, 1960

Volume No

1995

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

Prime Minister's Statement in Lok Sabha

The Prime Minister, Shri Jawaharlal Nehru made a statement in the Lok Sabha on March 17, 1960, in reply to a discussion on the demand for grants for the Ministry of External Affairs. Shri Nehru said :

Mr. Speaker, Sir, not very long ago, I had occasion to address this House in regard to an important aspect of foreign affairs in the debate on the President's Address. I am afraid I took a great deal of the time of the House then and I do not propose to tax the House's patience to that extent on this occasion. I hardly think it will be worthwhile for me to repeat what I said on that occasion, more particularly about one of the major questions before us, that is, the troubles we had in our frontiers because of Chinese incursions. We have discussed that on many occasions, rightly, because it is an important and vital matter.

Now, certain developments have taken place to which reference has been made. The Prime Minister of China has been invited by me to visit India for certain talks. He has accepted that invitation but Yet the date has not been fixed, except vaguely about the middle or the third week of April. Some Hon. Members have asked me and pressed me to say how these discussions will take place, what are the particular subjects of

discussion and the like matters.

Now, I would venture to say that it is hardly possible for me or desirable for me to speak in this House or anywhere, in fact, in public about the manner of talks or the manner of carrying on talks that we might adopt. That is not the way that diplomatic conversations or any like talks take place.

In the final analysis, one puts forward in the House or in public broad policies firmly, and it is for this House or for the country to have or not to have a measure of confidence in those who speak on its behalf.

Now, the position of the Hon. Speaker who spoke just before me is perfectly clear and understandable, because he thinks he has not any faith or confidence. May be, others won't have it either, but he has expressed himself with great clarity and said that the best thing for India would be to weaken the Present Prime Minister and to rely on the people. With, of course, the second part, I suppose, all would agree but, perhaps, others may somehow doubt the fact that the Hon. Member, Shri Yadav, as he said, represents the 40 crores of India. Perhaps, some others in this House have also some claims to representation and, perhaps, when it comes to calculation and statistics those who represents might not be easily Visible without a magnifying glass. But however that may be, whatever argument he may put forward is worthy of consideration as every argument should be.

Now, with regard to the many points that have been raised, my colleague the Deputy Minister has dealt with a number of them. In regard to this particular very important matter of the frontier incursions by China, that has become, and undoubtedly is, the major issue before us, before India, in regard to our foreign policy, because anything that affects the integrity of a country must necessarily be the most vital issue for that country. After all, the foreign policy of any country concerns itself primarily with the protection of that country, with the protection of its freedom, of its sovereignty, of its integrity.

These are the first tests of a foreign policy, and

in so far as it is unable to do so, well, it has failed. Whether it has failed because of wrong approaches or whatever the reasons may be, in that measure it fails. I am prepared to accept that definition, that conclusion.

Therefore, in this world today which is tremendously agitated over great problems of war and peace, in the course of a month or two it is said that some of the great ones of the earth are going to meet at a summit meeting to discuss the future of the world one might say because behind their talks lie not only the immediate questions which they might discuss about Germany or Berlin or that very vital matter, disarmament, but ultimately the future of the world does depend-not finally, but it will be affected by those talks or by subsequent talks because I do not imagine that this process of talking will end with the first summit meeting, because if it ended without success, then the future would be dark indeed.

It is not for me to prophesy what is going to happen there, and I have lately said in this House and elsewhere that the prospects are somewhat more favourable than they had been in the past. I believe in that and I hope for what I believe in. It is not merely wishful thinking-of course, it may be so because I so earnestly desire that some good results must come from these talks and what follows good results in regard to disarmament, in regard to stoppage of this horrible thing, production of atomic, nuclear weapons and their tests.

I hope so. Yet I am constrained to say that some recent developments have rather damped my optimism. Some forces appear to be at play which remind one rather forcibly of the days preceding the Second World War. I hope that these forces are not strong, and I do believe that the forces for peace are very much stronger. Nevertheless, it does cause one anxiety to realise that in spite of the two great wars, in spite of the public realisation of the terror of these hydrogen bombs etc., still there should be harping back in some people's minds on the ways and methods and thinking and actions which led to the Second World War, with this difference that the Second World War is supposed to be rather a child's play compared to the war that might descend upon us in this age of jet aircraft and nuclear weapons. That is the broad outlook in this world, an out-

look of hope, but, at the same time, tense with a great deal of apprehension.

On the other hand, one sees powerful movements, also full of hope, moving the millions of Africa, new countries arising there in their independence, new leadership, new urges, new passions, sometimes new conflicts. We talk about Algeria, and with Algeria, with their struggle for freedom, we have sympathised and we have sent them our good wishes. But it is not Algeria alone today but the whole structure of the African Continent that is changing and something new is emerging, something new that will undoubtedly have a powerful effect on the future of the world.

I often wonder what this world will look like in the next 20 years, 30 years, or by the end of the century-it is not far off, this period. It will be very different. We have seen great changes in Asia taking place, continuing. We see now this emergence of Africa on the world scene with a tremendous bang-it has not come slowly, it has come rapidly and rather noisily-and no man knows what the effect of it is going to be, because Africa with all its story of horror and suffering for centuries past in a country full of vitality, and a nation whose people are full of vitality cannot be sat upon too long.

In Africa also one sees the most flagrant example of a policy proclaimed to be a policy of racial suppression, racial antagonism, racial discrimination, a policy of the master race, pursued by those in the south of the continent of Africa, a policy, however much it may perhaps have sympathy from some people in some countries, which at any rate, hardly any person in other countries openly accepts or sides With not even those who may be considered the conservatives of the present age. And yet, there it is, and it is an amazing sight here in Africa, these countries rising up with all their strength and vitality and passion, and anger too sometimes, and there it is still, the continuation of this policy in the far south.

What is going to be the results of all this? These two things are mutually antagonistic. The great new independent Africa States can never agree to this kind of discrimination and racial antagonism which, in the ultimate analysis, is a continuing insult to them and indeed to

everyone concerned. So, we see this. I do not know how things will develop. But I am merely pointing out to this House these tremendous changes and upheavals that are taking place so that we might see our own problems, important as they are to us, in this wider picture and wider structure.

Behind all this lies this technological development which has produced atomic energy, atomic bomb, the jet aircraft, the space age and all that

81

coming up with a rapidity which we can hardly follow in our minds and which obviously are going to change the shape of things in the world and the shape of human living and all that, That is the world we live in. It is a good world for those who dare, who are not afraid, who can look ahead and we are not lost in petty squabbles and petty arguments. It is a bad world for those who do not realise what the world is and where it is aiming and are continually looking at their feet instead of looking sometimes ahead into the distance and to the stars. Whether it is a good world or a bad world, it is the world we live in and we have to face it with all its dangers and all its promises.

As I said, we should have this picture before us but inevitably we have to look at our own problems and the major problem for us in the foreign field is the problem of our frontier. There is no doubt about it, and though some of us may not speak in the high key of some Members of the Opposition, nevertheless, it is obvious that everyone of us is gravely concerned about this problem not only in the present but in the future that looms before us ; gravely concerned, not merely because it has taken place-it is where it is-but because of all manner of implications attached to it, all manner of forebodings.

I ventured to point out on a previous occasion that what has happened on our frontier is bad enough but the real historical significance of this is that something new has come. All this talk which Hon. Members opposite indulge in, of how we should behave on this occasion and on that occasion, what strong speeches we may deliver and the opposition may deliver, as to what we should have done in 1950 in regard to Tibet and what we should do now, is, I would say with all

respect, a very petty change in this mighty development that has taken place, as if in 1950, if we had sent a different letter to the Chinese Government, the whole course of world history and Chinese history and the misfortunes that have happened to Tibet would have changed.

I am amazed and astounded at this very simple type of reasoning of historical events and mighty forces at play and the lack of understanding that is shown in regard to them. Naturally, if you ask me, I am grieved at a great deal that has happened in Tibet. I think that the people of Tibet deserve our sympathy in every sense of the word. This is true. Nevertheless, the point that comes before me—not now but in 1950, 1951, 1955 and 1959—is what we as a nation can do about it, safeguarding our own honour, interests, etc. and helping the causes we have at heart. We have many causes at heart all over the world. If we have a cause at heart, naturally, somewhere in the African continent, that applies even more to the Asian continent and to those who might be our neighbours. But the fact remains : how do we understand this picture and what do we do about it.

It is easy for Hon. Members on that side or this side to speak bravely in this House. But it should be remembered that this great Parliament, which is sovereign in India, and whose writ runs to every corner of India, cannot send its writs beyond the corner of India and cannot send its writs where they cannot be accepted and will not be accepted. We cannot issue an order to Africa or to the American continent or to other parts of Asia. Sometimes Hon. Members speak here as if we have merely to pass a resolution here or deliver a speech here and the history of the world will change and the great forces at work in the world will somehow climb down because a speech has been made or a resolution passed.

Let us be idealists ; I hope we shall never cease to be idealists. But let us also be realists and let us realise what is the world. It is no good thinking that we are living in some past age, either from the point or view of modern technology or from the point of view of modern politics ; and the two are intimately connected together. With all the courage in the world, it will not serve us if we are not served by modern technology in defending our country and our

interests.

I am merely pointing out the approach to this question for a true understanding of it. I am by no means defending the failures that we may have committed.

Then the other things we are told about are Nepal, Sikkim and Bhutan repeatedly. Nepal is an independent country. She is very friendly to us and in very close relations. Bhutan is in special treaty with us. Sikkim is in even more special treaty with us. But the way some Hon. Members seem to imagine that we should go and impose our wishes, our will or even our advice on them seems to me a misunderstanding of how any one country can deal with another country. Nothing is more disliked than any attempt at imposition, even imposing something which we may have a right to impose. Even then it is disliked, much more so by countries who, whether they are big or small, weak or strong, have a certain self-respect to keep up and rightly so—who do not like being told to do this or that. So the type of approaches that Hon. Members

82

sometimes suggest here are the very worst approaches that one can make to these friendly countries, self-respecting countries, with whom we have close relations.

As for Goa and Pondicherry, I can report no progress. Of course, they stand on a separate footing. So far as Pondicherry is concerned, we are at least there; the fact that the de jure transfer has not been made comes in our way.

The suggestion was made the other day, and our attention was drawn to certain appeals from Pondicherry being preferred in Parts. This is very odd, I must say, and rather undesirable, and I hope that even before the de jure transfer takes place, or not, we shall be able to put an end to this business and try to bring in our Supreme Court into the picture even in regard to Pondicherry, because it is very difficult; we have been promised so often, and assured so often of this matter being finally settled, by the French Parliament or Government, and we went on waiting, but all these years have passed and something or other intervenes.

I shall not take much more of the time of the

House. I would submit that in this very difficult and tortured world, we have to take long views, and long view does not mean our not seeing the ground before us and merely gazing at the stars, but we just cannot understand this tremendously revolutionary period of history which is there today, without having some understanding of these forces that are at work, forces technological forces, which are converted into mighty revolutionary urges, and these nationalist and other urges which we see in Africa and elsewhere; and in Europe and America, there is great demand for Peace. and yet, somehow, a revival of the old militarism showing its head, which is rather alarming. it is rather odd! If we have to play any important part in this world, we can only do so by looking after ourselves first of all, understanding the world-trying to understand it-not throwing our weight about, but looking at these world problems with some humility, not imagining that we can solve them because that is neither right nor does it create a good impression- to throw weight about and tell them what to do. If we can manage our own little country with tolerable efficiency and success, we shall affect the world more that way than by advice being given. In these matters there may be differences of opinion, but I believe most Hon. Members will agree, just as in this question which is vital one for us-about these border troubles-there is no vital difference, may be differences in shapes and degrees, except perhaps among some Hon. Members opposite who think differently. I am referring to the members of the Communist Party. But I doubt even among members of the Communist Party some do not have that pull-what you call a nationalist pull-which does not lose itself id vague and amorphous internationalism. I believe, I have some international urges and feelings and I think the next stage in the world's progress is going to be internationalism unless it is destroyed before that. But internationalism which has no roots anywhere becomes quite amorphous and in the air and, therefore, it does not really play that part which it should in moulding the world. So we have to function in this nationalist sphere and this wider international sphere. We can only do good in the international affairs if we are true to ourselves and our country.

USA CHINA INDIA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC GERMANY ALGERIA BHUTAN NEPAL

Date : Mar 01, 1960

Volume No

1995

JAPAN

Agreement with Japanese firm Signed

An agreement between the Government of India and the Citizen Watch Company of Japan, for the establishment of a watch factory in India, was signed in New Delhi on March 25, 1960,

Shri R. V. Raman, Joint Secretary, Ministry of Commerce and Industry, signed on behalf of the Government of India, while Mr. E. Yamada signed on behalf of the Citizen Watch Company.

Shri Manubhai Shah, Minister for Industry, Dr. Shiroshi Nasu, Japanese Ambassador in India, and Shri S. Ranganathan, Secretary, Ministry of Commerce and Industry, were present.

The proposed watch factory, which will be in the Public Sector, will be located at Bangalore near the Hindustan Machine Tools Limited and will undertake the manufacture of low and medium priced watches which will be full lever 17-jewel type with shock absorber device.

The factory is expected to go into production in 1962. Beginning with an annual output of 1,20,000 watches in the second year, it will attain full production of 3,60,000 watches from the sixth

83

year onwards. The indigenous content of the watches will also progressively rise from 54 per cent at the beginning to about 84 per cent by the time full production is attained. Only items like main and hair springs, shock absorbers, and for some time, jewels may have to be imported.

The capital cost of the plant and the equip-

ment over the five-year period when full production will be achieved, is estimated to be about Rs. 70 to 80 lakhs including the cost of the jigs and tools manufacturing plant. Inclusive of the cost of factory blocks and services, the total capital cost will be about Rs. 1 crore to Rs. 1.25 crores.

The Citizen Watch Company will assist the Union Government in establishing the factory, in the preparation of specification for the plant and the equipment, supply of technical know-how, research and development. It will also render assistance in the manufacture of jigs, tools and fixtures and guarantee the performance of the plant and the product for an eight-year period, when the agreement will remain in force. The import of plant and equipment will be financed out of the Yen credit facilities made available by the Japanese Government.

Besides providing technical experts, the Japanese firm will also train 100 Indian technicians for a five-year period in their factories.

JAPAN INDIA USA RUSSIA

Date : Mar 01, 1960

Volume No

1995

NORWAY

Instruments of Ratification Exchanged

Instruments ratifying the Agreement for Avoidance of Double Taxation of Income between India and Norway which had been signed at the governmental level at New Delhi on July 20, 1959 were exchanged in Oslo on March 23, 1960 by the representatives of the two governments. A Notification under Section 49A of the Income-tax Act has also been issued for publication in the Gazette of India Extraordinary. With the completion of these formalities, the Agreement will come into force in both countries.

The Agreement provides for taxation of industrial and commercial profits, dividends, interest, royalties and pensions only by the country in which the source of the income is located. Relief from double taxation is thus provided for by an ab initio segregation of the areas of taxation.

The Agreement will be effective in India for and from the assessment year beginning on the first day of April 1959.

NORWAY INDIA MALI USA

Date : Mar 01, 1960

Volume No

1995

PAKISTAN

Shri Hafiz Mohd. Ibrahim's Statement on Canal Waters Dispute

Shri Hafiz Mohd. Ibrahim, Union Minister of Irrigation and Power, made the following statement in the Lok Sabha on March 15, 1960 regarding the Indo-Pakistan canal waters dispute :-

The Government of India have seen the announcement made by the World Bank on March 1, 1960, which refers inter alia to the current negotiations for the conclusion of a water treaty between India and Pakistan in settlement of the Indus waters question and the Bank's finance plan and the participation of various friendly governments in this plan.

The Bank's finance plan is related to the system of works to be constructed which would provide not only replacement from the three western rivers of supplies to meet the irrigation uses in those areas of Pakistan which have hitherto depended on supplies from the three eastern rivers, but also further substantial additional irrigation developments and development of important hydroelectric potential. These works would also

make an important contribution to soil reclamation and drainage in Pakistan.

The Government of India are grateful to the Bank for the strenuous efforts they have made and are making for the settlement of the Indus Waters question and are also glad that friendly governments are assisting in the implementation of the Bank's finance plan.

84

The Bank's finance plan of 1,000 million dollars is mainly for works in Pakistan and it does not include works under construction in India, like the Bhakra Project and the Rajasthan Canal Project, which are necessary to enable India to utilise the waters of the eastern rivers and on which we are ourselves spending more than 700 million dollars.

The Bank's finance plan is, as stated in the Bank announcement, contingent on the ratification of the Water Treaty now under negotiation. While it is implicit in India's acceptance of the Bank proposal of 1954 that it will make some contribution to meet the cost of constructing replacement works, the question of making such a contribution will arise only when full agreement is reached on the transitional arrangements, limited essential uses in India of the waters of the Western rivers and other questions which are at present being discussed in Washington. While the Government of India hope that the current negotiations will lead to an early settlement they consider it premature to specify India's contribution to the Bank's finance plan at this stage.

PAKISTAN LATVIA INDIA USA

Date : Mar 01, 1960

Volume No

1995

PAKISTAN

Joint Communique on Trade Talks

A Trade Delegation from Pakistan, led by the Hon. Mr. Hafizur Rehman, Minister of Commerce, arrived in New Delhi on March 14, 1960, for negotiating a new trade agreement to replace the Indo-Pakistan Trade Agreement which expired on January 31, 1960.

After preliminary discussions between the Hon. Mr. Hafizur Rehman, Pakistan Minister of Commerce, and Hon. Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri, Indian Minister of Commerce and Industry, negotiations continued between the Pakistan and Indian Delegations at official level. The two Delegations exchanged views on the impediments in the smooth flow of trade between the two countries and felt that closer trade and economic relations would be to their mutual benefit, and that there was considerable scope for expanding the present level of trade between the two countries.

As the result of these negotiations, a new Trade Agreement was signed in New Delhi on March 21, 1960 by Mr. I.A. Khan on behalf of Pakistan and by Shri K.B. Lall on behalf of India. The validity of the Agreement, which comes into immediate effect, will be for a period of two years and may be extended for a further period of one year provided either Government does not give notice to the contrary. Letters have also been exchanged between the two Delegations extending the validity of the last Trade Agreement till March 20, 1960. The new Trade Agreement comes into force from today.

Appended to the new Trade Agreement are two Schedules, indicating the commodities available for export from India and Pakistan respectively. The export and import of commodities mentioned in the Schedules as well as those not Mentioned therein will be subject to the laws, regulations and procedures of either country. The Agreement also provides for the most favoured nation treatment being accorded to the commerce of either country.

A Protocol to the Agreement has also been signed, which supersedes the Limited Payments Agreement signed at Karachi on December 3, 1959. The values of commodities to be exchanged

under this Protocol, have been raised from Rs. 2 crores to Rs. 4.10 crores either way. Under this arrangement, Pakistan has agreed to supply India with jute cuttings to the extent of Rs. 1 crore and also to raise the ceiling for cotton from Rs. 1 crore to Rs. 1.5 crores. India, on the other hand, has agreed to supply Pakistan with iron and steel to the extent of Rs. 1 crore and has raised the ceiling for cement and biri leaves from Rs. 70 lakhs to Rs. 150 lakhs. The list of items to be exchanged has also been enlarged to cover, inter-alia, the following items :-

Betel leaves, films, fish (dried and salted), drugs and medicines (Ayurvedic and Unani), rock salt, betel nuts, Kapok, etc. from Pakistan, and betel leaves, films, spices, groundnut seeds H.P.S. and stone boulders etc., from India.

As in the previous Agreement, the two Governments have entered into special arrangements by means of another Protocol, for supply by India of coal, hard and soft wood and stone boulders to Pakistan. Pakistan has also agreed under this Protocol to supply India with raw jute, the quantity and value will be determined as heretofore. In spite of India's own difficulties in regard to movement and supply of coal, she has agreed to make available to Pakistan, by rail and by sea, an additional quantity of 30,000 tons per month over and above one lakh tons of coal per month to both wings of Pakistan in accordance with the provisions of the last Trade

85

Agreement.

The question of the extension of the border trade arrangements provided for under Schedule 'D' of the last Trade Agreement for meeting the day-to-day requirements of the people living within a ten mile belt of the border between East Pakistan on the one hand and West Bengal, Assam and Tripura on the other, was also discussed. While the Pakistan Delegation felt that border trade did not lead to bona tide trade, they, however, agreed to hold further consultations in this behalf.

The two delegations also felt that there was scope for co-operation in respect of the production

and exchange of several commodities, such as raw jute, raw cotton, coal, newsprint, pig iron, steel of different sorts including structurals, cement and wood and timber. The two delegations agreed that it would be desirable to take such steps as might be found practicable to promote commodity consultations with a view to entering into long-term arrangements of mutual benefit.

The two delegations expressed the hope that the new Trade Agreement would lead to a considerable expansion of trade and economic co-operation between the two countries to their mutual advantage.

The working of the Agreement will be reviewed from time to time, at least once a year. The Protocols will also be subject to review every six months.

PAKISTAN INDIA USA

Date : Mar 01, 1960

Volume No

1995

PAKISTAN

Pakistani Stamps Showing Indian Territory

In reply to a question whether it is a fact that Pakistan have issued on the 23rd March, 1960 on the eve of Pakistan Day four new stamps and first-day covers to show what is described there as "correct position of Kashmir, Junagadh and Mangrol States in relation to Pakistan" and whether any protest has been lodged in this regard, the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of External Affairs, Shri Sadath Ali Khan said in Lok Sabha on March 1960:

Four new postage stamps of 6-pies, 2-Annas, 8-Annas and 1-Rupee were released for sale on March 23, 1960, by the Pakistan Posts and Telegraphs Department. The handbill announcing

the release of the stamps stated :

The question of a free plebiscite in Jammu and Kashmir is before the world forum for twelve years. Pakistan P. & T. is issuing a set of Definitive Postage Stamps showing the correct position of Jammu and Kashmir vis a-vis Pakistan and India. Opportunity has been taken to show the correct position of Junagadh & Manavadar as well".

Jammu and Kashmir, Junagadh and Manavadar are, as the House is aware, Indian Union territories. The issue of these four postage stamps by the Posts and Telegraphs Department of Pakistan cannot affect the status of these territories or the sovereignty of the Union of India over these territories.

The Government of India's concern at this unfortunate provocative and propagandist step which introduces a new irritant in Indo-Pakistan relations, has been conveyed to the Government of Pakistan.

PAKISTAN INDIA USA

Date : Mar 01, 1960

Volume No

1995

RUMANIA

Letters Exchanged

Letters were exchanged in New Delhi on March 1, 1960 between the Government of India and the People's Republic of Rumania embodying a trade arrangement for the year 1960. Shri K.R.F. Khilnani, Joint Secretary, Ministry of Commerce and Industry, who led the Indian delegation to the talks, signed on behalf of the Government of India, while Mr. D. Niculescu, Commercial Counsellor of the Rumanian Embassy in India, signed on behalf of his Government.

Trade between the two countries has been steadily increasing and it is expected that, as a result of the new arrangement, trade will considerably improve during 1960.

The value of India's exports to Rumania increased from Rs. 2 lakhs in 1956 to Rs. 181

86

lakhs in the first 11 months of last year. In 1956, India imported goods worth Rs. 35 lakhs from Rumania and this increased to Rs. 70 lakhs in the first 11 months of the last year.

The main items of import from Rumania are oil drilling equipment, tractors, chemicals machine tools, petroleum products, power transformers, newsprint, etc. Exports from India are pepper, tea, vegetable oils, hides and skins, semi-processed and tanned, Iron ore, ferro-manganese, mica, woollen textiles, cosmic textiles, light engineering goods, sports goods and various chemicals.

INDIA USA

Date : Mar 01, 1960

Volume No

1995

UNION OF SOUTH AFRICA

Prime Minister's Statement on Lok Sabha Resolution on firing in South Africa

Moving a resolution on the police firing in South Africa, in the Lok Sabha on 20 March 1960 the Prime Minister, Shri Jawaharlal Nehru made the following statement :

Mr. Speaker, Sir, I gave notice of a Resolution which I intended moving to day. With your permission and the permission of the House, I should like to make a very minor alteration, a

verbal one, in it-inclusion of the name of a place-to make it a more factually correct Resolution.

I beg to move : "That this House deplores and records its deep sorrow at the tragic incidents which occurred at Sharpeville and in Langa township near Capetown in South Africa on March 21, 1960 resulting in the death of a large number of Africans from police firing. It sends its deep sympathy to the Africans who have suffered from this firing and from the policy of racial discrimination and the suppression of the African people in their own homeland."

Sir, the other day, when mention was made about this tragic incident in this House, I ventured to say something and to express a sense of shock which, not only this House, but the whole country had experienced on receipt of this news from South Africa. Now, the Resolution I am moving is, as the House will see, if I may use the word, a moderately-worded resolution. It has been deliberately worded in that way not because any of us feel very moderately about this matter because it is a matter in which strong feelings are roused and have been roused in this House and in this country and over a great part of the world. Nevertheless, I thought that it would be in keeping with the dignity of this House and of Parliament if we should express ourselves in this restrained and moderate and rather limited way rather than use strong language. The matter is too serious merely to be disposed of by strong language or any language. It is not the custom of this House normally to consider such matters which are supposed to be in the internal jurisdiction of another country nor indeed would we like the other countries to consider matters in the internal jurisdiction of this country. That is the normal practice ; it is the right practice. Nevertheless, sometimes, things happen and occurrences take place which are not normal at all but which are exceedingly abnormal and then it becomes difficult and undesirable for some abnormal convention to come in the way of the expression of the feeling which is deep-seated and powerful. After all, this House is and ought to be to some extent a mirror of our people's feelings and, therefore, although this is not a normal procedure, we felt that this House should be given an opportunity of

expressing the strong feelings which it has in regard to this tragic incidents.

It is bad enough for a large number of people to be killed or for their being a mass killing as there has been in this place in South Africa a week ago. It is worse to have this killing in the manner it was done, so far as accounts have appeared. You must remember that behind all these lies a certain deliberate policy which the South African Union Government is pursuing. This is perhaps not the time to discuss in any detail that policy, the policy of segregation, apartheid or, however it is called. But it is well to remember all the same what this policy means, both in theory and in principle, and in practice. In principle and in theory it is the negation of everything that the UN stands for and we stand for, of course. I am putting it from the larger ground of what the UN and the UN Charter stand for. It is the negation of what presumably every civilised Government today stands for or should stand for. That is a serious matter.

Not too long ago, when voices were raised in a great part of the world denouncing the racial

87

policies of the Nazi regime in Germany and a great war took place bringing enormous slaughter in its train, it was said that partly at least there were many reasons-it was because of those racial policies which the old Nazi Government pursued on the basis of master race, with the right not only to suppress but to exterminate people belonging to some other race, which they thought was almost a sub-human race. Now, that policy, in principle, is adopted and openly proclaimed in the South African Union and as has been often stated in this House, that can only lead to disaster because it is impossible to conceive that other countries of South Africa or indeed of any other part of the world would accept that or submit to that policy. That is the question of principle-apartheid. But in regard to the actual practice of it, I wonder how far Hon. Members are really aware of the details of how the Africans have to live, what they have to submit to, to what conditions of living, where families are torn asunder, husband from the wife, father from the son. Without special permission, they cannot leave ; they cannot move or do anything without special

permits and passes.

They may have lived in a place for a whole generation but if they have got a little work outside that place they have to leave that immediately, within a question of hours. But I am not going into that. What I am only pointing out is that it is not merely a question of theory-important as it is, the question of principles and theory-but a question of the practice, the enormous burden that is cast upon them, the African people, by the Government there. They are, as I said, the people whose homeland is that country. They are not aliens, they do not come from elsewhere. The people of Indian descent in South Africa, as we all know,-and remember-have had to put up with a great deal of discrimination and suffering and we have resented that. But we must remember also the African people have to put up with something infinitely more than that and our sympathies must go out to them, therefore, even more than to our kith and kin there.

I am moving this resolution today just a week after these occurrences. It so happened and today has been declared by some African organisations as a day of mourning, and perhaps, therefore, it is to some extent appropriate that this resolution should be considered by this House on this day of mourning.

The other day the Prime Minister of the United Kingdom visited Africa and I think in South Africa itself he referred to what he called a wind of change coming or blowing across the African continent. That was a moderate reference to the ferments and tempests that are taking place in Africa. But whatever that may be, it is clear that the policy of the South African Union Government has not taken into consideration these changes, or knowing them, realising them, nevertheless is not going to be affected by them. And they introduce this system, namely, every person has to carry a pass wherever he goes, and he must not go in this area or that area. The House will try to think of it: if every person has to carry a pass all the time, going from one part of the area to another and to be harassed by the police, it is the life not of even a normally semi-free person, but almost the life of a prisoner on ticket of leave. That is what the African population of the South African Union has been

reduced to, and it is not surprising that they have resented it and protested against it.

I cannot say without much further knowledge the sequence of events that happened there, but broadly speaking, it was a peaceful protest, as far as we know. There might have been some violence but I cannot say definitely. But the fact remains. that these people who are protesting in the main peacefully were mowed down by machine guns, while at the same time, to terrify them, I suppose jet aircraft were flying overhead and all kinds of military machines surrounded them.

Some thing terrible has happened there; something terrible not only on that particular occasion but in the context of the modern world; and it is not surprising that there has been this great reaction all over the world, and I believe the matter is going to be brought before the United Nations.

Now, the United Nations Organisation also, normally, does not interfere in the internal affairs of another country although there have been cases when it has interfered and rightly interested in giving consideration to those matters. It may be said that this is not a matter for the United Nations-a matter that is likely to lead to violation of international peace and security. that is, the Charter of the United Nations. Well, in that sense, in the strict sense of the word, perhaps it is not. But in any real sense of that word, of that phrase, it is very much a matter in which the United Nations, as representing the international community, should consider this, because it involves something of the most intimate concern to humanity itself.

This problem is dividing today, and will divide even more, humanity into large differing

88

and conflicting sections. It means something even worse than a normal war between nations, something of racial conflict spread all over the globe. I do not say all these things will come but they may come and they will undoubtedly come if this kind of policy is persisted in.

So, this matter is not one merely affecting

the South African Union. It affects the whole of Africa and indeed it affects all of us, whatever we may be. It is an odd position that a member of the United Nations is using its State power for suppression, for the assertion of its racial superiority within its territory; that is the question; using the State power in doing something which is objected to and denied by the United Nations in its Charter.

This is the background. These are the problems that are likely to arise in the future. Because of this, I have ventured to put forward this resolution for the consideration of this House.

SOUTH AFRICA USA GERMANY INDIA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC

Date : Mar 01, 1960

Volume No

1995

UNION OF SOUTH AFRICA

Prime Minister's Statement on Lok Sabha Motion on Firing in South Africa

Speaking on an adjournment motion in the Lok Sabha, on March 23, 1960 on the firings on Africans at the Langa township and elsewhere in South Africa, the Prime Minister, Shri Jawaharlal Nehru, said :

Mr. Speaker, this motion or two motions raise rather difficult issues. Normally, as you have been pleased to say, this is not a matter which this House should discuss; I mean some internal matter within the internal jurisdiction of some other country. Therefore, if I may respectfully say so, what you have said about these motions is the only right approach to them.

Nevertheless, quite apart from these motions, something has happened at the Langa township near Cape Town which has shocked the conscience of the world, and more particularly, of course, of us here in India and perhaps in other countries of

Asia and Africa; but I would not like to exclude Europe or America, because this is, as far as we know, one of those very special happenings that almost affect the course of history. Here is Africa at the present moment-resurgent, proud and in a defiant mood, after long centuries of suppression. Many countries are becoming independent; they have become independent and they will become independent. On the other side, there is this picture of people of practically a whole nation, excepting some groups who came from Europe, who have settled down and who are, of course, fully entitled to full citizenship and rights and privileges, but nevertheless a minority; these people of the minority are passing all manner of laws, segregation, apartheid and all that, which we well know, and finally asking every African not to move about without a pass or ticket-a prisoner-like thing converting the great majority of the population of South Africa into a kind of semi-prisoners-this is an extraordinary thing. And when those people, so far as I know, peacefully protested by not taking out those passes, there was a conflict and there was this large-scale killing.

Now, killing is bad at any moment, but this kind of culmination of all these events leads to certain conclusions in the minds of people which point to this being not the end of an episode but the prelude to future conflicts; because I cannot understand the people of Africa submitting to this kind of thing. There can be no doubt that people in Asia, to whatever country, whatever party or group they might belong, will also give their fullest sympathy to them. That is the position. So that a situation arises when our normal approaches and even normal rules and procedures are not always adequate to deal with it.

I do admit that it would be wrong, at the present moment, to discuss this matter in a motion for adjournment or in any other way. But I am not clear in my mind how far it should not be permissible sometime or other later to find some way for this House to express its opinion. I do not commit myself. But, when there is a strong feeling in this matter in this country and in this House, surely, some way ought to be found for the expression of that feeling. That is the position.

Hon. Members said something about protesting to the South African Government. We have no relations with the South African Government of protest or communication; and, it would be rather a feeble thing for us to send a note of protest with regard to this matter. What the United Nations may do about it, I do not know. But if any such thing is raised there our sympathies will be with it. How it will be raised and what the response might be I cannot say.

When I read of this episode I was reminded powerfully of something that occurred in India

89

41 years ago-the Jallianwala Bagh massacre. That was followed, as everyone here knows, by all manner of developments, upheavals, struggles and the like. And, I do not imagine that this thing, this large-scale killing, and even more so, the spirit behind it, the spirit of racial mastery, the spirit of authoritarianism, the spirit of not only segregation but treating the great majority of the people as an inferior race, as a sub-human species, that is a thing which, obviously, can never be accepted not only by them but by the hundreds of millions of Africa and Asia. And, therefore, we seem to be, perhaps, on the verge of more serious happenings. Not in the immediate future, I mean, because nothing can be more serious in the world than vast racial conflicts. All these thoughts come to my mind.

Now, it is not necessary, if I may say so, for this House, at the present moment or later, to express formally its own reaction to these events. Because everyone knows how every single Member of this House and this country must feel about it and does feel about it. I ventured, at your bidding, to express my own opinion on this subject because, as Hon. Members do, I feel strongly about this. Normally, I must restrain myself as much as I could-a Member of the Government has to speak in restrained language. But lest that restraint might be mistaken for a lack of strong feeling, I thought I might take advantage of your invitation to express the views of myself and my Government.

SOUTH AFRICA USA INDIA

Date : Mar 01, 1960

Volume No

1995

UNION OF SOUTH AFRICA

Indians in South Africa

Replying to a question in the Rajya Sabha on March 8, 1960, the Prime Minister, Shri Jawaharlal Nehru said : "Under the provisions of the Groups Areas Act, people of different colour and origin, i.e. 'Whites', 'Coloureds', 'Natives' and 'Indians' will have to live separately in different areas proclaimed for each group. The people of Indian origin, like other groups, will, therefore, have to live separately, even from the 'Natives'. They are also affected by other 'Apartheid' laws in regard to education, transport, cinemas, place of entertainments, carrying on business, etc.

"The Government of India have no means for taking any active steps. These people of Indian origin residing in the Union of South Africa are South African nationals and not Indian citizens. However, the Government of India have placed this matter of treatment of people of Indian origin in South Africa before the United Nations General Assembly every year, and the latter has passed several resolutions recommending discussions between the Union of South Africa on the one side and India and Pakistan on the other. The Government of India regret that the Government of the Union of South Africa have so far taken no action in pursuance of the resolutions of the General Assembly".

SOUTH AFRICA INDIA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC USA PAKISTAN

Date : Mar 01, 1960

Volume No

UNITED ARAB REPUBLIC

President Nasser's Visit

At the invitation of the Government of India, Mr. Gamal Abdel-Nasser, President of the United Arab Republic, paid a visit to India from March 29 to April 10, 1960. On March 29, President Rajendra Prasad held a State Banquet in his honour at Rashtrapati Bhawan.

Welcoming President Nasser, Dr. Prasad said:
Your Excellencies, Ladies and Gentlemen:

We have much pleasure in welcoming in our Midst tonight His Excellency Gamal Abdel-Nasser, President of the United Arab Republic. As I said a few hours ago at Palam, he has done us the honour of being with us on the auspicious day of Id and provided us with an opportunity of offering him our Id greetings in person.

President Nasser symbolizes the spirit of awakening in the Arab world. His championship of Arab nationalism is based on no narrow considerations. Indeed, the movement itself is part of the great resurgence which is going on throughout Asia and Africa. Arab nationalism, as symbolised by President Nasser, represents an urge for independence, unity and rapid progress. We who are faced with many similar problems can appreciate this urge. We hope and trust that the cherished desire of the Arab peoples for greater solidarity and progress will be achieved.

Contacts between the region represented by

90

the United Arab Republic and India are older than history. They have their roots in the pre-historic era. Our ancient countries have been, in our chequered histories through many a rise and fall and seen many vicissitudes of fortune. We have known the rise of great empires and awe-inspiring kings, but somehow both of us have managed to survive the endless revolutions of the wheel of Fate. And now in modern times our two countries have emerged, let us hope for ever,

from the period of darkness. We are now free to build up our countries and to shape our destinies. There is no doubt we have a leeway to make up, but we in this country have taken in hand the task of reconstructing our economy to the best of our resources. Prosperity at home and peace in the world is our motto.

I am glad, Mr. President, that you will be going round and seeing some of our projects, big and small. Some of the projects have already been completed and work is proceeding apace on others in spite of several difficulties. We have, however, no doubt that our Government's determination and our people's abiding faith in the destiny of India will enable us to get over all the difficulties and accomplish the task that lies ahead.

We feel very happy to know that under your and your Government's inspiring leadership the United Arab Republic is forging ahead. The people of this country have nothing but the friendliest feelings towards your people and, therefore, they feel gratified to know of the progress you have been making.

I take this opportunity of welcoming His Excellency President Gamal Abdel-Nasser to our country and asking you, ladies and gentlemen, to raise your glasses and drink to his health.

INDIA USA

Date : Mar 01, 1960

Volume No

1995

UNITED ARAB REPUBLIC

President Nasser's Reply

In his reply to President Rajendra Prasad, President Nasser said.

Your Excellency President Rajendra Prasad,
Your Excellency Pandit Nehru the Prime

Minister, my friends the builders and
leaders of modern India :

My presence among you here today, my friends, in this atmosphere of total friendship, represents an opportunity I have long looked forward to. My visit to your country has been in my mind for a long time. Though the visit was delayed, yet I was sure that my looking forward to it as a personal pleasure and as a living experience on the one hand, and the long way this visit could go in further strengthening the bonds between us on the other, as well as the great contribution it would make towards further mutual understanding, would drive me to your great country at the first opportunity.

My good fortune has been such that I should come to your country to celebrate with you, as my dear friend His Excellency Dr. Rajendra, Prasad, the President of the Republic, has said, the Bairam feast. Indeed, my presence among you here adds to my delight on the occasion.

The moving reception given to me and to my companions, the members of the delegation representing the U.A.R., since the landing of our plane, and the warm welcome we felt everywhere Mr. President, as well as the noble feelings expressed by your people ail along the route this afternoon, are not different from what we expected. We feel that this is the expression that the great people of India wished to convey to the U.A.R. people, or rather to the entire Arab nation, united by the faith in Arab nationalism.

We feel this is a message of friendship and love which we have to carry with us from the people of India to the Arab nation. We feel this is rather a natural response to the message of friendship and love we carried from our nation to the people of India.

Mr. President, I hardly think I am in need of stressing the feelings that our Arab people bear for your great country. Apart from the feelings emanating from the heart, there is also an admiration that comes directly from the mind, for your continuous struggle, your big struggle for the development of your country, your continued struggle for the rediscovery of India and for rebuilding it, your struggle for the consolidation of the moral and spiritual values as a contribution to the building of an international society

where peace based on justice prevails.

In expressing all this, our people speak from practical experience. We have been able to see India, both leaders and people adopt and enforce the principles and ideals preached by them. India has proved in a practical way that India's positive will is equal to her moral faith and that she can defend her principles and keep up her enthusiasm.

Mr. President, we hope that Indo-Arab co-

91

operation will be a Powerful force in the consolidation of Afro-Asian solidarity on a big scale and in the building of a better world. We share your view that the way to that is by working for the prosperity of the country and for world peace.

Mr. President, it delights me to, celebrate the Bairam feast here with you all. Your kind words Mr. President, make me feel as if I were at home. I seize this opportunity. Ladies and Gentlemen, and ask you to drink with me a toast to the great people of India, to her President and to her Prime Minister and to the builders of her future and to wish them all total success and constant joy.

INDIA USA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC

Date : Mar 01, 1960

Volume No

1995

UNITED ARAB REPUBLIC

Nehru-Nasser Joint Communique

At the conclusion of President Nasser's visit to India, the Ministry of External Affairs issued a Joint Communique in New Delhi on April 10, 1960.

The following is the text of the Communique:

On the invitation of the Government of India, His Excellency President Gamal Abdel-Nasser, President of the United Arab Republic, visited India from March 29 to April 10, 1960. The President was accompanied by Dr. Mahmoud Fawzi, Minister of Foreign Affairs, Mr. Aly Sabri Minister of Presidential Affairs, Mr. Tooma-El-Awad Allah, Minister of Municipal and Rural Affairs, and other high officials from the United Arab Republic.

The President and members of his party visited some of the principal cities of India. At Delhi, the President addressed the members of the Indian Parliament. At Aligarh, he received an honorary doctorate from the Aligarh University and in Bombay, has inaugurated the Egyptian and Syrian Cotton Festival. He also visited a number of industrial establishments, scientific institutions and rural development projects. Wherever he went in India, President Nasser was accorded a warm and friendly reception by the people. In the Government of India's view, the enthusiasm shown by the people was a tribute to a leader who has secured and consolidated the freedom of his country. It also provided eloquent evidence of the friendly feelings which the people, of India have cherished through the ages for the people of the Arab countries.

During his stay in Delhi, President Nasser and Prime Minister Nehru had a number of talks on the world situation in general and other problems of mutual interest. The President and the Prime Minister reiterated their faith in the policy of non-alignment and their resolve to maintain friendly relations with all countries. They are of the view that while assistance and co-operation through International agencies or otherwise would be welcome for the development of the newly independent countries of Asia and Africa, there should be no interference in the internal affairs of any country.

The President and the Prime Minister welcomed the trend towards relaxation of international tension. They also welcomed the forthcoming meeting of the Heads of Government and expressed the hope their efforts to reduce tension would meet with success. They pledged their support for any measure of agreement which

would promote an atmosphere of peace and reduce the chances of conflict.

The President and the Prime Minister welcomed the progress which has already been made by the Conference on the suspension of nuclear tests which is now meeting in Geneva. They expressed the hope that final agreement would be reached without further delay, thereby relieving anxiety throughout the world. They regretted that at a time when avenues are being explored for reaching an agreement on the permanent abolition of nuclear tests and considerable progress has been made in that direction, nuclear bombs have recently been exploded over a region in Africa against the wishes of the people who are affected by such explosions and against the consensus of world opinion. They expressed the hope that such tests would be discontinued.

The President and the Prime Minister also discussed the prospects of the disarmament talks which are now taking place in Geneva. They were of the view that the progress on disarmament is an essential condition for reducing tension and promoting a peaceful atmosphere. They expressed the hope that the meeting of the Tenation Disarmament Committee of the United Nations, would lead to positive results in the field of disarmament.

The President and the Prime Minister discussed the recent developments on the African continent. They welcomed the awakening among the people of Africa and the resurgent spirit of freedom which inspires millions all over the

continent. They welcomed the attainment of independence by many nations of Africa and expressed the hope that such nations as are not yet free would achieve their freedom without further delay. They also welcomed the growing sense of kinship and solidarity among the people of Asia and Africa who are facing similar problems and are determined to solve these problems in a spirit of mutual co-operation and understanding.

The President and the Prime Minister deplored the racial discrimination and the denial of fundamental human rights which are being prac-

tised as state policies in some parts of Africa. In particular they expressed their sense of shock and profound regret at the recent large scale killing of innocent people in the Union of South Africa. These events have shocked the conscience of civilized people all over the world and the President and the Prime Minister expressed the hope that the weight of world opinion would be brought to bear on the authorities responsible for the adoption and execution of such policies.

The President and the Prime Minister reiterated their view that the question of Palestine should be solved in conformity with the provisions of the U. N. Charter, the resolutions of the United Nations and the principles unanimously adopted at the Bandung Conference of 1955 for the peaceful settlement of the Palestine question. They expressed their concern at the situation in Algeria and reiterated their view that the right of the Algerian people to self-determination and independence should be recognised and fully implemented.

The President and the Prime Minister discussed problems relating to the economic development of the under-developed countries. They agreed that these countries are facing problems of a similar nature and that it is to their advantage to cooperate with one another in their own interest and in the interest of the world as a whole.

The President and the Prime Minister noted with pleasure that friendship and understanding between their two countries is growing day by day. This friendship and understanding is based not only on sharing of common objectives in their approach to world problems but also on close co-operation in the economic and cultural spheres. The President and the Prime Minister look forward to continued co-operation between their two countries in all fields and to the further strengthening of the ties of friendship and understanding as a result of the present visit of President Nasser to India.

USA INDIA EGYPT SYRIA SWITZERLAND SOUTH AFRICA INDONESIA ALGERIA

Date : Mar 01, 1960

Volume No

1995

UNITED ARAB REPUBLIC

Trade Agreement Signed

India will soon be importing rice from U.A.R. An agreement to this effect was signed in New Delhi on March 21, 1960.

The agreement was signed by Shri C.A. Ramakrishna, Director-General of Food, on behalf of the Government of India and Mr. Taha Abd El Mottaleb, Counsellor, on behalf of the Misr Trading Company, Cairo. The agreement was also signed by Mr. Abbady, Commercial Counsellor in the U.A.R. Embassy.

The agreement provides for the import of one lakh tons of rice from U.A.R. against non-convertible Indian rupee which will be utilised by the sellers for purchasing from India jute, tea and certain non-traditional items.

The supplies will begin in April, 1960 and be completed by July 1960.

INDIA EGYPT

Date : Mar 01, 1960

Volume No

1995

YUGOSLAVIA

Cultural Agreement Signed

A Cultural Agreement between Yugoslavia and India was signed in New Delhi on March 11,

1960. The Agreement aims at further strengthening the existing ties of friendship and promoting further understanding and closer co-operation between the two countries in the fields of science, education and culture.

His Excellency Dusan Kveder, Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary in India of the Federal People's Republic of Yugoslavia, signed the Agreement on behalf of Yugoslavia and Shri Humayun Kabir, Union Minister for Scientific Research and Cultural Affairs, on behalf of India.

93

The Cultural Agreement consists of five Articles and will come into force on the date of exchange of the Instruments of Ratification which will take place at Belgrade.

Under the Agreement, the two Governments desire to promote exchange of representatives and delegations in the fields of education, science, culture and arts between the two countries; reciprocal visits of professors and research workers for giving lectures, special courses etc., as well as exchange of students on scholarship basis; reciprocal visits and attendance in congresses and conferences between the literary, scientific, artistic, sports' and journalists' associations and organisations; exchange of cultural, scientific and educational material and equipment; translation and exchange of books, periodicals and other scientific cultural and technical publications, and, as far as feasible, the exchange of copies of archaeological specimens and of ancient manuscripts; organisation of scientific and artistic exhibitions, theatrical and artistic performances, film shows including documentary films and newsreels and the dissemination of knowledge of each other's culture through radio, press and similar other means.

The two Governments will encourage the organisation of competitions and other activities in the fields of sports and physical culture between their two countries.

The Agreement also envisages the setting up, if necessary, of an Indo-Yugoslav Advisory Committee in each country to ensure the implementation of the Agreement.

The present Agreement is the 11th Cultural

Agreement signed by India since 1951. The earlier Agreements were signed with Turkey, Iraq, Indonesia, Japan, Iran, Poland, Rumania, the United Arab Republic, Czechoslovakia and the U.S.S.R.

Text of Agreement

The Governments of the Federal People's Republic of Yugoslavia and of the Republic of India.

Considering the cordial and friendly relations existing between the two countries and desirous of concluding an agreement to provide for the promotion of cultural, relations and intellectual life and mutual co-operation in scientific, educational and cultural fields between the two countries, have agreed as follows :-

ARTICLE I

The Contracting Parties will endeavour to promote the development of close relations and cooperation between the Academies, Universities and Scientific and Research institutions of the two countries by means of :-

- (a) exchange of representatives and delegations in the fields of education, science, culture and arts;
- (b) reciprocal visits of professors and research workers for giving lectures, special courses etc. as well as exchange of students on scholarship basis;
- (c) reciprocal visits and attendance in congresses and Conferences between the literary, scientific, artistic, sports, and journalists' associations and organizations ;
- (d) exchange of cultural, scientific and educational material and equipment ; translation and exchange of books, periodicals and other scientific, cultural and technical publications; and as far as feasible, the exchange of copies of archaeological specimens and of ancient manuscripts;
- (e) organisation of scientific and artistic exhibitions, theatrical and artistic performances, films shows including documentary films and newsreels and the dissemination of knowledge of each other's culture through radio, press and

similar other means.

ARTICLE 2

Each Contracting Party will receive, as far as its own resources and requirements will permit, nationals recommended by the other Government for study, training and specialisation in its educational, cultural, scientific, technical and industrial institutions. These scholars will observe the domestic laws of the country and the regulations of the institutions in which they will work.

ARTICLE 3

The Contracting Parties will encourage the organisation of competitions and other activities in the fields of sports and physical culture between their two countries.

ARTICLE 4

In order to facilitate the implementation of

94

the present Agreement, the Contracting Parties will consult with each other from time to time, and, if agreeable to both parties, an Indo-Yugoslav committee may be convened in New Delhi and Belgrade, on a rotation basis, from time to time to suggest programme for the approval of the Contracting Parties.

ARTICLE 5

(a) The present Agreement shall be ratified and shall come into force on the date of exchange of the instruments of ratification, which shall take place as soon as possible.

(b) The present Agreement shall remain in force for a period of five years and thereafter until the expiration of six months from the date on which one of the Contracting Parties shall give notice of its intention to terminate the Agreement.

(c) In the faith, where of, the following plenipotentiaries have signed the present Agreement in duplicate in English, Hindi and Serbocroat languages, all the three texts being equally authentic, except that in case of doubt the English text

shall prevail.

Signed at New Delhi this 11th day of
March 1960.

Humayun Kabir Dusan Kveder

For the Government of For the Government
the Republic of India. of the Federal People's
 Republic of Yugo-
 slavia.

Note :- On March 10, 1960, the Prime Minister presented to
Parliament white
Paper III, which contains the notes, memoranda and
letters exchanged
between the Government of India and the Government of
the People's
Republic of China between November, 1959 and March,
1960. The
Paper has been published separately.

95

YUGOSLAVIA INDIA USA IRAQ TURKEY IRAN JAPAN POLAND NORWAY SLOVAKIA CHINA

Date : Mar 01, 1960

April

Volume No

1995

Content

Foreign Affairs Record 1960
Volume VI APRIL

No.4

CONTENTS

PAGE

PAKISTAN

| | |
|---|-----|
| Shri Krishna Menon's Statement in Lok Sabha on withdrawal of Kashmir case from U.N. | 97 |
| Joint Communique on Indo-Pakistan Press Code | 103 |

PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA

| | |
|---|-----|
| Premier Chou En-lai's Visit | 104 |
| Mr. Chou En-lai's Reply | 105 |
| Nehru-Chou Joint Communique | 107 |
| Lok Sabha Debate on Nehru-Chou Talks | |
| -Prime Minister's Statement | 108 |
| Rajya Sabha Debate on Nehru-Chou Talks | |
| -Prime Minister's Statement | 111 |
| Prime Minister's Reply to Lok Sabha Questions on his talks with Premier Chou En-lai | 115 |

MINISTRY OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS: EXTERNAL PUBLICITY DIVISION
GOVERNMENT OF INDIA

PAKISTAN CHINA INDIA

Date : Apr 01, 1960

Volume No

1995

PAKISTAN

Shri Krishna Menon's Statement in Lok Sabha on withdrawal of Kashmir case from U.N.

Replying to a discussion on April 23, 1960, in the Lok Sabha on a resolution demanding withdrawal of the Kashmir case from the United Nations, the Defence Minister, Shri Krishna Menon made the following statement :

Shri Tariq has moved this Resolution which has given us an opportunity of reminding ourselves of this problem. It will live with us unless and until Pakistan vacates its aggression on Kashmir territory, because what is involved here is really the sovereignty of this land. That is the fundamental issue.

The Resolution before us asks us to withdraw our complaint or rather our reference—we have not actually made any complaint to the Security Council. Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, I say with great respect that the criticism that is made of the mover's approach to this for availing this remedy is bad, but, if I may say so, the reasons given for it are worse. The reasons why we cannot withdraw it from the Security Council are not only technical ones. If they are technical ones, we would overcome them. The reasons go to the basis of our foreign policy, of our approach to international affairs and, what is more, to our security.

Now, there are certain fundamental things in connection with Kashmir and this debate has roamed far and wide. Therefore, it becomes necessary, since matters have been raised, to refer to them in brief.

First of all this reference was made to the Security Council at a time when conditions as far as were known then were not the conditions that came to be known afterwards. We submitted the complaint to the Security Council under Chapter VI of the Charter of the United Nations -Settlement of Disputes—because at that time we were not aware of the fact that Pakistani Armies had intervened. At least we were not officially aware. At that time many Pakistani nationals were there and they were aided and abetted by Pakistan ; but it had not become a warlike action by a constituted State.

Secondly, at that time our one desire was to limit the spreading of conflict. Reference has been made - and I think it is only right to refer to it—reference has been made to the sinister role of Lord Mountbatten in this affair. Apart from being a reflection on Lord Mountbatten, it is rather a reflection on this country. We were a self-governing Dominion at that time and it was incumbent on the Governor-General or the Head of the State to act according to the advice of the Ministers. So, if we place the responsibility on Lord Mountbatten, we are really blaming our Government and our Prime Minister. But, in fact, it is not the case at all. Lord Mountbatten's role in this, as Head of the State, was to accept accession. But, in the subsequent letter that went out there was some reference to the ascertainment of the opinion of the people to which I shall

refer later.

Therefore, the main position in regard to this was this : we went there at a time when we did not know as much as we did later. And, our lack of knowledge was not due so much to our lack of care as to the fact of deliberate concealment on the other side. And, so, when Pakistan made its reply-some 15 days later-to the United Nations they answered our application with several points--I think it was 14 or something of that kind. But none of them referred to Kashmir except other references to Junagadh, Hyderabad and genocide and the two-nation theory and all kinds of things which had nothing to do with this matter. The long reply did not refer to the Kashmir State except a two-line paragraph in which they denied aggression. The others are irrelevant. Our complaint was, in fact, met by denial which, afterwards, proved by the U.N. Observers to be wrong. Therefore, there, has been no legitimate or proved fact in support of the denial.

Reference has been made to the fact that aggression has not been found by the United Nations. That is to throw away the support we have got from the findings of the U. N. Commission itself when Sir Owen Dixon suggested that on such and such a date when the Pakistani forces crossed the frontier they committed a breach of international law. That might be a roundabout way of going about it. But it was a finding that aggression had been committed.

In this matter we have to stand on various practices. One, being a modern nation, though an old country, being a modern nation, having come into independence after the emergence of the United Nations and the Charter, the commitments in relation to the Charter are part of our Constitution. Therefore, we are bound as much by

97

the municipal law of this country as by the international obligations which have been sanctified or accepted by our municipal law. We cannot get away from the obligations of the Charter of the United Nations.

Secondly, it is not our interest to get away from it. The solution, if it were accepted would

be something like saying, if you have got a bad headache, cut off your head. That would be no remedy. So, to displace the United Nations and to lend our support even if we are badly hurt would be to disown and disengage ourselves from all the obligations, moral and otherwise, we have entered into. It would accentuate or rather would take us away from the forces that help operate in this world towards world peace, co-operation and human development and, what is more, would belie every profession and every declaration that we have made before that body. It is quite true that aggression has not been vacated in Kashmir. It is also true that even the UNO in its resolutions --it is sometimes forgotten--has found in favour of our sovereignty of that region, because every resolution speaks about the sovereignty of Jammu and Kashmir--Jammu and Kashmir is an integral part of India--and because there are no States in this country, whether it be the Maharashtra that has to appear or Gujarat that has to appear next week or Kerala in which there is trouble often or Bengal or Punjab, there are no States with boundary, with frontiers. The frontiers of Jammu and Kashmir are on the Arabian Sea, the bay of Bengal and the foot of the Himalayas. That has been sanctified by the declaration of the UN where it speaks of the sovereignty of the Jammu and Kashmir Government which is indeed the Government that is like any other Government, part of our constitutional arrangements. It is so by international law ; it has been accepted by Pakistan, by ourselves and the British Government at the time of Partition. It is international law.

Secondly, it is the will of the people themselves declared in their constituent assembly and afterwards by two different elections from which only those people who were held away by duress were prevented from participation but who, even if they had voted against this would still leave a large electoral majority in favour of this declared will. Therefore, the plebiscite in every form has been gone through. We come to this question raised by Shri Sadhan Gupta. He said that we made a mistake in making a commitment about the plebiscite. We are inclined to accept the versions of other people about us; we are even likely sometimes to accept such terms. Two or three years ago it was common in our country to speak about Kashmir and India as if they were two separate countries. They have got out of it.

Similarly, when we speak about the plebiscite and so on, we are accepting the version of people who do not agree with us. We made no commitment in regard to the plebiscite without any conditions. We have referred to it. The only resolutions of the UN by which we are bound are the resolution of the 13th August, 1948, 5th January 1949 and the 17th January or whatever it is. These are the only resolutions which India has agreed to. Every delegate or I myself or any representative of the Government-every delegate has been instructed and has said it before the Security Council that we are not bound by any resolution which we have not accepted. We may in good faith try to carry out but we cannot prevent the Security Council passing resolutions anything more than we can prevent the SEATO powers declaring India to be in their protection. For instance, if a royalty were to return to some particular country whose name I shall not mention and were to say, "Macmillan was my ancestor and the whole continent of America is part of my country", we cannot stop him doing it. You may send him to some place for mental cure. If the Security Council were to pass any resolution or the SEATO powers were to say that any country in the 32nd parallel is under its protection, we cannot stop them. We can only refuse to accept that. There was no question of any resolution being accepted.

It takes me to this point. There is the Plebescite Front and what not. What has been the view of the UN ? We accepted it as a working basis some years ago. Some years ago, there was a resolution which was divided into three parts ; it is what may be called a concertina resolution. One part is tied up with the other. The second part becomes operative only when the first part is performed ; so also about the third part. Our connection has been and I am glad to say that it is now regarded as at least not controvertible-that the first part has not been performed. That first part was that the Pakistani elements in the territory of Jammu and Kashmir must withdraw. Their contention was that they were not there ; and it was said that all the forces that there were at that time, except such people as were required for local police work in the so-called Azad Government, should withdraw. At that time when the Resolution was passed, the northern areas were not under the Azad Government and in fact the

Pakistani delegate himself admitted that he had no control over it. Therefore, the whole area which is now so significant to us, much more than is realised by our countrymen,-Baltistan,

98

Gilgit, the whole area of Chitral, frontiers with China, Soviet Union and so on, that is those areas-was never part of Azad Kashmir ; they were, those areas, within the sovereignty of the Jammu and Kashmir Government.

So when this resolution was passed the Pakistan Government had agreed to withdraw all these forces. Not only that they did not withdraw all these forces, they accentuated and added to them. Therefore, the first part has not been performed, and unless the first part is performed the second part is not triggered. That has been our argument. I hope we successfully established it that the first part has not been performed and therefore we cannot look at the second part because it is necessary to have the first part performed.

Supposing, for argument sake, the first part has been performed, then comes performance of the second part which, may be on account of our weakness, may be because we are pre-occupied may be because we never had experience in these matters, has been easily translated, by those who ought to know better, as meaning de-militarisation. We have never at any time, whether in Shri Gopaldaswami Ayyangar's time or anybody's time, agreed to the de-militarisation of Kashmir. No sovereign nation will agree to demilitarisation of its own territory. And, on behalf of the Government of India, I would say-we are accused of passion in this matter ; as the Prime Minister rightly said, it is not my passion, I reflect the passion of my country in this matter-we would not permit, we would not agree to any tribunal however great, we would go down as a people rather than agree at any time to de-militarisation.

So there is no question: of de-militarisation in this matter. There is another point in this first part. Apart from the withdrawal of these troops, it was said in the first part that it was incumbent on the other side not to create con-

ditions which would create enmity between us. So when they carried on all this campaign with all their heart and when speeches were made that they would invade this and that, they created that kind of conditions and they have broken the first part.

So unless Pakistan behaves like a civilised nation and not carry on a war of nerves, a psychological war against us, continually pricking our frontiers and everywhere, unless the first part is fulfilled-the first part was not fulfilled, and make no reservation in this matter; the first part in regard to the resolution of 13th August remains unfulfilled and, what is more, it remains violated-the second part does not come into operation.

But if the first part has been performed, the second part would require taking away, first of all, of the forces, the 32 battalions and the battalions, the so-called Azad Army, the Pakistan's regular army that have come in after the conclusion of cease-fire, after the drafting of these agreements. It is only when they have been removed that other matters would come in.

Then, what is it that in the second part we have committed ourselves to ? We said we would withdraw ourselves in certain strong points, and I am sure I am not endangering the security of the country when I tell you that even today on the soil of Jammu and Kashmir the number of Indian Armed Forces is at a level lower than permitted by the cease-fire agreement. That is the pacific approach that this country has made to this problem.

Supposing this was so, even the second part has been performed, what do we say in the third part? We never said anything about a plebiscite in the third part. We simply said that we would discuss with the Pakistan Government certain methods, this, that and the other, and these methods were put on a kind of architectural plan in the 5th January resolution. It was not an offer of plebiscite. In fact, there are various documents, which you can obtain from the Ministry of External Affairs, where the United Nations itself has said that plebiscite is only one method of ascertaining the opinion. So the plebiscite which has by repetition become almost a gospel, was not a commitment on our part. If it was a commitment it was a conditional commitment,

it required the satisfaction of three or four stages of conditions, which have not only been not fulfilled but have been violated by the action of a reverse kind.

So, when we went there, we agreed to this resolution in order to restrict the area of war, in order that the specific purpose of the United Nations may be promoted.

The second point we have to remember is this, that we have not taken a dispute to the United Nations. There is no dispute, so far as we are concerned about Kashmir. There is no more a dispute about Kashmir than there is a dispute about U.P. What is before the Security Council, under the terms of the Charter, is a situation which is very different from a dispute. And,

99

what is more, the Security Council has not got the powers under the Charter to adjudicate in a dispute. That could become the function of the World Court if we agree to its jurisdiction. But no legal issues can be resolved at the Security Council under the terms of the charter. Thereafter, if it is a dispute, it must be either a boundary dispute or a legal dispute. If it is a boundary dispute, it would have to be settled under the terms of a pacific settlement where there must be agreement on both sides. Therefore, we have referred no dispute. We have referred a situation-I have forgotten the relevant clause of the Charter-which was inimical to the peace of the world, which was deteriorating the relations between two countries and which might lead to this, that and the other.

The third fact to be remembered is this. Perhaps the House would not feel very much moved by it, but they are familiar with this phenomenon as well as other individuals at the United Nations. In all these years, we have been maligned up and down the world on many charges. We have been, for example, charged with genocide, we have been charged, for example, with an ill-treatment of the minorities-who are the majorities in Kashmir and what is more, we have been told that the Muslim population of India-I hope the Muslim population if they recognise themselves as a separate identity will take this into account-we have been charged with holding the Muslim population of India as a hostage in

regard to Kashmir—a large hostage indeed, of 60 million. So that is the third factor, that we should bear in mind.

The fourth is that it is quite true that the resentment of this House and of this country as a whole in regard to the Security Council is understandable, because this Council is composed of 11 great nations, most of them nations whose constitutions are founded in the ideas of truth and liberty, who have not thrown their weight on the side of resisting aggression. Even as late as last year, the Secretary-General, when called upon in another connection to state the juridical position about the changes of sovereignty, said that no act of war could be permitted by the United Nations to change what is called the status juris: that is to say, the Jammu and Kashmir Government is part of this country under the international law, under the terms of the Constitution in 1935 which was implemented at the time of partition, and what is more, by the fact that the United Nations themselves have recognised in their resolutions on Jammu and Kashmir—when the question of Jammu and Kashmir was raised—that Jammu and Kashmir Government had no international status except inasmuch as they could be either related to us or to Pakistan—of course, it was related to us. Therefore, this position having been recognised, there could be no question whatsoever of our surrendering any part of this territory, and that is why our position has been on the one hand consistent with the background of our country and the necessities of the world and on the other with the practical considerations of the situation.

We have told the Security Council that 40,000 to 42,000 sq. miles of our territory remain under external occupation. There is another thing that is not realised; they have been annexed by Pakistan, I believe, under clause 1, sub-clause (2) of their Constitution legally from their point of view, and from our point of view illegally. They have been annexed by Pakistan. We have not recognised and we will not recognise the fact that we have ceased to be sovereign over these territories. What is more, under our present position, with the recent decision of the Supreme Court, no Government in this country except by an amendment of our Constitution, can alter the boundaries of Jammu and Kashmir, because they are part of our sovereign territory, and there can

be no change of our national boundaries except by an amendment of our Constitution. So, it has been made very clear. Therefore, all the excitement on the part of Shri Tariq about Mangla dam is natural, but, in my humble submission, unnecessary, because, no Government in this country-not that it wants to, but even if it wants to-can alter the boundaries; it is not possible except by a change in our Constitution.

Then, reference has been made to the fact that we are not taking enough care about it : what have we done to take this back ? Questions have been asked with regard to the present position. First of all, I would like to say that the present position is that on our sovereign territory, are two administrations : one is the civil administration of the Government of India functioning through the Government of the State of Jammu and Kashmir, indeed as any other State, and the other is the de facto administration which is inimical, the so-called Azad Government and certain principality governments presumably in these mountain States. This is the de facto position; and these are held apart not so much by physical forces as by voluntary agreement on our side. It should not be forgotten that India was a party which initiated these cease-fire negotiations, and that we negotiated at a time when, as some one has stated, there was a prospect of armed victory. Rightly or wrongly, and I believe rightly, we took the view that victory by armed forces alone is not enough and it is necessary to proceed to a settle-

100

ment. On either side of the cease-fire line are observers of the United Nations and it would not be proper for me to mention what I feel about the performance of the operations in so many areas, composed of many nations, and I regret to say that many of them belong to military alliances, whose business it is to report on various violations. Now, these violations are reported and, if you look at them, they will look like a score-board. That is to say, the aim appears to be-I speak subject to correction, because there is the risk of criticism, but this looks like a score-board-to even tip. Actually, we made some hundreds of complaints-I forget the number now, I think it was 1028-against Pakistan and they have made 870 complaints against us. But the score is always even and it is slightly tilted against us every year.

it looks like that. We will leave that alone.

But this cease-fire line is not held by any armed forces but is held by observers and by a law that, in fact, operates against us, because we observe the international law very scrupulously, that is, within five miles of that line no armed forces can operate, with the result that when a raid is committed, we cannot do anything about it, because our uniformed men are precluded from going there and violating that line. That is the position regarding the cease-fire line. Of course, I do not want to whine about the position and we are carrying on as best as we can.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, the worst part of it is that during the last three years considerable acts of sabotage have been taken place inside our territory, and when I say territory I mean our administered territory, a very unfortunate word. In a part of our administered territory these acts of sabotage have happened. This was originally initiated by a General called Akbar Khan, but it so happens that we have instituted an army study, an army research and what not, and there is no doubt whatsoever that the materials for this, the personnel for this the money for it, according to the investigations, have proved to come from Pakistan. It is an act of underground war or guerilla war against us and we might take the evidence of what cannot be called a weighted authority in our favour, the News Chronicle of London. It says:

"An unofficial cloak and dagger movement has been launched inside Indian Kashmir by fire-eating General Akbar Khan, a veteran of the 1948-49 Kashmir war days, to counteract the internal distress and bolster up his own position. Thus, this tacit encouragement of subversive movements of General Akbar Khan suggests he intends to have Kashmir by fair means or by foul."

Then he goes on in various places to talk about taking these places by force, if need be. Our policy is based on friendship with our neighbours, whoever they might be, but equally it is based on resistance to aggression.

Now much has been said about our preparedness in this matter. We cannot put up our minds, and indeed we did not, and we told

the Security Council that on the other side of the Indo-Pakistan international frontier, not the Kashmir Line but upon the other side of the Indo-Pakistan international line is not only the country of Pakistan but a member of a great military alliance. That is to say, it is like our war machinery in the British days. Our power at that time was not what was collected here but what we and the British war office put together. Similarly, it stands in a greater military alliance and in view of the various conditions I do not want to go into greater detail about it. It is said or thought that the change of Government in Pakistan has brought about or is bringing about some result. I hope that it will. I think we may not forget these things, because we have to keep our powder somewhat dry, even if we trust our neighbours.

This is what the General said when he was commanding an army, and not when he was a pensioner. He said :

"I hope to have an army which is highly skilled and it is on that that the future of Pakistan will depend ... The American commitment was to give the Pakistan army the means to create certain units that would balance certain divisions. This programme has now been geared in. It is moving splendidly. it is a limited programme."

It was limited two years ago and it is still being limited. Then he goes on to say-this is a press report :

General Ayub said that this was, for the first time, that exercises envisaging the use of tactical atomic weapons were being staged in Pakistan
Hitherto, the Pakistan Army's studies have been confined to studies of atomic warfare in the tactical field. 'To put our observations to a practical test, this exercise is being staged,' the conclusions and the technique of fighting in nuclear

battle-fields would be evolved from this exercise. The exercise is being staged keeping in view the terrain in West Pakistan plains"

This is the important part of it.

"The exercise is being staged keeping in view the terrain in West Pakistan plains where riverine obstacles".

I said :

"There are no rivers on the other side in the way of obstacles".

that is the whole idea is that all these things are in order to resist the Soviet Union but the riverine obstacles are on our side. I said :

"I do not have a copy of a map to circulate but you know where riverine obstacles are".

The report goes on to say :

"The battle has been developing during the past two months. Now the climax is about to reach."

I said :

"This is about the army manoeuvre."

This has been the position two years ago. It is not my purpose to heat up any difficulties or to come in the way of any conciliatory processes that go on. But going back to this question of explosions inside, during the last three years there have been 229 cases of explosions in the territory of Jammu and Kashmir, on the whole working out at an average of 90 a year, that is to say, one in every four days. When I say explosions, at present they are not what may be called merely countrymade explosives of any kind but they have war materials in them.

Also, in the same period there have been infiltrations into our territory, first starting just over a hundred going up to 211 in 1958, 152 in 1959 and 25 in the few months of this year, that is, the first two months of this year. Infiltrations mean not people who come because they are hungry. The infiltrators are international criminals who are penetrating our frontiers and who have been either arrested or rounded up and so on. But as circumstances obtain, we do not deal with

all these people every time. They can be pushed back. They are pushed back. But these are the fellows who really try to do harm. So there is an act of insipient aggression against us going on all the time. This should be borne in mind and it should not lapse into the background of our thinking when we are talking of the territorial integrity of our land.

Now that takes us to the last of our positions. Government cannot accept the Resolution as it stands for the reasons I have stated and not because some technical positions cannot be found if we want to. There are technical difficulties, but they can probably be overcome. It may even be that the Security Council is tired of it. But suppose that you withdraw it from the Security Council, there is nothing to prevent the whole issue from going before the General Assembly. At the present moment it does not go before the General Assembly where it is possible to gear votes even more because it is tied up in the Security Council. Two organisations of the United Nations cannot bear the same dispute at the same time. Therefore it does not go in that way. But if we were to withdraw this from the Security Council even if we wanted to, certain consequences follow. We would have proclaimed to the world that now the Charter is not worth adhering to. That will be a great decision to take.

Therefore it is not only Kashmir that is involved. It is the basis of our foreign policy, it is the basis of the world organisation and our whole approach to peace and world co-operation that are involved. Therefore even if whatever risks we may have in this matter-and there are no risks just because the question is in the Security Council,-the only risk is that it is possible for Pakistan to bring it up now and then and have a debate, but there are no military risks because the matter is in the Security Council, because on the last occasion when this was brought up the risk was of foreign invasion as under the guise of importing United Nations Emergency Force it was sought to be proposed on behalf of Pakistan by some of the western powers that the United Nations Emergency Force should go into the territory of Jammu and Kashmir. The Government's reply at that time in no uncertain terms but in extremely categorical ones was that we would not allow in any circum-

stance a foreign soldier to land on our soil, that is to say, we would not permit the bringing in- not only permit we would resist and push out- we would physically not permit anyone entering the territory where our administrative writ ran. If the idea was to bring them on the other side, we may not be able to prevent it except by an act of war. But we would regard that as further

102

violation with international support. And therefore when in 1958 I think it was, the Government of India very stoutly resisted the proposal for sending of a United Nations Emergency Force for this purpose, which would have meant the sending of troops of certain countries acting as international soldiers- for what purpose, one does not know- because that would have been violation of our territory, the Security Council would have been prevented from that action.

There is at the present moment no actual danger to us, but there is this question remaining there. And from moral and legal point of view there is much to be gained. Therefore, Government cannot agree at all to this resolution. Speaking for myself, it would be very wrong for me to say that it should not have been brought, because there are various parliamentary methods of raising issues. It is important that we should have this question in mind, partly because of the presence of the Indian army, partly because of Kashmir, and much more so on account of the economic and democratic development that has gone on in the State of Jammu and Kashmir.

There is comparative quietude, and the solution of the problem of Jammu and Kashmir will rest on the industrial and economic development of our land and the maintenance of our unity. That way, the political and social equilibrium will so shift that there will be no option for the people on the other side except to join their brethren on this side of the Cease-fire line.

This it would be better for us, it would be part of our policy that we do not attempt to do that by the violation of an agreement we have reached. We have told the Security Council that under international law every agreement that we have entered into, we shall carry out. But

we shall not accept an agreement because somebody says we have accepted it. Secondly, we have also conformed, we have pointed out that there are certain principles and doctrines of international law which have to be observed, for example what is called *indubius mittius*, that is to say, if a treaty entered into by two sides has to be interpreted, it has to be always interpreted liberally in favour of the persons who carries the onus of implementing it.

Therefore, in regard to all these matters a different view has to be taken. But it very much depends upon the determination of this country. We may not forget that not long ago-it is now getting on to thirteen years-this country, this part of India was invaded, invaded first by irregulars numbering about a quarter million, and for a few days a single battalion of the Indian army was responsible for checking the tide of invasion. And on the soil of Kashmir lie buried some of the best officers of our fighting forces. We owe a debt of gratitude to them, and, what is more, we owe a debt of obligation to see that there shall be no shaking on our part, no back-sliding on our part in this matter.

Kashmir is a live issue with us, because it is part of our sovereign territory, not because it is a piece of land ; it is part of our history, it is part of our kinship, it is a section of our people. What is more, the economic development of that country, the development of those resources, and the prevention of the intrusion of the apparatus of international conflict in the Asian continent, is very much dependent upon our ability to maintain our hegemony over this strategic area.

PAKISTAN USA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC INDIA CHINA MALI UNITED KINGDOM PERU

Date : Apr 01, 1960

Volume No

1995

PAKISTAN

The Indo-Pakistan Information Consultative Committee met in New Delhi on April 27 and 28, 1960. After the conclusion of the meeting a joint communique was issued simultaneously in New Delhi and Rawalpindi on April 28.

The following is the text of the Communique:

The Indo-Pakistan Information Consultative Committee met in New Delhi on April 27 and 28, 1960. The Pakistan Delegation was led by the Minister for National Reconstruction and Information, Government of Pakistan, Mr. Z. A. Bhutto, while the Indian Delegation was led by Dr. B. V. Keskar, Minister for Information and Broadcasting, Government of India.

The Committee reviewed the working of the Indo-Pakistan Agreement of 1948 and the Prime Ministers' Agreement of 1950 in relation to the information media. The Committee recognised the vital role that the Press, Radio and other information media could play in promoting greater understanding and in helping the Governments concerned to resolve outstanding disputes in a peaceful and friendly manner.

The Committee felt that the common attitude of the two countries should be to promote and encourage objective and helpful treatment of

103

material, particularly that relating to subjects in dispute and to ensure that presentation reflects the attitude of friendly countries resolved to remain friendly.

The Committee welcomed the distinct improvement and greater understanding that had come to mark the relations between the two countries since the assumption of office by President Mohammed Ayub Khan.

The Indo-Pakistan Information Consultative Committee, whose members include representatives of the Press of Pakistan and India, examined in detail the joint Press Code which was adopted by the A.I.N.E.C. and the P.N.E.C. in 1950, and in

view of the desire of the press in both countries to assist in the promotion and maintenance of friendly relations adopted the following resolution reaffirming and enlarging the principles governing the Press Code.

"Noting the common desire of the Press of both countries to exercise restraint and to assist in the maintenance and promotion of friendly relations between India and Pakistan ;

"Recalling that an Indo-Pakistan Joint Press Code had been adopted in May 1950 to facilitate further implementation of the Indo-Pakistan Agreement ;

"Reiterates that the Press in both countries observe voluntary restraint in publishing matter concerning both countries :

- (a) by avoiding dissemination of news calculated to undermine relations between the majority and minority communities in the two countries ;
- (b) by refusing to give currency to mischievous opinion of individuals or organisations likely to rouse communal passions or create a sense of insecurity among members of the minority community ;
- (c) held by excluding rigorously from the Press of each country opinion directed against the territorial sovereignty of the other or purporting to incite war ;
- (d) by seeking through normal Press channels or Government Agencies verification of news of communal incidents before it is published ;
- (e) by exercising due care and caution in publication of reports of communal incidents ;
- (f) by avoiding alarming headlines for reports of communal incidents ;
- (g) by avoiding publication of pictures, poems and cartoons likely to excite communal passions ;
- (h) by affording full facilities to Governments for correction or contradiction of

published reports ;

(i) by examining objectively outstanding problems between the two countries with a view to promoting just and amicable solutions ;

(j) by confining comment to the merits of the problem or problems in dispute and not making such problem or problems the basis of a general attack on the two Governments ;

(k) by eschewing personal, contumacious or scurrilous attacks on the respected leaders of either country or the religion, culture and faith of the people of both countries ; and

(l) by avoiding historical controversies which may create or revive bitterness between the two countries.

PAKISTAN INDIA USA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC

Date : Apr 01, 1960

Volume No

1995

PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA

Premier Chou En-lai's Visit

At the invitation of the Government of India, His Excellency Mr. Chou En-lai, Premier of the State Council of the People's Republic of China, camp to New Delhi on April 19, 1960 and stayed here for a week. On April 20, Prime Minister Nehru held a State Banquet in his honour at the Rashtrapati Bhavan.

Welcoming Premier Chou En-lai, Shri Nehru said :

Mr. prime Minister, Your Excellencies, Ladies and Gentlemen,

We are meeting here today to do honour to the Prime Minister of China who is our respected guest not only in his individual capacity, but also as the representative of a great nation. We have had the privilege and pleasure of welcoming him on several occasions previously in our country. It was a matter of deep satisfaction to us that the two great countries of Asia, India and China, were forging bonds of friendship in the present age, even as they had lived in friendship through ages past. This friendship and cooperation appeared to us to be a guarantee of peace in Asia. Thus this friendship with this great neighbour of ours became one of the corner-stones of India's policy.

We meet today, however, under different circumstances when serious disagreements have unfortunately arisen between us. That is a misfortune for all of us and, I think, for the world. It is a double misfortune for us in India because we have been conditioned for long years past to believe in peace and in peaceful methods and to consider war a thing of horror, unbecoming to civilized nations. We have opposed not only war but also what is called the "cold war" because this represented the approach of hatred and violence. We have endeavoured to follow, in our limited and imperfect way, the teaching of two great sons of India, the Buddha and Gandhi.

It is strange and a matter for great sorrow for us that events should have so shaped themselves as to challenge that very basis of our thinking and caused our people to apprehend danger on our peaceful frontiers along the great Himalayan mountains which we have loved for thousands of years and which have stood as sentinels guarding and inspiring our people.

You, Sir, have come here at this critical moment and we welcome your visit. Much has happened which has pained our people, much has been done which we think should be undone, much has been said which had better been left unsaid. We have to try to the best of our ability to find a right and peaceful solution to the problems that have arisen. That solution must be in consonance with the dignity and self-respect

of each country as well as in keeping with the larger causes of peace in Asia and the world.

We have raised the banner of peace before other countries and we cannot afford, and the world can ill-afford, for us to let this slip from our hands.

We meet here at a difficult and crucial moment in the world's history and in our own relations. Thousands of years of two great and ancient civilizations stand as witness to our meeting, and the hopes of hundreds of millions for a happier future are tied up in our endeavours. Let us pray for our success so that we may be true to this past of ours as well as the future that beckons to us. For our part, I can assure you, Mr. Prime Minister, that we shall endeavour to do our utmost so that our efforts may lead to success and to the maintenance of peace with dignity and self-respect of both our great nations. As the Buddha said, the real victory is the victory of all which involves no defeat.

I feel that you have the same urge for peace and cooperation and that with our joint endeavours, we shall not only halt the unhappy process of deterioration in our countries' relations, but also take a step towards their betterment.

With this high aim in view, I welcome you, Mr. Prime Minister, and your colleagues, and request that we drink to your good health and to the success of our quest for pence.

CHINA INDIA USA

Date : Apr 01, 1960

Volume No

1995

PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA

Mr. Chou En-lai's Reply

Replying to Shri Nehru, Premier Chou En-lai said:

Your Excellency Respected Prime Minister Nehru, Ladies and Gentlemen :

I am greatly honoured to have the opportunity today to attend the banquet given in our honour by His Excellency Prime Minister Nehru. In my own name and that of Vice Premier Chen Yi, I wish to thank His Excellency Prime Minister Nehru and extend greetings to all the Indian friends and the Heads of foreign missions present here.

Nearly three and a half years have passed since I last visited your great country. During this period, great changes favourable to world peace and human progress have further taken place in the world, and our two countries have scored not a few achievements in building our respective lands. In the last one year and more, although

105

there occurred certain difficulties in the relations between our two countries owing to temporary differences of opinion on the boundary question between the two countries and certain unfortunate and unexpected incidents, this should not, nor can it, shake the foundation of the long-standing friendship between our two peoples. The friendly contacts between our two peoples have a history of thousands of years. Since our two countries attained independence respectively, this age-old traditional friendship has undergone further development on a new basis. In order to build up our respective countries and safeguard Asian and world peace, we need to continue to strengthen our mutual friendly cooperation. I am deeply convinced that the profound friendship between our two peoples is unshakeable.

There is nothing more important to our two peoples than our respective cause of construction. Although our countries have different social systems and follow different roads in their construction, they suffer from equally serious poverty and backwardness caused by colonialism and face equally arduous tasks of construction. It is therefore very natural that our two peoples should be concerned for each other and learn from each other

while engaging in their respective construction. The Economic Construction Exhibition held by India in our country in 1956 aroused the great interest of our people. The Indian people, too, attached importance to the Chinese agricultural exhibition held in Delhi this year. The Chinese people have had the honour of receiving quite a number of specialised Indian delegations, and Chinese delegations of similar nature have also visited and studied in India. It should be admitted that not enough has been done in the past to exchange experience in construction between our two countries. In the future, along with the further development of construction in our two countries, it is necessary to strengthen particularly this important link in the friendly cooperation between our two countries.

The Chinese people are devoting all their energy to increasing production, improving the living standards and rapidly building their country into a truly prosperous and strong one. In the past ten years and more, the Chinese people have scored some achievements in these respects. However, those achievements are still extremely limited compared to the tremendous tasks to be accomplished in the future. The Chinese people are fully aware that they will have to make strenuous efforts for several more decades in order to completely lift themselves from backwardness. The Chinese people not only are determined to build up their own country, but sincerely hope that their friendly neighbour India and other Asian and African countries will also quickly grow prosperous and strong. The Asian and African peoples are all industrious and talented, and they all cherish the strong desire of freeing themselves from poverty and backwardness. With this most favourable condition plus our rich resources, it is entirely possible for us to overcome all the difficulties encountered in our construction and to develop our industrial and agricultural production. We Asian and African countries should have the self-confidence that what the Western countries can do, we also can do, and will certainly do even better than they. The dire sufferings brought by colonial rule made us unite together; the glorious tasks of construction should make us unite together even more closely.

We all urgently need a lasting peaceful international environment so that we can devote all our efforts to domestic construction. Both our

countries have made unremitting efforts in the cause of safeguarding Asian and world peace. We jointly initiated the Five Principles of peaceful coexistence and carried out good cooperation at the Bandung Conference of historic significance. We are glad to note, at the time of the fifth anniversary of the Bandung Conference, that the movements against colonialism and racial discrimination and for winning and safeguarding national independence in Asia, Africa and Latin America have won a continuous series of victories. The Chinese Government and people have adhered faithfully to the Five Principles and remained loyal to the Bandung spirit; they have always supported the struggles of Asian and African Peoples and safeguarded the solidarity of Asian and African countries; this stand of China is firm and unshakeable. Some people do not think so, but this we do not mind. We believe that, provided they do not bear us any ill will, they will come to a correct understanding after a period of observation.

As to the present world situation, the prospects for winning peace are brighter than ever before. Like India, China hopes that the conferences concerning disarmament and the forthcoming East-West conference of government heads will lead to further relaxation of the international situation. But some influential circles in the world are still engaging in armament expansion and war preparations, reinforcing their aggressive military alliances, expanding their military bases abroad, and seeking by every means to poison the international atmosphere and obstruct East-West agreement on a number of important international issues. What is particularly worthy of note is that, fostered by these circles, the militarist and

fascist forces which launched the last World War are now reviving and once again menacing the peace and security of the world. All this shows that the safeguarding of world peace is still an arduous task. Under these circumstances, it is necessary for China and India to strengthen their friendly cooperation so that they, together with other peace-loving countries and people of the world, can make significant contributions to world peace and the progress of mankind.

As to the boundary question between our two countries, it is, in our opinion, only an issue of a limited and temporary nature compared with the fundamental question of preserving friendly cooperation between our two countries. To use a common Chinese expression, it concerns only one finger out of ten. Of course, we recognize that a settlement of the Sino-Indian boundary question has its difficult aspects, because this is an extremely complicated question left to our two countries by colonialism; yet, on the other hand, we also have favourable conditions for settling this question, because both our countries have attained independence and share the desire for friendly cooperation, and it is possible for us not to be bound any longer by outdated ideas. The Chinese Government and myself are deeply convinced that so long as we constantly care for the long-term interests of the friendship between our two countries, take into consideration both the historical background and the present actualities, act on the basis of the Five Principles and in the spirit of mutual understanding and mutual accommodation, it is entirely possible to achieve a fair and reasonable over-all settlement of the boundary question between the two countries. The Sino-Indian boundary question is left over by history; it is not created by either of our two Governments. The Chinese Government, in particular, does not wish to see the relations between our two countries affected by the boundary question. In order to seek various avenues to a peaceful settlement of the boundary question, the Chinese Government has never stinted exerting its greatest possible efforts. I sincerely hope that the present meeting between the Premiers of the two countries will yield positive and useful results.

As His Excellency Prime Minister Nehru aptly put it, friendship is necessary not only for our two countries, but for peace in Asia and the world. I believe that our joint efforts will surely uphold and develop the friendship between our two countries. I thank once again His Excellency Prime Minister Nehru and the Indian Government for their invitation and hospitality and heartily wish even more and greater achievements for the Indian people in the great cause of building up their country and defending peace in Asia and the world.

I propose a toast
to the traditional friendship between the

peoples of China and India,
to the prosperity and strength of India,
to Asian and world peace,
to the health of His Excellency Prime Minister
Nehru and
to the health of His Excellency President
Prasad.

CHINA INDIA USA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC INDONESIA

Date : Apr 01, 1960

Volume No

1995

PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA

Nehru-Chou Joint Communique

On the conclusion of the talks held between the Prime Ministers of India and China, the Ministry of External Affairs issued an official communique in New Delhi on April 26, 1960.

The following is the full text of the Communique:

At the invitation of the Prime Minister of India, Shri Jawaharlal Nehru, His Excellency Mr. Chou En-lai, Premier of the State Council of the People's Republic of China, arrived in Delhi on the 19th April to discuss certain differences relating to the border areas which have arisen between the Government of India and the Government of the People's Republic of China. His Excellency Mr. Chou En-lai was accompanied by His Excellency Marshal Chen Yi, Vice-Premier of the People's Republic of China, His Excellency Mr. Chang Han-Fu, Vice Foreign Minister of China, and other officials of the Chinese Government. His Excellency the Premier and his party concluded their visit to India on the morning of the 26th April.

The two Prime Ministers had several long, frank and friendly talks between themselves. Their Excellencies the Premier of the Chinese

People's Republic and the Vice-Premier also had long talks with the President, the Vice-President and several senior Ministers of the Government of India.

The two Prime Ministers explained fully their respective stands on the problems affecting the border areas. This led to a greater understanding of the views of the two Governments but the talks did not result in resolving the differences that had

107

arisen. The two Prime Ministers were of opinion that further examination should take place by officials of the two sides of the factual material in the possession of both the Governments.

The two Prime Ministers, therefore, agreed that officials of the two Governments should meet and examine, check and study all historical documents, records, accounts, maps and other material relevant to the boundary question, on which each side relied in support of its stand, and draw up a report for submission to the two Governments. This report would list the points on which there was agreement and the points on which there were disagreement or which should be examined more fully and clarified. This report should prove helpful towards further consideration of these problems by the two Governments.

It was further agreed that the officials should meet from June to September, 1960, alternately in the capitals of the two countries. The first meeting should take place in Peking and the officials would report to the two Governments by the end of September, 1960. During the period of further examination of the factual material, every effort should be made by the parties to avoid friction and clashes in the border areas.

Advantage was taken of the meeting by the two Prime Ministers to discuss certain other important problems in world affairs. The two Prime Ministers welcomed the forthcoming conference in Paris of the Heads of Governments and expressed the hope that this conference would help in lessening international tensions, banning the production and use of nuclear weapons and promoting disarmament.

Volume No

1995

PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA

Lok Sabha Debate on Nehru-Chou Talks-Prime Minister's Statement

The Prime Minister, Shri Jawaharlal Nehru, made a statement in the Lok Sabha on April 29, 1960 on the debate on his talks with Premier Chou En-lai. He said :

Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, I beg to move:

"That the joint communique issued on the conclusion of the talks between Premier of the State Council of the People's Republic of China and Prime Minister of India, laid on the Table of the House on Tuesday, April 26, 1960, be taken into consideration."

On that day, Sir, when this communique was published, three days ago, I had occasion to say something about it, to explain some parts of it in this House, in answer to a number of questions that had been put. Therefore, I do not think it would be necessary for me at this stage to say much. There is not too much time available and I would like rather that Hon. Members of this House have as much time as possible so that I could reply or give any points of explanation at the end of the debate.

There are just one or two matters I would mention. In this morning's newspapers there is some reference to what Premier Chou En-lai has said yesterday in Kathmandu. Now, it is not perhaps quite right in such circumstances to rely co newspapers reports, but he is reported to have said that what I had stated in this House or some part of it was unfriendly. I do not know to what

particular passage or words he was referring to, and it is rather difficult for me to explain or say anything about it.

But much has been said in the last many months, about a year, which certainly has not been very friendly to either country, much has been said on both sides. On the whole, considering the deep feelings that have been aroused in these matters, we as a Government have tried our utmost, whatever we may say, to say it in a friendly way, although the content might necessarily be such as he has not liked.

Now, we are dealing in this matter with what perhaps cannot be described precisely as a border dispute. It is, of course, a border dispute, but that is rather a narrow description. What we are dealing with is a dispute about extensive border areas. There is difference between the two, and when we claim that certain areas of ours have been occupied by the Chinese forces or authorities and when we ask them to retire from that area, necessarily it is not something which is likely to be appreciated or liked by the other party. In the nature of things that is so, but I would like to lay stress on this because in one of the six points which Premier Chou En-lai referred to in a Press interview here, there was something about not making territorial claims, subsequently he said, as pre-conditions. But anyhow, the whole of this case is about territory, and when we say this territory is ours and they have occupied it wrongly and that they should withdraw from it, inevitably, that is a matter dealing with that territory, and it would be odd to say that this matter is something apart from territorial claims.

108

However, I do not wish to go more into this matter at this stage, and I should be glad to explain anything that requires explanation towards the end of this debate.

Mr, Speaker, Sir, some few days ago here in Delhi city, talks were being held between the Prime Minister of the People's Republic of China and the Prime Minister of India and of these talks, the world was a witness. There was no country in the wide world which was not only not interested but anxiously interested in these talks, not because of the participants, but because a tremendous historical drama was being enacted

in Delhi city, a drama of which only the beginnings have been seen and no man knows what the end of it will be and how long it will take.

Here we have met in this Parliament this afternoon to discuss this drama, this event of tremendous historical importance; and, I must confess to a feeling, of sorrow and regret at the manner in which we have considered this event of tremendous historical importance, which has shaken or, at any rate, interested all the Chancelleries of the world and two to three hundred million people, not only in India and not only in China but elsewhere.

Here, unfortunately, in the early part of this debate, which was mostly noisy and tumultuous and in the other parts of the debate, I have tried with all the intelligence that I can command, to understand the stands, the various viewpoints, the various criticisms. I confess, I have failed; I have failed to find any appreciation of even what has happened and what is happening, something which has shaken the world's mind. Petty disputes, petty references, insinuations, shame, some brave words, kinds of words like "why do you allow strong language?" "why do you go on talking?" "talk is no good" and so on, were used. Now, talk is no good, and I would venture to repeat to the Hon. Members opposite that talk is not good. The talk they indulge in does not lead anywhere. So, here we discuss this thing. We may be small people as individuals, but somehow we, are conditioned and placed at a moment of tremendous historical significance for our country, for Asia and for the world. It is not a small matter what we are discussing, not a little joint communique that has been before this House. That is only a small step in this long journey.

Is there any realisation of this? The Hon. Members who spoke last read out briefly from some poem which he might have read in some school long ago. Is this the way of dealing with this tremendous event today, in this pettifogging way, without any realisation of what we are dealing with, what the subject is, what the present is and what the future is going to be?

The Hon. Member who speaks so eloquently, he also told us how bravely we should all join together driving out the aggressor. All this is

very interesting. But is that an intelligent approach to a tremendously difficult question which faces us today? I take it that we are all interested, we are not only interested but passionately interested, in preserving the integrity and sovereignty of our country and meeting any aggressor. But I object to learn that an aggressor has to be met by this type of language that we have heard from some members of the Opposition here today.

What exactly are we discussing? What are we discussing? I am here to explain. May be I am wrong or my Government is wrong. Let us face these issues. But merely shouting loudly about courage, about throwing out the aggressor does not show, if I may say so with all respect, any realisation of the situation or what it means and how it is to be done. It has no meaning at all. It has no Place in this House of Parliament which has to decide the future destiny of India.

Here is a situation which has arisen, and we have discussed this on many occasions in this House for the last year or so now, I am not going into this question. We have discussed it. It may be our slackness, our laxness or whatever it was, in the past, that is, the Government's. A situation has arisen, and because of that situation, it was decided to invite the Chinese Premier to come here to discuss it. At that time too, some Hon. Members in this House were opposed to this, opposed to any talks, anything, and merely wanted brave words. It was not clear to me then how these brave gestures then or at any time would help; I say, any time, even in the middle of a war, I think I will talk; at no time, shall I refuse to talk. And I may explain that our policy is—last year I stated this, and I wanted to repeat it now.—to protect with all our strength the integrity and sovereignty of India, and our policy is and will be, and I repeat, our policy is going to be, to try to be friendly to China.

We are going to try to be friendly to every country; we are going to try to be friendly, more particularly to our neighbours, whether it is Pakistan or whether it is any other; and therefore, we are going to try, because it is a basic policy; now, following that policy does not mean our tolerating

aggression; that is a different matter. But that is the basic policy, not this policy of constant hatred and violence and hitting which has no meaning in the modern world. If I may say so, people who talk about war probably have no conception of even old war, much less new war..

Anyhow, here is a situation that has arisen. It does not mean not resisting aggression with the best of your ability and strength. But even so, the door has always to be kept open and every effort has to be made even though the effort may not prove helpful; there may be little optimism about the effort-to solve a problem in other ways. And the mere delay itself sometimes helps in this business.

I do not think that my meeting Premier Chou En-lai and my talks with him have worked wonders. But I do think that it was not only the right thing to do but that it has justified itself, not in a big way; it has justified itself because we have done the right thing. That itself is something.

Secondly, it has, I think, given him and his colleagues, and given us, a clearer appreciation of the situation. That is, of each other's mind, which is an important factor. It may be that the two appreciations are in direct conflict with each other. It may certainly be. Nevertheless, they are clearer.

Here was a situation. It was not as if there was a team to meet him. There was no team to meet him. I wanted Premier Chou En-lai to meet as many of our Ministers as possible. In fact, to some extent, he met every one of our Ministers in larger groups. More particularly, one of the persons I wanted him to meet was the Defence Minister. I wanted him to meet the Defence Minister because the Defence Minister had been associated with him for many many weeks in the Geneva Conference which led to the Indo-China peace. He was the one person, apart from me, who had met Premier Chou En-lai previously, and met him at length. So that they know each other. And when we discuss such matters, it helps.

People imagine that these discussions are

carried on by sitting, throwing challenges at each other, telling him, 'You are an aggressor. Get out'. This is not a normal way of talks. If Hon. Members Opposite have in the remote ... or distant future ever any chance of carrying on such talks, they will themselves realise that that is not the way to do it.

Therefore, one talks informally-the formal talking is only something for the public-one talks in a friendly way, one probes the mind, one tries to understand what is behind the mind, and tries to see how many avenues there are to be explored and all that-not throwing challenges at each other. Two big countries challenging each other-the moment you do that, you shut the door and when you shut the door, what remains? Either sitting sullenly and doing nothing, just cursing like an old woman or going out sword in hand or whatever weapon you have, and fighting. There is nothing else left.

I do not like either of these alternatives. One has to explore and to find out, meanwhile naturally preparing for any contingencies that might arise. That is the obvious course every country follows. Hon. Members of the opposition have not quite understood this primary fact. And they have denounced what Government has done.

The Hon. Member who spoke last quoted Goldsmith, I would say something has happened since Goldsmith lived and wrote all that; and it is quite amazing, the fabulousness with which this matter is approached by some Hon. Members here.

There are one or two factors which I should like to put. There was the reference to a new road being built. Hon. Members for once have not been quite wide awake enough. There is reference to this in the Third White Paper. There is reference to this in the Second or the Third White Paper I forget-but there is reference in the White Paper any way.

It is our information that a road has been built west of the original Aksai Chin caravan route. And, this matter was brought up by me before Premier Chou En-lai. I told him about it. I must confess that I was a bit surprised to find that he did not know much about it.

He said, 'I do not know; I can say nothing about it'. But the point is that we did refer to it. This was done in the middle of last year, not now. It is very difficult for us to find dates and to give dates as to what happened and when. But, broadly speaking, the picture we have is that some years back, that is, I mean in the fifties, not longer than that, the old Aksai Chin route which was an old caravan route frequently used or not often used, that and another route nearby, north of that, were being used by people coming from Sinkiang. It was always used. It was used more later by Chinese forces and troops coming through

110

in the early fifties as a caravan route.

Later, about 1957-58, they built that road along the caravan route and brought their supplies etc. from Sinkiang to Tibet. But they have been using it as a caravan route. That was one incursion.

Later, it was last year when larger areas of Tibet were occupied and, probably, about the middle of last year this other road was built. It was, indeed, on this other route, a bit of it that Karam Singh was taken back. There is something about it in Karam Singh's evidence. It is there.

In such a state of affairs, thinking on the subject not as Government or as Opposition but as people not only interested in the safety and integrity of India, we should see what steps should now be taken. That is the problem before us. And, in doing that, a wrong step may have far-reaching consequences, far-reaching consequences not on the moral plane-although I am not prepared to omit the moral plane-but on the strictly practical plane of achieving what we set out to achieve. After all, if we want to do something, if we want to achieve something, not shout about it, how do we achieve it? There, a debate does not help. If it is a strength versus strength, strength has to be matched by strength, by determination, by all the things that go behind that strength.

It is much too serious business that we are faced with in this country. And certainly, I who have the honour to lead this Government and this House, would not presume to say on behalf of my Government that we can do anything very

big without the widespread help of the country and all kinds of various groups in the country. Some people may not; every one may not help but basically in a crisis of this type the country tries to pull together and that is why at the beginning of my remarks, I expressed my sorrow because the evidence we have given today in this debate is not of people trying to pull together, not of people who realise even the danger of this crisis that we face but of groups hurling abuse at each other. This is not a sign of strength and the world is a witness of what we are doing; they may not be impressed by this debate.

It is a very serious question and, therefore, I beg of this House to consider this question in all its various aspects and then decide jointly because it is not a party matter. One thing I do not know, whether it is a party Matter. I suppose it is and it is this question of alignment and non-alignment. That is the basic thing, very basic thing and I would venture to tell this House why I call basic. Apart from the usual reasons, in this context, the moment a person thinks of giving up non-alignment I it means exhibiting a sense of weakness, a sense of non-reliance on ourselves and hope that others would come to our help.

I think that is the correct analysis of that approach. In fact I say there could be no other analysis of that approach. I say there could be nothing more dangerous for this country, nothing more fatal for our future than to spread this feeling of despondency or lack of self-reliance and asking others to help. There is nothing more fatal. What will happen in future I do not know. I hope that whatever happens we shall never have that feeling of despondency and want others to pull us out of our difficulties in a matter of this kind. It is admitted that we have to face this tremendous problem and tremendous menace that has come to us, an event of the most vital importance to our country and to our future. We can only do so first of all, by remaining calm about it and not shouting too much about it and imagining that by shouting we can solve major problems. We do not do so-secondly, understanding the situation in its context here, in its world context, because no subject can be divided up like this from the world position today; and thirdly, in terms anyhow, of building up our strength and meanwhile trying our utmost to explore every avenue for peaceful settlements, however difficult

they might seem. We have to explore them. That is the right way and that is the practical way apart from theory.

That is the policy we propose to follow in this matter, and at every step, whenever anything occurs we shall naturally come to this House, come to this Parliament to explain it to gain its support, to gain its confidence. If that policy is not approved of or agreed to then, of course, it is the right of this House to choose another Government to carry it out. But we must realise when we decide on a policy we must show, as every country shows when faced with these difficulties, a measure of homogeneity of working together, facing the difficulties together, forgetting our many internal problems, difficulties and quarrels. That is how a country behaves when a crisis comes.

CHINA USA INDIA NEPAL SWITZERLAND CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC OMAN

Date : Apr 01, 1960

Volume No

1995

PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA

Rajya Sabha Debate on Nehru-Chou Talks-Prime Minister's Statement

The Prime Minister, Shri Jawaharlal Nehru, made a statement in the Rajya Sabha on April 29,

111

1960 on the debate on his talks with Premier Chou En-lai. He said:

Mr. Chairman, I beg to move :-
That the Joint Communique issued on the conclusion of the talks between the Premier of the State Council of the People's Republic of China and the Prime Minister of India, laid on the Table of the Rajya Sabha on the 26th

April, 1960, be taken into consideration.

This Joint Communique is not a very long document. It is only about a page and a half and it is the outcome of about twenty or twenty-two hours of talk and discussion. Behind that lies not merely the talk, but a certain significant historical situation that has arisen which affects not only India and China but in a sense the world. If I may say so, the significant sentence in the communique is that in spite of all these efforts no solution was found. That is the real thing. All the rest shows that however difficult the task may be, the attempt to find solutions is not being given up and will be kept up to the end in so far as there is any hope. That is the main result of these talks and this Communique. I have no doubt that it was not only worthwhile but right for us to have invited Premier Chou En-lai here and to have had these talks. It was right anyhow. Not to have done so would have been wrong. Although these talks have not helped in the least in the solution of the problem they have certainly given a greater understanding to us of the mind of the Chinese Government and to the Chinese Premier of the mind of the Indian Government. And that was why I was anxious that Premier Chou En-lai and his colleagues should meet as many members of our Government as possible to see that it was not just one spokesman who was putting across the mind of the Indian Government, and I hope the Indian people, but from a variety of points of view he should gather that. It was important that he should and I believe he must have done that.

Now, Sir, I do not propose, at this stage, to take up more time of the House and it will be more convenient if at the end I may answer some of the questions raised.

Mr. Chairman, the brief discussion we have had here has ranged over a wide field, not going deeply into any particular aspect of it. The motion that I made was about this joint communique. Some reference was no doubt made to it but generally the subject has been dealt with from the point of view of the past. Whose fault it was that this has arisen and what steps should be taken to remedy it? That is right and I am not complaining.

Now there are two or three factual matters

that I would refer to. Reference has been made to a new road. This new road, according to our information, had been built there, probably sometime last year, early last year or about the middle of last year. Shri Ganga Sharan Sinha asked : "How was it built there ? How did we allow it to be built ?" The road was built in the area which had at some time previously been occupied by the Chinese. It was ever since last year, in the beginning of last year and may be, even earlier. That area was occupied by the Chinese forces and they have built that road there. There is a reference to this road which is west of the Aksai Chin road, in some of the papers and in our White Paper. There is reference to it in Mr. Karam Singh's evidence in the White Paper. I referred to this and I drew the attention of Premier Chou En-lai also to the building of this new road. He did not seem to be fully aware of what had been done there. So he could not enlighten me about it.

Then there has been the question of what Premier Chou En-lai has said at Kathmandu. He has made a complaint that some things that I said were unfriendly. Also, he said, I think in his press conference in Delhi, that I had not used the word 'aggression' or described the Chinese action as one of aggression. I am not quite sure in my mind whether I used that word or not and it is quite possible that I did not use the word because the whole discussion was about the Chinese forces having entered the Indian territory. We were discussing it in great detail. At least we were putting each other's cases to each other and the whole case was that they had entered our territory and therefore committed an aggression, according to us. Whether I used the word 'aggression' or not I have no recollection but the whole purport of the argument was that aggression had been committed and that it should be vacated. Perhaps Premier Chou En-lai has placed his case before the public in the course of a long press conference held here but briefly if I may recapitulate it, it was this, that in both the western and the eastern sectors, both these areas have long been under the Chinese or Tibetan jurisdiction-the eastern sector under Tibetan or a part of it, a relatively small part under Tibetan and a large part under Sinkiang's jurisdiction. This had occurred in regard to the western sector for about 200 years. Now, according to us, as the House knows, our case was that both these areas have long been

under Indian jurisdiction so that there was a basic and fundamental difference in the actual approach

112

and either both our facts were wrong-both could not be right-or one of them was wrong and inevitably, therefore, we were led to this, that the facts should be more thoroughly examined. There was no other way except breaking off and not having any further contact which would have been undesirable. We did not and we do not expect some wonderful solution to emerge out of this examination of the facts. Nevertheless, we thought that this process must be gone through, it should be gone through and that it might help to some slight extent. I do think that Premier Chou En-lai's coming here did help in bringing a part of his mind before us, as perhaps it helped him to understand what our Government and our people were thinking, so that the whole discussion turned rather on facts. It was no good my going on telling him to vacate the aggression, which I did in a different language, when he was telling me ; "Vacate the aggression; you are in our territory." It is an extraordinary or rather a comic situation, factually I mean. You cannot carry on an argument this way, his telling me this and my telling him the exact reverse of it all the time. So we had necessarily to discuss on facts in so far as this was concerned. He gave me some facts, according to him, and I gave him a good many of our facts. I tried to have a fuller examination from the official basis but he said that he had not brought many of their records. How was one to prove factually the jurisdiction of a country or the administration of a country ? It is an extraordinarily difficult thing where you are dealing with a country where people do not live or hardly live or are very few. Maps, rival maps, are produced. Historical records, rival historical records are produced. I am not at the moment balancing them, because I am convinced that with regard to these matters the evidence that we have in our possession is very good and our case is a very strong one. I have no doubt about it, I am merely placing before the House how difficult it is to deal with: this question when exactly contrary sets of facts are produced. That was the difficulty. it appeared that so far as the original Aksai Chin road was concerned, it was an old caravan route, hundreds and hundreds of years old. This has

always been used as a caravan route by people going from Sinkiang to Tibet. This and the nearby route were used by the Chinese forces, probably in 1951, or may be 1952. That is to say, soon after the Chinese Government came to Tibet, soon after that, they used that road, the caravan road, it was not a road proper but they used it for bringing materials, supplies, forces etc. Later, three or four years later, they built some kind of a road there probably in 1957 or 1958. Now, in the last eighteen months more or less, less perhaps according to our information and our belief they occupied a number of other places in the Ladakh area, apart from the Aksai Chin area. And later, about the middle of last year, they built the other road in the area controlled by them. It was not obviously possible for us to stop the building of that road, because they controlled that area. Either we control it by pushing them out or we cannot prevent their building that road. That is the position.

Now, the broad approach to this question can be one of attempts at finding some way to settle it, or war. Even if ultimately one is driven to conflict, one makes these attempts and at the same time, one has to prepare oneself and one's country, to face any emergency that might arise. These are the broad principles which anyone would agree to. One may differ about the detailed implementation of these principles. We are trying to follow these lines and even from that point of view, this examination by officials is helpful, from our point of view.

The Hon. Member, Dr. Kunzru referred to various things. He referred to what I stated, I think, and to the failure to find out what China claims to be her boundary. That has been our attempt. Even in the correspondence published in the White Paper, we asked them repeatedly what was the precise boundary. They showed it in their maps. They showed it in some descriptions. But we wanted to know the precise boundary, just as we gave them our precise boundary in terms of latitudes and longitudes and exact points. They have not done it. They did not do so when the officials met here either. In fact, they made that a reason for determining the boundary precisely. They said it had not been determined precisely. It has not been demarcated and therefore we should sit down and demarcate it. Our reply has always been

that while it is true that it is not demarcated on the ground, it has been delimited precisely enough in maps, records etc. and it is not possible to demarcate it over certain areas at all, physically. Anyhow their present position was : Let us demarcate it. And they defined their boundary in the western sector as going from the Karakoram Range down south to the Kongka Pass. But that is not the major water shed. There are two water sheds there, the major one which we claim to be the real boundary and the minor one on the west of it, or from the Karakoram Range, down south to the Kongka Pass. Therefore, partly they indicated their boundary, not precisely, and the one they indicated was, according to us, the wrong place, going much to the west of the real boundary.

113

Then Dr. Kunzru referred to and asked how the present situation had arisen and who was responsible. That is rather a difficult question for me to answer. May be he is right, not so much, I think, as to how the situation has arisen, because it has arisen because of numerous factors with which we have nothing to do, but we might say that we might have been wise enough to foresee and to predict what had happened and prepared for it. Possibly he is right. It is rather difficult for me to say. May be I am not a very good judge of my own actions. It is difficult to judge one's own actions and one's own mind. But I would like him to appreciate that the things that have happened have been on a rather major world scale. Whether they happened near our border or elsewhere, the changes that were taking place during the last ten years or more, have been tremendous changes, and anything that we might have done really would have been on a relatively small scale even, if I may say so, if we had greater provision than we had. It is always easy to be wise after the event. But let us consider it in the larger interest, because something has been happening in these years which is of tremendous historic significance, and which we have to face, not now but in the future.

Ever since the Chinese Revolution, every person, at all acquainted with the position, know of China's growing strength and repeatedly we had discussed this matter amongst ourselves, not now but ten years ago. We might have misjudged something, but the major fact was not at all

hidden from us, and it was repeatedly discussed as to what steps should be taken and what should not be taken. Then the Hon. Member said something about the foreign policy being proportional to our strength. That, of course, is a statement with which nobody can disagree. It should be. But what exactly is the foreign policy we have followed which is outside our strength is not clear to me. In any policy that you follow, in so far as it depends on the strength of other countries, naturally the question arises against what country, how many countries. No country today is strong enough to follow a foreign policy of its liking, not even the great countries, United States of America and the Soviet Union. Even they can, not follow it completely because of the amazing forces at work in the world today.

Then he referred to something, to non-alignment and Panchsheel perhaps indicating that that was where our foreign policy went ahead of our strength. Well, I think that Panchsheel and non-alignment are principles which fit in with every country's strength-I would not say every country perhaps there may be some which it does not-but certainly and oddly enough, all or most of the opponents of this policy, the foreign countries which criticise it almost all admit the rightness of the policy for us in the past and the rightness for the present. These are critics. I am not talking about those who approve of it.

In reply to a question the Prime Minister said Panchsheel has nothing to do with countries misbehaving or invading or committing aggression. If you have a law and if a man commits murder, well it is murder, It does not mean that the law is bad. I do not see this mixing up. Panchsheel does not mean that we should leave our borders weak. That is not the meaning. Our borders should be strong and a country should be strong, Panchsheel is a code of conduct, a code of behaviour between countries. It is a right code. If a country does not follow it, well it misbehaves and should suffer for its misbehaviour. That is a different thing. The charge is that we did not have our borders adequately strengthened or defended. That is rather difficult to go into but it is not particularly an easy matter to defend them in the sense that it should have been defended to prevent this. In fact, it is an amazingly difficult matter. In fact, it was an impossible matter in these areas. It might be possible that something might have been done, a

little here and there but if you just analyse the position, the factual position of where our borders are, how one reaches those borders, how one sends supplies to these borders, you will understand. It is an impossible position in many ways. Of course, 'impossible' may be a strong word. We may have diverted all the energies of the nation in those days to building those roads but even then it would have taken several years, sending supplies there and all that, I cannot say. A little more might have been done but even that would have been inadequate purely from the military point of view, I think, to defend against any person if he wants to push in. That is to say, it required time to do so. I do not think it is an impossible thing to be done but it required time and behind that time was required something which any country requires and must have, industrial development. It is not a question of a resolution passed at a public meeting or feelings. A country is strong only in the measure of its industrial development; nothing else can make it stronger. We tried to concentrate on industrial development, as we are still trying, because that was our very basis ; otherwise, with all the will in the world, we cannot defend. Why is China supposed to be strong ? It is because she has tried to develop herself industrially in the last ten years by ways which we cannot and do not wish to adopt but this raising of our strength does not mean our sending platoons, battalions and com-

114

parties to far corners of the border region with which people can defend that area. However, it is probable and I am prepared to admit the Hon. Member's statement that we might have done more if we had concentrated on that particular thing.

CHINA USA INDIA NEPAL CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC

Date : Apr 01, 1960

Volume No

1995

Prime Ministers' Reply to Lok Sabha Questions on his talks with Premier Chou En-lai

In the Lok Sabha on April 26, 1960, the Prime Minister, Shri Jawaharlal Nehru, placed on the Table of the House a copy of the joint communique on his talks with Premier Chou En-lai. Replying to a number of questions on the subject the Prime Minister said :

Last night, soon after the issue of the joint communique, Premier Chou En-lai held a press conference. It was a very prolonged press conference which, I believe, lasted for about two hours and a half. There is some reference to it in this morning's papers, but they have been unable to give a full report, which possibly may appear tomorrow. I myself have not seen the full report of that, but such things as I have seen indicate that he had naturally stated and given expression to his point of view, which, very often, is not our point of view, and certainly not of the Government of India. It is possible some misapprehension might arise occasionally.

The Hon. Member refers to the six points. We do not agree to them. The points were-I am reading from The script which he gave to the press :

"1. There exists a dispute on the boundary between the two parties"

Of course, there exist disputes. That is the first point.

"2. There exists between the two countries a line of actual control up to which each side exercises administrative jurisdiction."

An Hon. Member: Does the Prime Minister draw a line of distinction between the area under administrative control and the geographical area ?

The Prime Minister : There is no question of administrative control or any control. It says, what it says is, not very happily, not correctly,

but broadly, that there is a line of actual control broadly, meaning military control.

An Hon. Member: That would mean that Longju and part of Ladakh would be in their hands, the status quo should be maintained.

The Prime Minister : Longju is in the hands, that is under military control. It is militant control, it means military control.

"3. While determining the boundary between the two countries, certain geographical principles such as watershed, river valley and mountain passes could be applicable equally to all sectors of the boundary."

If it is a principle laid down, that watershed are applicable, and we naturally agree that watersheds are very important factors ; it is the most important factors in mountaneous regions, rivers valleys etc. It does not carry us anywhere.

"4. A settlement of the boundary question between the two countries should take into account the national feelings of the two peoples for the Himalayas and the Karakorum mountains."

I take it as a response to the fact that the Himalayas are an intimate part of India and Indian culture and all that. If the Chinese feel strongly about the Karakorum, they are welcome to do so, I have no objection to it.

"5. Pending settlement of the boundary question through discussions, both sides should keep to the line of actual control and should not put forward territorial claims as pre-conditions, but individual adjustments may be made."

Whatever the explanation of that may be, it is rather an odd way of putting it. Presumably it means that they will not discuss anything, unless the territorial claim is accepted, may be that. It may be that ; it is not quite clear.

"6. In order to ensure tranquillity on the border so as to facilitate the discussions,

both sides should continue to refrain from patrolling along all sectors of the boundary."

This is what he has said. This is not some

115

thing that I agreed to. In fact, he said before stating this, that :

"On the boundary question, it is not impossible for the two sides to find common point or points of proximity, which in my view may be summarised as follows : ..."

and then he has summarised them. He has given his view ; it is not so clear, but there it is. Anyhow, I am not agreeable to this particular approach, but I should like to make one or two things clear.

I believe he was asked something about 'Were you asked to vacate ?' In what form, I do not remember. He said, 'No' or something to that effect. He said that he was not asked to vacate or something like that.

The Prime Minister of the Chinese People's Republic presumably came here because something important had happened, the important thing being, that according to us, they had entered our territory, over a large area of our territory, which we considered aggression. That was the whole basis of his coming here. And if Hon. Members may remember, in one or two public statements I made at the airport and at the banquet, I had repeatedly referred to something have been done which should be undone. The whole argument was based, our argument was based, on the Chinese forces having come into our territory. Their argument was based on the fact that they have always been there, that is to say, not those particular forces, but that the Chinese authorities either of Sinkiang in the north or of Tibet have been in constructive or actual possession of these areas, not now but for two hundred years. That was such a variance, such a tremendous variance in the factual state that there was no meeting-ground, when, according to us, and we repeat that now too after all these talks, that their forces came into this area within quite recent times ;

naturally, they did not enter a broad area on one date, but in the main, they had come to this area in the course of the last year and a half or so, That is our position. Some may be even less than a year, some may be a little more than a year, and some may be a little more than that. I am talking about the western sector. That is our case, to which we hold.

Their reply to that was that they have been in constructive and actual possession or actual possession of this for two hundred years. Now, there is some difference, factual difference between the two statements, a very considerable difference, and there it is. And naturally, in the course of our long talks, we considered various things they had to say and I had to say, we listened to each other. May I remind the House that in talking with interpreters having to interpret Chinese into the English language, it is a very laborious process. Broadly, it takes three times the amount of time that a normal talk takes, that is to say, an hour's talk will become a three-hour talk with interpretation into Chinese, not double but three times. And so, very prolonged talks took place. And this basic disagreement about historical and actual facts came up again and again.

Now, we are quite clear in our minds about our facts, and we are prepared to, and we did state them, and we are prepared to establish them with such material as we have got. The Chinese position was, as I said, basically different facts ; historically, actually, practically, they are quite different.

Also, the attempt was made, it was frequently stated, to equate the eastern sector with the western sector. That is, according to the Chinese although in the eastern sector, we had no right to be there, we had nevertheless advanced gradually in the course of the last few years, last six or seven or eight or ten years, to the present boundary line which we call the McMahon Line. They equated it to the western sector, although the conditions are quite different and the facts are quite different.

So, the position emerged that apart from friendly sentiments and all that, the actual discussion came against a rock of an entirely different set of facts. If facts differ, if inferences differ, arguments differ ; after all, every argu-

ment, every inference, depends on a certain set of facts. If the basic facts are different, then there is no meeting-ground at all, unless some slight clarification takes place about certain basic facts. Therefore, it was suggested and ultimately agreed to that these facts should be explored from the material available with us and with the Chinese Government. I had suggested that it might be done here and now, but, to that, while we were prepared to do it, they said they did not have most of their material here, so that we could not advance much on that line. Thereafter, it was suggested that this pure examination, factual examination might be done on an official basis later, that is, after our talks and this was agreed to.

It is obvious that the officials who might do it have no authority or competence to deal with this problem in the sense of suggesting anything

116

in the sense of dealing with the political aspect of the problem or suggesting any solution or recommending anything ; they cannot do it. It is not their function. All they can do is to examine such facts, and as is stated in the communique, to more or less list the facts that are agreed to, the facts on which there is a difference of opinion or such on which perhaps some further inquiry may be necessary. Anyhow, I do not imagine that this process will clarify the situation and make it easy of solution. I do not think so, but it might somewhat make some basic facts clear or at any rate, we would know exactly on what evidence their case stands. For the moment, we do not know that except what they state. They know to some extent our evidence, not all of it, because when they could not produce all their evidence, there was no reason why we should produce all of it. Anyhow that is the position of this communique that a committee or a set of officials to call it a committee was not correct-some of our officials are going to meet some of their officials with our set of facts, material, documents etc., and examine their set of material, maps, documents, and all these-these are such things as revenue reports, revenue records, collection of taxes and all kinds of things. They will give an objective report which, presumably, would not be a report in which both agree. But anyhow they will draw

up a list.

That is as far as we have gone at present-to present that report.-Then presumably that report will be considered by the two Governments and they will decide what other steps might be taken.

In the Communique itself a period of four months has been fixed for this process, for the meetings which are going to take place in Peking and New Delhi-two centres-for examining these papers. Probably the first meeting will take place right at the beginning of June, the first week of June. No exact date has been fixed.

Broadly speaking, the position, therefore, is that after these prolonged talks, which consisted of our stating fully whatever we thought about our respective stands and positions, we were unable to convince each other and we-both parties-remained unconvinced at the end of it-we standing for what the House knows we stand for, and they standing for something entirely opposite and based on an entirely different set of facts. We thought that in the circumstances it was desirable from many points of view to pursue this line of inquiry at the official level, without any authority to the officials to come to any decisions, and then take this up. Meanwhile obviously when this is being done-and otherwise too- we have to avoid clashes on these border areas because these clashes do no help any body.

An Hon. Member: Apart from these claims and counter-claims based on either historical data or actual possession, as the Prime Minister suggested in his speech of welcome, namely, that the primary issue was the restoration of an atmosphere of peace which had absolutely disappeared, was there any reciprocation of that sentiment from the other side during the course of the talks ?

The Prime Minister: As far as I remember, I said 'good faith'. Obviously when there is a conflict, one of the elements which helps in removing it is good faith and, of course, peace. We were always coming against this hard rock of an entirely different set of facts. This House accepts a certain set of facts which we have ventured to place before it with some confidence that they are correct and which we have believed.

Now they produce an entirely different set of facts not relating to what had happened for 200 or 300 years plus what has happened in recent years.

So it becomes a little difficult to discuss. If one is fairly clear about some basic facts, one can draw inferences and discuss. But when the basic facts are so completely different, some kind of an attempt should be made to find out what the basis is for those facts.

Neither their facts nor our facts are secret. Our facts are well-known ; so are the is except in minor matters. Their case is that from immemorial times, you might say, or at any rate, for hundred. of years, their border has been from the Karakoram Range to the Kongka La Pass. Unless you have maps, you will not be able to understand it. If you accept that border, a large area of Ladakh is out off. They say that of this area, the northern part pertained to Sinkiang, not to Tibet at all, and the little lower part to Tibet. That is, broadly, their case. They say that they came there-not the present Government but the previous Chinese Government-previously. They referred to something that I had said in Parliament here which some Hon. Members perhaps did not like. They took advantage of that from their own point of view. They said, 'How is possession there in an area which is an arid area where nobody lives' ?

They said that most of this area is like the

117

Gobi desert. You do not have normal administrative apparatus in such areas. You have constructive control ; in addition, sometimes an administrative officer goes there, occasionally some tax collector goes there. They do not sit there. It is because it is so deserted. During winter periods, nobody can go there at all ; nobody can move about there. They said, 'But we have been in constructive and actual possession of this all along, long before the present People's Government came; before that too'. That is their case, and they gave this boundary. But one thing which is worth noticing is that through our correspondence or talks, the boundaries have never been given precisely by them, as we have latitude, longitude, mountain peaks, this and that. Hon. Members will see

how even in the White Paper we have given very precise boundary. But in spite of our efforts to get a precise boundary we did not succeed except these broad ranges.

In reply to a question Shri Nehru said : In the communique it is said that every effort should be made by the parties to avoid friction and clashes in the border areas. That is a general direction which we take and which we give. We found that it is very difficult and partly undesirable to be precise about it. I think we cannot immobilise people so that they can go and sit and not go to the right or left. I think it was right anyhow to tell them that they should not take any step which obviously brings them into conflict. Our people will be completely free to move about these areas without coming into conflict.

118

CHINA USA INDIA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC

Date : Apr 01, 1960

May

Volume No

1995

Content

Foreign Affairs Record 1960
Volume VI MAY No.5

CONTENTS

PAGE

COMMONWEALTH OF NATIONS

Final Communique
119

INDIA IN THE UNITED NATIONS
Shri C.S. Jha's Statement in Trusteeship Council on
Western
Samoa

121
Shri C.S. Jha's Letters to the President of the Security
Council 125

POLAND
Indo-Polish Loan Agreement Signed
128

TURKEY
Nehru-Menderes Joint Communique
128

UNION OF SOUTH AFRICA
Shri A.K. Sen's Statement on Subversion of Human Rights
by
South Africa
129

UNITED ARAB REPUBLIC
Nehru-Nasser Joint Statement
133

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
Indo-U.S. Food Agreement Signed
134

MINISTRY OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS: EXTERNAL PUBLICITY DIVISION
GOVERNMENT OF INDIA

INDIA USA POLAND TURKEY SOUTH AFRICA

Date : May 01, 1960

Volume No

1995

COMMONWEALTH OF NATIONS

Final Communique

The tenth conference of the Commonwealth prime Ministers was held in London from May 3 to 13, 1960. The Prime Minister, Shri Jawaharlal Nehru was among those who attended the conference. At the conclusion of the conference a communique was issued on May 13, 1960.

The following is the full text of the Communique :

The meeting of the Commonwealth Prime Ministers ended today. Pakistan was represented by its President. The United Kingdom, Canada, Australia, New Zealand, India, Ghana, the Federation of Malaya, and the Federation of Rhodesia & Nyasaland were represented by their Prime Ministers. South Africa was represented by the Minister of External Affairs, and Ceylon by the Minister of Justice.

This was the 10th of these meetings to have been held since the war. It has taken place at a time of great significance to the Commonwealth and to the world.

The continuing growth of the membership of the Commonwealth was marked by the attendance at this meeting of the Prime Minister of the Federation of Malaya, which achieved independence in August 1957. The representatives of the other Commonwealth countries welcomed the presence of the Federation at the conference.

The Commonwealth is an association of independent, sovereign States each responsible for its own policies, but the primary objective of all is world peace and security. It is their declared purpose to do everything in their power to achieve that objective, and to continue to co-operate to that end with all the peace-loving nations of the world.

In this spirit, the Commonwealth Ministers have reviewed the major international problems of the day on the eve of the impending 'summit' conference, which is to be attended by the Prime Minister of the United Kingdom. They expressed their sincere hopes for a successful outcome of that conference, as a further step in the relaxation of international tension. They discussed, in particular, the problem of disarmament, and

they welcomed the progress made at the Geneva conference on the discontinuance of nuclear-weapons tests. They hoped that, on the basis of the preliminary work already done, the summit conference would be able to make some significant progress towards an eventual settlement, under international control, of the problem of disarmament. An advance towards a solution of that problem, linked with a progressive lessening of political tensions, would afford a firm basis for strengthening confidence between nations and promoting world security.

The Commonwealth Ministers also discussed the problems of Africa, the Middle East, the Far East and South-East Asia. They recognized that economic and social progress are essential for political stability. They welcomed the continued contribution which mutual assistance under the Colombo Plan affords throughout South-East Asia to these aims ; and they agreed that, there and elsewhere, throughout the less-developed areas of the world, the best hope of peace, stability, and political freedom lies in practical international co-operation of this kind.

The Ministers reviewed the world economic situation. They noted that while, in general, the outlook was favourable, the economic expansion which had taken place since their last meeting had been greater in the industrialized countries of the Commonwealth than in the primary-producing countries. They agreed that an important condition of the prosperity of these countries was their ability to develop their export trade. They also recognised the urgent need to maintain and, where possible, increase the flow of economic assistance to the less developed countries. They welcomed the decision to establish an International Development Association.

The Ministers discussed European trade problems. They expressed concern at the prospect of any economic division in Europe and its possible political implications. The countries of Europe form an important market for Commonwealth exports. The Ministers expressed their hope that these countries would follow trade policies in accordance with the principles of the General Agreement on Tariffs & Trade, and thus avoid damage to the economies of the primary-producing countries and those that are also developing exports of manufactured goods.

In addition, the European countries have an important contribution to make in assisting the economic development of the less advanced countries. The Ministers hoped that these problems could be speedily and satisfactorily resolved,

119

with due regard to the interests of countries outside Europe.

The Commonwealth Ministers reviewed the economic development of Commonwealth countries in Africa which have recently attained, or are approaching, independence. They agreed that consideration should be given to the possibility of co-operative action among members of the Commonwealth in assisting the economic development of these countries. This possibility will be studied, in the first instance, by officials of Commonwealth governments, and the Commonwealth Economic Consultative Council will examine it at its next meeting.

The Ministers also reaffirmed their belief in the value of exchanges between Commonwealth countries of persons with specialized skills and experience. They agreed that further efforts should be made to foster and encourage these exchanges, whether on a regional or other basis, and that the Commonwealth Economic Consultative Council should take this question into urgent consideration. They trusted that employers in Commonwealth countries—whether governments, statutory bodies, or private companies—would be ready, wherever possible, to encourage members of their staffs to undertake a period of public service abroad, and would do their best to ensure that their prospects in their home countries would not thereby be prejudiced.

The Ministers considered various questions of constitutional development within the Commonwealth. They noted that the Federation of Nigeria would attain independence on October 1, 1960. They extended to the Federation their good wishes for its future, and looked forward to welcoming an independent Nigeria as a member of the Commonwealth on the completion of the necessary constitutional processes.

The meeting was informed that, in pursuance of the recent plebiscite the Constituent Assembly

in Ghana has resolved that the necessary constitutional steps should be taken to introduce a republican form of constitution in Ghana by July 1, 1960. In notifying this forthcoming constitutional change, the Prime Minister of Ghana assured the meeting of his country's desire to continue her membership of the Commonwealth and her acceptance of the Queen as the symbol of the free association of its independent member nations and, as such, the Head of the Commonwealth. The heads of delegations of the other member countries of the Commonwealth assured the Prime Minister of Ghana that the present relations between their countries and Ghana would remain unaffected by this constitutional change, and they declared that their Governments would accept and recognize Ghana's continued membership of the Commonwealth.

The meeting noted a statement by the South African Minister of External Affairs that the Union Government intended to hold a referendum on the subject of South Africa becoming a republic. The meeting affirmed the view that the choice between a monarchy and a republic was entirely the responsibility of the country concerned. In the event of South Africa deciding to become a republic, and if the desire was subsequently expressed to remain a member of the Commonwealth, the meeting suggested that the South African Government should then ask for the consent of the other Commonwealth governments either at a meeting of Commonwealth Prime Ministers or, if this were not practicable by correspondence.

The Ministers reviewed the constitutional development of the Commonwealth, with particular reference to the future of the smaller dependent territories. They agreed that a detailed study of this subject should be made for consideration by Commonwealth governments.

Whilst reaffirming the traditional practice that Commonwealth conferences do not discuss the traditional affairs of member countries, the Ministers availed themselves of Mr. Louw's presence in London to have informal discussions with him about the racial situation in South Africa. During these informal discussions Mr. Louw gave information and answered questions on the Union's policies, and

the other Ministers conveyed to him their views on the South African problem. The Ministers emphasized that the Commonwealth itself is a multi-racial association, and expressed the need to ensure good relations between all member States and peoples of the Commonwealth.

120

UNITED KINGDOM USA PAKISTAN CANADA AUSTRALIA GHANA INDIA NEW ZEALAND SOUTH AFRICA SWITZERLAND SRI LANKA RUSSIA NIGER NIGERIA

Date : May 01, 1960

Volume No

1995

INDIA IN THE UNITED NATIONS

Shri C.S. Jha's Statement in Trusteeship Council on West Samoa

[Shri C.S. Jha, India's Permanent Representative to the United Nations, made a statement in the Trusteeship Council on May 9, 1960 regarding Western Samoa, a Trust Territory under New-Zealand Administration.

The following is the text of the statement

Once again the Trustee-ship Council is engaged in the consideration of conditions in the Trust Territory of Western Samoa. This will in all probability, be the last but one occasion when the Trusteeship Council will devote its attention to this Trust Territory, and the fact that in less than two years' time Western Samoa will emerge as an independent country lends special significance to the present occasion.

In the consideration of conditions in Western Samoa, the Trusteeship Council has had the benefit of the detailed and encouraging annual report by the New Zealand Government on the administration of Western Samoa. We have also had the advantage of studying the supplementary information given by the representative of the Administering Authority and the Special Re-

representative in their opening statements as well as during the course of the questions and replies in the political, economic, social and educational fields. We are grateful to the Government of New Zealand and to the Special Representative for their valuable assistance to the Council.

Now that the Territory of Western Samoa is going to be independent so soon, it is the future of Western Samoa which compels attention. The past-and this includes to a large extent the report of 1959 which we are considering-recedes, relatively speaking, into the background. One would have thought that independence being so proximate, there was no need for the Trusteeship Council to concern itself any longer with the details of the administration of Western Samoa. This is no doubt true to some extent, but We believe that the period intervening between now and the independence of Western Samoa is one of great importance. Preparations will have to be made not only in the political but in the social and economic fields for the tasks that await the Samoans in the near future, and we believe that it is the task of the Trusteeship Council, by their constructive criticism and suggestions, to assist the Administering Authority and the Government of Western Samoa to take the right road for the future-the road that leads to a stable, prosperous and yet progressive society in full freedom and independence.

As I had occasion to mention during my intervention in the general debate last year at the twenty-fourth session of the Council, the emergence of Western Samoa as an independent country has a special significance in that it will mark the birth of the first sovereign and independent Polynesian State in the Pacific. We reaffirm our sincere hope that other territories in the area, large and small, which are at present Trust Territories or Non-Self-Governing Territories, will also join the comity of nations.

We would like to preface our observations by congratulating the Government of New Zealand for the able and friendly manner in which they have conducted their relations with the Government and the peoples of Western Samoa. When New Zealand lays down responsibilities of administering power in Western Samoa she will leave behind abundant goodwill in that Territory; and there is ample evidence that the momentum

of goodwill will continue significantly to influence the future relations of an independent Samoa with New Zealand in various fields, not the least important of which is the availability and employment of trained personnel from New Zealand for many years until the Samoans can provide such personnel themselves.

We are happy to be assured by the Administering Authority that no significant changes were anticipated in the time-table which the New Zealand Government furnished last year covering the intermediate stages in the transfer of responsibility to the Samoan people. Since the General Assembly at its fifteenth session will give detailed consideration to the various aspects, particularly in relation to the future constitution of the Territory and the termination of the Trusteeship Agreement my delegation does not wish at this stage to pre-judge the various issues that will arise in this connexion.

I would only add, the attitude of my delegation at all times will be determined by the desire to assist in the emergence of Western Samoa as an independent country in the most favourable conditions in accordance with the freely expressed wishes of the people of Samoa.

My delegation is happy to note the various constitutional developments that took place in the

121

Territory during the Year under review. The establishment of cabinet government and the replacement of the High Commissioner as head of state by the three-member Council of State-changes brought about by the Samoan Amendment Act 1959-are significant and encouraging signs. We are also happy to note that the drafting of the future constitution is well under way and that the Working Committee is expected to complete this task by the end of this month and will submit its recommendations to the constitutional convention in July or August of this year. We do not have very much information about the proposed draft constitution, but the information given by the Special Representative on some of the more important recommendations of the Working Committee lead us to believe that the draft constitution which will finally emerge will be best suited to the somewhat peculiar circum-

stances existing in the Territory.

My delegation welcomes the passing of the Citizenship Ordinance in September last year. The provisions of the Ordinance appear to my delegation to be satisfactory and in line with the generally accepted principles that govern this question in most of the areas of the world. The problem of the domestic status of the inhabitants of Western Samoa and its ramifications cause my delegation some concern, as we have indicated also in the past. I should like to quote in this connexion a significant passage from the report of the Visiting Mission of 1959 :

"The Mission is confident, however that the Samoans, on due reflection and after seeing the future position with regard to citizenship, will wish to remove the present distinction in domestic status based on race. Since the achievement of that basic objective of Trusteeship System includes the elimination of, discriminations based on race, this is a matter of relevance to a territory which is emerging from Trusteeship."

The Visiting Mission has emphasized the desirability of removing distinctions in domestic status based on race. and my delegation would once again endorse this view. The existing legislative provisions under which the status of different sections of the community is determined by the percentages of their blood do not appear to my delegation to be appropriate; indeed, they would appear to be the antithesis of the modern concept of citizenship. We were happy to bear the Special Representative state that there is a growing feeling among responsible persons in Western Samoa towards abolishing these distinctions; and while recognizing the strength of tradition in Western Samoa, we should like to express the hope once again that progress will be made in the right direction in this matter.

In connexion with the electoral system in the Territory, my delegation feels that there is scope for improvement. The existing system by which the large majority of the Samoans are denied suffrage rights would appear to be out of step with the generally accepted notions of democratic practice. We agree with the view that nothing should be forced upon the people of the Territory

against their wishes. We also realize that the Administering Authority has continued to impress upon the people of Western Samoa the desirability of introducing universal suffrage.

In this connexion, the Council will recall that the Visiting Mission of 1959 had suggested drawing up what might be called the non-matai roll, besides the existing matai roll. It would seem to my delegation that this suggestion might, to some extent, bring about a more democratic and accessible system of suffrage; and we hope that the Working Committee, which is at present engaged in a study of this problem, will make suitable recommendations acceptable to the people of the Territory as a whole.

We would also like to express the hope that in the forthcoming elections to the Legislative Assembly the normal election procedures and, particularly, the practice of secret ballots will in fact be in operation.

In the field of local government, my delegation has noted with some concern that although both the District and Village Board Ordinances passed by the Legislative Assembly as early as 1953 provided the framework of a local government system for Western Samoa, there has been no significant change and the traditional matai system continues to dominate all fields of local government. My delegation has stated in the past that we would be opposed to the imposition of any system against the wishes of the people. We adhere to that view ; but at the same time we cannot help expressing the hope again that in due time the matai system will adapt itself to the changing economic and social conditions in the Territory. In today's world it is impossible to shut out the winds of change from any part of the globe however remotely situated ; it is the path of wisdom for old and traditional societies to respond to these and thereby avoid difficulties for themselves.

My delegation has noted the somewhat limited progress in the field of civil service. The impor-

tance of an able and strong civil service in any Territory, and particularly in Western Samoa, which is on the threshold of independence, cannot be over-emphasized. We welcome the establish-

ment the Public Service Commission. It would seem to my delegation, however, that the Samoanization of the public service is not proceeding as satisfactorily as it should, and there is still a very large number of seconded non-Samoan officers filling, responsible posts in the Territory. We realize the difficulties involved. We also realize the Administering Authority is doing what is possible to improve the situation. At the same time, we should like to stress once again the need for increasing the present pace of the Samoanization of the public service.

We spoke last year in terms of an emergency programme for the training of selected Samoans and the possibility of availing of such training facilities in public administration as may be obtainable from the United Nations. The Council will recall that the Visiting Mission of 1959 had also laid considerable stress on this aspect of the problem ; and while appreciating the efforts that are being made, my delegation hopes that further endeavours will be made to ensure the Samoanization of the public service as soon as possible.

What we have said in connexion with the civil service applies equally to the judiciary in the Territory. We regret to note that there is no qualified Samoan judge. This is again a question to which the Administering Authority and the Samoan Government might well give serious consideration. An independent Samoa cannot rely entirely on non-Samoan officers to impart justice in the Territory, and we trust that the training in law which we are told is going on at present will be accelerated so as to make it possible for at least some Samoans to occupy judges' chairs when the Territory becomes independent.

In the economic field the paramount question is that of the economic viability of the future independent Samoa. We are happy to note the growth in the production of the three principal crops of the Territory, namely, banana, copra and cocoa. The production and exports of these commodities show significant improvement and we would like to commend the authorities concerned for these.

Having said this, my delegation would like to express the view, as we have done in the past, that the possibility of diversifying the economy of the Territory should receive immediate and urgent

attention of the authorities concerned. In this connexion we have suggested the possibility of the cultivation of alternate crops and the introduction of cottage industries, handicrafts and small industries not requiring too much capital which will process the raw materials available in the island. With the increased production of coconut, it might be possible to start developing coconut by-products and, particularly, the oil and coir industries. We have noted with satisfaction the details of the Development Plan, which we hope will go far in ensuring the economic viability of Western Samoa.

For Territories like Western Samoa, which are tiny specks in vast oceans and relatively poor in natural resources, the hidden resources of the sea acquire special significance. We understood from the Special Representative that no survey of the fishing resources of the ocean in the vicinity of Western Samoa has yet been made. We believe that the Administering Authority will be rendering a great service to the Samoans if they undertake the survey of the fishing and other resources of the sea around Western Samoa. The survey might well be initiated between now and the date of independence and carry forward beyond the date of independence, as such surveys are inevitably time taking. To my delegation, fishing-particularly deep sea fishing-which has to be preceded by orientation and training of Samoans in fishery methods, appears to offer the best long-term prospect of maintaining the rapidly expanding population in Western Samoa with an adequate standard of living.

On the question of the land and land tenure, we have already indicated our views during the questioning period. It seems to my delegation that there is considerable scope for improvement in the existing system of land and land tenure. We note that large areas of cultivable land are at present not under cultivation for one reason or another. With the rapid growth of population in the Territory, it will be necessary to utilize every available acre of land, and we have no doubt that the authorities concerned will give this matter their urgent consideration. We have no doubt that the New Zealand authorities will extend all necessary assistance, financial and technical, for the economic development of the Territory.

We would also endorse, once again, the recom-

mentation of the Visiting Mission that in view of the responsibility of the United Nations towards Western Samoa, favourable consideration should be given to any request for assistance to Western Samoa by the United Nations Organization through existing programmes such as the Expanded Programme of Technical Assistance, the Special Fund, etc. The specialized agencies have,

123

as in the past, to play an invaluable role, in the achievement of this process.

In the field of social development, we have noted with satisfaction the improvement in the provision of medical and health facilities. There is, perhaps, still room for further expansion of health facilities and we trust that the authorities concerned will find it possible to tide over their present financial difficulties and ensure the maintenance of efficient and satisfactory health services in the Territory. In this connexion, the assistance offered by the WHO in the form of fellowships for training qualified Samoan personnel will no doubt be pursued.

We have expressed the view in the past that women's activities in the Territory need not, perhaps, be confined merely to the field of health and health education. Women all over the world are taking more and more interest in serving their countries with distinction in various fields, and we have no doubt that the women in Samoa will not be behind others in this matter and will play an increasingly important role in their national life including participation in the political life of the country.

In the field of education, the efforts so far by the Administering Authority and by the Government of Western Samoa do not appear to have been adequate. We have noted with satisfaction the increase in the number of students in the schools in the Territory, but this problem should be tackled with enhanced vigour and determination. The New Zealand Government have promised continued assistance to the Territory by way of granting scholarships for higher education in New Zealand and for the training of teachers, etc. At we stated last year, my delegation feels that a "crash" programme needs to be undertaken.

Special efforts will have to be made in this direction in the next two years. Increased facilities for secondary-school education and even higher education must be provided in the Territory. Vocational education and technical training of personnel also need particular attention. There are fields in which the New Zealand Government can be of special assistance, not only during the period of stewardship of Western Samoa but, as they have themselves happily indicated, afterwards also. There are also fields in which Western Samoa can cooperate with neighbouring territories in the Pacific region for the establishment of institutions to serve common needs. We realize that in view of the Territory's financial limitations it may not be possible immediately to introduce universal free and compulsory primary education, but this problem will, we trust, cease with the improved economic conditions in the Territory in the near future. In this connexion, we would whole-heartedly support the recommendations of the Visiting Mission of 1959. We are happy to note that efforts are being made for the further development of the Avelo Agricultural College, for raising the standard of instruction at the Samoa College and for the establishment of a high school in the island of Savai'.

As we have repeatedly stated, my delegation has always attempted to the best of its ability to offer such views and suggestions as might, in our opinion, help towards the improvement of conditions in Western Samoa. We are anxious to see the emergence of an independent and sovereign Samoa, strong and self-supporting. Taking into account the smallness of its Territory, the limitations of its resources and the increasing population and the special circumstances prevailing in the Territory, there will be need for close co-operation between New Zealand and Western Samoa for many years to come in various fields, to the mutual advantage of both.

We trust that the proposed treaty of friendship between New Zealand and Western Samoa will establish friendly and mutually satisfactory relations between the two countries, on a basis of equality and mutual benefit. The details of any such proposed treaty are not yet available, and if only for that reason it would be inexpedient to discuss them at this stage. We would however, recall that the independence of Western Samoa and termination of the Trusteeship System are not conditional or contingent upon the

conclusion of the treaty of friendship, and that the proposed treaty, if negotiated beforehand, will be subject to approval at a plebiscite and ratification later by free Samoa in accordance with her constitutional processes. We note with satisfaction that some details of the proposed treaty will be furnished by the New Zealand Government in time for information and discussion, if any, by the General Assembly.

My delegation, however, cannot let this opportunity pass without expressing some thoughts on the basis of relationship we would like to see established between New Zealand and Western Samoa. Last year my delegation asked whether any thought had been given to the possibility of making Western Samoa into an independent State without any defence commitments or attachments with any country and with its inviolability assured by the United Nations through an appropriate resolution or declaration by the General Assembly. We pointed out that in the case of Samoa this might be a distinct possibility, having regard to

124

its small size, its geographical location, the completely peaceful nature of its population, and the fact that its independence will have been brought about under and in fulfilment of the Trusteeship System with the United Nations. We believe, Mr. President, that the best assurance for defence of Western Samoa would be the pursuit of a policy of hostility towards none and friendly relations with all nations, with full faith in the United Nations Charter. It is our hope that in any future relationship with New Zealand, which is discussed and will be eventually embodied into a treaty of friendship or some other similar document, Western Samoa will not be brought into the orbit of any existing or future military alliance.

In conclusion, I should like to express My delegation's appreciation of the significant role played by the Fautua and other Samoan leaders to ensure a happy and prosperous future for their country. We were sorry to hear of the unfortunate illness of the Prime Minister, and my delegation joins others in expressing our hope that he will soon recover completely and be able to direct the activities of his Government and people in these crucial days.

Finally, we should like to thank again the representative of New Zealand and the Special representative for their co-operation- with the members of the Council in the consideration of conditions in the Trust Territory of Western Samoa.

INDIA USA WESTERN SAMOA NEW ZEALAND CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC

Date : May 01, 1960

Volume No

1995

INDIA IN THE UNITED NATIONS

Shri C. S. Jha's Letters to the President of the Security Council

Shri C. S. Jha, India's Permanent Representative to the United Nations, addressed two letters to the President of the Security Council during May, 1960 in reply to his Pakistani Counterpart's letters dated March 24 and 29, 1960.

The following is the text of the letter Shri Jha wrote on May 20, 1960 :

I have been instructed by the Government of India to refer to the letter dated 24 March 1960, from the Permanent Representative of Pakistan addressed to the President of the Security Council regarding recent developments in Ladakh.

The Pakistan Permanent Representative denies that his letter of 3 December (S/4242) was intended to put pressure on India and to aggravate the situation caused by the Chinese incursions into Ladakh. This denial, I regret to say, follows the pattern of other previous denials referred to briefly in para. 2 of my letter of 22 December 1959 (S/4249)

In para. 3 of his letter, the Pakistan Representative refers to the resolution of the Security Council dated 17 January 1948. The Security

Council resolution of 17 January 1948, which Pakistan has consistently violated, refers to the situation which was the subject matter of India's complaint to the Security Council and directs the parties to keep the Council informed of all important developments in regard to that situation. In utter disregard of this resolution, Pakistan marched its regular armed forces into the Indian Union territory of Jammu and Kashmir, annexed the northern areas of the State during the period of the cease fire, increased the fighting strength of the so-called Azad Kashmir forces, also during the period of the cease-fire, received military aid and joined military pacts, thereby increasing its military potential in the area under its unlawful occupation. Apart from these violations of its obligations, Pakistan continues to use its unlawful occupation of part of Jammu and Kashmir to instigate subversion and sabotage activities in the territory of the Indian Union in Jammu and Kashmir. The Government of India have, from time to time, brought these developments to the notice of the Council.

The position of the Government of India in the matter of the recent Chinese incursions into Ladakh has been clearly stated in para. 5 of my letter of 22 December 1959. The recent incursion by China into territory of the Indian Union does not give Pakistan, herself an older aggressor on Union territory, the right to exploit to her advantage a similar aggression from another quarter.

It is requested that this communication may be brought to the notice of the members of the Security Council.

Please accept, etc.

(Signed) C. S. Jha
Ambassador Extraordinary and
Plenipotentiary
Permanent Representative of India to
the United Nations.

The following is the text of Shri Jha's letter dated May 17, 1960:

I have been instructed by the Government

125
of India to refer to the letter dated March 29,

1960, (S/4292) addressed by the Permanent Representative of Pakistan to the President of the Security Council and to convey the regrets of the Government of India for the inconvenience caused to the Council by the volume and frequency of these communications arising out of the factually inaccurate and propagandist approach of the Government of Pakistan.

The Pakistan Permanent Representative complains that I have not stated anything more about the Mangla Dam Project. Your Excellency and the Members of the Council are aware of the Government of India's position on the Mangla Dam Project which was clearly stated in my letter of August 7, 1959, (S/4202) and in other previous communications on this subject. I do not propose to burden the Council with reiteration of the Government of India's position on this matter.

The Pakistan Permanent Representative has stated that in my letter of October 29, 1959, (S/4234) portions have been lifted from the text of the "proceedings of the Security Council and those of the United Nations Commission for India and Pakistan, and an attempt has been made so to juxtapose them as to lead to inferences which are alien to the intention of the documents concerned." I dealt with the matter briefly and only referred to essential points as I did not want to burden the Members of the Council with long quotations. The only relevant points in a case of this sort are those bringing out the view of UNCIP on the points in issue. In view of the Pakistan Permanent Representative's allegation, however, I reproduce below, with apologies to the Council, para. 128 from the Commission's first interim report, which the Pakistan Representative has quoted, and para. 129 of the same report which he has not quoted, to show conclusively that the allegation made by the Pakistan Permanent Representative is entirely baseless

"According to the Security Council's resolution of 17 January, the Government of Pakistan was requested to inform the Security Council immediately of any material change in the situation. In a letter addressed to the Security Council, the Pakistan Government agreed to comply with this request. The Government of Pakistan had, however, not informed the Security Council about the

presence of Pakistani troops in the State of Jammu and Kashmir. Sir Mohammed Zafrullah Khan explained that, since the Commission had been charged to deal with the problem related to the India-Pakistan question, his Government thought that the information should instead be given to the Commission, but he had been unable to do this previously because of the delay in its arrival on the subcontinent."

"According to the statement of Sir Mohammed Zafrullah Khan, the Pakistani troops entered Kashmir early in May 1948. The records of the Security Council show that the Commission was provided for but not fully constituted at that time. The Commission had its first meeting in Geneva on 15 June, but was informed of the presence of the Pakistani troops in the State of Jammu and Kashmir only on 8 July".

The UNCIP was clearly of the view that Pakistan did violate the Security Council resolution of January 17, 1948. I quote part of para. 4 of appendix to a letter dated August 27, 1948, from the Chairman of the U. N. Commission to the Foreign Minister of Pakistan, which gives this position in clear unambiguous terms :

"The Security Council, resolution of 21 April 1948, which sets forth the terms of reference of the Commission, was adopted with cognizance of the presence of Indian troops in the State of Jammu and Kashmir. The presence of Pakistani troops in Jammu and Kashmir, however, constitutes a material change in the situation inasmuch as the Security Council did not contemplate the presence of such troops in that State, nor was it apprised thereof by the Government of Pakistan."

In para. 6 of his letter the Pakistan Permanent Representative has quoted a passage from the aide-memoire handed by the Chairman of the U. N. Commission to the Government of India on February 25, 1949, to show that this text in no way lends support to my statement that there is no exclusive or final character

about the plebiscite proposal." This is yet another attempt to confuse the issues involved. The Pakistan Permanent Representative must be aware that the Government of India accepted the terms of the U. N. Commission's resolution of January 5, 1949, not on February 25, 1949 but on December 23, 1948, when India's formal acceptance was communicated to the Chairman of the Commission and that the relevant aides-memoire are, therefore, those dated December 21 and December 22, 1948, (S/1196, page 36-42)

126

which recorded the U. N. Commission's views on alternative methods as follows :

"As regards the third point (alternative methods), he (Mr. Lozano) said that the Commission wished the possibility of a plebiscite to be explored first. Should the plebiscite administrator, however, find a plebiscite to be impracticable, the way would be open to consider other methods for ensuring a free expression by the people of Jammu and Kashmir of their wish regarding the future status of the State."

(words within brackets and underlining are mine)

"As regards alternative methods of ascertaining the wish of the people regarding the future status of Jammu and Kashmir, Mr. Lozano said that the statement in paragraph 3 of the aide-memoire dated 21 December 1948 was substantially similar to his own record which reads : 'Mr. Lozano said that it would be up to the plebiscite administrator to report to the Security Council (through the Commission) if he found the plebiscite procedure to be impossible for technical or practical reasons. The plebiscite administrator and/or the Commission could then recommend alternative solutions'."

The Pakistan Permanent Representative in para. 7 of his letter questions the factual basis of the Government of India's view that Pakistan has failed to implement Parts I and II of the UNCIP Resolution of 13 August, 1948. The

factual basis for the Government of India's view are the findings recorded by no less an authority than the U. N. Commission on the violation by Pakistan of Part I of the UNCIP resolution of 13 August, 1948, by the Organisation and consolidation of the so-called Azad Kashmir Forces (para. 225 of its third interim report) and by the annexation of Northern areas (paras. 272 and 274 of its third interim report). Relevant extracts from these paragraphs are reproduced below

Paragraph 225

"Although it might be a matter of discussion whether the numerical strength of the Azad Kashmir forces has actually increased since August 1948, there is no question that those forces, who have since then been working in close cooperation with the Pakistan regular Army and who have been trained and officered by that Army, have increased their fighting strength. It is reasonable to suppose that, if the Commission had been able to foresee that the cease-fire period would be prolonged throughout the greater part of 1949 and that Pakistan would use that period to consolidate its position in the Azad territory, the Commission would have dealt with this question in part II of the resolution of 13 August."

Paragraph 272

"It seems, however, very doubtful whether the northern areas were in fact in the autumn of 1948 under the 'effective' control of the Pakistan High Command, in the sense that the Commission understood the term 'effective control'. The Pakistan Government (Annex. 24) stated that no Pakistan regular troops at any stage were employed in the operations which took place between May and December 1948".

Paragraph 274

"However, by January 1949 Pakistan undeniably held military control over the northern areas; the area was administered by local authorities, not those of

the Jammu and Kashmir Government,
with the assistance of Pakistan officials".
(underlining mine)

These show clearly that there was no need
for a fresh determination of facts which had
already been determined by the Commission . As
for non-implementation by Pakistan of Part II
of the resolution of August 13, 1948, even the
Government of Pakistan does not claim that it
has withdrawn its armed forces from Jammu and
Kashmir, although the Security Council imposed
upon it this obligation in Part II as far back as
January 1, 1949. The Government of India's
view that Pakistan has failed to implement Parts
I and II of this resolution is, therefore, incontes-
table.

I request that this communication may
kindly be circulated to the members of the
Security Council as a Security Council document.

127

Please accept, etc.

(Signed) C. S. Jha

Ambassador Extraordinary & Plenipotentiary
Permanent Representative of India
to the United Nations.

His Excellency
Sir Claude Corea, K. B. E.
President, Security Council,
United Nations,
New York.

INDIA PAKISTAN USA CHINA SWITZERLAND

Date : May 01, 1960

Volume No

1995

POLAND

Indo-Polish Loan Agreement Signed

An agreement for the utilisation of a Polish

Credit of Rs. 14.3 crores to India was signed in New Delhi on May 7, 1960 by Dr. W. Trampczynski, Minister for Foreign Trade of the Polish People's Republic, and Shri B. R. Bhagat, Deputy Minister of Finance, Government of India.

The credit bears interest at 2 1/2 per cent and is repayable in Indian rupees in eight annual instalments. The first instalment will become payable at the end of one year after the drawal of the credit for the last shipment of purchase for any specific project. All contracts for the supply of equipment will be concluded before June 30, 1962.

The Credit will be used for the purchase of machinery and equipment from Poland for the construction of mutually agreed industrial plants.

Payments relating to project work, technical and other services for setting up the plants will, however, be made separately under the Trade and Payments Agreement between the two Governments in force at the time. Prices of goods to be bought and sold under the agreement will be based on world prices.

An Indian technical team is expected to visit Poland shortly to study the projects for which the credit will be utilised.

Money repaid by India will be used by Poland for buying Indian goods under the Trade and Payments Agreement. Payments made by India will be deposited in the Reserve Bank of India in a separate account, opened in the name of the Narodowy Bank Polski.

POLAND INDIA USA

Date : May 01, 1960

Volume No

1995

TURKEY

Nehru-Menderes Joint Communique

On his way back home from London after attending the Commonwealth Prime Ministers' Conference, the Prime Minister, Shri Jawaharlal Nehru visited Turkey from May 20 to 24, 1960. During his stay there, Shri Nehru held talks with the Prime Minister of Turkey, Mr. Adnan Menderes on matters of mutual interest. After the talks were over, a joint communique was issued in Ankara on May 24, 1960.

The following is the full text of the Communique :

The Prime Minister of India, returning the visit to India of the Turkish Prime Minister in 1958, is now paying a visit to Turkey lasting from May twentieth to twentyfourth. During his stay in Ankara he had talks with the Prime Minister of Turkey. His Excellency Mr. Adnan Menderes and the Turkish Foreign Minister, His Excellency Mr. Fatim Zorlu. These talks were friendly and covered many matters of common concern, including problems of economic development of mutual interest to the two countries. During these talks the two Prime Ministers recalled with pleasure the cooperation between their two countries at the Bandung Conference and reaffirmed their adherence to the principles adopted at Bandung.

Overshadowing all other problems of world concern is the failure of the Summit conference and its possible repercussions on the international situation. This conference had evoked the liveliest expectations of men of peace and goodwill all over the world. While it was realised that problems of the world cannot be solved at one conference it had been hoped that even at this Summit conference, some effective step would be taken towards general disarmament under an appropriate system of control, and a reduction of international

128

tensions. Such a step would have paved the way to some extent and created a favourable atmosphere for the progressive solution of the world's problems. It would have led to greater concentration of the progress and development of the less industrially developed countries of the world which is a question of vital importance today. It is, therefore, a matter of deep regret to the two Prime Ministers that the Summit Conference should have ended in failure. But no such temporary failure

can be accepted as the final result of efforts for peace. The logic of circumstances and the earnest wishes of mankind demand peace. Not to succeed in this great venture is a failure of humanity itself.

While there are political and economic differences in the structure of various countries, the demand for peace is common to all, and attempts at peaceful solutions must therefore be pursued, regardless of temporary setbacks or differences in outlook. A peaceful world necessarily involves peaceful relations between the different nations.

Although in the circumstances of today the determination of the issues of peace and war rests in a special measure on great powers, the two Prime Ministers consider that all countries and people are affected by these issues and must share the responsibility. The fate of every country hangs on a proper solution of the vital and terrible question of peace and war. It is, therefore, of the utmost importance that every nation, small or big, should make its full contribution to the furtherance of the cause of peace.

The Prime Minister of India expressed his happiness at visiting Turkey and his grateful appreciation of the warm reception accorded to him. Both the Prime Ministers expressed their gratification at the opportunity which this visit has afforded them of meeting together and exchanging views on matters of current interest on a friendly basis.

TURKEY UNITED KINGDOM INDIA INDONESIA USA

Date : May 01, 1960

Volume No

1995

UNION OF SOUTH AFRICA

Shri A. K. Sen's Statement on Subversion of Human Rights by South Africa

Shri A. K. Sen, Minister of Law, Government

of India, made a statement on May 16, 1960 in the U. N. Seminar on Human Rights held in Tokyo regarding the subversion of human rights by South Africa.

The following is the text of the statement :

I am extremely grateful for the indulgence you have given. As I had occasion to tell you and the seminar the last time I spoke, according to us this is a vital problem, what is contained in the agenda in Item II, especially clauses (b) and (c). This is described as (b) penal sanctions against social discrimination, and (c) penal sanctions for safeguarding social and economic rights, including the right to health and to education. The agenda is described preceding the clauses as follows : "How far and to what extent can substantive criminal law ensure the protection of human rights as set forth in the Charter of the United Nations, in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and in national constitutions ?" It really presupposes that the Charter of the United Nations, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, and the rights guaranteed under various national Constitutions are accepted as norms, and the only question is how far and to what extent substantive criminal law should ensure the protection of these rights.

It is certainly important to discuss, accepting these norms of human behaviour and of human values, as to how far criminal laws in different countries are fashioned and designed to ensure that these rights are observed and not subverted. But we would live in a state of unreality, especially when we have met in Asia in a very ancient land where we are very privileged to be assembled together-in the land of Japan, if we did not take note of the fact that not only are these norms not accepted in certain countries today-not only are these rights not accepted as fundamental facts of human society but the entire state and entire system of laws are designed and fashioned so as to subvert these rights which we accept as established facts of human society. It is all the more important for us as we have been drawn from various countries of Asia happily to be associated with our colleagues from Australia and New Zealand, countries which are principally peopled by persons of European origin. Though we have been drawn from different stocks of the human family we are proud

to share in common values and common concepts of human society and behaviour and norms and are anxious to see that the laws of various countries which we represent, and naturally laws of

129

other countries with whom we are in direct or indirect contacts, are designed so as to ensure the observance of these fundamental rights now enshrined in the Charter of the United Nations, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, and in various national constitutions like that of India.

While I am laying stress on this fact, I am constrained to name one country where the subversion of these rights has become most acute and noticeable and deliberate—that is the Union of South Africa where unfortunately there are large populations native to the soil and also drawn from Asiatic countries, from Malayan States, from India, from China, and Pakistan, our neighbour. These people, drawn from the ancient land of Asia, and native populations, indigenous populations, are subjected to a system of laws, which is the very negation of the rights we are anxious to safeguard and continue. Social, economic and legislative discrimination is writ large in the State where these unfortunate people are to live. The most strange fact is that the Government of the State takes pride in the fact that they are the instruments and deliberate instruments in a calculated course of subversion which is contrary to all our ideas of good life peace, advancement of the human mind and soul and the basic value of human existence. These are things which cannot possibly be fitted into racial compartments. We are proud that what we share today is a common product of human civilization in which all countries and races are free to participate. That is the basis of the concept of the United Nations and that is the foundation of these rights which we are anxious to safeguard.

Let us see why it is necessary to stress this fact so clearly because I don't think it is possible to safeguard these rights or to prevent these rights from being completely abrogated and subverted unless it is accepted as a basic tenet in the constitution of every country that the rights prescribed in the Charter of the United Nations and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights are regarded as norms of human behaviour and society. Otherwise laws cannot possibly conform

to these norms if there is a state where the norm is discrimination, privilege for the few and slavery for the rest, tragedy, miserable existence, poverty degradation and illiteracy for the vast majority, and a decent existence only for the few. Then there is no use thinking of safeguarding these rights because laws will be old-fashioned to preserve that inequality which is the accepted norm of that society. We shall be failing in our duty not only to the United Nations but to the people whom we represent here unless we raise our voice of protest in this seminar, drawn as we are mostly from the Asiatic countries, against the system of barbarism and fascism which seeks to continue in slavery millions of people who have been doomed under it. This is for the purpose of not only voicing our own particular interests but for the purpose of showing that unless we who are representatives of Asiatic countries proclaim to the whole world, the civilized world, that the system which prevails today in South Africa is the very negation of human rights and human civilisation, we shall not be rendering that sincere service to the cause of human rights which I am sure we are all anxious to do.

The penal laws of the country are not only designed to subvert human rights but they are fashioned with the sole purpose of subverting the very basis of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. Let us take only a few examples because we haven't much time and I don't want to labour so much on this point. The facts are so well known. There are certain fundamental freedoms guaranteed under the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the Charter. May I read only the great Preamble to the Charter of the United Nations: To reaffirm faith in fundamental human rights, in the dignity and worth of the human person, in the equal rights of men and women and of nations, large and small"-great words, great principles-"to reaffirm faith in the fundamental human rights and the dignity and worth of the human person, in the equal rights of men and women and of nationse." This is followed by an equally great declaration of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. Article 1-oft-repeated but never useless to repeat over and over again in a world where it has yet not been accepted by all-"all human beings are born free and equal in dignity and rights. They are endowed with regional functions and to that towards one another in a spirit of brotherhood"

Article 2

"Everyone has a right to life, liberty and security of person".

Article 3 :

"No one shall be held in slavery or servitude".

Article 7 :

"All are equal before the law and are entitled without any discrimination to equal protection of the law. All are entitled to equal protection against any discrimination in violation of this Decla-

130

ration and against any incitement to such a discrimination".

Article 9 :

"No one shall be subjected to arbitrary arrests, detention or exile".

Article 13:

"Everyone has a right to freedom of movement and residence within the borders of each state".

Article 16 :

"Men and women of full age without any limitation to the race, nationality or religion, have a right to marry and found a family. They are entitled to equal rights as to marriage, during marriage and at its dissolution".

Article 17:

"Everyone has a right to own property, alone or in association with others. No one shall be arbitrarily deprived of his property".

Article 19 :

"Everyone has a right to freedom of

opportunity and expression".

Article 21 :

"Everyone has a right to take part in the government of his country directly or through freely chosen representatives".

Article 23:

"Everyone has the right to work, to free choice of employment, to just and favourable conditions of work and to protection against unemployment".

Let us see how the country which I have named and which is unique in the family of nations in this respect has in its basic concepts and all the laws which it has passed in the last ten years gone contrary to each and every one of these articles which I read out to you and yet continues to be a member of the United Nations-a country in which unfortunately large numbers of people from the Asiatic continent have to live.

Now let us see what are the great discriminations which the laws have perpetrated there. There is what we call the segregation of non-whites under the Group Areas Act of 1950. Under this act, hundreds of thousands of Africans and non-Europeans employed in industry and engaged in business in urban areas were asked to clear out from their established homes and places of livelihood inhabited from time immemorial and shifted to areas where they may have no opportunity for employment. The act seeks to divide the entire South African population into groups on a racial basis and segregate them in different areas, scattered throughout the country, It was enacted to drive Indians and other non-Europeans from the urban areas to distant and outlying undeveloped areas. The Group Areas Act places no responsibility on the government to rehabilitate those who are uprooted, nor does it make any provision for the grant of compensation of any kind. The right to live, the right to property, the right to move freely, the whole concept of everyone enjoying the same right and subject to the same laws are thrown to the winds. The houses which they may be forced to sell or to give up would not fetch fair prices as there have been no displaced Europeans to buy them. The Act has already deprived thousands of non-Europeans and thousands of their

families of their only means of livelihood, and large numbers of Indians and people from Pakistan have been the worst victims. They have put severe restrictions in the way of trade and business for the Asiatic community and the African community.

Non-Europeans have thus been segregated from the urban areas where approximately 90% of the wealth of the country is concentrated and relegated to areas already overcrowded and impoverished. This is directly contrary to Articles 13 (1), 17 (2), 20 (3) and the other articles of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

Under Article 13 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, everyone has a right to freedom of movement and residence within the borders of each state but this right is denied to non-Europeans.

One of the most invidious restrictions on African freedom is the pass system whereby the Africans outside their reserves are required to carry on their persons as many as 12 documents to explain their presence. All the necessary documents which the Africans must carry are incorporated in one booklet which is called the "Reference Book". This is the penal law of a country which is supposed to have subscribed to the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and to the Charter. It has an identity number and

131

full particulars of the holder and also carries his photograph, besides tax receipts, service contracts, etc. Without these an African cannot leave his reserve. He cannot obtain a train ticket. He cannot go to work. He cannot walk on the streets after curfew hours which applies only to Africans. He cannot attend schools. In fact he can do nothing without a pass. Failure to carry any of these passes at any time is a criminal offence and is liable to result in conviction and imprisonment. This iniquitous and discriminatory system leads to terrible abuses by the police. Every month thousands of Africans who are arrested for breaking the pass law are wrested from their families and taken out of town to do forced labour on slave farms. This is testified not by merely Asiatics but by no less a person than the accredited correspondent of the Toronto

Star, a Canadian who has in his latest dispatches completely exposed the serious abuses to which these pernicious laws have been put.

The pass laws are thus used as a mechanism for the forced labour system. It is opposition to these pass laws which led to the large scale police firings in South Africa in the month of March last which has shocked the conscience of the entire civilized world.

Under Article 23 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, every one has a right to work, to free choice of employment, to just and favourable conditions of work and to protection against unemployment. Under the same article everyone without discrimination has the right to equal pay for equal work, and everyone has a right to form and join trade unions for the protection of these interests. All these have been denied to the non-whites in Africa. Africans and other non-Europeans are prevented from entering professional occupations and doing skilled work by a number of legislative enactments and administrative measures. There is an Apprentice Act which lays down certain conditions of employment. These conditions in practice have excluded all non-Europeans from apprenticeship. They are barred from entering such occupations as chemists, architects, accountants, surveyors, etc. The wage act has afforded a protection to the white worker and prevents the non-white from even getting semi-skilled jobs. Only 2 per cent of the Europeans have been classed as unskilled while the figure for Africans is 84 per cent. Under the Industrial Conciliation Act, the Africans is excluded from the definition of "employee" and in consequence may not participate in any negotiation concerning disputes between employers and employees.

At the same time the avenue of collective bargaining is closed to him. Trade unions are not permitted to register him and a strike by an African worker may be held to be a criminal offence. Under the Criminal Law Amendment Act, an African who goes on strike is liable to punishment by flogging.

Well, one has only to read these outrageous statutes to appreciate to what extent these subvert the basic tenets of the Charter and the Declaration of Human Rights. These measures prevent Africans

from bargaining with their employers to obtain better wages or to use the weapon of strikes to secure better conditions of work.

The Marketing Act of 1937 provides for consultations with producers in the area to which schemes, under the Act, apply for the marketing of their produce. Only Europeans are entitled to vote on the resolutions approving these schemes. Non-Europeans have no say in the matter of disposing of their produce because of these provisions. Then one of the most important disabilities that an African suffers from and which has brought him down to the level of the slave arises from the application of the master and servant laws. The common feature of these laws is that it is a criminal offence for a native to absent himself from work or leave the service of the master within the period of his service contract. The so-called labour contracts enable the Europeans to exploit the ignorant and the illiterate native labourers. They can be terminated in practice at the will of the European masters and it is only his words that are accepted in the law courts. It is hard for a native worker to escape his master; when caught, he is punished and punishment usually consists of forced working on the farms. When the period of conviction is over, then again the never-ending process of fulfilling the terms of service contract begins. Then the inequitable system of taxation. Then the denial of political rights. Under Article XXI in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights everyone has a right to take part in the government of his country directly or through freely chosen representatives, and the will of the people is the basis of the authority of government. AU political authority in South Africa is the monopoly of the white population which represents only a fraction of the total population-only about two million amongst a population of thirteen million. The Union Parliament has two houses, the Senate and the House Assembly. All members of Parliament must, in terms of the South African Act, be of European descent. Europeans enjoy full representation and universal adult franchise. But of all non-Europeans in South Africa excepting

132

only the coloureds, are excluded from general voters, role. Even the coloureds are now excluded I think. Africans are rigidly kept out of the general voters' role. They may only vote for three

native representatives of the Lower House who must be only Europeans. Africans can only select a few white Senators for them. No non-European women, whatever her race or colour, may acquire a vote, no matter what her qualifications may be. Discrimination on the grounds of sex, is prohibited by the Declaration of Human Rights. Faced with this situation the non-Europeans are turning now more to other methods for gaining their rights and liberties rather than to parliamentary methods or other methods known in law. Thus a situation has been created which the whole world is anxiously watching. Whatever field we may come to, education, property rights, social rights, health measures, this ghost of apartheid or separatism, separate rights and privileges for the law and the negation of rights for the majority is the rule. That shows to what extent the laws of a country may go to completely subvert human rights. I, therefore, request, Sir, all the distinguished Participants in this conference gathered together from countries 'which are deeply dedicated to these noble principles of the Charter and the Declaration of Human Rights that they raise their voice of protest against this subversion of human rights and freedom in that country, specially because many of our own people have been subjected to humiliations and indignities and sufferings there. I may compare the conditions in South Africa with those in New Zealand from where our distinguished colleague, Mr. Wild, comes. I was pleased to see the other day, to meet one of the Ministers of his country drawn from an ancient stock in his land whose population have now been completely intergrated with the white population, and the Maori has developed I think most amazingly under the system of laws which are operated, not to suppress him, not to oppress him, but to help him in his own development. I convey my deep appreciation for this state of affairs in this part of the world where we have people of European origin living together with people of another stock belonging to the land itself and inhabiting the country for a very long time. These examples have been forgotten. But the history of the world and the history of human civilization are great pointers as to how things will shape in the future, and those who think that they can continue ignoring these fundamental facts of human history and civilization for all time to come will only learn a bitter lesson before they realise the falsity of such a course and the

futility of their conduct. These are all so important for us to remember in order to see how we fashion our own laws so as to ensure the observance of human rights. I feel that we cannot have a set of laws conformable with the concepts, the basic concepts of human rights unless we have either in the constitutions of the countries with which we are concerned or at least in the documents like the Bill of Rights and the Magna Carta in England, enshrined some of these fundamental rights as norms which should never be transcended. These should never be circumvented. Even if there is a power either in parliament or somewhere else to circumvent them, such powers should never be used.

SOUTH AFRICA INDIA JAPAN USA AUSTRALIA NEW ZEALAND CHINA PAKISTAN CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC ECUADOR CANADA

Date : May 01, 1960

Volume No

1995

UNITED ARAB REPUBLIC

Nehru-Nasser Joint Statement

The Prime Minister, Shri Jawaharlal Nehru on his way back home from London after attending the Commonwealth Prime Ministers' conference paid a visit to U. A. R. from May 16 to 20, 1960. During his stay there, Shri Nehru had talks with President Nasser on various subjects of mutual interest. After the talks, Prime Minister Nehru and President Nasser issued a joint statement in Cairo on May 20, 1960.

The following is the full text of the statement:

We have been deeply distressed to learn of the failure of the Summit Conference in Paris. This long-awaited conference had roused the hopes of mankind and people in all countries had looked forward to some effective step being taken by this conference towards the stoppage of

nuclear tests, an advance towards general disarmament and a lessening of the tensions that have afflicted the world and come in the way of cooperation and progress. It has been generally recognised that peace and an ending of the cold war are essential for the progressive solution of the world's problems and for the progress of industrially underdeveloped countries. The collapse of the Summit Conference, even before it had applied itself to these problems came, therefore, as a shock everywhere. The apprehension that this may lead to an intensification of the cold war

133

and even more active concentration on armaments is particularly distressing.

Peace is essential for the world. For countries like the United Arab Republic, India and other countries struggling for progress and the betterment of the lot of their people, peace is a paramount necessity, as no effective progress can be made in an atmosphere of conflict and cold war. The real and basic problems of the world today are the maintenance of independence and integrity of all States and the application of the world's resources towards the development of all nations and peoples and more particularly those who have suffered for long from underdevelopment.

We deeply regret, therefore, the failure of the Summit Conference. We realise that a particular responsibility in regard to peace and war rests on the great Powers which have developed industrially and technologically and in the production of the terrible weapons of modern warfare. But, this responsibility is not confined to them. It is a responsibility shared by all countries and peoples alike, for the fate of every country is involved in the proper solution of the vital and terrible question of peace and war. It is of the utmost importance that the set-back resulting from the failure of the Summit Conference should not be allowed to worsen the present international situation. Otherwise, this can only lead to an intensification of cold war and the possibility of a dreadful war which would put an end to all hopes of progress and, indeed, lead to a world disaster of which it is difficult even to measure the terrible consequences.

Every nation, whether big or small, must

bear its full share of responsibility for the world situation. We would appeal, therefore, to all the leaders and nations of the world to stand firm against any deterioration in the international situation and to spare no efforts in the service of the noble cause of peace and the building up of a world community of nations. To this great cause we dedicate ourselves anew and pledge the support of our countries."

UNITED KINGDOM USA EGYPT FRANCE INDIA

Date : May 01, 1960

Volume No

1995

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Indo-U. S. Food Agreement Signed

The Governments of India and the United States signed in Washington on May 4, 1960 an agreement, which provides for the sale of 16 million metric tons of American wheat and one million metric tons of rice over a period of four years.

President Eisenhower signed the agreement on behalf of the United States and Shri S.K. Patil, India's Food and Agriculture Minister, on behalf of India.

Speaking on the occasion, President Eisenhower said that the agreement was a practical symbol of the term "Food-for Peace" and hoped that the food being made available would be rejected in India's accelerated progress.

Shri S.K. Patil said that the agreement was unique in its range and dimension and perhaps even more significant in its concept. The signing of the agreement by the U.S. President himself was an indication of his abiding interest in India's progress.

The following are the salient features of the

Agreement.

It is the largest single transaction negotiated with any country since the Public Law 480 Programme was established in 1954. The total value of the transaction is \$ 1,276 million (approximately Rs. 607.4 crores) which would finance \$ 965 million worth of wheat, \$ 116 million worth of rice and U.S. ocean transportation cost of \$ 195 million. In terms of quantity, this is equivalent to 16 million metric tons of wheat and 1 million metric tons of rice.

It is the first long-term Agreement under Title I of P.L. 480, the agreement covering a period of 4 Years 1960-64. It is also the first Agreement designed to help in establishing a substantial reserve of foodgrains. One fourth of the total quantity of wheat or 4 million metric tons and the whole of the quantity of rice will be earmarked for this purpose, thus making it possible to have a reserve of 5 million tons of foodgrains.

One fourth of the total value of the transaction or \$ 319 million will be made available immediately to finance the purchase of 4 million metric tons of wheat during U.S. fiscal year 1961 and 250,000 tons of rice during the period ending

134

December 31, 1960. The balance of the amount will be available on or after January 1, 1961.

There would be sufficient flexibility in the amount to be imported each year, making it possible for the Government of India to regulate purchases with reference to actual requirements from time to time, transportation, storage accommodation available and other relevant factors. Purchase authorisations for each year will be determined on the basis of an annual review by the two Governments prior to the beginning of each U.S. fiscal year. The review will take into account all relevant factors such as U.S. stock position, changes in India's production, consumption and stocks, other imports, storage facilities, etc. The first such annual review for wheat will be held in June, 1960 in the light of the Report of the Wheat Utilisation Mission which visited India recently. So far as rice is concerned, the first review will take place in August 1960 when firm estimates of the U.S. production of rice will be

available.

The import of wheat under the Agreement will be over and above our usual commercial imports from other countries; the quantum of commercial imports would be determined on the basis of a review of India's foodgrains supply, financial position and other relevant factors to be made by the two Governments prior to the beginning of each U.S. fiscal year.

Of the rupees accruing to the United States as a consequence of the sales of wheat and rice under the Agreement, \$ 1076 million (approximately Rs. 512 crores) or 84.5 per cent will be made available to the Government of India for financing economic development projects. One half will be given as loan and one half as grant. The remaining \$ 200 million will be used for U.S. expenditure including development of foreign markets for U.S. agricultural commodities.

The projects to be financed either from loan or from grant, may be in respect of agriculture, industry including production of fertilizers, irrigation and power, transport and communication, credit institutions, public health, education and rehabilitation and other economic development projects. The emphasis will be upon the Agricultural Sector including construction of food reserve storage.

The Agreement by assuring India adequate supply of foodgrains during the Third Plan will enable her to devote her energy and resources to further expanding food production so as to achieve the goal of self-sufficiency by the end of the Third Five Year Plan. Further, the Agreement by enabling India to build up a substantial reserve of 5 million tons of foodgrains would help her in holding the price line and in counteracting speculative tendencies in the economy.

135

USA INDIA LATVIA

Date : May 01, 1960

June

Volume No

1995

Content

| | | |
|---|----------|-------|
| Foreign Affairs Record 1960 Volume VI | JUNE | No. 6 |
| | CONTENTS | PAGE |
| HUNGARY | | |
| Trade Agreement Signed | | 137 |
| INDIA IN THE UNITED NATIONS | | |
| Shri C.S. Jha's Statement in Trusteeship Council on Ruanda-Urundi | | 137 |
| Shri C.S. Jha's Statement in Trusteeship Council on Tanganyika | | 144 |
| JAPAN | | |
| Instruments of Ratification Exchanged | | 149 |
| POLAND | | |
| Shipping Agreement Signed | | 149 |
| TECHNICAL COOPERATION MISSION | | |
| Financial Assistance | | 150 |
| UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS | | |
| President Prasad's Speech at State Banquet | | 151 |
| Welcome Speech by President Brezhnev | | 152 |
| President Prasad's Speech at Bandung Luncheon | | 153 |
| Speech by President Brezhnev | | |

154
President Prasad's Reply to Kremlin Reception
155
Speech by President Brezhnev
156
President Prasad's Address to Soviet-Indian Friendship Society
157
Speech by President Brezhnev
158
Indo-Soviet Agreement on Oil Exploration Signed
163

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
Agreement on Establishment of Indian Investment Centre Signed
163

MINISTRY OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS : EXTERNAL PUBLICITY DIVISION
GOVERNMENT OF INDIA

HUNGARY INDIA USA JAPAN POLAND INDONESIA

Date : Jun 01, 1960

Volume No

1995

HUNGARY

Trade Agreement Signed

A new Trade and Payments Agreement between Hungary and India was signed in New Delhi on June 25, 1960. The Agreement, which will come into force from July 1, 1960, will remain valid for three and half years. The current Trade Agreement, which was signed in June 1954 and Mr A was later amended by a Protocol in 1959, expires on June 30, 1960.

Mr. J. Baczoni, Deputy Minister of Foreign Trade, Government of Hungary, who led the Hungarian Trade Delegation, signed on behalf of his Government and Shri K.R.F. Khilnani, Joint Secretary, Ministry of Commerce and Industry, on behalf of the Government of India.

Under the terms of the new Agreement, all transactions between India and Hungary of commercial and non-commercial nature will be financed in non-convertible Indian rupees and trade between the two countries will thus be on a balanced basis. The new arrangement is expected to increase and diversify considerably our trade with Hungary to mutual advantage.

The important items of Indian exports to Hungary will be tea, coffee, tobacco, vegetable oils, mica, shellac, oil seeds, jute and coir products, iron ore and steel billets, de-oiled meals, semi-tanned and processed skins, leather, cotton, woollen and silk fabrics, handloom and handicraft products, sports goods, shoes, light engineering goods, railway equipment, textile machinery and veneers.

Imports from Hungary will mainly consist of various types of capital goods and machinery for small-scale industries, heavy electric generating sets, photographic sensitized material, tools such as pneumatic tools, precision tools etc., components of electric supply metres, pharmaceuticals and drugs in bulk, material testing instruments, garage tools, machine tools, refractory bricks, radio transmitting and receiving tubes and radio parts.

HUNGARY INDIA USA

Date : Jun 01, 1960

Volume No

1995

INDIA IN THE UNITED NATIONS

Shri C. S. Jha's Statement in Trusteeship Council on Ruanda-Urundi

Shri C. S. Jha, India's Permanent Representative to the United Nations, made a statement in the Trusteeship Council on June 23, 1960, on the Trust Territory of Ruanda-Urundi.

The following is the full text of the statement:

Mr. President :

During the last few days, while examining conditions in Ruanda-Urundi, the Council has appropriately focused its attention on the Report of the Visiting Mission which went to the Territory earlier this year. The Report that this Visiting Mission, composed of Ambassador Mason Sears, Chairman, Ambassador Omar Loutfi, Mr. Solano Lopez and Mr. Paul Edmonds, has brought us is a document of remarkable objectivity. I should like, therefore, to begin by paying my delegation's tribute to the members of the Visiting Mission and to express our appreciation of the great contribution that their work has made to our understanding of the disturbed, confused and complex situation prevailing in the Territory of Ruanda-Urundi since November of last year. We also acknowledge with appreciation the patient and painstaking assistance given to the Council by the distinguished Special Representative and the Representative of the Administering Authority.

Mr. President, the circumstances of the examination of conditions in the Territory of Ruanda-Urundi are different from those in other years. Indeed, our deliberations this year are invested with great importance for two reasons. First, the continuing tension in the Territory, the worst manifestations of which took place in November 1959; and secondly, the Report of the Visiting Mission which brings out many points vital to the future peace and progress of the Territory. Just as the Visiting Mission found the prevailing tension among the inhabitants of the Territory and the need for reconciliation to be their principal concern and the main theme of their Report, so must the Council take full note of the need for establishment of a harmonious atmosphere in the Territory and of mutual confidence in the relations between the different sections of the people. Reconciliation, which is the word used by the Visiting Mission, therefore, becomes the principal concern of the Trusteeship Council in our present deliberations.

By the terms of the resolution appointing the Visiting Mission, the Trusteeship Council asked the Mission to make a special investigation of the causes of the disturbances in Ruanda-Urundi. Consequently, a large part of the Visiting Mission's Report is devoted to this aspect of its work. The

Mission took pains to ascertain the real causes of the conflict and of the continuing tensions and made suggestions with a view to reconciliation among the people as the essential basis for future political progress in Ruanda-Urundi. We would like to say at once that to us the Mission's analysis seems to be objective and fair and that we are broadly in agreement with its conclusions.

It is needless for me to narrate in detail the series of incidents that took place. My delegation put a number of questions to the representative of the Administering Authority on the subject of disturbances in November 1959 and while we recognise that these were widespread, we cannot help the impression that the Administering Authority did not take all the precautionary and preventive action that it could have taken before the disturbances actually took place. Warnings to the effect that the situation in the Territory might deteriorate were not lacking and these were given to the Administering Authority by the people of the Territory in good time. In paragraph 142 of the Visiting Mission's Report, for example, it is stated, that the Political Reforms Commission had said as early as April 1959 that though the problem between the different ethnic groups of Ruanda was a social one, "there was a tendency for it to become racial due to the unfortunate intervention of certain ill-disposed or ill-informed people, who stirred up racial hatred through the press and by subversive statements". The Commission said further that it was "astounded by the fact that the Government looked on passively on this scene of destruction of the state and seemed 'to encourage the division by its attitude." It is, no doubt, a serious indictment and while the Administering Authority may adduce circumstances in refutation of this, it would appear that the machinery of the Administering Authority in the Territory, by its passivity, was unable to prevent the tensions from mounting during the period before the disturbances.

The Administering Authority evidently, with fore-knowledge of the possibility of serious outbreaks, had actually drawn up a plan of action. The latter consisted of a five-phase military operation. The first phase was implemented as early as 24 October, 1959, in the words of the representative of the Administering Authority. Yet, when the Hutu upheaval took place there was, in the words of the Visiting Mission, a long

series of incidents in which Hutu hordes pillaged and set fire to thousands of huts belonging to the Tutsi. This kind of thing seems to have gone on for six or seven days before the Administering Authority mobilised its forces to suppress the uprising. The representative of the Administering Authority has told us of the difficulty of locating the acts of arson and of localising the conflict, While appreciating these difficulties, it is nevertheless our view, Mr. President, that much more could and should have been done to prevent the disturbances from assuming the proportions that they did and from causing enormous loss of life and property.

We see not only comparative inaction by the Administering Authority in the first few days of the occurrence but we also find that they refused the offers of the Mwami of Ruanda to help restore law and order. The Administering Authority rejected the offer on the ground, as the representative of the Administering Authority has stated before us, that "what the Mwami and certain Tutsi reactionaries wanted was to be put in charge of repression in order to liquidate by force those who opposed them." We are not sure of the wisdom of the rejection of the Mwami's offer at a time when the Administering Authority themselves were unable to prevent most serious outrages by Hutus against the Tutsi population. In the light of the Visiting Mission's Report we would also be unable to accept the Administering Authority's estimate of the present Mwami. According to the members of the Visiting Mission, the institution of Mwami is held in high esteem by all the sections of the population and the Mwami or King of Ruanda has repeatedly expressed his desire to serve not as an absolute monarch but as a constitutional Head of State. We cannot ignore the words of the Chairman of the Visiting Mission. Ambassador Mason Sears, who has stated before the Council: "The Mwami is a good man Under successful national reconciliation. I believe, he is capable of being a humane and an effective leader of a democratically organised Ruanda." We think, therefore, that the Administering Authority would have been well advised to associate at the very earliest stage of the troubles the traditional authority of the Mwami with the Administering Authority's own forces of law and order in controlling and limiting the consequences of the unfortunate upheaval.

The Administering Authority does not seem to us to be making matters easier by the way

138

they have described the Tutsi leaders, for example, as 'reactionaries' and 'feudalists' etc. and the Hutu upheaval as 'a popular uprising of the oppressed against the oppressor'. I would like to make it clear, Mr. President, that my delegation deplores all manifestations of violence, whether by the Hutus or by the Tutsis, and we do not wish, and indeed we have no, reason, to take sides. But we are bound to say that the description of an uprising on the part of the Hutus, whatever the causes of it, which resulted in arson, intimidation, murder, robbery, etc. for several days and resulted in mass exodus of the Tutsi population, in terms of seeming approbation, is rather odd. We know that following these troubles Tutsi Sub-Chiefs were replaced by a large number of Hutus. Again, whatever may be the reason or justification for this, it does not help to say that-and I quote again the words of the Administering Authority-"the traditional authorities had been properly expelled owing to a popular movement against them." We are not surprised, Mr. President, therefore at the Visiting Mission's noticing considerable estrangement between the Administering Authority and its local representatives on the one hand and many political parties on the other, the largest of which is the UNAR.

Mr. President, we have been constrained to make observations on the causes and conditions of the disturbances. We fully appreciate that the task of maintaining law and order in any area where emotions run high is a difficult one, and we do not wish in any way to weaken the hands of the Administering Authority. But at the same time it is necessary that the Administering Authority should hold the scales even in its dealings with various factions and, what is even more important, should appear to those concerned to do so. Any other course would be fraught with the most unfortunate consequences against which the Trusteeship Council in the discharge of its responsibilities must enter a caveat.

The seriousness of the disturbances that took place in Ruanda are borne out by the large number of refugees, estimated at 22,000, many of whom have had to leave their hearths and

homes and are now refugees in their own homeland. This, in our view, is a very unfortunate situation, because apart from the personal tragedy involved in the forcible displacement of such large numbers of people, bitterness and conflict will persist while these refugees—so called—remain deprived of their right to live in their own homes and enjoy a normal life. We note the information that the Special Representatives has given to the Council with regard to the restoration of refugees and we are glad to learn of the continuing efforts to secure the return of the refugees to their original homes. We note, however, the view of the Visiting Mission that the measures taken by the Administering Authority have not brought entirely satisfactory results. The Administering Authority seem to complete the resettlement of large numbers of refugees in areas away from their homes. Resettlement of persons wishing to return to their homes in places other than those which have been their homes for decades does not appear to us at all equitable. A declaration of policy that the so-called refugees have the right to return to their homes and that the Administering Authority will assist in every way to secure them their just rights may, even at this late a stage, have a salutary effect on the morale of the people and might help considerably in the process of reconciliation.

We now turn our attention to the political developments in Ruanda-Urundi. The basic fact today, which can be ignored only at one's own peril, is the march of one African country after another toward independence. It is obvious from a reading of the Visiting Mission's Report as well as from the statements of the Administering Authority that the wave of freedom, which is sweeping across Africa, has reached Ruanda-Urundi. The people of that Territory are astir; they are demanding independence which cannot be delayed much longer. We have reason to believe from the policies adopted by the Administering Authority in the neighbouring Territory of Congo, at whose coming independence in a few days time we heartily rejoice, that the Administering Authority is itself receptive to the currents and forces that are moving vast masses of men and women in Africa to-day. We do not doubt that they would like to prepare Ruanda-Urundi for independence at the earliest possible date. Normally speaking, if conditions of harmony and co-operation between the main elements of the

population inter se and with the Administering Authority had existed, our deliberations, might have been a relatively simple exercise in discussing installments of reforms, target dates, timetable for independence, etc. But in the difficult conditions prevailing in Ruanda-Urundi, conditions which have appropriately been called explosive, we have a delicate task requiring all the wisdom, skill and patience of the Administering Authority as indeed of the Trusteeship Council.

It seems to us that the central fact, the core of any future peaceful and orderly political advance in Ruanda-Urundi toward independence, must be reconciliation between the main elements of the population. To bring it about should be

139

the first task of the Administering Authority. The Visiting Mission very wisely recommended this. Indeed, they took the first step towards reconciliation by bringing all the political parties together with the Administering Authority for the first time for discussions on various important matters relating to the future of the Territory. Through the good offices of the Visiting Mission effective consultations did take place and many misunderstandings and fears were removed ; and hopes for national reconciliation and the Territory's evolution towards independence in circumstances of mutual trust, peace, understanding and harmony were raised for the first time. This was, however, just a beginning and the Visiting Mission in the communique that they issued in the Territory before their departure made a series of suggestions. Incidentally I would say that the normal issuance of such a communique would not be within the functions of the Visiting Mission, but in the special circumstances of conflict and unrest and uncertainty among the people and the need for pouring oil over troubled waters, we would regard the communique as appropriate. The Mission's suggestions may be summarised as follows :

- (1) A round table conference of the representatives of the Administering Authority and of Ruanda-Urundi. In the Visiting Mission's opinion such a conference would dispel the atmosphere of agitation, fear and intimidation prevalent in the last few months in Ruanda and would pave the way for national reconciliation. The conference was to be held in August followed by

elections.

(2) United Nations observers to attend such a conference.

(3) Communal elections scheduled to take place in June and July to be postponed until after the proposed conference.

(4) Elections by direct universal suffrage to national assemblies for Ruanda and Urundi to be held in September 1960, supervised by the United Nations.

(5) Assemblies resulting from these elections to draw up a constitution establishing democratic institutions.

(6) Belgium to ask United Nations General Assembly to discuss the question of the independence of Ruanda-Urundi and the termination of Trusteeship at its 1961 session.

(7) A United Nations Mission to be sent as quickly as possible to Ruanda-Urundi to assist in the development of the Territory.

We would like to say, Mr. President, that these well-considered views and suggestions of the Visiting Mission, to which the Administering Authority appear to have agreed at 'the time, were on the right lines and we favour their broad approach to the solution of the problems in Ruanda-Urundi.

It seems, however, that later on the Administering Authority, for reasons which are not very convincing to us, changed their mind and have now decided upon steps which are not only somewhat different in scope and character but, what seems more important, represent quite a different approach and thinking on the part of the Administering Authority. In the first place, the round table conference originally proposed for August was changed into a conference for Ruanda only and was instead held in the month of May. No United Nations observers were asked to this meeting nor could the Administering Authority secure the participation of the UNAR-which is among the largest and most representative political parties. Consequently, the decisions of this body had neither the weight nor the range that was originally contemplated. Secondly, the Administering

Authority would hold communal elections in June and July and it is only after these elections that they would convene, perhaps in October, a larger meeting to discuss all questions concerning the political future of Ruanda-Urundi and prepare the 1961 legislative elections. Thus the timetable suggested by the Mission was in some ways reversed. The comprehensive conference, which the Mission had in mind and which the Administering Authority also had at that time contemplated, will now come after and not before the communal elections. This, Mr. President, does not appear to us to be a sound decision. The Visiting Mission, we believe, was quite right in thinking that holding any elections, even communal elections, which will be of great importance as they will be the first large measure of democratisation in the Territory, before the processes of reconciliation had really set in would not be appropriate ; and they were further, in our view, right in thinking that no real conciliation could come about except in the framework of a comprehensive timetable of future progress towards independence and future political arrangements entered into by the many political parties in the Territory and the Round Table Conference attended by United Nations observers, as to the future of Ruanda-Urundi in a spirit of give and take. We have serious doubts whether the right

140

atmosphere exists for the communal election scheduled to be held in a few days time. Our doubts have been strengthened after hearing the petitioner Mr. RWAGASANA, who gave us an enlightening exposition of the real political orientation in the Territory. In our view, the Administering Authority will be wise to follow the suggestions of the Visiting Mission, and even at this late stage postpone the communal elections until after the lifting of the emergency and restoration of normal political activity in the Territory. The elections could well take place in August as originally contemplated. This will also give the Administering Authority time to implement suitable and necessary measures regarding amnesty, for it is quite clear that without the participation of the large number of leaders of the UNAR, who are at present in exile, there could be no real reconciliation or elections which would fully reflect opinion in the

Territory. We have heard from the petitioner that UNAR not having confidence will not participate in the communal elections; and that would mean a bad start for the plan of democratization and political advancement which the Administering Authority themselves have in mind. The postponed elections could also be held on the basis of universal adult franchise, which seems to be the wish of the political parties in the Territory, instead of the present adult male franchise.

These conclusions, Mr. President, are reinforced by the statement of the petitioner, Mr. RWAGASANA before us on behalf of UNAR. There is much force in the UNAR's view that the communal elections to be held under an emergency regime cannot be regarded as fair. He has stated that his party is not permitted to hold political meetings in the Territory and many of its members, who have had to flee the Territory, will not be able to offer their candidatures because of certain residential requirements. These allegations have not been altogether refuted on behalf of the Administering Authority and although we take note of their statement before this Council that there has been considerable relaxation of the restrictions imposed under the military regime and that certain powers have now been restored to the civil authorities. The state of emergency still continues, and will not permit of the full and free exercise of all political rights by individuals and political parties. The communal elections, in the words of the representative of the Administering Authority, "will be of an important Political character inasmuch as they would give rise not only to the basic administrative cadres but also to the electoral bodies which will then elect the legislative assemblies." We also believe that considering the basic importance of the communal elections and the special circumstances prevailing in the Territory, it might be desirable to have United Nations observation even at the stage of communal elections. We trust, Mr. President, that the Council will endorse these views and that the Administering Authority will give serious thought to these very vital considerations.

I would now turn, Mr. President, to some matters of detail arising from the Visiting Mission's Report. As I have already indicated, we favour the adoption of universal adult franchise for the communal elections. No cogent argument

has been advanced as to why the women of the Territory should be excluded from the elections. The postponement of the latter suggested by us would enable the Administering Authority to prepare an electoral register based on universal adult franchise. The electoral system proposed for the communal elections also does not appear to us to be satisfactory. Voting by party lists usually results in entire lists being adopted especially in a population largely illiterate ; although in theory voters are entitled to elect candidates from any of the party lists it has been found in practice that where such a system prevails, there is undue weightage in favour of the slightly favoured party and the election returns do not reflect the strength of the different political parties. We believe that elections based on single or double member constituencies would be more suitable to the conditions of Ruanda-Urundi.

The Chairman of the Visiting Mission made the following statement in an answer to one of my questions: "Throughout our travels through Ruanda we were accosted by literally hundreds of thousands of people. Some would have big banners calling for . immediate independence. Others would have banners 'We want democratic institutions'. I believe that 99% of those who raised the apparently opposing banners did not really and truly contemplate exactly what they were saying; because it is a fact that you cannot have independence without democratic institutions nor can you have democratic institutions without resultingly having independence." We generally agree with this. There is and ought to be no real conflict between the demand for immediate independence and that for democratic institutions, and we believe that the very fact that these demands are put forward in contradiction, shows the extent of mutual fear and distrust among the main elements of the population, namely, the Hutus and the Tutsis. In our view, democratic institutions must be introduced immediately and the culmination of this process

141

should be the independence of the Territory. This would naturally favour the element of the population in a majority but if there is goodwill this fact alone would be of little significance in a democratic society. Furthermore, we think that a satisfactory political system acceptable to the

people as a whole can be built around the institution of the Bami, as a constitutional head and symbol of the unity of the people. That does not, of course, mean that there should be a long interval between the introduction of the first democratic processes and independence. For reasons which I have already stated to-day and on other occasions in this Council, the time is long past when there could be a long and leisurely process of democratisation before independence. We believe that the best way to satisfy the demand of the people is to enter into immediate consultation with them and prepare a timetable allowing for a minimum delay between the introduction of democratic elections, the devolution of autonomous power on elected bodies, and the independence of the Territory. It is more important than ever that the Administering Authority should prepare a timetable in consultation with popular representatives and submit proposals for the independence of Ruanda-Urundi and for the termination of the trusteeship, and these could be discussed at the General Assembly's session in 1961.

We agree with the Visiting Mission in its belief "that any unnecessary continuation of the Special Resident's power to restrict fundamental rights will in the long run not be conducive to reducing the tensions in the Territory." We also agree with the Mission that the continued existence of the emergency regime cannot fail to give rise to doubts about the validity and the worth of the communal elections. The lifting of the emergency and the promulgation of suitable amnesty measures will be the most important step towards bringing about reconciliation and promise of future harmony and stability in the Territory.

The reforms proposed in the Interim Royal Decree of January 1960 prescribe that the Vice-Governor-General administering Ruanda-Urundi shall take the title of Resident-General and exercise executive power in the Territory, together with all functions conferred on the Governor-General of the Belgian Congo by Royal Decrees and orders, and that he shall correspond direct with the Belgian Government to which he is required, *inter alia*, to submit the budget of the Territory and the annual report on its administration. The legislative councils to which elections are proposed in January 1961 on the basis of universal adult franchise will be held within

the framework of the provisions of this Interim Decree, which means that the legislative councils for Ruanda and Urundi and any co-ordinating body established by these councils for the entire Territory will in law not have any autonomous powers. There would be no field, apart from external affairs which naturally must be the domain of the Administering Authority, in which popular representatives will exercise autonomy. What seems necessary is devolution of autonomy, to begin with in certain fields, which could be later enlarged so that by the time the Territory attains independence the popularly elected legislative councils and responsible Ministers should exercise full self-government.

After the National Elections of 1961, the reserve powers of Resident-General should be extremely limited and assurance should be given that these will not be exercised except in the case of extreme necessity.

We have noted, Mr. President, the measures that are under way to train suitable personnel for indigenous civil cadres, and we hope that the Administering Authority will give due attention to the Visiting Mission's view that these need to be greatly accelerated. We would suggest that the Administering Authority take advantage of the facilities available from the United Nations through OPEX and other programmes in this field.

The Visiting Mission's recommendation that the national assemblies to be set up as a result of the elections at the beginning of 1961 should draft constitutions establishing democratic institutions is a sound one and deserving of special attention. The adoption of this recommendation will eliminate to a very large extent the controversy that has arisen concerning the institution of the Mwami and the relations between Ruanda and Urundi. It is our view that a traditional authority with the reputation, the prestige and the popularity that the Bami command can be a stabilising factor of great value in the evolution and development of Ruanda-Urundi as an independent state. And we hope that the Administering Authority will refrain from taking any precipitate action on this question and will, on the other hand, actively discourage any attempt from any side to bring this institution into the arena of political conflict. In this context we would express the hope that the fears expressed in several communications to

the Council from political parties in Ruanda about the Administering Authority's intentions to depose the Mwami are totally unfounded. For we believe that any such course will have unfortunate consequences for the future of the Territory. The Bami and everybody else con-

142

cerned, including the UNAR, seem agreed that the two monarchies should be constitutional. On this essential point, therefore, there is no room for dispute. The important thing is to transform the character of all the various Councils and Assemblies through popular elections, and to entrust them with powers which have hitherto been exercised either by the Administering Authority or under its control by the Bami.

During question time, I drew attention to several questions that would arise on account of the Congo and the Territory's relationship with that country. As I said, these questions should be carefully studied by the Committee on Administrative Unions. I should like to reiterate the view that such arrangements between the Trust Territory and the Congo as are regarded essential or unavoidable by the Administering Authority should be entered into on a provisional basis only pending their consideration by the General Assembly at its next session. The Administering Authority will, we trust, inform the General Assembly at its next session of all these arrangements including the status of the personnel of the Force Publique du Congo Belge. Any continuing links with an independent Congo will for obvious reasons require the approval of the General Assembly.

In view of the complexity and the importance of these questions it would be useful, in our view, for the Council to recommend that the affairs of Ruanda-Urundi be inscribed as a separate item on the agenda of the 15th Session of the General Assembly.

Mr. President, I have devoted the major portion of my statement to the political developments, present and future, in the Territory, since this is a paramount question which faces the Administering Authority, the people of Ruanda-Urundi and the Trusteeship Council in so far as its functions are concerned. I will not, therefore, take much time of the Council on speaking at

length on other matters, namely, economic, social and educational, which are of equal importance, but the solution of which must necessarily hinge on satisfactory political progress in the Territory. The Annual Report is now two years out-of-date and the additional information submitted by the Administering Authority does not appear to be altogether adequate. Neither gives the impression of any dynamism, or any acceleration in the pace of economic, social and educational advancement. While pressing political matters must necessarily engage attention, we hope that there will be no slackening of effort in the social, economic and educational fields. We would commend to the attention of the Administering Authority the careful and well-considered observations and recommendations of UNESCO and of the Visiting Mission, and we hope the Administering Authority will take into consideration the many suggestions made during the question and answer period in these fields.

One of the important recommendations of the Visiting Mission was the despatch of a United Nations Mission to the Territory to assist the administration in the Territory's development. The Visiting Mission naturally did not wish to spell out the precise functions of such a mission, but they had evidently in mind a mission appointed by the Trusteeship Council or the General Assembly with powers of giving advice to the Administering Authority on matters relating to the development of the Territory and also in the field of reconciliation. Apparently, the Administering Authority did not favour such a mission and, according to the information given to 'this Council, they are now in contact with the Secretary-General of the United Nations for the despatch of a technical team led by a suitably qualified person, the team to be selected by the Secretary-General. In the absence of acceptance of the idea mooted by the Visiting Mission, which, in our view, would have been preferable, we welcome the initiative of the Administering Authority in seeking the assistance of the Secretary-General. We would expect the Administering Authority and the Secretary-General to inform the General Assembly and the Council in due time as to the development in this matter, and as soon as possible.

In conclusion, Mr. President, I would like to

express on behalf of my delegation, our sincere good wishes to the people of Ruanda-Urundi. We hope that they will, as the Visiting Mission has said, on the basis of compromise solutions and arrangements find political understanding and live and work together in harmony to prepare themselves for the responsibilities that will be theirs on the dawn of independence of the Territory. The independence of Ruanda-Urundi we feel, is close at hand, and we are sure that given goodwill and the determination to resolve their present difficulties a bright future awaits the people of the Territory as a new and united nation on the Continent of Africa. We were impressed by the intelligence and calibre of the only petitioner, Mr. RWAGASANA, who appeared before us. We feel that there are many others in the Territory like him in all political parties, who could undertake responsibility in the period between now and independence. It is the

143

duty of the Administering Authority to prepare them in the most favourable and harmonious circumstances, and likewise it is the function of this Council to urge the Administering Authority to that end. It is in this spirit that my delegation has offered its observations and suggestions.

INDIA USA CONGO BELGIUM MALDIVES CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC

Date : Jun 01, 1960

Volume No

1995

INDIA IN THE UNITED NATIONS

Shri C.S. Jha's Statement in Trusteeship Council on Tanganyika

Shri C.S. Jha, India's Permanent Representative to the United Nations made a statement in the Trusteeship Council on June 14, 1960, on the Trust Territory of Tanganyika.

The following is the full text of the

statement :

During the past week the Council has been engaged in examining the report of the Administering Authority on Tanganyika for the years 1958 and 1959. As in previous years, we have had the benefit of the presence of the able Special Representative for the Territory, Mr. Fletcher-Cooke, who has again helped many of us to fully understand the conditions in the Territory. This is not to imply that the annual report for the Territory has in any way been less informative than in the past, but very often we have had to ask the Special Representative for clarification and additional information to have as clear a picture as possible of the Territory. I should also like to thank Mr. Chant, whose personal and thorough knowledge of the Territory has been of considerable assistance to all of us.

This year we have had the additional advantage of having before us the report of the Visiting Mission that went to the Territory early this year. The members of the Visiting Mission, under the able and inspired leadership of Mr. Mason Sears, have given us a very detailed and objective analysis of the main problems that face Tanganyika today. We have found most of the observations in the report of the Visiting Mission extremely instructive and thought-provoking. I should like to express here the very warm appreciation of myself and my delegation to the members of the Visiting Mission for the excellent work they have done in producing their report.

As I said in my statement last year, the Trust Territory of Tanganyika has special importance, being the largest of the Trust Territories that came under the Trusteeship System and one of the last on the continent of Africa that have still to attain independence. In some ways the evolution into independence of a Trust Territory of the size of Tanganyika—361,000 square miles, about equal to the size of Turkey, with a population of nine million—may be said to be the acid test of the vindication of the Trusteeship System of the United Nations.

The cardinal development which lends special significance to our examination of the conditions in the Trust Territory of Tanganyika this year, and which was indeed the focus of attention by

the Visiting Mission, is the announcement of a large measure of constitutional advance to be effective from 1 October. This had of course been preceded, as the Visiting Mission has pointed out, by several, though rather small and too gradual, instalments of reform. In July 1959 a Council of Ministers was established and five elected members were appointed as Ministers. The Post-Elections Committee on Constitutional Reforms was constituted in May 1959 and submitted its report in December 1959, one of its recommendations being that the great majority of the seats in the Legislative Council should be elective. Finally, on 26 April 1960 it was announced that from 1 October 1960, ten of the twelve Ministries would be held by unofficial members of the Legislative Council, and that elections will be held in September 1960 on the basis of an extended franchise.

My delegation recognizes without hesitation that the year 1959 has been one of active constitutional development on the basis of careful examination, inquiry and preparation, and that the reforms proposed to be brought into effect from 1 October 1960 will represent a large measure of advance toward self-government, though still far short of full self-government. It seems to us that, important as the proposed constitutional reforms are, they have to be viewed against a background of certain internal and external factors and these indeed must often be recognized as the chief determinants of the measure and pace of further progress.

I have in mind, first, the mounting demand for independence. The Visiting Mission has stated

"There is a steady emotional pressure for uhuru, for complete independence in the near future. This natural feeling is shared by even those African leaders who realize the serious practical problems which newly independent Tanganyika will have to face."

144

We have also been told by the Special Representative, in answer to questions, that the national executive of the Tanganyika African National Union—the largest and most representative party in the Territory—has pronounced itself in favour of immediate independence, and

the word "immediate" is to be taken not literally but to be interpreted as a matter of six months or so. It is also known that the Tanganyika African National Union in the forthcoming elections wishes to secure a mandate from the electorate for demanding complete independence from the Administering Authority.

Secondly, there are the dramatic developments in Africa, where one country after another is attaining independence and becoming a Member of the United Nations. A mighty wave of freedom is sweeping across the Continent of Africa, bringing into the open forces which have hitherto been suppressed but can no longer be resisted. Indeed, a chain reaction has set in, the conclusion of which must inevitably be the freedom of all countries in Africa which are not yet free and masters of their own destinies.

I mention these facts not because they are not known to the Administering Authority and to the other members of the Council but because, in our broad examination of the conditions in the Trust Territory of Tanganyika, we cannot afford to lose sight of these historic developments. Thus we are discussing conditions in Tanganyika in an entirely different context from that of the previous years. The striking changes in context are as follows : First, there is the constitutional advance likely to come about in a few months' time, which will introduce a representative government with a cabinet consisting of ten elected members out of twelve. Secondly, there is now an extended, though still restricted, franchise, which will result in an electorate of about 900,000 'in place of the Previous 58,000. Thirdly, within a few months there will be a popular government with an elected Chief Minister, which will result not only in' further stimulation of the demand for independence but in greatly increased attention to the social and economic development of the Territory.

My delegation, As I have said, notes with much satisfaction the impending constitutional reforms and the fact that by and large they are welcomed by the major political party in the Territory. But, when we look at the over-all Picture of the social, educational and economic conditions in the Territory and the comparative slowness of progress in these matters in recent years, we cannot help feeling that a large hiatus exists between expectations and achievements. It

is obvious that under pressure of the popular demand for uhuru and also-what is perhaps even more compelling-of the political development in Africa, the constitutional advance contemplated might very soon become out of date. There is a general air of expectancy in the Territory, which is also confirmed by the statement of the Secretary of State to the Visiting Mission in London, that the contemplated constitutional steps will be only a transient phase. Indeed, one cannot but be impressed by the inevitability of the independence of Tanganyika in the not very distant future. However, at the same time, the impression we have is one of comparatively unhurried gradualness in the evolution of Tanganyika toward independence. It will, for example, take several years for Tanganyika to Africanize its higher civil services and posts. The report of UNESCO shows the dismal state of primary and secondary education in the Territory. The economic problems of the Territory are colossal and will take many years for-even a beginning toward integrated economic development. The financial resources of the Territory are inadequate to its growing needs. There is reason to believe that most of the wealth produced in the Territory is not retained therein, with the result that sufficient internal savings for capital formation and investment do not appear possible. All this means that there is no correspondence between the' pace of political development which must inevitably be extremely rapid, and social, educational and economic developments, which have been at an extremely slow pace in the past and do not promise, from the material before us, to be especially rapid in the future.

It has been found by experience elsewhere that self-government itself is the greatest stimulus to social, educational and economic advancement. The longer self-government or independence is delayed, the more complex are problems likely to become in the difficult conditions of the modern world. Therefore, it seems to us that the processes preceding the freedom of Tanganyika need to be greatly accelerated, and this applies not merely in the political field but with even greater force to the educational and economic fields including, of course, the Africanization of the civil services, if independence is to be real.

Our delegation has year after year advocated the fixing of early successive intermediate targets

and dates in the fields of political, economic, social and educational advancement in the Trust Territory of Tanganyika, following the General Assembly recommendation contained in resolution 1274 (XIII) in respect of all Trust Territories. We are aware that the Administering Authority

145

has so far preferred to make a pragmatic approach to the problems of political advancement in the Territory. Whatever may have been the validity of such an attitude in the past, it seems to us that the wisest course to follow now would be to fix, in consultation and harmonious co-operation with the leaders and political organizations of the Territory, a time-table for independence. We were told that the present instalment of constitutional advance is not the last but the penultimate stage before independence. We would like to see an early target date fixed for independence in consultation with the people of Tanganyika, and in the intervening period internal self-government to be established in the Territory.

Before I make some observations in detail, I should like to make a few general comments. We are all anxious, and I am sure the Government of the United Kingdom is equally so, that by the time Tanganyika becomes independent, steps will already have been taken to see that it gets a good start. The record of the United Kingdom in this matter is an admirable one, particularly in countries like Ceylon, Malaya, Burma and my own country where the British Government had built up a strong responsible indigenous civil service which without difficulty took on the responsibilities when independence came.

When we view conditions in Tanganyika against this very commendable record of the United Kingdom, we find that these are far from satisfactory. It is true, and we realize it, that the pace of political evolution on the African continent has been greatly accelerated in recent years. It is also true that the pace at which these developments have taken place has made it difficult for the Administering Authorities in Africa to maintain a parallel progress in various fields. It seems to my delegation, however, that even the present thinking of the Administering Authority is not fully in tune with the needs of the situation. We have heard phrases such as the "grand design", "crash programme" and so

forth, but we do not see adequate evidence of these in actual practice. We have been told about the timehonoured practice of committees and commissions having been set up to look into various problems that face the Territory, but no concrete steps have been taken yet to meet the situation. Time is of the greatest essence in Tanganyika today and between now and independence the Administering Authority cannot afford to lose even one day in preparing the people of the Territory for taking over the responsibility of looking after their own affairs.

My delegation is not unaware of the difficulties that face the Territory, particularly in the field of the civil service and in regard to economic problems. We also fully realize that the Administering Authority is conscious of the immensity of the problems. In many directions the Administering Authority is exploring ways and means of meeting the situation. However, what disturbs us somewhat is the lack of promise of substantial progress by the time independence comes. This would be unfortunate because it would give the new independent State a poor start and leave it a legacy of onerous problems to tackle at its very birth which may be beyond its capacity. Therefore, my delegation feels that no avenue should be left unexplored and no stone left unturned in finding ways and means of solving the numerous problems that face the Territory.

The extent of the advance indicated by the impending constitutional reforms over the situation existing in 1956 or 1957 is the measure of the change in the political thinking of the Administering Authority. While expressing gratification at the progresses made in the constitutional field, my delegation has to affirm that we are not satisfied with certain aspects of the constitutional proposals. We do not find any reason for not introducing universal adult suffrage, except perhaps a traditional timidity of approach to such a question. The qualifications for franchise which include the ability to read and write in English and income of a minimum of ₤ 75 per annum, or present or past incumbency of a prescribed office, have been rightly criticized by Mr. Julius Nyerere in the Legislative Council; and the memorandum presented by TANU to the Visiting Mission also contains a categorical demand for universal adult suffrage. In the course of an answer to a question

it was stated that it was not for administrative reasons that the Administering Authority was opposed to the introduction of adult suffrage at this stage. The Visiting Mission has also commented in the following terms

"In view of the demand for wider suffrage, the Mission regrets that it was decided not to introduce adult suffrage at this stage but thinks that the present restrictions in the franchise are not likely substantially to affect the results of this year's elections. The Mission is confident that the new government which will enter office after the elections will give this matter further attention and that the introduction of adult suffrage will not be long delayed."

The Administering Authority has used this

146

observation of the Mission in support of the A that no harm has been done by not introducing adult suffrage. Such an inference, however, we do not consider to be a valid one. Indeed, it may be asked, why not introduce adult suffrage in conformity with the wishes of the people if the introduction of the extended franchise was to produce the same result? Besides, the process through which a certain result is achieved is often of equal if not greater significance than the result itself. While regretting the non-introduction of adult suffrage, we feel confident, with the Visiting Mission, that the further reform of the franchise system toward universal adult suffrage will be among the first undertakings of the popular government Which will assume power in a few months' time.

In this connexion my delegation would like to express that experience elsewhere, including India, has shown that the exercise of universal adult suffrage has neither been administratively difficult nor has it produced consequence's at one time feared by those who have had to take a decision in that regard. The conferment of the right to vote is the best means of creating political consciousness and of political education of the masses of the people from whom the strength of a democracy derives. It is also the experience elsewhere that illiteracy is no bar to intelligent voting. Indeed, if one were to wait for universal

literacy or even a high literacy rate before introduction of adult suffrage, the development of real democracy in many countries would be postponed for many generations.

My delegation also feels that large reserve powers are still retained with the Governor of the Territory; and that the formation of a Cabinet consisting of some elected members and some official members might, with the best of goodwill, make for actual difficulties in the working of the cabinet system. However, we would not labour these points further in the confident belief that the coming constitutional reforms will be a short-lived stage in the march of Tanganyika towards independence in the very near future.

I have mentioned the civil service. We realize that the Territory, even with the maximum effort, cannot afford to lose all the expatriate personnel holding senior posts in the civil service. The rate of Africanization is slow; it can be quickened and it must be quickened. But for some years to come, it will be necessary to retain the overseas personnel. We are told that the Administration might come up against some difficulties in the way of British personnel continuing in the Territory after independence. The new Government of Tanganyika will no doubt examine the grievances, some of which may be quite genuine, of these overseas personnel and provide whatever assurances are required. At the same time, one cannot help expressing the hope that the overseas personnel will also appreciate the genuine difficulties which an independent Tanganyika will have to tackle and not submit demands which are either unfair or which would cause undue burden on the limited financial resources of The Territory.

In a spirit of loyalty to their cadres and to the work that they have accomplished in Tanganyika we trust that most of such personnel would agree to remain under an independent Government of Tanganyika even under the new and perhaps from their own point of view relatively less privileged conditions. In this connexion the possibility of recruitment of personnel from other sources will also, we hope, be explored and this has particular reference to Asian and African countries, many of which have the capacity to provide such personnel on salaries considerably below that of European overseas personnel and with perhaps greater assurance of continuity.

The United Nations OPEX programme can certainly help in this process.

Talking about the United Nations programmes, I should like to state that we feel that the Administering Authority should take more active steps to make use of the assistance offered by the United Nations and its specialized agencies. We know that the need for assistance from all possible sources is great in Tanganyika today and, therefore, we feel the Administering Authority should even now take the initiative and actively negotiate further assistance from the United Nations and the specialized agencies. Having said this I would hasten to pay our sincere tribute to the specialized agencies, particularly to the Food and Agriculture Organization, the World Health Organization and the United Nations International Children's Emergency Fund for their work in the Territory in difficult conditions. I am confident that any schemes relating to Tanganyika falling within the scope of the United Nations Special Fund and the Expanded Programme of Technical Assistance will receive the most sympathetic consideration of these agencies.

In the field of general economic development of the Territory, there is again need for considerable improvement. The country's resources are admittedly limited but, as the Visiting Mission has reported, it is obvious that even the existing resources are not being fully utilized. The customary land tenure and the nature of subsistence economy in the Territory tend to come in the way of full exploita-

147

tion of the Territory's resources. We have no doubt that the future Government of Tanganyika will give this matter their urgent and close attention.

We realize that external assistance in a big way will be required and we endorse the suggestion of the Visiting Mission that any request for assistance from the United Nations should be sympathetically considered. At the same time, it would seem to my delegation that even if the Territory receives the maximum possible assistance from the United Nations and other external sources there would still be a large gap, and we believe that this is one field in which the Administering Authority can continue to assist the Territory, even after independence. We are

very happy to hear that the Government of the United Kingdom has already given careful consideration to this problem and we note with satisfaction the statement of the representative of the United Kingdom that the United Kingdom Government will do everything in its power to help the Territory and its people even after independence. We also trust that the United Kingdom Government will not wait till after independence and will immediately make available to the Territory greatly increased funds and capital resources from the Colonial Development Fund and from other sources of capital in the United Kingdom. It may also be possible for them to negotiate a special loan to Tanganyika with the popular government later this year. Such measures, may I venture to suggest, will be the highest fulfilment of the Trust by the Administering Authority towards Tanganyika and will no doubt prove to be acts of wise statesmanship.

In the educational field, the situation appears to be unsatisfactory. There has been a drop in enrolment at the initial stage of the primary school. Even the annual rate of enrolment in the primary and middle schools taken together has dropped from the preceding years. During the questioning period we were told that in order to give emphasis to secondary education in the Territory it would be necessary to restrict the number of children that go into the primary schools. This is a very disturbing situation indeed. We realize fully the need to expand the facilities available at the stage of secondary schools, but it does not seem to my delegation to be either desirable or even necessary to do this at the expense of primary school education.

Another aspect of education which should receive careful and urgent consideration is the problem of wastage. We have been informed that out of the children that go into the primary schools less than 20 per cent reach the middle school stage and only about 4 per cent or 5 per cent reach the secondary stage. We have not been able to get any satisfactory explanation of this very unsatisfactory position. We believe that some very intensive and immediate "crash" programme, to use a familiar expression, is necessary to induce the children and their parents to make full use of the facilities at present available in the Territory.

The situation is really extraordinary that in a backward and under-developed Territory like Tanganyika where there is every reason to expand educational facilities, there are thousands of vacant seats in the schools. As the Visiting Mission has reported, it is possible that introduction of English in the primary classes might help to ease the situation. The authorities concerned should also consider carefully the possibility of abolishing fees in the schools in the Territory. In this connexion, it is interesting to note the fact that UNESCO has recently recommended that schooling should be free for the first six years.

Another unsatisfactory aspect of the educational set-up in the Territory is the inadequate training facilities for teachers. Here again, we are told that there has been a drop of almost 30 per cent in the teachers under training. We are told that this is due to the shift in the emphasis from primary to secondary education. As we indicated during the questioning period these explanations cannot satisfy any one completely. My delegation believes that no longer can the problem of education be tinkered with; it has such far-reaching consequences and is of such urgency that it must be tackled immediately and effectively. We feel certain that these are problems which will receive priority when the new Government takes over later this year.

I have now reached the conclusion of my statement. I know that it has been in part critical of some of the broad aspects of policy and administration in the Trust Territory. I can assure the Administering Authority that such criticism has been made in the usual friendly and constructive manner of my delegation. I would not like anything in my statement to obscure our deep appreciation of the efficiency and orderly manner in which the Administering Authority is preparing the people of Tanganyika in the last stages before the independence of the Territory. The Administering Authority itself recognizes that Tanganyika shall be independent at an early date. This in itself is a remarkable advance which we in this Council note with much satisfaction. We would pay a tribute to the Adminis-

148

tering Authority for the fact that the rapid progress towards independence is being made, not in conflict, but in harmony and in co-operation and

agreement with political opinion in Tanganyika. Tanganyika being a multi-racial society presents like all such societies some very complex problems. The efforts of the Administering Authority, despite temporary setbacks, towards the evolution of a harmonious multi-racial egalitarian society set a good example and deserve our commendation.

Even more remarkable is the spirit shown by the majority community, namely, the Africans in Tanganyika. In their leader, Mr. Nyerere, who heads the largest and most representative political party in the Territory, the TANU, Tanganyika has a man of courage, vision and wisdom. The striking success which he has hitherto had in securing the full co-operation and confidence of the Asian and the European political parties is ample evidence of his statesmanship. In a multi-racial society like that in Tanganyika, it is but right that political responsibility should be largely exercised by the Africans who form an overwhelming majority of the population; but at the same time it is the path of wisdom that others who have made Tanganyika their home and contribute to the economic prosperity and to the personality of Tanganyika should be regarded as partners in a common enterprise.

A multiracial society, to be harmonious so that each element strengthens the other and all contribute towards the common end, should be based on the principle of equal rights and opportunities for all without any special privileges or handicaps for any element of the population. It gives us the greatest pleasure and satisfaction to see that Mr. Nyerere and his great organization, the TANU, show full awareness of these principles and are working towards their full implementation. We wish them success and good fortune. We are sure that a Tanganyika with a harmonious social structure has a bright future and will play a significant role in the society of nations.

INDIA USA TURKEY CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC UNITED KINGDOM BURMA

Date : Jun 01, 1960

Volume No

1995

JAPAN

Instruments of Ratification Exchanged

The Instruments of Ratification of the agreement between India and Japan for avoidance of double taxation of income were exchanged on June 13, 1960 at the Japanese Foreign Office in Tokyo by Mr. Aiichiro Fujiyama, Japanese Foreign Minister, and Dr. P.K. Banerjee, Indian Charge d' Affaires. The agreement was signed in New Delhi on January 5, 1960.

Speaking at the function held for exchange of Instruments of Ratification, the Japanese Foreign Minister, Mr. Aiichiro Fujiyama, expressed the hope that the agreement would facilitate, in large measure, trade and economic cooperation as well as cultural exchange between Japan and India.

Dr. P.K. Banerjee, in his reply, said the agreement had opened a new chapter of friendly collaboration between India and Japan and would encourage greater trade and economic and cultural cooperation between the two countries.

JAPAN INDIA

Date : Jun 01, 1960

Volume No

1995

POLAND

Shipping Agreement Signed

A Shipping Agreement between the Governments of India and the Polish People's Republic was signed in New Delhi on June 27, 1960 at the

conclusion of the negotiations between an official Polish delegation and representatives of the Government of India.

Dr. Nagendra Singh, Joint Secretary, Ministry of Transport and Communications and Director-General of Shipping, signed the Agreement on behalf of the Government of India and Mr. Jozef Markiewicz, Director in the Ministry of Shipping, Poland, on behalf of the Government of the Polish People's Republic.

It has been agreed that either Government will nominate a shipping organisation to conclude arrangements to operate a shipping service between

149

India and Poland. On the Indian side, the Western Shipping Corporation has been nominated for the purpose and the Polish Ocean Lines on the Polish side.

Under the Agreement, the two Governments have undertaken to give to the ships, crews and cargoes of either country the same treatment as is given to the ships, crews and cargoes of the most favoured countries.

A Committee consisting of representatives of the two sides will be set up to evaluate and review the working of the Agreement.

Payments arising out of this Agreement will be made in accordance with the Trade and Payments Agreement between India and Poland.

The present Agreement replaces the Shipping Agreement between the two Governments signed in 1956, which could not be implemented owing mainly to the Suez crisis.

The two Shipping Organisations nominated by the two Governments under the present Agreement have already met and drawn up an Agreement between themselves for operating a scheduled service between the two countries. It is proposed to have 12 sailings each per year. In other words, there will be one Indian ship and one Polish ship sailing from Indian and Polish ports every month each way. This service will maintain a regular schedule and will charge a common agreed tariff and will be operated otherwise in close co-operation so as to achieve equality in all aspects in regard to the operation

and maintenance and results of the service.

The details of the arrangement relating to the service are subject to ratification of the shipping companies concerned on both sides.

POLAND INDIA USA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC

Date : Jun 01, 1960

Volume No

1995

TECHNICAL COOPERATION MISSION

Financial Assistance

An agreement was signed in New Delhi on June 28, 1960 between the Government of India and the U. S. Technical Cooperation Mission under which the T. C. M. would make available Rs. 48.6 lakhs (\$1,021,682) to the Indian Institute of Technology at Kanpur.

The amount would be used to purchase from outside India educational and scientific equipment apparatus and class room equipment for demonstration and research purposes.

The Indian Institute of Technology, Kanpur which is expected to be the Regional Institute for Northern India, has already received four grants from the U. S. Technical Cooperation Mission.

The agreement was signed by Shri N. C. Sen Gupta, Joint Secretary, Union Ministry of Finance and Mr. C. Tyler Wood, Minister for Economic Affairs and Director of TCM. Today's agreement brings the total U. S. dollar assistance to the Kanpur institution to slightly more than two million, while a total of Rs. 50.6 lakhs has been provided in the past for local currency costs. The combined U. S. dollar and rupee contribution comes to Rs. 1.5 crores.

The Institute at Kanpur along with three similar institutions in Kharagpur, Bombay and Madras will set the standards for engineering institutions throughout India and will meet to some extent the growing need for engineering education.

Another agreement was signed in New Delhi on June 30, 1960 between the Government of India and the United States Technical Cooperation Mission for further aid to India's Malaria Eradication Programme.

As a result of this agreement, a sum of \$831,218 (about Rs. 40 lakhs) was made available out of which \$719,935 (Rs. 34.3 lakhs) will be spent on acquiring from abroad stocks of DDT and the rest of the funds will be utilised for the import of anti-malarial drugs and laboratory equipment.

The latest grant brings the U. S. financial assistance to the Malaria Eradication Programme to a little over Rs. 38 crores. Part of this assistance has been made available in Indian rupees resulting from sales of agricultural commodities supplied to India under Public Law 480.

150

INDIA USA

Date : Jun 01, 1960

Volume No

1995

UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS

President Prasad's Speech at State Banquet

The President, Dr. Rajendra Prasad paid a visit to the U.S.S.R. from June 20 to July 5, 1960. On June 21, a State Banquet was held in his honour in the Grand Kremlin Palace in Moscow.

Speaking on the occasion, President Rajendra

Prasad said:

I have been deeply moved by the many kind and pleasant words which have been spoken here about myself and my country. I take them as the expression of the affection and goodwill which the Government and the people of your great country have for my country and my people.

Though the frontiers of your country have, geographically speaking, not been very far from us, there had been but little direct contact between us until our independence.

The visit of my Prime Minister, Shri Jawaharlal Nehru, to the Soviet Union in 1955 and the visit of your Prime Minister, His Excellency Mr. Khrushchev, to India in 1955, began a new era in forging fresh bonds between our two countries which, we sincerely hope, will continue to grow closer with the passage of years.

The visit of Their Excellencies Mr. Voroshilov Mr. Kozlov and Madame Furtseva which was followed by the second visit paid by your great leader, His Excellency Mr. Khrushchev, to India earlier this year not only brought to us a greater understanding of each other but further developed the close and personal understanding between the leaders of the two countries which is of very great importance.

In this rapidly shrinking world, in which every country has become the neighbour of every other country, this close understanding between the leaders of your country and of mine is of much significance for, though the nature of your struggle and ours has been different, there are many ideals which we share in common.

Like you, we are striving for the good of the common man in our country, who for centuries had been denied economic opportunities for giving him a reasonable standard of living. Like you a few decades earlier, we are now embarked on a gigantic industrialisation of our country-along with improvements in our age-old agricultural methods-which will not only change the face of India but bring to our 400 million people opportunities, for a new life which did not exist before.

In this we have received the generous help of your Government, as of many other friendly

Governments.

The modern steel plant at Bhilai, standing in the midst of a countryside which had not changed for centuries, the vast agricultural farm at Suratgarh, the huge machine building factories which will shortly go up at Ranchi, the many oil wells, which are sprouting on the western shores of India-these are a few of the projects in which we have had your ready assistance.

I am happy to think that your experience and the skill of your experts will assist us in the building of the New India on which we have embarked.

But it is not only in factories and farms that our two peoples are beginning to get to know each other. Art and culture, it has been said, know no frontiers. We are glad, therefore, that cultural exchanges between the Soviet Union and India have been growing. In the fields of dance and drama, films and music-to say nothing of literature-there has been a growing awareness of each other's heritage and progress.

And, finally, there is the growing collaboration between the leaders of your country and mine in the field of international affairs, in the United Nations and elsewhere, and above all in the task of maintaining world peace. We have been living through a crucial period of human history. Science and technology have placed in the hands of mankind the possibility both for its succour as well as its destruction. A special responsibility rests on great countries such as yours to help in preserving the world from war and destruction. The task is not easy; there have been setbacks; but it is only through patience, determination and constant striving that the fear of war, which has been clouding man's mind for so long, can be removed. Once that is achieved, the diversion of the staggering expenditure on armaments, which is at present a burden on mankind, might well become the means for revitalising the economics of the underdeveloped peoples of the world.

In the endeavour for disarmament and world peace which your country is making you have our best wishes. Addressing our Parliament a few months ago in New Delhi, your Prime Minister

151

said that "like unbound Prometheus, the peoples

of Asia and Africa are straightening their mighty shoulders starting to build a new life for themselves". The one pre-condition for the success of these mighty efforts-which are now convulsing a significant part of the world-is the continuance of peace and tranquillity in the world. This is a task in which all of us must cooperate because the price of failure would be disastrous.

May 1, in conclusion, thank you once again for the very friendly sentiments which have been expressed this evening for my country and for myself and express the hope that may our understanding and affection grow in a common endeavour for peace, goodwill and happiness for all.

USA RUSSIA INDIA ITALY

Date : Jun 01, 1960

Volume No

1995

UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS

Welcome Speech by President Brezhnev

Welcoming Dr. Prasad, Mr. Brezhnev said :

Your Excellency, Esteemed Mr. President,

Esteemed and dear friends :

It is a great pleasure to receive today our distinguished guest-the well-known statesman of India and President of the Republic of India Mr. Rajendra Prasad.

Mr. President, this is your first visit to our country but our people have long since known you and welcome you as a good old friend. We profoundly respect you who dedicated your life to the service of the homeland, your great country, its industrious and gifted, people with whom the principles of the Soviet Union are linked by the ties of close fraternal friendship.

After India gained her independence, friendship between our states and peoples has been strengthened from day to day. And the Soviet people, all of us, sincerely rejoice in this. Our friendship, like a banyan tree, sends out numerous aerial roots and its crown becomes ever larger.

The exchange of visits by Indian and Soviet statesmen makes a big contribution to the further development and strengthening of our friendship. The historic visits of Prime Minister Jawaharlal Nehru of India to the Soviet Union and of Nikita Khrushchov, the head of the Soviet Government, to India, as well as the visit to our country of India's Vice-President Radhakrishnan and the recent visit to India of Soviet statesmen, Comrades Kliment Voroshilov, Frol Kozlov and Ekaterina Furtseva have indeed been an outstanding vivid manifestation of the fraternal relations between the U.S.S.R. and India.

Permit me to express confidence, Mr. President, that your visit will promote the further strengthening of our friendship and mutual understanding. The friendship between the Soviet Union and India, in spite of the different ways along which our states are developing, is the best testimonial to the viability of Lenin's principles of peaceful co-existence. It shows that, given goodwill and mutual desire, differences in the social and political systems cannot be an obstacle to the establishment of peaceful and friendly relations between states. This is the only reasonable policy. In present-day conditions, Nikita Khrushchov said, when two systems exist on our planet—the socialist and the capitalist—no other method except peaceful co-existence has yet been invented to free mankind from wars.

Only those states whose ruling circles do not know the meaning of common sense, do not heed the opinion of their people and do not want to understand that the times of imperialist dictation, by the strong are a thing of the past, continue to oppose peaceful co-existence. But, as the facts show, the policy of strength is far too decrepit a horse which cannot be saddled any longer. We Soviet people note with great satisfaction that the Soviet Union and the Republic of India are marching shoulder to shoulder in the great movement of our time, in the struggle for peace and peaceful co-existence. Our people highly

appreciate the support lent by the Government of the Republic of India to the Soviet proposals on general and complete disarmament, on the prohibition of nuclear armaments and other peace loving actions which the Soviet Government and its head Nikita Sergeyvich Khrushchov advance and uphold with great passion and determination.

The Soviet people, just like the Indian people have a lofty sense of national dignity, honest sincere intentions and profound respect for other peoples. We are pleased to note that our great friend the Indian people, the Government of India and Prime Minister Nehru personally gave a fitting evaluation of the recent provocative actions staged by certain United States quarters. Dear friends, the Soviet-Indian friendship, which is a great historic achievement of our peoples has been tried and tested by life and time. It has good, bright prospects for further strengthening and developing, for our peoples are united by the community of lofty ideals-the desire for the

152

maintenance of peace and the safeguarding of progress and prosperity of our countries.

The Soviet Union is prepared to continue to co-operate with the Republic of India, to multiply our economic, scientific and cultural contacts, to strengthen by all efforts the friendship between our great peoples. May I propose a toast to the fraternal friendship between the peoples of the Soviet Union and India, to the prosperity of the Republic of India, to the health of our dear guest-President Rajendra Prasad !

President Prasad's Speech at Bandung Luncheon

The President, Dr. Rajendra Prasad was the guest of Honour at a luncheon held in Moscow on June 22, 1960 by the Ambassadors of the Bandung Countries.

Among those present at the function were : Mr. Brezhnev, President, U.S.S.R., Mr. N. V. Tsitsin, President, Soviet-Indian Cultural Relations Society, Mr. I. A. Benedictov Soviet Ambassador to India, and the diplomatic representatives of Afghanistan, Burma, Cambodia, People's Republic of China, Ceylon, Democratic

Republic of Vietnam, Ethiopia, Ghana, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Iran, Japan, the Lebanon, Morocco, Sudan, Thailand, and Turkey.

The following is the full text of the speech President Prasad made on the occasion :

Your Excellencies, Ladies and Gentlemen,

I appreciate the honour which the representatives of the Bandung countries have done me by inviting me to be their guest this evening. In a sense, Bandung represents the end of one epoch in the history of Asia and Africa and the beginning of another. Much has happened in these two huge continents since then. Some of these developments might not be to the liking of all of us, but there can be no gainsaying the fact that the march to complete liberation of Asia and Africa from colonial rule continues unimpeded. If another similar conference were to be called today, at least 39 countries would join the conference and not 29 as in April 1955. The destinies of most people in Asia and Africa were controlled for centuries not by the people themselves but by alien rulers. Bandung gave notice to the world that Asia and Africa were determined to decide and pursue their own independent policies and not bow to decisions taken for them by others. In that sense, the Bandung Conference was an important landmark on the road to the complete liberation of Asia and Africa.

The countries assembled at Bandung five years ago set before themselves a number of objectives. On one point the participants were most emphatic; that is the condemnation, of racialism as a means of cultural suppression. The hopes of the Bandung countries in this respect remain yet to be fulfilled. In recent months in one part of Africa racialism has reared its head in a particularly ugly form. I have no doubt, however, that human dignity and human freedom cannot be suppressed for all time to come and that those who are seeking to enforce a policy of racialism are running against the tide of history.

I take this opportunity to express our joy at the achievement of freedom by a number of countries in Africa since the meeting at Bandung. A sleeping giant has awakened from its slumber and one by one the African countries are shaking

off their centuries-old shackles of foreign domination. In their struggle for independence they have had the moral support and sympathy of their Asian brethren. Independence is no longer an issue either in Africa or in Asia. The question is one of consolidating freedom by giving it a broad economic base. In this there is considerable room for mutual co-operation and assistance amongst the Asian-African countries themselves. Indeed one of the main objects of the Bandung Conference was to discuss ways and means by which the Asian and African peoples could achieve fuller economic, cultural and political co-operation. We shall welcome assistance from the more highly developed countries of the world, but we have to depend primarily on our own efforts. Many countries have been unstinted in their assistance. Standing before our Soviet guests this evening, I must express in particular our appreciation of the generous assistance that we in Asia and Africa have received from the Soviet Union. We are grateful for this to the Soviet Government and the Soviet leaders.

Let us hope that the friendship and goodwill generated at Bandung will grow stronger and stronger, that in our day-to-day working and actual dealings with one another and with other nations, particularly with Bandung countries, all of us shall act in a manner calculated to foster and strengthen that spirit.

Excellencies, Ladies and Gentlemen, I would

153

now request you to join me in drinking a toast to the freedom and prosperity of the countries in Asia and Africa, to mutual collaboration between Asia and Africa and the rest of the world, and in particular to co-operation between Asia and Africa and the Soviet Union.

INDIA USA RUSSIA INDONESIA AFGHANISTAN BURMA CAMBODIA CHINA ETHIOPIA GHANA
VIETNAM IRAN IRAQ JAPAN LEBANON MOROCCO SUDAN THAILAND TURKEY

Date : Jun 01, 1960

Volume No

1995

Speech by President Brezhnev

Speaking on the occasion President Brezhnev said :

Esteemed Mr. President,

Esteemed gentlemen,

Dear friends,

Permit me first of all to thank you all wholeheartedly for the invitation to take part in today's luncheon, arranged in honour of representative of one of the great Bandung family of nations-the President of the Indian Republic, Dr. Rajendra Prasad.

Such meetings of the representatives of Bandung nations have become a good tradition in Moscow. They are proof that the spirit of Bandung is alive and that it is a force which cements Afro-Asian friendship and solidarity.

In the past few years there were people who shouted about the bankruptcy or even death of the Bandung spirit. The enemies of peace and progress are infuriated by its principles and ideas. They would have buried with pleasure the Bandung spirit and are working, as you know full well in this direction without shirking anything and without sparing any means.

But this is a useless effort.

As Nikita Khrushchov said at the 20th Congress of our party, the Bandung Conference reflected the "will of hundreds of millions of Eastern people". The spirit of Bandung cannot be buried just as the peoples' will for national freedom cannot be destroyed.

The ideas of Bandung are spreading to an ever bigger number of Afro-Asian peoples in Asia and Africa, where the overwhelming majority of mankind lives. The number of peoples gaining national independence is growing with every

day. Morocco, Tunisia, the Sudan, Malaya, Ghana, Guinea, the Cameroons and Togo received independence after the Bandung Conference. In 1960 this family will be joined by several new African states with a population of some 70,000,000.

The peoples of the countries of Asia, Africa and South America have learned from their own experience that struggle against colonialism does not end with the winning of state independence. This marks the beginning of a new stage of struggle for genuine political and economic independence.

Freedom, equality and well-being will not come by themselves. The people have a very correct saying: "You cannot get gold without digging". Aware of this, the peoples of these countries are stepping up with every day the struggle for doing away with the legacy of colonialism in (the political and especially economic spheres, in all its manifestations, old and new.

Today it is already clear that the days of the disgraceful colonial system are numbered. Through the efforts of the peoples of the East, of the Soviet Union and the other socialist states, of all the progressive peoples of the world, it will be ruled out forever from the life of humanity.

The fact that the Bandung Conference has pointed out as the principal task of all the Afro-Asian nations the struggle for the preservation and consolidation of world peace, for the peaceful co-existence of all nations irrespective of their social systems, is its historic merit. The struggle for peace is closely intertwined with the struggle for independence.

We rejoice at the fact that in questions of the struggle for peace, as well as in the questions of the struggle for independence, the peoples of Asia and Africa come out in one front with the peoples of the Soviet Union and the other socialist nations.

Together with us are many millions of ordinary people in Europe and America. The overwhelming majority of mankind is now for peace against war, and this is a huge, really

unconquerable force.

The recent visit of Nikita Khrushchov, Chairman of U.S.S.R Council of Ministers, to India, Burma, Indonesia and Afghanistan has again shown that friendship between the peoples of the

154

Soviet Union and the peoples of the East is growing and developing on the basis of the principles of peaceful co-existence and in conformity with the Bandung spirit, has confirmed their joint resolution to fight for the relaxation of international tension, for the consolidation of peace and the liquidation of the remnants of the disgraceful colonial system.

But neither should one underestimate the strength of the adversaries. Facts show that of late they have greatly stepped up their activities dangerous to the cause of peace. The forms these activities are taking are only too well known.

In these conditions the voice of those who stand for the principles of Bandung, for peace and broad international co-operation, for the earliest solution of the cardinal problem of our time—the disarmament problem—must re-sound still louder.

A characteristic feature of the situation today is the heightened international role of Asian and African nations. As early as 1919 the great Lenin pointed out that "the period of awakening of the Orient in the contemporary revolution is followed by a period of participation, of all the peoples of the Orient in deciding the destinies of all the world so that they should no longer be only a source of enrichment. - The peoples of the Orient are awakening to practical action so that each people should decide the question of the destiny of all mankind"; now his forecast is coming true.

Gentlemen, the solidarity of the countries of Asia and Africa and their friendship with the Soviet Union and other socialist nations have become a major factor in international life today. So long as the peoples of Asian and African countries were isolated in their struggle for independence they could be compared to numerous rivulets.

Now these rivulets have merged into a mighty river. It will be no exaggeration to say that the solution of cardinal problems which are agitating mankind today largely depends upon the strength of the unity of peace forces. It is our deep conviction that in the face of our growing unity the forces of war, the enemies of progress, are in for inevitable defeat.

Allow me to propose a toast to the further successful development of the independent nations of Asia and Africa, to the earliest and complete liberation of other countries from the yoke of colonialism.

Long live unity and solidarity of Asian and African peoples ! Long live unity of all peace loving forces ! Long live world peace !

INDONESIA INDIA RUSSIA USA MOROCCO SUDAN TUNISIA CAMEROON GHANA GUINEA
AFGHANISTAN BURMA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC

Date : Jun 01, 1960

Volume No

1995

UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS

President Prasad's Reply to Kremlin Reception

The President, Dr. Rajendra Prasad was entertained at a reception given in his honour by the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet in Moscow on June 30, 1960.

Replying to the reception, President Prasad said :

Your Excellencies, Chairman and members of the Supreme Soviet, Excellencies, respected guests and dear friends :

I am most grateful to His Excellency President Brezhnev for the very kind words which he has spoken about me and my country. I greatly

value them because I know that they come from genuine friends of my country. I have been for ten days in the Soviet Union and tomorrow I am leaving Moscow on my way back home. I am particularly happy that I shall have the opportunity of visiting two Asian members of the Soviet Union before I finally leave Soviet territory.

These have been ten memorable days and they have left an indelible impression on me. From the time I set foot on the Soviet soil I have been overwhelmed by the friendship and hospitality of the Soviet people and their government. The cheering and enthusiasm of the people, young and old, men and women, wherever I have during the last ten days, have reminded me of enthusiastic crowds in my country. I have been overwhelmed by this mass demonstration of friendship and cannot adequately express my thanks to the Soviet people. Excellencies, I came as a stranger to your country but you and your people have welcomed me as a dear friend and as I am about to leave, I feel sad. For, parting with a friend is always sad. I have said that the impressions on me during the last ten days have been overwhelming. I have visited old cathedrals, museums and art galleries. I have also seen a collective farm and your agricultural and industrial exhibitions in Moscow and in Kiev. I am powerfully impressed by the tremendous progress which you have made in every field. That you

155

have been able to achieve so much and within such a short time has a lesson for all of us in underdeveloped countries. Your collective farms and your huge industrial projects represent one aspect of Soviet progress in recent years ; the loving care with which you are protecting your past heritages, in your libraries, museums, art galleries and other cultural centres is an eloquent expression of your pride in the past history of your country. As I said in Leningrad, Soviet life and culture today represents a happy blending of the past and the present; of art and science.

You Excellencies, Chairman and Members of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet, your country and mine have come very close to each other in recent years. Many of our Ministers and leaders in other walks of life have been to the Soviet

Union. Our youngmen are receiving their training in your factories. Even today we have in Moscow a senior member of my Government, Shri. Morarji Desai. A few days ago our Minister of Oil and Mines was here discussing future development plans with the members of your government. We have received very substantial assistance from the Soviet Government during the past five years. This has enabled us to carry out and plan a number of Industrial and agricultural projects. I have read with much interest the details of your Seven-Year Plan. We in our country are at present engaged in working out the outline of our Third Five-Year Plan.

Compared with you we are still at early stages of the economic development of our country. We know that we have to rely on our own efforts for the progress of our country but I am happy to say that we have received very substantial assistance from a number of friendly countries in the execution of our first and second five-year plan. May I say that we are most grateful to the Soviet Government for the generous and unconditional assistance which you have given to us.

Bhilai stands as a monument of Indo-Soviet friendship and understanding but there are other projects in India also which have been made possible by Soviet assistance. I may be allowed to hope that such practical demonstration of Indo-Soviet friendship will continue in the years to come, Two days ago, I had the pleasure of planting a friendship tree in the public park at Sochi. I then, expressed the hope that the friendship between the Soviet Union and India would last for as many centuries as that tree would last for years. I wish to repeat this expression of hope this evening.

Your Excellencies, I have been for a very short period in this country and would not ordinarily lend myself to any general statement. I cannot, however, let this occasion pass without referring to one thing which has powerfully impressed me during the last ten days. I have watched crowds of working people enjoying their holiday at Sochi ; I have seen thousands of young men and women participating in a festival in Kiev. I feel convinced that the Soviet people under the wise leadership of His Excellency Mr. Khrushchov want nothing more than to live at peace and enjoy the fruits which economic and

material progress has brought them. Mr. Khrushchov is a firm believer in the policy of co-existence ; so are we in India. He does not believe that war is inevitable ; so do we not. This sharing of common ideals provides a bond between our two countries which, I am sure, will increase in the years to come. When, therefore, I heard large crowds at all the places I have visited saying Hindi Russi Bhai Bhai I reciprocated their feelings wholeheartedly. May I say again Russi Hindi Bhai Bhai.

Your Excellencies and dear friends, may I request you to join me in a toast to the Members of the Supreme Soviet, the Soviet people, friendship between India and the Soviet Union and to peace throughout the world.

USA RUSSIA UKRAINE CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC INDIA

Date : Jun 01, 1960

Volume No

1995

UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS

Speech by President Brezhnev

Speaking on the occasion President Brezhnev said:

Dear Mr. President,

Dear friends,

The stay of our distinguished and most esteemed guest His Excellency, the President of the Republic of India, Dr. Prasad is drawing to an end and we regret that this visit was so short.

Soviet people have the most warm and sincere feelings for the envoys of India because We understand and share the peaceful aspirations of the Indian people and their Government.

The great friendship between our peoples is cemented by the businesslike, mutually beneficial Soviet Indian co-operation, in the economic, scientific-technical and cultural fields. Our friendly relations are based upon the great Leninist principle of peaceful co-existence.

156

It is our firm conviction that even those countries whose governments still cling to the unrealistic "positions of strength" policy will recognize in the end that the only reasonable path is that of peaceful coexistence. It is the only path in the presentday conditions that leads to genuine progress. This is why the broad popular masses in all countries understand so well the Leninist idea of peaceful co-existence.

All honest people on earth are deeply incensed by the fact that the rulers of certain Western,-states cling so stubbornly to a policy long since-refuted by life and most resolutely opposed by the vast majority of states and peoples.

The policy "from positions of strength", the policy of brinkmanship, is suffering one setback after another, but some in the West fail to draw proper lessons from that.

It is high time for the Western ruling circles to understand that peace, peaceful coexistence, general and complete disarmament are the banners which have been firmly grasped by the peoples.

The Soviet Union has always deeply sympathized with the aspirations of peoples for peace. The Soviet Government has more than once proclaimed and is proving by concrete deeds that we want to live in peace and friendship with all peoples, that our most cherished goal is to relieve mankind of wars and to rule them out for ever from the life of human society.

Receiving here today our distinguished visitor, the President of the Republic of India, Dr. Rajendra Prasad, we note with satisfaction the great contribution made by the 400 million Indian people and their Government to the great movement of our time, the movement for world peace.

We are happy to realize that our great

friendly peoples always attain mutual understanding in the struggle for the preservation of peace.

We sincerely wish our friendship and co-operation, to continue to develop and gain in strength.

Here is a toast to the President of the Republic of India His Excellency Dr. Rajendra Prasad, to the prosperity of India, to the fraternal friendship between the Soviet and Indian peoples. Hindi-Russi Bhai, Bhai!

INDIA USA

Date : Jun 01, 1960

Volume No

1995

UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS

President Prasad's Address to Soviet-Indian Friendship Society

During his visit to the U.S.S.R. President, Dr. Rajendra Prasad was given a reception at a meeting held under the auspices of the Soviet-Indian friendship society in the Kremlin Palace in Moscow on June 30, 1960.

Replying to the reception President Prasad said :

Your Excellencies and Dear Friends,

I am very grateful to the citizens of Moscow, to the workers as well as to the intelligentsia, for having organized this meeting on the occasion of my visit to the Soviet Union. This striking manifestation of friendship towards my country and my people has touched me deeply. I shall not fail to convey your affectionate sentiments to my people when I return to India next week.

This meeting forms the climax of many demonstrations of friendship which I have witness-

ed wherever I went, from magnificent Leningrad in the North to sunny Sochi in the South. Wherever I went I found the people happy, bard-working, devoted to peace, inquisitive about India and enthusiastic about India and enthusiastic about Indo-Soviet friendship.

You have rightly called this gathering the Friendship Meeting between the USSR and India. Yet, 20 years ago -why, even 15 years ago-such a meeting would have been inconceivable. Then our two countries were almost strangers. Physically, the Himalayas were an insuperable obstacle. Politically, we had no relations with each other. Culturally, there were few contacts between us. And ideologically, we had gross misunderstanding about each other.

Yet, even during this period, our peoples had a certain attraction for each other. Though our knowledge of the Revolution of 1917 was limited, we felt that it was a mighty event which was bound to affect the course of humanity. In the same year, 1917, there appeared in India a great man who transformed the movement of freedom in India, from the concern of a few politically minded persons, to an upsurge of the masses. I need hardly say I am referring to the Father of our Nation, Mahatma Gandhi. In his bitter and protracted struggle against arrogant racial

157

domination in South Africa, Gandhiji had already forged those weapons of Satyagraha or soul force, and non-violent noncooperation, weapons with which India eventually won independence. It is pleasant to recall that in formulating his philosophy and planning out his campaign, Gandhiji was deeply influenced by a kindred spirit in Russia Leo Tolstoy who, too, deeply felt the inequity of racial and political domination in various parts of the world.

I have just said that there was not much contact between India and Russia before our country attained independence. Yet, the few contacts that there were, were invaluable. Jawaharlal Nehru was present at the 10th anniversary of the October Revolution and, on his return to India, he wrote a series of articles about his impressions of Russia which opened our people's eyes to the historic happenings here. Rabindranath Tagore, too, visited Russia and was most warmly received.

I am happy to learn that the centenary of the birth of Tagore is going to be worthily celebrated in the Soviet Union in 1961 and that, one of Tagore's play "Chitra", has just been produced as a ballet in Kubyshev. I understand that other Indian ballets and plays are under production in Moscow.

One of the first acts of the Government of India, after the attainment of independence, was to establish diplomatic relations with the USSR. During the first few years, however, the relations between our two countries were somewhat passive. But during the last six or seven years, there has been a great blossoming of Indo-Soviet friendship. This was a natural development and was bound to come about. Yet, if any two events accelerated this process, they were the visit of Jawaharlal Nehru to the Soviet Union in the summer of 1955 and of Mr. Khrushchev to India a few months later. Apart from the personal contacts, which were thus firmly established, these visits resulted in the deepening of the understanding and appreciation of each other's policies. The 20th Congress, which was held soon after these visits, declared that the peaceful co-existence of nations, following different social and political systems, was the first kernel of the Soviet policy. This historic declaration removed any misunderstandings that might have still lingered in people's minds. A few days ago, I noted with special pleasure, Mr. Khrushchov's recent reaffirmation to this policy, despite the dire events in the month of May.

On the foundation thus carefully laid down by our leaders, a fine super-structure of Indo-Soviet collaboration is growing up. I need only mention a few names-the Bhilai Metallurgical Plant, the Suratgarh State Farm, the Cambay Oil Project, the Barauni oil refinery and the Ranchi Machine Building plant-in order to show how beneficent and comprehensive this collaboration has been. I have no doubt that the Third Five-Year Plan, which eclipses its predecessors in range and magnitude, will provide greater opportunities for our two countries to cooperate with each other in great task of nation-building.

In building up our nation, we are also building up peace. To all sceptics and cynics to the Right and to the Left, the USSR and India have shown that two great countries, following different

traditions and holding different philosophy, can freely and happily cooperate, not only in promoting the people's welfare, but in promoting peace. May this friendship between India and the Soviet Union, which is as immovable as the Himalayas, and yet has overcome even the Himalayas, in their determination to get closer to each other, remain for ever as a beacon to the policy of not merely peaceful but fruitful co-existence. Let me conclude these remarks by echoing the cry which I heard wherever I went in the Soviet Union. "Long Live Peace throughout the World".

INDIA USA RUSSIA PERU SOUTH AFRICA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC

Date : Jun 01, 1960

Volume No

1995

UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS

Speech by President Brezhnev

Speaking on the occasion President Brezhnev said:

Dear comrades and friends,

Allow me on behalf of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR and the Soviet Government, on behalf of all representatives of Moscow public who are gathered here, to welcome cordially our distinguished visitor, the President of the Republic of India, Dr. Rajendra Prasad, also Mr. Jagjiwan Ram, Minister of Railways, Mr. S. Sutt, Foreign Secretary, and all other members of the President's party.

We are glad to meet again our dear Indian guests who have come to our country on a goodwill visit.

A traditional friendship which has roots going deep into ages binds the peoples of the Soviet Union and India. It was born in the old

times when our fellow countryman , Afanasy Nikitin went on an unparalleled voyage "beyond

158

three seas" and reached India. He not only discovered India for the Russian people, but in a way established a link between the hearts of the peoples of our countries for perpetual friendship.

Our peoples became even closer to each other when the heroic Soviet people accomplished the Great October Socialist Revolution. It shook the entire world and opened for the peoples of the Orient, including the Indian people, bright prospects of liberation from the colonial oppression which for centuries tormented their souls, doomed hundreds of millions, whole nations, to starvation and physical extermination, destroyed their ancient material culture.

One year after the Great October Socialist Revolution, here, in the ancient Kremlin, there took place the memorable meeting between the founder of our state Vladimir Ilyich Lenin and the first Indian delegation. The envoys of the Indian people warmly greeted the Soviet people and declared that they deeply believed that "our brothers in great, free Russia will extend a hand to us in the cause of the liberation of India and all the world".

Vladimir Ilyich Lenin, the best friend of the Oriental peoples, gave a warm welcome to the delegates of the great Indian people. He always regarded with great cordiality and sincere sympathy the talented and industrious people of India and foresaw the great role India must play on the international scene when she rids herself of the fetters of colonialism.

And these forecasts of Lenin came true. Contemporary India takes an active part in the struggle for the application of the principles of peaceful co-existence, for the maintenance and consolidation of world peace. India is one of the active parties to the drafting of the well-known "Pancha Shila" principles which were proclaimed by the historic Bandung conference on behalf of hundreds of millions of people in the East.

Soviet-Indian friendship and co-operation have been greatly flourishing in recent years. A vivid manifestation of the friendly sentiments and

fraternal relations between the Soviet and Indian peoples were the historic visits to the Soviet Union of Mr. Jawaharlal Nehru, the Prime Minister of India, and the visit to India of Comrade Nikita Sergeyevich Khrushchov, the head of the Soviet Government. The Soviet and the Indian peoples gave a warm, very hearty welcome to the heads of government of the friendly countries.

The identity of views in strengthening peace and friendship between the peoples is the main foundation of the successfully developing Soviet-Indian friendship. This friendship has become a worthy example of relations between states and plays a great role in international affairs.

In the years of our friendship the Indian people, public figures and statesmen of India have had the opportunity of seeing that the Soviet Union sincerely strives for peace, and, in practice, carries through a policy of friendly relations with all states.

All progressive mankind, all the working people, now recognize that the Soviet Union is the strongest mainstay, the true champion of freedom progress and world peace. And the name of the head of our Government, the tireless champion of peace, Nikita Sergeyevich Khrushchov, has become most popular and dear to all peoples of the world.

We are rightly proud of this. The fact that the policy and the practical actions of the Soviet Government and its head are highly appreciated by the majority of the world's population, is the best evidence showing that this policy is the only right and reasonable one in present-day conditions.

As for the present policy of some Western powers, facts show that it is not approved by the peoples, which has been strikingly demonstrated by the recent events in South Korea, Turkey and Japan. And there is nothing accidental about this.

The present reactionary policy of the United States was begotten and adopted as national policy by the late John Foster Dulles. This policy is based on the arms race on the aggravation of the situation and fomenting of conflicts. But the bad seeds, sown by Dulles, could not yield good crop. Popular wisdom rightly says: "Do not expect a good crop from bad seeds".

Speaking of the universal recognition and support of our peaceable foreign policy, one cannot ignore that reactionary circles in the West seek to persuade public opinion that the USSR has allegedly retreated from its policy of peaceful co-existence, of late. In doing so they refer to the vigorous actions taken by the Soviet Government in connection with the exposure of the provocative, aggressive flights by United States planes over Soviet territory and the statement made by Nikita Khrushchov, the head of our Government, on the futile activity of the 10-Nation Committee.

In vain do the imperialists expect that the

159

Soviet Government and people will tolerate and calmly overlook their aggressive actions, provocations and deceit of the people. This has never happened and never will happen.

We shall continue tirelessly to explain our peaceable policy and to do our utmost for the triumph of peace on earth. But our foes must know that there is a limit to everything. We shall never tolerate attempts at trampling upon our freedom and independence, our sovereignty, we shall not tolerate aggressive actions and provocations. In the name of peace we shall resolutely expose the advocates of "cold" and "hot" war, and if necessary we shall give a crushing rebuff to any aggressor who would dare to attack our country.

Resolutely exposing the aggressive actions of the imperialist circles, the Soviet Government is consistently and persistently fighting for the consolidation of peace and for the relaxation of international tension. Another striking manifestation of our Leninist peaceable policy has been the programme of general and complete disarmament submitted to the United Nations by Nikita Sergeyevich Khrushchov, the head of the Soviet Government, and the recent proposals by the Government of USSR on the basic provisions of a treaty of general and complete disarmament.

We made these proposals not because the Soviet Union is unable to put up a sound defence and render an aggressor harmless. It is common knowledge that our country has a universally

recognized superiority in the most up-to-date nuclear weapons and also effective means of delivering these weapons. Nevertheless we propose that all means of delivering atomic and hydrogen weapons should be destroyed already in the first stage of disarmament with the simultaneous liquidation of military bases on foreign territories and the withdrawal of foreign troops from such territories. Our plan envisages that all disarmament measures, from start to finish, should be effected under strict international control.

However, the United States and other Western powers which took part in the work of the 10-Nation Committee in fact side-stepped the discussion of any practical disarmament measures, despite the fact that on a whole number of important questions the Soviet Union took their position into account. The Western powers were plainly trying to use the Soviet Union's participation in this body as a screen for the arms race. In these conditions the Soviet Union hid to suspend its participation in the work of the 10-Nation Committee and take the question of disarmament and of implementing the resolution of the United Nations General Assembly on universal and complete disarmament to the next session of the General Assembly.

The efforts of the Soviet Government to solve the disarmament problem have the unanimous support of all the peoples of the world. This is quite natural.

The overwhelming majority of the peoples distinctly realise that modern war can destroy millions of human beings and bring an unheard-of catastrophe upon humanity. With the present arms race and "cold war" policy this is a real danger.

To avert it, to prevent the destruction of everything created through thousands of years by the labour of millions, there is only one path to assert the principle of peaceful coexistence in relations between states and to destroy all means of warfare. Taking a sober view of contemporary conditions, there is no alternative to this path. And war calls are not a sign of reason but a sign of madness.

The Communist Party and the Soviet Govern-

ment consider that now that there has come into being, is growing and gaining strength a powerful camp of socialist states which has the support of peace-loving countries of all continents and of the vast majority of mankind, the great goal of which many human generations had dreamed has for the first time become a practical possibility. This goal is to put an end to wars, to exclude wars in general from the life of human society and to put relations among states on the basis of the principles of peaceful co-existence.

This realistic, noble policy which meets the aspirations of all peoples is now supported by the majority of mankind. Try as the imperialists may to ignore this indomitable will of the people, sooner or later it will triumph. As the Indian saying goes : "The cock may not crow, but the dawn will come".

On the question of disarmament-the main question of our time-we have the sympathy and support of the 400 million peace-loving Indian people.

I should like to recall the words you said, Mr. President, last January during the visit to India of Soviet statesmen Comrades K. E. Voroshilov, F. R. Kozlov and E. A. Furtseva. You said then : "We noted with admiration the

160

recent efforts of your Government to stabilise and strengthen peace, to dispel the fog of the cold war', and your initiative in the cause of disarmament of states. Your country indeed has given proof of its sincerity in this matter".

This statement of yours, Mr. President, has been a source of great satisfaction to us.

Now, more than ever, we must be vigilant, strengthen the friendship, unity and cohesion of the countries of the socialist camp and of all peace-loving states in order to prevent a new war. Recent events have shown that certain quarters in the United States by their reckless actions gravely endanger the security of peoples. They have torpedoed the meeting of the heads of government of the four great powers on which the peoples of all the world placed great hopes, deadlocked the work of the 10-Nation Committee. They are doing everything in their power to in-

crease tension in international relations, to bring nations back to the "cold war" at its worst.

It is a gratifying fact to us that the people and the Government of India just as the vast majority of world opinion have assessed the actions of these quarters for what they are worth. Sober-minded people in India realise well that the efforts of the aggressive forces to aggravate the international situation are edged not only against the socialist states but also against the states of Asia, Africa and Latin America which are defending their national independence and fighting for complete liberation from colonial slavery.

It is self-evident that colonialists need the "cold war" atmosphere to undermine the independence of these countries, to impose their will and their "leadership" upon countries which have recently embarked upon the path of independent development, whereas the elimination of international tension ties the colonialists' hands and ensures most favourable conditions for the consolidation of the national independence of these countries.

The Soviet Union treats with respect the policy of neutralism and non-participation in aggressive blocs followed by India and other countries of South-East Asia. For these countries neutralism is a means to preserve their independence and sovereignty, to ensure their security, to develop their national economy and culture. Soviet people are gratified by the fact that all attempts of SEATO and those whom this aggressive bloc serves to move the countries of South-East Asia from neutralist positions have failed.

Although reactionary imperialist circles of the West do not abandon their efforts to fan up the "cold war", we nevertheless take an optimistic view on the prospects for the development of the international situation. Our confidence is based on the fact that events have taken place in the world which have radically changed the correlation and the balance of forces. Now the camp of socialism and of other peace-loving countries encompasses more than a half of mankind.

The authority and role of the independent nations of Asia, Africa, and Latin America have grown substantially in the solution of important

international questions. In connection with this the Soviet Union comes out for the invitation of the leaders of such great countries as the People's Republic of China, India, Indonesia and others to the summit meeting.

As to the Soviet Union, it will continue doing everything to improve the international climate. We regard our successes in the economic, scientific and technical spheres as an important contribution to the common cause of the peoples' struggle for peace. And you know that the successes of the Soviet Union are not trifling.

Our country is now living through a great upswing. Matters are very good with us, and they will be even better in the future. We all are particularly pleased by the successes scored in the fulfilment of the seven-year programme for the Soviet Union's economic and cultural development.

The Soviet people, like giants, are advancing by leaps and bounds. Our rapid rates of development help us to solve successfully the tasks of building a communist society and to win in the peaceful economic competition with capitalism. We prefer to compete with the capitalist countries not in the production of the means of war, but in the creation of ever greater boons for the people, in the guaranteeing of their tranquil and peaceful life.

By the way, the Vice-President of the United States Nixon, who is aspiring for Presidency, said the other day that the Soviet economy would not outstrip the United States economy ever in the current century.

Well, such statements are nothing new for us. Mr. Nixon's forecasts are not original in the least. They were borrowed, obviously, from the arsenal of the bourgeois yellow press. It was this press that once cried that the "Bolsheviks would not hold out more than a year", that our programme

161
for the country's electrification and industrialisation, our Five-Year Plans, are a "utopia", a "speculation", and are "doomed to failure".

In general, they told various cock-and-bull stories. In the meantime the Soviet Union

through the heroic efforts of her people, outstripped all the capitalist countries of Europe and is already treading on the heels of the United States.

It is not because things are good there that Nixon is trying to deceive the American public.

The facts convincingly refute Mr. Nixon. They show that the rates of the Soviet Union's economic development have always been several times higher than in the United States. It is common knowledge, for instance, that during the past six years, the ratio between the rates of Soviet and American industrial development was five to one in favour of the USSR. And nothing at all indicates that in future it might improve somewhat for the United States.

Esteemed Mr. President,

Dear friends,

An important factor in modern social development is co-operation between the countries and peoples not only in the political, but in the economic, cultural and other spheres too. This is imperatively required, as Vladimir Ilyich Lenin said, by the "world's general economic relations". The development of economic and cultural contacts and co-operation among nations is a solid foundation, a correct road to the consolidation of world peace.

Co-operation in the economic and cultural spheres between the Soviet Union and India is, to our mind, developing favourably to mutual benefit.

The Soviet Union is rendering aid to the Indian people in the development of their national economy.

We, Soviet people, believe it is our duty to render aid to peoples whose economic and cultural development was hampered artificially for many decades by the predatory colonialist policy. This aid not only promotes the well-being of the peoples of these countries, but also serves the cause of consolidating world peace. We shall continue, as Nikita Khrushchov said at the The Congress of the Rumanian Workers' Party, to render aid to the peoples which have already gained political

independence but are still in economic dependence. go that they should grow stronger and be in a position to conduct firmly a policy in the interests of peace.

We are pleased by the Indian people's high appreciation of the disinterested Soviet assistance in consolidating India's economic independence. The Indian people expressed their appreciation to the Soviet people by regarding the Dhillai Steel Plant, built with Soviet assistance, as a symbol of the unbreakable fraternal friendship between our countries.

The new industrial enterprises, such as the heavy machine building works in Ranchi, the factory manufacturing mining equipment in Durgapur, the oil refinery in Barauni, and the Neyveli thermal power station, which are rising with Soviet assistance, will enable India to manufacture her own equipment for large industrial enterprises, will do away with the necessity of importing costly equipment and, naturally, will speed up India's economic independence.

Recently the USSR and India signed another very important economic agreement.

Under this agreement the Soviet Union will render India all possible assistance in setting up a new and vital branch of her economy--the oil and gas industry.

Our assistance to India is disinterested. It has no political strings attached which might affect the sovereignty of the Indian state or infringe her economic or political interests.

The Soviet Union takes an exceptionally great interest in the ancient but always young culture of India. This interest in India has been displayed in our country since old times. Such outstanding Russian cultural figures as Novikov, Radishchev, Karamzin, Lebedev and others devoted much of their creative endeavour to India and her people. It is well-known that as early as 1859 Dobrolyubov, the Russian revolutionary democrat, welcomed the Indian people's uprising against the foreign enslavers at that time. Leo Tolstoy maintained friendly contacts with Gandhi for Ninny years.

The Soviet people's interest in the original,

talented works of Indian writers is borne out by the fact that in Soviet times books by Indian authors reached a total impression of 12,500,000 copies in the USSR. Performances of Indian artistes and exhibitions of Indian representative arts are very popular in the Soviet Union.

162

The Indian people reciprocated by their great respect for and interest in the culture and science of the Soviet peoples. This has been illustrated, for instance, by the big success of the exhibition of Soviet painting which opened in Delhi on June 14. Soviet artists, actors, pianists always have great success in India.

The agreement on cultural, scientific and technical co-operation signed between our two countries early this year will play a great role in the further development of Indo-Soviet cultural relations.

Soviet people are firmly convinced that inasmuch as our friendly relations rest on the granite foundation of the immutable principles of peaceful co-existence and good neighbourliness, there is great scope for the further development of political, economic and cultural co-operation between the Soviet Union and India to the benefit of our peoples. Unquestionably the friendship between our great peoples will continue to develop and gain in strength successfully, heartening all friends of peace and progress.

The Soviet and Indian people will continue to march forward shoulder to shoulder in the struggle for peace, for the security of peoples, for the triumph of the principles of peaceful co-existence.

Long live the unbreakable fraternal friendship of the peoples of the Soviet Union and India
Long live world peace !

USA RUSSIA INDIA INDONESIA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC KOREA TURKEY JAPAN CHINA
PERU

Date : Jun 01, 1960

Volume No

1995

UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS

Indo-Soviet Agreement on Oil Exploration Signed

An Indo-Soviet agreement for technical collaboration in exploration, development and production of oil and gas was signed in New Delhi on June 16, 1960.

Shri K.K. Sahni, Joint Secretary, Department of Mines and Fuel, signed on behalf of the Government of India, and Mr. V. Sergeev, Counsellor for Economic Affairs in the Soviet Embassy, New Delhi on behalf of the Government of the U.S.S.R.

The present agreement covers the utilisation of 277 million roubles (Rs. 33 crores) allocated to oil exploration, out of the 1500 million roubles (Rs. 180 crores) Soviet credit to India for the Third Five-Year Plan.

The credit was extended to India under an agreement signed between the two Governments on-September 12, 1959.

An additional agreement was signed on February 12, 1960 determining the list of enterprises as well as the nature and volume of technical assistance required for the enterprises to be financed by the credit.

The agreement executed today is for the purpose of implementing the additional agreement.

The Government of India have nominated the Oil and Natural Gas Commission as the Indian party for implementation of the agreement. The agency nominated by the U.S.S.R. Government is the Technoexport, Moscow.

INDIA USA RUSSIA

Date : Jun 01, 1960

Volume No

1995

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Agreement on Establishment of Indian Investment Centre Signed

The Governments of India and the United States signed an agreement in New Delhi on June 20, 1960 for establishing the Indian Investment Centre cum institution that will play an important new role in Indian economic development.

Assistance valued at about Rs. 59,10,000 will be made available to the Centre through the U.S.-Technical Cooperation Mission (TCM) as a result of the agreement. Of the total, \$ 713,000 (Rs. 34 lakhs) comes from TCM to cover foreign exchange costs while local costs of Rs. 25 lakhs will be covered by rupees derived from sale proceeds of U.S. Agricultural Commodities supplied to India.

Participating in the signing were Mr N.C. Sen Gupta, Joint Secretary of the Finance Ministry, and Mr. C. Tlyer Wood, Minister for Economic Affairs of the American Embassy and Director of T.C.M.

This marks the initial effort by TCM to aid such an institution. The decision by the two Governments to enter into the agreement was

163 prompted by the success of similar investment centres in other countries, notably in the Netherlands.

The Centre will help create an interest in India by foreign investors and provide a medium through which Indian and foreign businessmen can cooperate in joint efforts.

The Centre, whose headquarters will be in New Delhi, will be of particular advantage to small and midium businesses which are unable to devote extensive time and funds to the investigation of prospects for foreign cooperation.

The purpose of the Centre is to promote the flow of foreign private investment capital into India in a manner most helpful to the Indian economy and the objectives of the Plan. It will provide the technical facilities required for capital sources preparing prospectuses and assisting negotiations.

To Investment Centre will provide :

1. data on : production, trade, markets, labour, resources etc;
2. information on the economic, financial and industrial policies of the Government;
3. source material on Indian industrial and banking institutions, laws and; regulations bearing on foreign investment;
4. surveys of foreign investment possibilities;
5. advice to Indian businessmen on attracting foreign capital;
6. assistance to potential foreign investors interested in investment in India;

and perform other allied functions.

The Centre will be a non-profit. registered society. It will have a Board of Directors with a Chairman.

The TCM aid will cover salaries for the services of five foreign technicians and short-term experts, costs for the purchase outside India of various equipment and the establishment of a Reference Library.

164

USA INDIA

Date : Jun 01, 1960

July

Volume No

1995

Content

Foreign Affairs Record 1960
Volume VI JULY No. 7

CONTENTS

PAGE

UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS

 President Prasad's Farewell Speech from Moscow
165
 President Prasad's Dinner Speech at Stalinabad
165
 President Prasad's Reply to Uzbek Reception
166
 President Prasad's Farewell Speech from Tashkent
167
 President Prasad's Impressions of his visit to Soviet Union
168
 President Prasad's Farewell Messages to Soviet Leaders
169
 Indo-Soviet Oil Agreement Signed
169

UNITED KINGDOM

 Agreement on Import of Films Signed
169

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

 Import of U. S. Films
170
 P. L. 480 Agreement Signed
170

MINISTRY OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS : EXTERNAL PUBLICITY DIVISION
GOVERNMENT OF INDIA

RUSSIA UZBEKISTAN USA INDIA

Date : Jul 01, 1960

Volume No

1995

UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS

President Prasad's Farewell Speech from Moscow

The President, Dr. Rajendra Prasad, who visited the U.S.S.R. from June 20 to July 5, 1960, made the following speech at the time of his departure for Stalinabad from Moscow on July 1, 1960:

I would like to thank your Government, your leaders and your people for the very friendly and gracious welcome which we have been given everywhere during our visit to your great country. I had read a great deal about the progress which you have made in industry, agriculture, technology and science ; I had heard much from your distinguished leaders whom we had the pleasure of welcoming in India. I have now been able to see for myself the striking progress which you have made and the even greater achievements which the future promises.

I have also seen the friendliness of your people and I have been touched by the warmth of their welcome wherever I have been-from Moscow and Leningrad to Kiev and Sochi. This is a friendliness that the people of your country have in common with the people of India, who have welcomed your great leaders, Mr. Khrushchev, Mr. Voroshilov and others, with equal sincerity and goodwill during their visits to our country.

There is need today for fostering this spirit of goodwill and friendliness among' peoples everywhere. It is imperative that humanity's march forward should not be arrested by the devastation of modern nuclear war. It is in this respect that great powers, such as the U.S.S.R., carry a heavy responsibility on their shoulders to ensure that science continues to enrich humanity and not destroy it.

In bidding you all farewell today, I would like to convey to you the sincere good wishes of our people, wishing you prosperity, happiness and -above all-peace.

RUSSIA USA INDIA UKRAINE CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC

Date : Jul 01, 1960

Volume No

1995

UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS

President Prasad's Dinner Speech at Stalinabad

During his visit to Stalinabad President Prasad was given a dinner by the President of the Supreme Soviet of Tajikistan, Mr. Abduvakhid Khasanov on July 2, 1960. Speaking on the occasion Dr. Prasad said :

Your Excellencies and Dear Friends,

I am very grateful to you for the warm reception which you have given me. I appreciate this particularly as Tajikistan is our nearest neighbour. A visit to Tajikistan was long overdue. We have had the pleasure of receiving some of the distinguished leaders of Tajikistan in India, whom I am glad to see here today and with whom I am happy to renew my acquaintance. No Indian leader, however, has, so far been able to visit Tajikistan. My Prime Minister Jawaharlal Nehru, had the good fortune to visit Uzbekistan and to have glimpses of Kazakistan and Turkministan, but unfortunately he was not able to come to Tajikistan. Our Vice-President visited Kazakistan. but was unable to come here. I am glad that it has fallen to me to fulfil this neglected duty.

Even the few hours during which I have been here, I have been realising how great is the affinity between India and Tajikistan. Last night I saw a beautiful picture of Tajikistan. When I was seeing the film, I wondered whether I was

really in Tajikistan or whether I was in our own Kashmir. The great mountains, covered with snow, the deep ravines, the fine meadows, the fruits, the flowers and the nets-all reminded me of parts of our own country.

What has impressed me is not only the beauty of your Republic but the progress which it has made during the last few decades. This progress is the more astonishing when one remembers how backward all this area used to be before the Revolution. I note that in Tajikistan you are developing industries which are particularly suitable for this region. My visit to collective farm this afternoon was an eye-opener to the progress you have made in agriculture. Culturally, too, you have not lagged behind other Republics in Central Asia and you can hold your own even with the Republics in Western Russia. The progress which you have achieved has a lesson for India, though our tradition, philosophy and social system do not exactly correspond to yours.

Another feature which has impressed me greatly is the equality of your multi-national State. I note that different races inhabit this

165

Republic and yet there is perfect harmony between them.

When I go back to India, I shall tell my Government and my people of the great progress which has been achieved by, what one may almost call, our sister Republic, Tajikistan ; the inter-racial brotherhood that prevails among the people here ; and the devotion to peace which your people share with all the other peoples the Soviet Union and with my own people. I shall also tell them of the kindness and hospitality which you lavished on a complete stranger like myself. I know that this consideration has been extended not to me personally, but to the people whom I have the honour to represent, Let me thank you once more for all this and say, Salaam Alekum!

TAJKISTAN INDIA UZBEKISTAN USA RUSSIA

Date : Jul 01, 1960

Volume No

1995

UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS

President Prasad's Reply to Uzbek Reception

The President, Dr. Rajendra Prasad who visited the U.S.S.R., from June 20 to July 5, 1960 was given a reception by the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the Uzbek SSR at Tashkent on July 4, 1960.

Replying to the reception President Prasad said :

Your Excellencies and Dear Friends,

I am grateful to the Chairman of the Supreme Soviet of the Uzbekistan Republic for the very kind sentiments which she has expressed, I am also grateful for the warm friendship and hospitality which you have extended to me.

During the last two weeks, I have travelled much in the Soviet Union. Wherever I went, I met with overwhelming kindness on the part of all sections of people. I have formed a number of impressions which I must sort out at leisure. The foremost amongst my impressions is the grandeur of the progress which the Soviet Union has made in so short a span as four decades. This progress has been the more remarkable in the Central Asian Republics because of their conditions forty years ago. Yesterday I came away from Stalinabad, a fine modern city, which, I was told, was just a little village, with a single street lamp, alit with kerosene oil, before the Revolution. Tashkent and Samarkand, too, have grown out of recognition. It would not be too much to say that many parts of Central Asia have, during the last forty years, leapt from the medieval, or even the primitive, age to the modern period.

This transformation of Soviet Central Asia has a special significance for countries which are still underdeveloped. Our Government realises

that they cannot wait for the slow and gradual disappearance of such evils as 'poverty, illiteracy, ignorance and disease. These require radical treatment. I recall with pleasure the very substantial assistance which we have received from the Soviet Government in the development of our economy. In many vital sectors, such as steel, oil, machine-building and pharmaceuticals, India has had the benefit of the advice and assistance of the Soviet experts ; and Indian and Soviet technicians have been working together in close co-operation and collaboration. The range and scale of such co-operation will be far greater in our next Five Year Plan, which will be decisive for India's future ; and I have no doubt that the Soviet Government will extend its sympathy and help in ample measure to the execution of this Plan.

Yesterday I had the pleasure of visiting a city which always had a certain fascination for me, Samarkand. There, as elsewhere in the Soviet Union, I noticed with what reverent care you have been renovating ancient buildings, excavating old ruins and preserving your cultural heritage. Between India and Uzbekistan, there have been contacts of various kinds from time immemorial. There are ample historical proofs available that with the spread of Buddhism in Central India, Indian ideas and Indian culture spread into these regions also. Through the route of Kashmir and Kandhar the philosophy of India travelled through Central Asia right up to Siberia. This period of history is still the subject of investigation and research by scholars. I was interested to learn that within Uzbekistan recent excavations have discovered not only a whole Buddhist temple but also a golden image of the Buddha in it.

A relationship of a different type was established when Babar came to India from Ferghana, not far from Samarkand. It was one of his descendants Shah Jahan who built the Taj and gave to India an imperishable work of art. Now, our relations with Uzbekistan and, indeed, with the entire Soviet Union, have entered a new phase. There have been exchanges of visits between your leaders, artistes, singers, dancers and writers, and ours. All this has increased the mutual esteem which we feel for each other and our common desire for peace. Wherever I travelled in the Soviet Union, I noticed the people's horror

166

of war and yearning for peace. I also noticed how faithfully your Government and, in particular Mr. Khrushchev, whom we had the honour of welcoming to India twice, reflect and implement the peace-loving sentiments of the Soviet people. Mr. Khrushchev has been as untiring in his quest for peace as my own Prime Minister, Jawaharlal Nehru. Let us hope and pray that their efforts and the efforts of all men of peace may, sooner or later-sooner rather than later-be crowned with success.

I now propose a toast to the health of our gracious hostess, the Chairman of the Supreme Soviet of the Republic of Uzbekistan, to the further progress and prosperity of the people of the Soviet Union and to the ever-lasting friendship between our two countries.

USA UZBEKISTAN INDIA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC GHANA

Date : Jul 01, 1960

Volume No

1995

UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS

President Prasad's Farewell Speech from Tashkent

On the conclusion of his 15-day visit to the Soviet Union the President, Dr. Rajendra Prasad made the following speech at the time of his departure for India from Tashkent on July 5, 1960 :

Your Excellencies and Dear Friends,

Within a few minutes from now I shall be leaving the Soviet soil. I am happy that I was able to come to your country. My only regret is that I could not stay with you longer. Nevertheless, I go back to India richer in experience and with a clearer appreciation of the great tasks on which the Soviet people are engaged and of

your achievements. During the past fortnight I was touched by your repeated expressions of friendship for my country and by the warm welcome which you have accorded to me and the members of my party. Wherever we have been, whether it is in the capital of your country, Moscow, Leningrad, Kiev, Sochi, Stalinabad, Samarkand or Tashkent, your people have received me as one of their own. I shall carry back to my country the story of this great welcome and demonstration of friendship for India. I feel sure that they will be happy to hear of it.

I have been, to several parts of the Soviet Union. I wish to refer in particular to my visit to Tajikistan and Uzbekistan. I have seen with wonder and admiration your efforts to fuse into one community peoples with different social, historical and ethnic backgrounds. At the same time, you are sparing no efforts to preserve what is good and distinctive in the art and culture of the different nationalities. I have also listened with much attention and interest to the accounts given to me of the education in the Asian Republics in more than one language. I am sure we can profit by your practical solution of a problem similar to one which faces us in India.

During my short stay in your country, I have had an opportunity of studying the details of your current Seven Year Plan and of knowing of the success which you have achieved so far. We in India started Planned development of our country barely 10 years ago and our thoughts are now primarily engaged on working out our Third Five Year Plan. During the last 10 years we have had substantial assistance from friendly countries in the financing of our development plans. We have welcomed such assistance because we know that they are without any political or other strings. I take this occasion to express our gratitude to the Soviet Government for the very substantial assistance amounting to nearly 2.7 billion roubles, which we have received from them. I hope we can count on your continued co-operation and assistance during the Third Plan period.

As I have said more than once during the last fortnight at different places in your country, we in India greatly value the co-operation between your country and ours. The Government and the people of India believe that co-operation is possible between countries with different social and ideo-

logical backgrounds. Our experience in our relations with your country is eloquent proof of this. Your leader, Nikita Sergevich Khrushchev, declared at the 20th Party Congress that in the present circumstances war was not inevitable and that peaceful co-existence was an absolute necessity. He has affirmed this repeatedly since then the latest being the occasion of the congress of Rumanian Workers' Party at Bucharest a few days ago. We wholeheartedly echo these sentiments. No sane person in the world should want anything but peace. I have no doubt that with patience and perseverance it should be possible to remove the barriers of suspicion and misunderstanding which divide some countries of the world from others today. The Indian people will always be on the side of those who are working for peace. We shall, therefore, support the efforts of your great leader Mr. Khrushchev, in reducing tensions and promoting peace.

Your Excellencies and dear friends-I thank you again. Long live friendship between the Soviet people and the people of India.

167

UZBEKISTAN USA INDIA RUSSIA UKRAINE CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC TAJIKISTAN ROMANIA

Date : Jul 01, 1960

Volume No

1995

UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS

President Prasad's Impressions of his visit to Soviet Union

President Rajendra Prasad gave the following impressions of his visit to the Soviet Union to the All India Radio Correspondent at Tashkent on July 5, 1960:

About fifteen days ago when I stepped on Russian soil, I had great enthusiasm to meet new people and make their acquaintance and also

an eagerness to see new things. The moment I landed in Moscow, the cool breeze of the Soviet capital welcomed me and gave me a new message of friendship. All that I saw there made a great impression on me. Big and magnificent buildings, wide roads and the enthusiasm of the Soviet people-all these were inspiring to me.

When I reached Leningrad, I found the thoughts of Lenin pervading the very atmosphere of the place. The whole city was filled with the echo of the revolution which Lenin had brought about. When I saw the place where in 1917 Lenin had raised the banner of revolution and given a new message to his country, I was reminded of our own country's revolution and the days of 1917. The Father of the Nation, Mahatma Gandhi, had begun the freedom movement in 1917 itself. I was reminded of the fact that Gandhiji's basic principles were wedded to truth and non-violence. In Russia also today the people in their own way are seeking and striving for disarmament and world peace.

From Leningrad when I arrived in Kiev, the history of a full epoch Bashed before my eyes. I was greatly inspired to see the people engaged in their country's reconstruction programme and children blooming like flowers. When I saw thousands of men and women swimming in the, Dneiper river, I was at once reminded of the scenes in our own country when people gather for a holy bath at the time of fairs and festivals. Leningrad and Kiev of today leave hardly any scope for imagining that these places had once been battlefields and to a great extent destroyed. I also saw a kolhoz (collective farm). This is situated at a place where battles had been fought. But today, there are green fields.

After visiting Leningrad and Kiev and seeing their reconstruction, I went to Sochi, the new mountain city and a famous health resort. I was greatly impressed by the arrangements which had been made there for providing rest to the general people. Here the sulphur springs have been very well utilised. I also saw how the people are given treatment by taking bath in these springs.

After completing my visit to these four cities, I also saw Stalinabad, Samarkand and Tashkent. The natural warmth of these cities

was matched by the love and affection of the people.

It is unnecessary to emphasise that whatever I saw there was grand. Stalinabad is a new city which has developed from a small village into a big town. Big factories and buildings are being constructed here.

Samarkand is a big historical city. Here I saw ancient buildings and observatories connected with the life and days of Timurlaine and his grandson Ulukbaig who was a great astrologer.

In Tashkent the capital of Uzbekistan, the old can be seen changing into new. What is most significant is that adequate arrangements are being made to repair and protect ancient monuments.

It was surprising to find that in these Central Asian Republics of the Soviet Union, the Arabic script was used in olden times or there was no script at all. Now in all these places the Russian script has been introduced, and through their different languages people are learning technical scientific and other subjects. Where text books were not available in the regional language, they have been translated from Russian or other foreign languages. All this has been done in the last few years.

Two things were to be seen prominently in all places in the Soviet Union. The first was that machinery was used for all types of work whether in industry or agriculture. The second was that adequate arrangements had been made to protect and preserve all that was historically important, both in monuments and men.

The people of Soviet Union, whether men or women, are all industrious and to the extent I could see they are healthy and prosperous. Specially I saw women working in all fields. Many other jobs, such as driving of trains motors and buses, which are done only by men in our country, are carried out by women in the Soviet Union. Children's education is, of course looked after by women. We could learn good many things from that country while having our own system and an independent personality. During the course of my visit wherever I went in the Soviet Union, I found people devoted to their

168

work and engaged in reconstruction with great zeal and mutual affection. They had a very keen desire for world peace. I also found them very friendly towards India. I received their best wishes at all the places and I am carrying these for my own countrymen.

UZBEKISTAN INDIA RUSSIA USA UKRAINE UNITED KINGDOM CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC

Date : Jul 01, 1960

Volume No

1995

UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS

President Prasad's Farewell Messages to Soviet Leaders

The President, Dr. Rajendra Prasad sent from the plane on July 5, 1960 the following messages to His Excellency Mr. Brezhnev, Chairman of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the U.S.S.R., and His Excellency Mr. N. Khrushchev, Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the U.S.S.R.

Message to President Brezhnev :

Departing from this friendly country I wish to convey to you and to your colleagues my sincere thanks for the hearty welcome and warm hospitality which the Soviet people have extended to me and the other members of my party during our visit to your great country. I am fortunate in having had this opportunity of seeing your country and learning at first hand the tremendous progress you have made in every field. I feel sure that this visit of mine will strengthen still more the friendly ties between our two countries. I wish happiness and prosperity to the Soviet people.

Message to Prime Minister Khrushchev:

I have just left Tashkent on my way home

after having spent a memorable fortnight in your country. I wish to thank you most warmly for the hearty welcome which you and your people gave me wherever I went in the Soviet Union.. I have now a clearer appreciation of your aims and ideals and of your achievements, and I wish you success in your efforts and your people happiness and prosperity.

USA UZBEKISTAN

Date : Jul 01, 1960

Volume No

1995

UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS

Indo-Soviet Oil Agreement Signed

An agreement for the import of kerosene and other petroleum products from the U.S.S.R. was signed in New Delhi on July 15, 1960. Shri B. Arora, Managing Director, signed on behalf of the Indian Oil Company and Messrs. S. G. Nikolaev and G. I. Sakulin on behalf of "Sojuznefteexport", the Soviet Oil Export Organisation.

The Indian Oil Company, wholly owned by the Government of India, has been set up to enter the distribution and marketing of petroleum products in India.

The payment for the supplies under this contract shall be in rupees, the contract being covered by the Indo-Soviet Trade Agreement. The initial period of the contract is four years and the quantities to be imported will increase from year to year.

Due to rapidly increasing consumption of kerosene and diesel oil, it is estimated that the total quantities to be imported for the country's requirements will hardly be reduced by the time the two new refineries

in the public sector come on stream. The supplies under the present contract are expected to meet an increasing proportion of that deficit.

USA INDIA

Date : Jul 01, 1960

Volume No

1995

UNITED KINGDOM

Agreement on Import of Films Signed

An agreement for import of films was signed in New Delhi on July 26, 1960 between the Governments of India and the United Kingdom. Shri K. R. F. Khilnani, Joint Secretary, Ministry of Commerce and Industry, signed on behalf of the Government of India, while Mr. A. Greaves, Joint Managing Director, Rank Film Distributors of India (Private) Limited, signed on behalf of the Rank Films of U. K. The agreement will remain in force for a period of two years.

The agreement provides for the utilisation, inter alia, of the earnings from U. K. films in India for rental or purchase of Indian films for export to non-traditional markets and for production of films in India in collaboration with

169

Indian producers or otherwise.

INDIA USA

Date : Jul 01, 1960

Volume No

1995

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Agreement on Import of Films Signed

An agreement for import of films from the U.S.A. was signed in New Delhi on July 14, 1960. Shri K.R.F. Khilnani, Joint Secretary, Ministry of Commerce and Industry, signed on behalf of the Government of India, while the Motion Picture Export Association of America was represented by Mr. Charles E. Egan.

The agreement, which will be in force till March 1962, provides for utilisation, inter alia, of the earnings of the U.S. films in India for the purchase or rent of Indian films, production and co-production of films in India and also for investment in Indian Government securities.

The Motion Picture Export Association has undertaken to ask their member companies to assist in promoting exports of Indian films to the U.S.A. and other markets.

It is expected that, as a result of this arrangement, a healthy collaboration will develop between the film industry in India and the U.S.A. and that Indian films will find an increasing market in U.S.A. and other countries served by the Motion Picture Export Association.

USA INDIA

Date : Jul 01, 1960

Volume No

1995

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

P. L. 480 Agreement Signed

An agreement was signed in New Delhi on July 29, 1960 between the Governments of India and the U.S.A. for the import of an additional quantity of 4,00,000 bales of cotton under title I of P.L. 480 Programme. Two-thirds of this quantity will be available in staple lengths below 1-1/16 inch and the remaining one-third will be in staple lengths 1-1/16 inch and above upto 1-3/16 inches.

The cost of the cotton, including 50 per cent of the cost of transportation in American ships, will be \$41.6 million (Rs. 19.8 crores).

These imports will be paid for in Rupees by the Government of India. The agreement indicates that 85 per cent of the rupee sale proceeds will be available to the Government of India for economic development.

The agreement was signed by Shri N. C. Sen Gupta, Joint Secretary, Ministry of Finance, and Mr. Tyler Wood, Minister for Economic Affairs and Director, Technical Co-operation Mission, U.S. Embassy in New Delhi.

Arrangements have also been made to license the import of a further quantity of 2,00,000 Indian bales to be procured from usual commercial sources.

Since the inception of the P.L. 480 Programme in India in 1956, raw cotton worth \$87 million and covering a quantity of about 8,00,00 Indian bales has been received from U.S.A. under the Programme.

The over-all total of U.S. economic assistance to India till date is over \$3.5 billion (Rs. 1,666 crores).

170

USA INDIA

Date : Jul 01, 1960

August

Volume No

1995

Content

Foreign Affairs Record 1960
Volume VI AUGUST No. 8

CONTENTS

PAGE

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

- Prime Minister's Statement initiating Lok Sabha
Debate on Foreign Affairs
171
- Prime Minister's Statement initiating Rajya Sabha
Debate on Foreign Affairs
176
- Prime Minister's Reply to Rajya Sabha Debate on
Foreign Affairs
179
- Prime Minister's Statement on Leopoldville Airport
Incident involving Indian Crew
185

INDIA IN THE UNITED NATIONS

- Indian Personnel in U.N. Emergency Force
186

ITALY

- Technical Collaboration
186

JAPAN

- Agreement with Japanese Firm Signed
186

PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA

- Anti-Indian Propaganda
187

SWITZERLAND

- Indo-Swiss Credit Agreement Signed

187

UNITED KINGDOM

Indo-U.K. Credit Agreement Signed

187

Indian Immigrants in U.K.

188

MINISTRY OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS: EXTERNAL PUBLICITY DIVISION
GOVERNMENT OF INDIA

USA INDIA ITALY JAPAN CHINA SWITZERLAND UNITED KINGDOM

Date : Aug 01, 1960

Volume No

1995

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

Prime Minister's Statement initiating Lok Sabha Debate on Foreign Affairs

Initiating a debate on August 31, 1960 in the Lok Sabha on the present international situation and the policy of the Government of India in relation thereto, the Prime Minister, Shri Jawaharlal Nehru, said : Sir, I beg to move :

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

It has been my privilege to move a resolution of this kind almost in every session of Parliament. It is right that these matters should be brought up before the House and yet I have a feeling that this might not become some mere act of routine where I repeat more or less what I have said previously and many Hon. Members repeat what they have said previously. To some extent, I suppose that is inevitable and cannot be avoided. Nevertheless it is rather odd that in this rapidly changing world where all kinds of developments are taking place we should perhaps tend into practising this routine. I propose to

say briefly something about some important developments and then await the opinions and the comments of Hon. Members of this House.

Taking the broad view of the world today and of international affairs I suppose that the biggest thing is the tensions that exist there which have existed and grown worse. They have existed, of course, for a long time but they have grown worse for the last three or four months. How is one to deal with this matter? How is the world to deal with it? Somehow they have got wrapped round the question of disarmament which is the only effective way perhaps to deal with these international tensions. It is not a subject in which we, in India, can do very much. I mean to say that we are not among those countries which have got very large armaments. It is a matter essentially for those countries that have them, more particularly for the two or three, or four or five countries which are supposed to be nuclear powers. But, nevertheless, it is obvious that every country, certainly India, is deeply interested in this question of disarmament because of the consequences of not finding a solution. They are terrible.

Today we may discuss a multitude of subjects and events. But the fact is that all our schemes and planning and all the other subjects, important or unimportant that come up before Parliament, sink rather into insignificance when put in this background of this tremendous growing tension and all the world living on the brink of this chasm or precipice when even the slightest movement, even by accident, might make the world topple over. Therefore, I think, the most vital question in the world as it is today is that of disarmament.

Unfortunately, as with everything however important, a tendency arises to get into ruts and routines. The committees and the commissions that have considered this question have tended to get into these routine ways and therefore the progress has not been very considerable. Still, there was much progress in regard to nuclear weapons. There was a very great deal of progress and we were all hoping that the final result would be achieved in a large measure. That too somehow stopped some three or four months ago.

Again, there is a good deal of talk about considering this matter, may be in the United

Nations Assembly session that is coming or otherwise. Partly because of this talk the next session of the United Nations General Assembly may well be a very important one-important because of this disarmament question. It is said-Hon. Members may have seen reports in the newspapers-that possibly the important Heads of States or Heads of Governments may even go there to attend this session because of this question of disarmament. Anything that speeds up the process of consideration of this issue and leads to some steps towards its solution will be welcomed by us.

This UN session is going to be unusual also because a number of new countries from Africa will be represented in it. The African representation has grown considerably and will grow in the course of this year and next year even more. That has an effect not only on Africa but also on the general world situation and on the United Nations. In a sense, leaving out this question of disarmament, the most significant feature of the world today are these developments in Africa. We welcome the freeing of a large number of nations and yet lately there has been a measure of anxiety in our mind on various conflicts that have been arising there more especially in the Congo.

As soon as the Congo became independent we naturally recognised it, congratulated this new free country and arranged and we are arranging

171

for our proper representation there on the diplomatic level. We looked upon the Congo as a single entity not to be split up. That is our approach to the Congo question, namely, that the integrity and the sovereignty of the Congo should be maintained. I do not propose to enter into the internal disputes in the Congo except to say that we still adhere to this approach of the integrity of the Congo.

When these troubles arose in the Congo the United Nations was appealed to and the United Nations responded-and responded with speed and efficiency. The United Nations has taken part in a way in other places in the world too in various ways, but this particular action that it took in the Congo is rather unique, a bit unusual and in a sense marked a new phase in the acti-

vities of the UN. Taking it all in all, I think it is a good phase, a desirable phase and the manner in which it has functioned in Congo has, I think, been commendable. I do not quite know what would happen in the Congo if the UN was not there. Apart from the possibility of a great deal of internal conflict there would be a possibility of intervention by other countries, big and small. If that happened in reality the independence of the Congo would not last very long apart from the misery caused. Therefore, it is better that the United Nations should go. The U.N. may occasionally or its representatives may occasionally make mistakes. But, nevertheless, there is the whole force of world opinion and all the world community is represented in the United Nations to check them and keep them in the right path. I would, therefore, like to express on behalf of our Government, our appreciation of the steps that have been taken broadly by the U.N. there.

Some countries have been called upon to send their armed forces under U.N. colours. We have not been called upon to send our armed forces in that way. But, we have rendered them a good deal of assistance, rather high class assistance, if I may say so. In numbers, I suppose, we have sent--I cannot exactly remember--may be about 200 to 250 persons from here. A number of them are of the Officer class or medical teams or others. That is to say, whoever we have sent there is not meant to fight there in that sense, but to aid. Of the principal officers that we have sent, one is a kind of an Adviser, Military Adviser to Mr. Harnmarskjold and another is going to be very soon his personal representative in the Congo. Both are very responsible posts. Even in the few days that they have functioned there, they have elicited a great deal of admiration from the people there.

We have now very recently had another demand, rather a heavy demand, apart from individual officers, something like three Colonels, two this and two that, for setting up there immediately a 400-bed hospital. We have agreed to it. That is to say, this kind of thing can only be done, of course, on a military basis. We are lifting all the apparatus, medicine and all men right to the Congo to put it up there within a fortnight. We have done this on the understanding that the United Nations will replace these

things in India. Naturally. That is to say, our normal method of helping is that we continue to pay our normal salaries of anybody who goes there. Every extra expenditure involved comes from the U.N. funds. All our people who go there get their salaries, etc. from us and the allowances, etc., and other expenditure comes from the U.N. That is, I believe, the normal way; in regard to this hospital too. The whole point was the speed with which this could be established there and under competent management. They came to us to do it, partly because some countries are ruled out and in the circumstances in the Congo, it has to be what is called an acceptable country, and we are one of the very few acceptable countries. But, also it has to be obviously a country which could do the job efficiently. So, they came to us. We were pressed very earnestly that we should agree. We have intimated to them that we can do so and send everything. Probably, the first batch will go within a few days, followed up by another batch.

In Africa, thus, you will see that barring a few areas, chiefly I think the Portuguese areas there, practically the rest of Africa has attained its freedom or is going to attain it soon. There is, of course, Algeria, that country which has lived under tragic conditions for many years and has suffered enormous loss and sorrow during these years in its fight for independence. We all of us here have expressed ourselves strongly in favour of Algerian freedom. Unfortunately, while on the one side all these territories in Africa which were under French domination have been freed, Algeria still continues. I do hope that the solution can be found of that too soon and that can only be in terms of Algerian freedom.

Apart from this, we come to perhaps what might be called the darkest parts of dark Africa, the Portuguese colonies there, from which during these many years, hardly a ray of light or information has come. To some extent it comes now : not very much. Still, it does come and it shows that things in these Portuguese colonies are also on the move. Anyhow, even apart from having facts, one can hardly expect that when the whole

172

of Africa is aflame, the Portuguese colonies can live in cold storage. Apart from our direct interest in the question of Goa, obviously: that has an indirect effect on that too.

I should now come to India and refer briefly to some of the matters involving foreign affairs. One is Pakistan. The House knows probably that after many years of painful effort and argument and discussion here and even more so in Washington and New York under the auspices of the World Bank, the dispute in regard to the division of the canal waters is gradually coming to an end. It may be said to have been resolved though there have been so many slips. But, I would not like to give a very definite assurance till actually it is finalised. But, I think one may with some confidence say that it is going to be finalised soon. In fact, the actual terms of the dispute were settled some time back. But, for many months, discussion has been in regard to the arrangements during the interim period, the interim period being 10 years. During these 10 years, various payments have to be made by us to Pakistan. Various steps have to be taken by Pakistan in the erection of canals and waterways. They are going to receive large sums of Money from other countries. That, of course, is not our concern. That is a matter between them and the other countries and the World Bank. Anyhow, because we have been and we are always anxious to settle these things peacefully, we agreed to pay in instalments during these 10 years a considerable sum of money.

Then came the question, during the interim period of 10 years, what share of the waters should be given to them that is to say, while they are building their canal system. This took some time, but it has been resolved I believe and now the final verbal touches are being given to this projected treaty, the canal waters treaty. Indeed, in the expectation of this being settled finally, I have accepted the invitation of the Pakistan Government to go to Karachi in about three weeks time, on the 19th September, for the purpose of signing this document.

Then, the other international question that affects us in India is that of our border with China or Tibet. Some few days back I stated in this House, probably in answer to a question, that an incursion had taken place in the North-east frontier, NEFA, that corner, where some Chinese soldiers had come, as we were informed, about four miles inside and then had gone away. I informed the House then that we had protested to

the Chinese Government. Their reply is that the fact was that nine working personnel went out to fell bamboos in the forest. They lost their way owing to low clouds and thick fog and crossed over the border by mistake, and as soon as they discovered this, they returned. I am placing this reply of the Chinese Government before the House. We are naturally further enquiring into this matter.

There is another small matter. An Hon. Member once referred to it in this House, and I believe he even attempted to move a motion for adjournment which you, Sir, were pleased not to allow. That was about the Shipki La, one of the passes to Tibet. Another hon. Member who comes from that part of the world had made some statement in the press that the Shipki La village which had been founded by Indians was now in the occupation of the Chinese or Tibetans. I should like to remove a certain misunderstanding that has arisen. Our frontier there, according to us, is the pass, the watershed, the Shipki La, "La" meaning the pass. That is the frontier and we have stood by it, and if you read many of the documents exchanged between us and the Chinese Government which have been printed as White Papers, it is clearly mentioned that is our case. The Shipki village is on the other side of the pass. Therefore, even according to us it is not an Indian territory, although Indians may have crossed there for grazing purposes or others. It has not been claimed by us at any time. Therefore, we must keep this clear—the Shipki pass which is the dividing line, which has been and is the dividing line, and the village that is on the other side, a small village.

Then I should make some reference to certain broad features in this world, because I do feel that unless we keep them in mind, we are apt to form wrong impressions of what is happening. We all realise that when we talk about disarmament, this matter has become of the most urgent consequence because of nuclear weapons and other like weapons. It was important before, but now it has assumed an importance which is quite different from the previous way we looked upon it. Now, nuclear weapons, of course, are a symbol of modern technological development, scientific and technological development, in the wrong way if you like, there you are. The fact is that we live in an era of quite extraordinary change. The

world is changing. People talk about space travel and going to the moon and all that. Presumably most people sitting here will in their lifetime we all these things happening or hear about them. That is only a symbol of the tremendous internal revolutions that are taking place in the technological basis which affect human lives, which are going to affect human lives. And if they affect

173

human lives, they affect human thinking, they affect the social structures we live in. Everything is affected by them. It may take a little time or more time. They affect in the final analysis the ideologies which we proclaim or others proclaim and the slogans we shout. That, as a logical argument, appears to me simple enough. They must. If we live in an age where there are railway trains, our social lives are affected. They become different from what they were in the age when only the bullock cart was the means of travel. If we live in an age of air travel telegraphs and telephones, our social structure is affected. Everything is affected thereby, apart from the means of production and distribution and all that.

These change-, are happening with extreme rapidity. We are relatively backward in it. We are less back-ward than many other countries in Asia, but we are naturally relatively backward, and it becomes really a question, if you test these things, how mature a country is in its technological advance. That is the real test, or course other things follow from it.

I am not discussing technology now. I am merely referring to it as affecting and governing international affairs. Of course, in terms of war, war depends on technology. It governs it in regard to so many other matters, it governs it in terms of ideologies that have often powerfully influenced groups and countries. That I should like this House to remember, because we as other countries are apt naturally to function in rather narrow grooves of thought because we have to deal with our day-to-day problems, and so we do not quite realise the astonishing things that are happening all round us which will affect us, which indirectly are affecting us.

I have referred to ideologies and the like, it is not my intention to go into that matter, but it is obvious that even those of us who thought that

we had seen the final light and been illumined thereby in whatever sphere it might be, whether in the economic sphere, social sphere or any other sphere, are being affected by these changes. No ideology, no approach, if you look at it from a scientific point of view, can ever be a final approach, because new things come into your ken, now thoughts, new things which change our minds. We see that happening even in the realm of communism which is supposed to be a very firm and fixed ideology. And that is why I think that much of it has powerfully influenced the world because it represents new thoughts, new approaches in the social and economic sphere. At the same time, it tends to become as rigid in its approach as the old rigidities, whether you call them religious or political or economic. Even just as, nowadays, when a new machine which is made, of the latest pattern which is made, by the time it is ready, is slightly out of date, because something newer has been evolved, so in the realm of thought too which is governed after all by the conditions we live in, by all these developments—the whole of communist ideology etc. after all is basically a development of the Industrial Revolution ; it came afterwards—other things happen. So, these rigidities are going ; although all of us may go on using the old rhetorics, the old phrases, the old slogans, the content of it is changing and must change, because if it does not, it does not catchup with the changing world.

Now look at this thing. There are arguments and there are some discussions. These discussions go on in the minds of people, not in India so much perhaps, but elsewhere, perhaps in India also. What is this peaceful coexistence ? What is Panchsheel? What is this policy of non-alignment and the like?

So far as non-alignment is concerned, I have talked about it so much, and with the approval of this House, that I do not wish to refer to it much except to say that in spite of this talk and discussion, some people's minds are so closed that they do not understand something that they should understand very easily. That is to say, they imagine that non-alignment is an acrobatic feat, of balancing between two sides, of sitting on a kind of spiked fence, and balancing yourself there. That is fundamentally a wrong way to understand it. It is not a question of balancing; it is not a question of sitting on a fence; it is a question of

doing what we consider right, whether it is on this side of the fence or that side of the fence. In fact, it is an attempt to uproot the fence and throw it away. Now, that is a different approach entirely. And I should like this House to appreciate that ; it may agree or not; that is another matter, but I should like this House to appreciate that basic thing, that it is not a question of balancing between two groups of Powers or two Powers or two policies or two ideologies. It is a question of trying to do what we think right, and in the process of doing it-and that is a part of doing it-trying to be friendly and co-operative with countries, even though we may disagree with them because that is the basis of our approach, a friendly and co-operative approach ; but then we may express our disagreement, but always in friendly terms. Normally, we avoid condemnation simply because in the world as it is today or in any world, con demnation does not convince; it makes people angry. And there is far too much of anger, and violence and hatred in the world for us

174

to add to it.

Therefore, it should be remembered that non-alignment is a positive policy, not neutrality, not a balancing feat. That positive policy may be sometimes wrong ; it might go wrong; that is a different matter ; and we can get it right ; but we must realise that it is a positive policy. And for somebody to say that you must be on this side or that-that may be his opinion-is against this conception of following an independent policy.

I personally do not understand why a country, any country, should be asked to be on this side or on that side or warring factions, when we do not want war, when we do not agree with these approaches, much less any country like India which is a big enough country, which need not be pushed about. And why should we be pushed about?

Now, take this question of peaceful coexistence. I see arguments, I see it from the newspapers and from other sources that arguments go on as to whether war is inevitable or not, on the theoretical plane and others. Now, if any person or any group thinks that war is inevitable, then, it obviously follows from that that disarmament is nonsense in its view or in the other country's view, because if war is inevitable, then disarmament has

no meaning; obviously then, coexistence has no meaning, peaceful coexistence, because you are inevitably going towards war, and to have peaceful coexistence would push you away from that mentality which prepares for war.

So, this question has intrigued me, when this argument takes place ; it does not take place in India, I mean, but elsewhere. That idea of war being inevitable, therefore, has been and is being rejected progressively by a very large number of countries, almost all, you might say. I mention this not because it is a kind of a theoretical approach but because that governs action, that governs the activities of a country which may believe that war is inevitable theoretically; it covers all its activities. If in theory, at the back of your mind, you believe that war is inevitable, that there is an inevitable conflict between different types of society and systems, then you cannot believe really in peaceful coexistence. You can only believe in that, if you think that war is not inevitable; what I mean is that war is a thing which may come about by accident or by device ; that is a different matter, but to think that it is inevitable does shut your mind to the activities fully to prevent it, and this is an incompatible thought, with peaceful coexistence. In fact, it is incompatible with the idea of countries following their different policies in their own ways. I wanted to put that before the House ; it is an obvious thing, but I thought that I might place that before the House, because there is a great deal of confusion of thought in this matter. To put it on an entirely different level, when people talk of siding with this military bloc or that, it exhibits again a strange confusion ; when people talk about joint defences and the like-they may be necessary or not necessary ; we may argue about it, but-they uproot themselves from the basic foundations of Indian policy, because the moment you think of that, you have given up all the policy that you have adhered to for the last dozen years and more ; you may discuss Which is the better and which is the worse, but it means giving up your independent policy, giving up your non-alignment policy, for what, for some kind of help that you receive. That is the utmost at which one can put it. Well, there are various types of helps, and the best help that one can receive is that of friendly relations with a country. Now, if we want some kind of material help and we think that is essential for us, in the shape of arms

etc.-help, of course, we receive from all countries, financial help, credits etc.-that is a different matter; but once you go into the other aspect of help, arms etc. you are inevitably sucked into the military vortex of military thinking; you are inevitably sucked-you cannot be sucked in two vortexes in one side-with the result that that leads to your giving up your basic position, and that leads, again, to what is more important, to enmity with the other side. You fall into the cold war area immediately, whether you want it or not.

Therefore, we should have a little bit of clear thinking on this. If we want to go into the cold war, of course, that is a different matter; but let us not talk about some matters. without thinking of the necessary consequences. Personally, I think that the attitude that India has taken. up, India's foreign policy of non-alignment, has created a powerful impression on, I would venture to say, almost all countries of the world, the big countries and the small countries. They have appreciated it and they have found that it offers help to them in the larger context of the world's affairs occasionally.

Even in this matter, as I just mentioned in another sense about the Congo, we are Galled upon to assist because we are one of the very few acceptable nations left. Suppose there were no acceptable nations left in the world from that point of view. Then what would have happened? Conflicting fears, rivalries, jealousies and conflicts.

Therefore, we feel that in spite of many

175
failings etc., the policies that we have pursued in regard to international affairs have served India's cause and the cause of the world and world peace.

USA INDIA CONGO ALGERIA PAKISTAN CHINA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC

Date : Aug 01, 1960

Volume No

1995

Initiating a debate on the present international situation and the policy of the Government of India in relation thereto, in the Rajya Sabha on August 17, 1960 the Prime Minister, Shri Jawaharlal Nehru, said :

Mr. Chairman, Sir, I beg to move :

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

I do not propose, Sir, at this stage to take up much of the time of the House. During the short time available, I would like to listen to the comments of Hon. Members and the combined wisdom of this House so that I can profit by it. Perhaps, I might speak somewhat more fully toward, the end of the debate in answer to any points that might have been made.

I might mention some of the salient developments during recent months. The most important development has been, as the House knows, the rather disastrous change in the international sphere ever since the collapse or the non-meeting of the Summit Conference preceded by other occurrences, let us say the U-2 incident and the rest of it. Since then there has been a full blooded return to the cold war. Before that, for months and indeed years there had been a gradual improvement, and we had all hoped that this would lead to some permanent changes in the relationship of the great countries towards each other and that the borders and the walls that had been erected separating them would gradually be removed. No one expected a solution of the problem of the world suddenly, but, an approach to it was certainly expected, so that this failure gave a great shock to the world. And what has, happened subsequently, if I may say so with all respect to the great countries concerned, has not been a very edifying sight in so far as the language used and the various behaviour patterns of the cold war being repeated again and again are concerned. And so, we are

at present, broadly speaking, in a more dangerous situation than we have been for some years past. I do not mean to say that the danger is immediate but it is such that at any time it may become worse if it does not improve. There are some relieving features. One of the biggest questions, of course, is that of disarmament, and I believe the Disarmament Conference is going to mod today in New York, though this is rather likely to be a preliminary Conference than a real one, so that something is happening which might perhaps lead to a bettering of the conditions. But on the whole, the general attitudes of the great countries are so rigid now that all the previous flexibility has gone, and when this kind of rigidity comes with the possession of large stocks of nuclear bombs flying about, then there is always a very great danger of some incident happening which might give rise to major conflict and wars.

Now, in regard to disarmament, there have been various proposals made, and in all these proposals there are many good points. But the major approach is, I take it, the approach of preserving a certain balance and control. By balance I mean, when there is so much suspicion and distrust towards each other, disarmament can only take place in a balanced way, so that the relative positions of the major powers do not change. If one becomes, according to one's thinking, much weaker, then they will never agree. Therefore, the changes have to be in a balanced way so that, as disarmament comes gradually, these suspicions also become less. But when I say gradually, I do not mean that this process of disarmament should be lengthened out indefinitely. I do not think there is anything less than what we can aim at; we should aim almost at complete disarmament. But inevitably, in our approach, one has to proceed by steps, for every country in the world is interested in disarmament. But it is obvious that unless there is an agreement between the great powers, and notably the three or four big nuclear powers as they are called, there can be no disarmament. That is the major issue, Sir.

Another very important and vital issue today is what is happening in Africa. After a very long period of colonial domination, they; have suddenly come out with a bang, and it is rather difficult for Hun. Members, I suppose, to be able

to tell me or tell us how many countries in Africa have become independent in the last two months. Almost every other day we read of some new country becoming independent, big countries, small countries, some very small and some with not even a population as that of shall I say, Delhi-Delhi has too big a population-but

176

Ghaziabad almost. It is quite extraordinary how very small countries are becoming independent. On the other hand, there are big, huge countries like the Congo. This is a very pleasing phenomenon, of course. But it is bringing tremendous problems; notably, the Congo exemplifies these problems. In the Congo itself, the situation has changed so rapidly, and is changing, that it is not an easy matter to say much about it, except to say this that I feel that the action that the United Nations has taken in regard to the Congo is to be welcomed for a variety of reasons, one is that this type of action--which is in a sense the first time the United Nations has moved in that way--is a right action, and may be in future this type of action may take the place of conflicts between countries. Secondly, the speed and efficiency with which it was taken showed that the United Nations is an Organisation which can function on occasions with speed. I should, like, therefore, to express my appreciation of that action, and more particularly of the part that the Secretary-General of the United Nations, Mr. Hammarskjold, has played in this action. At his request, we have been sending a number of people there--trained people, officers, pilots and others and some request or other comes frequently, and we are trying to meet those requests almost always, because we consider it important to give such help as we can in this very difficult mess of the Congo.

Now Sir, these are the two major world issues. Of course, there are many others. I will not refer to them at the present moment. But one thing I should like to refer to is my visit to London for the Commonwealth Conference. Now in that Conference there were some newcomers, new members. And what is more, the whole concept of the Commonwealth is changing because of these new members coming in. Probably when the next Commonwealth Conference takes place, there will be some other members also.'

All this has brought to a point the question of racial segregation in some countries of the Commonwealth, notably in the Union of South Africa and, to some extent, in African countries like Rhodesia or a part of the Federation there. So far as this Central African Federation is concerned, their policy, at any rate their proclaimed policy, is not one of racial segregation, although in practice it is so, and we have suffered from it. But in South Africa this is their proclaimed policy, and it came to a head by certain incidents which the House will remember. Anyhow, so far as the Commonwealth is concerned, there is this very vital and very difficult question, the question of apartheid in South Africa. When I say a 'difficult' question it is not difficult to decide so far as we are concerned because we have very clear views in this matter, and it is more than a dozen years since we broke off relations with South Africa on that very issue in a different form. But it is a matter which affects the Commonwealth very deeply, even though it might not be publicly discussed for various reasons, and I have no doubt that in the few months to come, or years to come, some vital decision this way or that way will have to be taken about this issue so far as the Commonwealth is concerned.

There is another issue tied up with it, that of South-West Africa, which after the First World War was made a Mandated Territory and which was handed over under a Mandate to the Union of South Africa. In this matter repeatedly. We and other countries have spoken in the United Nations about the behaviour of the Union of South Africa, because they do not acknowledge that it is a Mandated Territory, and they functioned almost as if it was a part of their own domain and they could do what they liked with it. They refused to send any kind of reports to the Trusteeship, Council on the basis that this was given to them by the League of Nations after the First World War, and the League of Nations having ceased to exist they derived full rights over it. This is an odd enough argument. As a matter of fact, the issue was referred to the World Court and the World Court naturally decided against it. Even so they have not reformed. The capacity of the Government of the Union of South Africa to persist in error is really quite remarkable, but I take it that if a country as an individual persists long

enough in error, retribution comes, and in the present state of Africa where we see a whole continent in ferment, doing many right things and doing many wrong things, and where all sorts of movements and revolutionary changes are taking place, I do not know where it will take them. But it is changing and changing rapidly, and it is good that it is changing, because the previous condition in the colonial administration was anyhow so bad that nothing else could be worse from the human point of view, even though from the economic or other points of view it might have produced more wealth for the time being.

The Congo is a very special example of this. In the Congo it is said that during many generations-I do not exactly remember the date, but certainly it goes back to the nineteenth century-since Belgium or rather the King of Belgium had control of it-during this period, from that time

177

till Congo became free the other day, they could produce three persons who had become graduates, and 8 or 9 persons who were reading in the university but had not completed their course and yet were given some degree or other, well, to increase the number of graduates by several hundred per cent, whereby 3 became 12. There are, I believe, 12,000 or more primary schools there, and not one of them had an African teacher. The Africans were not even considered good enough to be teachers in primary schools, not to speak of higher education. They have no doctors, no engineers, and so a very very peculiar problem has arisen there, in a country with great resources and no trained manpower. And all our sympathies must go out to those people who have to face these tremendous difficulties, and these difficulties are going to be lasting ones, because training does not come suddenly by magic. But for the moment Congo has to face political and other difficulties; and I must say that while the behaviour of the Belgium Government was so good when it agreed to give Congo independence after its long trial, actually, as it appeared later, it has not been at all good, and it has had a disruptive influence and is continuing to have that. I won't go into that in detail, because the situation is confused, but I should like to express my regret at the way the Belgium Government has rather spoiled the action it took originally by its subse-

quent activities there. So far as we are concerned we recognise, the Congo as an integrated independent State: we do not recognise any separate parts of it as separate States, and we see no reason why we should recognise the latter. And as I have said, we commend the activities of the United Nations and its Secretary-General in trying to solve these difficult problems.

Now, Sir, coming to India, one major question which unfortunately is constantly with us and is likely to be with us, is our border question. In regard to that, as the House knows, we sent a set of officials to Peking in terms of an arrangement arrived at when Premier Chou-En-lai was here. We sent them to Peking for discussion as regards facts, because they had no authority to deal with the major issues involved—they could not come to a settlement—but to we the material that they had and to show what we had, so that this might help further in the consideration of this problem. Well, they spent about six weeks there and they came back. And now the next stage is for the Chinese officials to come hem and I believe they are arriving here this evening, and in the course of the next few days they will have these discussions here. I would not like at this stage to say much more about it, nor is it proper, while these discussions are going on, for me to say any thing about these discussions or the problems behind these discussions. But I should like to say this that two months ago, early in June, there was an intrusion in the north-eastern area, into Kameng Division, when, according to the reports received by us, about 25 Chinese soldiers came across the border and penetrated into our area, about 4 1/2 miles within our border, by various passes, by the glacier passes, and when they were discovered, they went back quickly. The thing did not last long, but, nevertheless, it is a highly objectionable thing. Anyhow, it is objectionable more so because it was definitely agreed to when Premier Chou-En-Jai was here that we would not undertake any kind of patrol or military effort which might bring us into conflict. I need not go into the steps—other steps—we have taken in regard to this matter except to say that a strong protest has been sent to the Chinese Government and no reply has come for it.

May I in this connection refer to one aspect of this question which, I confess, troubles me

very much, and that is the activities of a party and its representatives in this country functioning in a way which is not only completely divorced from truth and patriotism, but which amazes me by the persistence in error and in defaming our own country's policy that it indulges in. I really fed amazed that often an organisation that calls itself the All-India Peace Council indulges in this kind of a thing. What kind of peace it has in mind, what kind of peace it talks about, I do not know. But I am deeply shocked over this kind of thing that any person calling himself an Indian and functioning in this way should defame his own country in a matter of this kind.

One thing more, Sir. That is in regard to Pakistan. We have had for many many long years discussions and arguments in regard to the canal waters issue. I cannot speak of it even now with finality, but I think I may say with some assurance that with the help of the World Bank, these issues I hope, will be solved soon, and I expect that a treaty dealing with these canal waters will be finalised in the course of the next two or three weeks or more-I cannot exactly say-may be a month, when I hope to go to Pakistan to sign this treaty.

178

INDIA USA CONGO UNITED KINGDOM SOUTH AFRICA BELGIUM PAKISTAN

Date : Aug 01, 1960

Volume No

1995

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

Prime Minister's Reply to Rajya Sabha Debate on Foreign Affairs

Replying to a debate on foreign affairs in the Rajya Sabha on August 18, 1960 the Prime Minister, Shri Jawaharlal Nehru, said :

Mr. Chairman, Sir, the course of the debate, yesterday, I believe, indicated that there was a

general and broad agreement with the policy of Government in regard to the matters dealt with. There were a number of minor criticisms and a number of questions were asked. So I propose, to begin with, to endeavour to answer some of the queries that were raised, give information and then to make some general remarks.

To begin with, may I say that I think it was the Leader of the Opposition here who made a remark which rather surprised me. I hope I am correct in quoting him. He said that China must not be allowed to discuss her fantastic claims with us at any level. If that is what was said by him, it seems to me a very extraordinary statement. These were very extraordinary statements to make that at any level, at any time, we must not discuss matters in dispute because, if this is accepted as a rule in international affairs, then the only recourse is not talking but hitting on the head. Normally, with the very limited growth of civilised practices, one avoids hitting on the head and talks. With a little further advance, the talk becomes polite talk even though it may be against each other. That is the normal international practice and, it is hoped, even in a narrow sphere. If this practice is followed, let us say, today, in these days of cold war between powerful countries, when each of them considers the other as completely wrong and highly blameworthy, they cannot talk, they would not talk, they should not talk and they can only throw their nuclear bombs at each other. We have none fortunately and so the question does not arise. But this mental outlook of not talking because the other party, in our opinion, is quite wrong and we are right is bad. However right we are, and however wrong the other party may be, the only way is to talk. I cannot see any other way. One may be driven to other ways occasionally but to say that one must not talk at any level would be an extraordinary position to take up. As a matter of fact, only last night, an official deputation came here from China to carry on the talks at the official level about maps, papers, documents, etc.

I do not wish to overstress this point but nevertheless, there is sometimes a tendency to imagine that we in our rightness should not talk to others and continue in our rightness although the world leaves us behind. It is not a good approach.

I say in considerable sorrow that there should be groups, parties and individuals in India who have so lost their roots in this country as to be unable to understand, unable even to see the truth as it is facing them. It is so because they have twisted, their mind so much that they cannot see straight.

I was dealing with what Mr. Bhupesh Gupta said yesterday. He spent a very good part of his speech in regard to my visit to Turkey. He has raised this in a number of questions previously and I cannot understand why this particular matter has occupied his mind so much. A newspaper in Delhi had a note on it which was based on no facts at all but on some rumours which the editor might have heard, and the Hon. Member has got hold of that note and bases his argument on it against our Ambassador in Turkey. The facts are that I was invited long ago, two years ago, to go to Turkey. It was repeated, and as I was in Europe coming back, I decided to take advantage of my being round about there to pay a visit there. I accepted the invitation, and when I accept an invitation, I do not go into the political views of the particular country or the government where I go to. I want to make friends not only with friends but with those who are not our friends and who may have different opinions. I am conceited enough to think that I can create an impression on the other party even though he may be different in views from me, and what is more, that conceit was justified in the case of Turkey this time. I did create an impression even on that Government to which the Hon. Member objects. He objects to my signing a Joint Communique with them. He does not say anything on the Communique itself. It was a declaration of my policy, not normally of the Turkish Government's policy, and the then Turkish Government signed something which no doubt they had not done before, the other Government I am talking about. However, the point was that I had agreed to go there, and when I read in the newspapers in London that there was some disturbance there I sent a message to the then Prime Minister that perhaps it might be more convenient to postpone my visit to some other time, that I would gladly come some other time. I could not put it more obviously. To that, his reply was that his Government would be deeply grieved and offended almost, if I postponed my visit. I decided,

therefore, to go, and I did go. May I remind the Hon. Member opposite that this very erst-

179

while Prime Minister, Mr. Menderes, had been invited by the Soviet Government to pay them a visit and he had accepted that invitation. He would have gone no doubt if he had not been pushed out before that, so that in these matters when you deal with countries, you do not deal with them in the narrow party spirit of any party or of the Communist Party. In international affairs in dealing with other countries you have to rise above that spirit. That does not mean that you should lose your own principles, forget them or your policy but you deal with everybody and you go to their homes and you invite them to our homes. I went last year to Iran. Now, Iran is a member of various military alliances, C.E.N.T.O. and others. I do not agree with them; I have criticised them but I went to Iran. The fact that their policy is different from ours does not prevent me from going to Iran. Now I hope to go to Pakistan. Am I not, to go to Pakistan because they have got the old Baghdad Pact round their necks, something round their feet and something round their hands and military alliances all over in the east and in the west? I go there because I want to be friends with Pakistan. I do not change my basic policy. I would beg of the Hon. Member to appreciate that in these matters it is not a sign of weakness, going to those with whom we disagree. It really would be most unfortunate if that was the practice because it may become difficult then for me to meet the Hon. Member because I disagree with him but I want to meet him; I want to talk to him.

There is only one more point. He referred to the Commonwealth Conference and said that I had to meet a formidable combination from all these-I suppose England, Australia, Canada and others-and that my hands were tied, my voice was choked and so on and so forth. Well, one's hands are often tied because good breeding ties them and the voice is often low because also the background of one's culture makes that low. But there was no external compulsion tying my hands or choking my voice there and I had my say frankly and fully as others did. And I believe what I said had created some impression on other people's

minds and I believe that the whole Commonwealth Conference dealing in its own way with a very difficult and delicate problem dealt with it rather well, not in the public meeting fashion of course. Naturally constituted as we are, we could have decided of course to wind up the show and break up but what was necessary was to make it clear to the public that broadly Waking the Commonwealth stood firmly against apartheid, racial discrimination and all that. It did that without using strong language or without waving arms about and there is no doubt that the knows that. We did it with courtesy and propriety and it has had the effect. not know what the future would be. yesterday that the future of the Commonwealth depended very much on how this question of racial discrimination was solved. Surely, that indication of mine is fairly clear.

Now, Sir, may I go on to Dr. Kunzru, who has been described by Mr. Bhupesh Gupta to be above all others? First of all, he asked us at what stage the question of the abandonment of nuclear tests was. Well, I do not exactly remember but I think that Committee, that is, the three or four Power Committee which deals with these matters sitting in Paris or Geneva, I forget for the moment where, has held over 200 meetings and they have come to a large measure of agreement not only about subsidiary matters but about important matters also. Two or three matters still remain to be decided. One is the number of tests that should take place and the other is the composition of the teams that test. The broad composition was supposed to be -I believe one proposal was-one-third Western countries, one third Eastern and one-third the so-called uncommitted countries. There were other proposals also. These are the two major things that they have not agreed to. I think the Western countries have suggested 20 visits and examinations a year and the Soviet Union has suggested a smaller number; so that a very great deal of progress was made and it seemed probable that they could finally solve the other points remaining too' but just then other developments took place, that is, the collapse of the Summit Conference and all that and that reacted there and everything was held up. Obviously they act and react on each other. go far as the general question of disarmament is concerned, that of course is held up also because of these. There are, as the House- knows many proposals but the latest proposals are some put

forward by the Soviet Government and some put forward by the United States Government. Both are complicated big proposals deserving very careful study. There is--I forget now perhaps today or may be after two or three days--to be a meeting of the General Assembly converting itself into a kind of Disarmament Conference of the eighty odd countries which is being held at the instance of a number of countries and there a resolution is being put forward by some countries and India is one of the sponsoring countries--which has really expressed a desire that these efforts for disarmament should continue. There is nothing very definite in it. I do not wish to place it before the House because it is a draft

180

resolution yet and it may be changed before it is put up there. These countries which have put it forward express their earnest desire that all the efforts that are made for the consideration and solution of the disarmament problem should be continued.

Then, Sir, Dr. Kunzru referred to newspaper accounts of feverish activities on the other side of the border, that is, our border with Tibet. He asked, 'what is the information of Government? Are we preparing ourselves to meet such dangers?' It is obviously not an easy matter for me to give any precise information about what is taking place in Tibet. First of all, I do not get precise information. Secondly, the information that we do get, it will hardly be right for me to place that before the House but the broad facts--the admitted facts--are that in the course of this year there has been a great deal of trouble in Tibet. That is the Chinese authorities there have had to face a great deal of trouble. One can see that, and they have admitted it themselves, when they said that pilgrims to Kailash and Mansarover and advised not to go there because of troubled conditions, because they could not protect them or give them security. Also we have an agent in Western Tibet and he could not get permission or facilities to go to his place in Western Tibet for months because the Chinese Government said to us that "Conditions are troubled there and therefore we do not want him to go now." Now, only lately they have permitted him to go. These were admissions on the part of the Chinese Government of troubled conditions in Tibet. We can draw our own conclusions from them. It is obvious that because

of these troubled conditions, the Chinese authorities must have strengthened their position in Tibet in many ways notably, of course, by building roads, etc. That is natural. And to some extent our own information fits in with that.

Now, the second part of the question was, "Are we preparing ourselves?" Now, Dr. Kunzru said, "I do not want a general statement. I want particulars." It is rather difficult for me to give particulars, military particulars about our borders. All I can say is that we have been not vaguely but actively taking steps to this end and those steps have reached a certain definite stage which gives us an assurance to meet such dangers. Apart from these steps, we have a very big programme of building border roads across those mountain territories. It is a very expensive programme and it was not easy for us to decide to spend these large sums of money over these mountain roads, in view of the pressures on our economy. But nevertheless we had to decide and we gave it priority roads and the procedures we have evolved to build these are procedures which will result in their being built in probably one-third of the time that the normal P. W. D. methods take—may be one-quarter even.

Then, another question of Dr. Kunzru was this. He referred to what our President said in his speech, in Madras I think, when he expressed the hope that the outstanding questions between India and China would be settled. And he asked whether this was merely a hope or it did have any substance and whether this was said on the Prime Minister's advice. It is rather embarrassing for me to discuss what the President says and what my relations are with the President. But I can assure Dr. Kunzru that the President said this without any reference to me. I knew nothing about it. But I saw it. I would add further that I was very happy he said it, happy not in the sense that on a practical consideration of the problem I expect this to happen in the near future. I am afraid not—but because I feel and the President feels that it should be always our policy to try to develop, to look forward to having friendly relations with our neighbour countries, because whatever our policies might be, geography is not going to change. First of all, our broad approach is and should be always a friendly approach to all countries. That does not mean that we give up any principle, any thing that we

consider right. Certainly not. We do not want to enter into a cold war even if we are opposed to something. We do not take up the cold war attitude, which we consider fundamentally wrong at every time and at any time. This expression was, I presume, a broad expression of hope which we should always have, even though there may not be any grounds for that hope that we shall solve these problems.

Then, he asked me about the Tibetan refugees who left Sikkim and went to Darjeeling and various places. Evidently he had in mind whether these people were not, or many of them were not spies. Our own information is that they are not spies. I cannot guarantee that out of hundreds of thousands, there are not one or two spies, but I do not think that these people are spies at all. In fact, it may be the other way. The Khampas are aggressive the other way. They have come to or probably not those who were engaged actually in conflicts. But they are a restless people. They are not used to this kind of work that we have given them of building roads, etc. They are frustrated to some extent and so they left Sikkim and went to various places. Some to Nepal and some to Darjeeling. A number of them have arrived round about Gorakhpur. We have traced many of them. A number

181

of them came back again to Sikkim and we have traced the others also. The U. P. Government, in fact, asked us if they were to open a camp for them near Gorakhpur. We said: No. no more camps all over the place." So, our policy is that if they want to go back to Tibet, obviously they can go back. We do not want to keep them by force. But whenever any of them come to India, they are disarmed. If they want to go back to Tibet, they can go in a disarmed condition. They cannot take arms from here.

Then, Dr. Kunzru again referred to that periodical called "China Today" and the criticism of India in it. He was completely right that the criticism that was being made in it of the activities of our Government was wrong and I think against the normal conventions that apply to such papers being brought out. We have drawn forceful attention to this of the people who publish the "China Today" here. May I add that recently, that is to say in the last few weeks, the Chinese

Press, that is in China, in Peking especially, has been carrying on a very unfortunate campaign against India, against our policies ? Even before, when the general strike took place here, they took it up in a big way and after that in other matters too. So they are carrying this on, which also seems to me to be rather improper. I do not mind the criticisms. In fact, our own newspapers criticise us. But it seemed to me that there was something more than ordinary criticism. It is a deliberate campaign carried on against us, and that, if I may say so, is opposed-if I may mention to Panchsheel. It is some kind of an interference in another country's affairs, more especially when we know that the Press in China more or less runs in line with Government policy. That is as far as I can remember Dr. Kunzru's questions.

Dr. Kunzru : May I ask one more question ? I asked whether the Government of India had any information about the Tibetans who wanted to return to Western Tibet via Bihar and Nepal. I understood from press reports that the Nepal Government was unwilling to allow them to return to Western Tibet through Nepal.

The Prime Minister : Well, there are some Tibetans who want to go back, but among these many are not quite sure of their own minds. perhaps. We have told them they can go whenever they like, but without arms they have to go back. That is our position. I cannot precisely say what the Nepalese Government's attitude is in this matter. Now Mr. Jaswant Singh referred to what is called the repeated Chinese violations of our air space and our large heart in putting up with these. I do not think he is quite correct. There have not been to our knowledge repeated violations of our air space. I cannot obviously say with assurance that there has not been any or how many there have been, because it is difficult to be absolutely certain. But most of the accounts that we get about the so-called air violations are based on somebody hearing the noise of a plane at night or in the day time, not seeing it even or, if you like, seeing it as a speck in the sky, because the jet planes fly anything from 40 or 50 to 60 thousand feet high. Nobody can identify them, and most of these planes can be our own planes flying about. There may be some Chinese planes but undoubtedly in many cases they were not. We have not found that out. There may be some Rights, they occur at night usually very high up,

and the same plane is seen repeatedly. All I venture to say is that it would not be correct to say that there have been frequent and repeated violations of our air space.

Then an Hon. Member asked me about East Germany and what their policy was in regard to us. Broadly speaking, East German policy has been familiar to us, and we have our Trade Agent and we have trade contacts. But some time ago one of their famous firms, which produces maps, produced a new map of China and the Chinese borders, and that map reproduced those borders as the Chinese claimed them to be. They reproduced the Chinese maps. When our attention was drawn to this, we protested, we pointed this out to their Trade Agent here who said that he would inform his Government.

The Hon. Member said something in defence of Belgium sending troops to the Congo to protect their nationals. I think the reports we received about what happened in the Congo were grossly exaggerated. I do not deny that there was trouble there. Some people were put in difficulty, were attacked, but there was an element of propaganda about the reports we received. I might mention that the Security Council is meeting, I think today, to consider the Congo question again, and it is rather a crucial meeting of the Security Council.

Now, Sir, I think I have replied to the various questions put to me. I should just like to make some general remarks.

The question of our broad policy often comes up in various forms, our foreign policy. Sometimes we are referred to as an unaligned country, uncommitted, neutral, and the like. Whatever the word used, very often there is no clear understanding of it, and it surprises me that after so many efforts to make people understand some

182

have not done so. I have objected to Our policy being called a neutral policy. It may be called an unaligned policy. An unaligned policy means that we are not aligned to military or like groups. That is a straightforward fact. We are not aligned to them, and we are not aligned with military blocs. That is all that it means and no more. From that other things flow. Those who object

to that policy only want that we should be tied bloc, with one of the military blocs. That is the only other alternative, aligning with a military bloc, and there is nothing in between. That is quite clear.

Then it is said that we may be unaligned, but even though we are unaligned, we incline this way or that way. Of course, we incline whenever we feel like inclining, because ours is an independent policy. It is not a negative policy, it is a positive policy derived from our views of the world situation and of our own situation, because always national politics, domestic politics and international affairs to some extent are tied up. One reacts on the other, one projects itself on the other, not wholly of course but to some extent they do, at least in our thinking they do. And we have been brought up now in two ways, we have been conditioned. One is, if I may say so, during Gandhiji's campaigns etc., our thinking etc. was governed by that. Our resolutions that we passed, not today but thirty years ago, sound singularly appropriate today. It shows the continuation of our thinking. It may be right or wrong, I am not for the moment entering into that, I think it is right even when we are now under the pressure of events as today, but I would go further than that, and when I go further than that, I hope the House will not imagine that I am speaking with any conceit of my country, because there are many things in this country which are shameful and of which I am thoroughly ashamed. Nevertheless the fact remains, in spite of all our failings, that there has been a way of looking at things in this country, if you like a philosophical way or whatever you like, a basic cultural pattern of this country which we may not have followed, but it is there, it has been there. It has been a way of tolerance, it has been a way which is completely opposed to the conception of cold war, absolutely dead opposed to it. In our history we may have our riots, our battles and our fights, but all our thinking has been opposed to this business of cold war, because cold war is based on hatred, on envy, on violence. We are opposed to it, not we as individuals, we have our failings; what shall I say, our national spirit is opposed to it, our thinking, our culture is opposed to it, so that I venture to say that the policy we have endeavoured to pursue is a policy which has its roots not only in the long past but in the spirit of the country if such a thing is there,

in the culture of the country, in the consciousness of the country. It is not an artificially imposed thing by the pressure of circumstances

Secondly, the whole of our freedom struggle which itself was in tune with the spirit of the country encourages us to think in that way. Thirdly, I say from every practical point of view, judging the world situation as it is, it is the right policy. It is not a policy, I do want to insist, of being in between two rival armies or sitting on the fence or being afraid of saying this or that. It is not SO. It is not a policy of inclining this way or that way. People seem to think that non-alignment means a careful balancing feat, some kind of rope-trick or what not. It is nothing of the kind. It is a straightforward way of trying to consider problems as we think they should be dealt with and trying to go to a particular goal. I suppose today in 'international politics by far the most important thing is peace. We all talk of peace. I really do not know how all of us feel that peace is really essential, we do of course vaguely, intellectually, but not emotionally.

Because the fact of the matter is that we see most peculiar things happening in this world. We live in this world today, a world of tremendous scientific and technological advance, a world in which-not in India, but in the Western countries and may be in future in India too-we shall have an affluent society with material goods overflowing and all that. Here is this tremendous achievement of modern technological civilization and a world which at the same time lives on the edge of terror all the time. I say terror definitely because if you look at the other aspect of it, it is an age of terror in Europe, in America, in Russia, everywhere, terror of the possible War that might come, terror that some day some incident, deliberate or accidental, may let loose the nuclear bombs and then what happens? It is a curious thing, this amazing aspect, this age of affluence, this age of tremendous advance changing things almost daily, and terror creeping in all the time. We discuss these.

Some reference was made to this U-2 incident and Mr. Bhupesh Gupta said that people did not realise the importance of it. In a sense, he is right. Everyone knows that countries have spies, espionage, counter-espionage. It is un-

fortunate. Spies are themselves the symbol of fear. Where you want to keep things hidden and secret, you are afraid. However, then it is. When espionage takes place in the air, it is some-

183

thing more because it is closely connected with the possibility of nuclear bombs. I am looking at it from the psychological point of view because Europe, people in England, people in America, people in Russia, far more than we here—we talk about war and peace; we are not emotionally conscious of it—are always conscious of the possibility of a nuclear war and nuclear bombs coming down upon them. So, a plane in the sky doing espionage work is connected in their minds with nuclear war and death from nuclear war. It is a thing which immediately creates a tremendous fear, excitement and anger. And Russia has been peculiarly spy-conscious. Possibly, rightly so. And I may repeat something which a very great Soviet statesman said to me. When I mildly protested to him about his rather rough language applied to other countries, he said: "Do you realise that for forty years we have lived in a state of siege, all these countries trying to suppress us since our Revolution, trying to crush us down, trying to put an end to us? These forty years have conditioned us. We are suspicious, and we are taking no chance. Our suspicions are roused and we want to hit back. These forty years have conditioned us." And there is truth in that. It is the conditioning in these countries. Just now people are being conditioned by this cold war and so there is this U-2 plane going in there and suddenly the Russian people realising that this thing has been coming for several years and we have not discovered it. It was a terrible thought—are we enough protected against these planes flying at a great height with their bombs? May be, they may destroy us, they might have destroyed us. There is this fear creeping in and further all this happening just on the eve of the Summit Conference. So, immediately the suspicion arises, is this Summit Conference a real effort or is that the real thing in the skies? See the context of it. It is not merely an act of espionage. I suppose in international law, it does not protect spies although they function. But see the context of this happening. Then you can realise the tremendous upheavals it has caused everywhere, upsetting the Summit Conference and all that.

I should like you to consider these problems today, whatever it is, whether it is our border problem or whether it is what is happening in Africa. If I may say so, there are these huge upheavals in Africa and all that. I mentioned the Union of South Africa which stands apart and the Portuguese possessions. And then there is Algeria. It is a tremendous tragedy. Year after year, hundreds of thousands of people have died, may be millions, during this period in this struggle. And the tragedy is even more. Tragedy is bad enough when dealing with a country Portugal but it is dealing with a country like, France which has always taken pride in its liberal ideas and France which even now in the present age has relinquished hold from a number of countries in Africa. I think there are about ten or twelve countries-big and small countries-which have become independent, and yet this most unfortunate Algerian struggle continues. It is terribly saddening. President, de Gaulle previously stated his desire to allow the Algerian people to have self-determination, to decide for themselves and said many things which seemed to lead to some kind of a solution, and yet, somehow or other, something has come in the way. And undoubtedly this is bad, very bad, for the poor Algerian people who are suffering directly. It is bad for France, it is bad for all of us, this kind of thin- continuing, and all that one can do is to hope earnestly that some kind of a solution will be found, and the solution can only be based on the freedom of Algeria.

But now I want just again to put this thought in the minds of Hon. Members, this thought of the world as it is today advancing, its tremendous technological and scientific pace and at the same time, not getting out of this grip of fear, this age of terror in which we live. In fact, before that major problem, all our problems are small; that overwhelms us; it will overwhelm us. Now, in this business what are we to do about it? Some people imagine, say, "You have got no friends. You should get arms, American. You should do this or do something else." That almost surprises me. It shows such a complete misunderstanding of the situation that I am amazed. Take the United States of America. We are having more friendly relations with them-they have been friendly throughout but they are more friendly to us than they have been ever before.

Take the Soviet Union. Our relationship with the Soviet Union is also more friendly than ever before. It is a remarkable thing and is worth considering how these two tremendous protagonists of the cold war can yet find this friendly feeling for India. It is an astounding thing and, I do humbly suggest, something of which we should be proud that we can function in this way. We have not tried to buy their friendship by any weakness of ours or by any subservience to anybody. But it is real friendship, tremendous friendship, because we appreciate those people whether in America or in Russia, and we know that the people in both the countries desire peace and do not want war. But somehow, events take place so that they create problems very difficult to solve. I can tell you of some. As you well know some problems in India pursue

184

us; we cannot easily solve them in spite of all the goodwill. That is life. We are dealing with them step by step. But the point is that the path, we are trying to play with greater or lesser success-I do not say that we always succeed-I believe, is the only right path, that is to try to keep away from the cold war, try to keep away from this military way of looking at things-alliances. etc.-which, if all of us accept, there would be war and there would be an end to everything. So we are a check on this idea spreading, this warlike mentality. And this is a practical thing and it is rooted, I believe, in our past policy, in our national consciousness of tolerance, of avoidance of hatred and violence although we may indulge in violence in our folly-we do. But still we do not believe in it; it is something not to believe in it, while others believe in it as a solution of things. And because of this-not only we but other countries believe so and act so-there is a ray of hope in the world. If this is waning there would be precious little for this world. So I would like this House and the country to understand our policy, not in the petty context of getting something-a little more or a little less. As a matter of fact these countries have been very generous to us and we are grateful to them. The United States has been very generously helping us and we are grateful to them. The Soviet Union is also helping us and we are grateful to them, and the value of their help is all the greater because they have given it not to

a country that was subservient to them but to a free country which has an independent policy.

USA CHINA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC INDIA TURKEY UNITED KINGDOM IRAN PAKISTAN IRAQ AUSTRALIA CANADA FRANCE SWITZERLAND NEPAL GERMANY BELGIUM CONGO RUSSIA SOUTH AFRICA ALGERIA PORTUGAL

Date : Aug 01, 1960

Volume No

1995

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

Prime Minister's Statement on Leopoldville Airport Incident involving Indian Crew

The Prime Minister, Shri Jawaharlal Nehru, made the following statement in the Lok Sabha on August 20, 1960 :

Hon'ble Members must have seen reports in the press about an unfortunate incident, involving an Indian crew on duty with the U.N. Command, at Leopoldville airport in Congo on the 18th August. I should like to give the House the information that has reached us about this incident.

On the morning of the 18th August, Fit. Lt. Virmani, Captain of an aircraft engaged on U.N. duty, had loaded three civilian Moroccans as part of U.N. Technical Assistance programme and 14 Canadian soldiers with equipment for Coquilhatville. He had just started one of the engines of the aircraft when armed members of the Congolese Force Publique surrounded the aircraft and ordered the crew to dismount under gunpoint. The Congolese had positioned a jeep mounted with a Browning machine gun, Fit. Lt. Virmani switched off the engine and his Indian crew dismounted from the aircraft. The passengers stayed behind in the aircraft. The crew were manhandled by the Congolese soldiers and made to raise their arms. They were then led towards the control tower building in a hands-up

position. During their journey the crew told the Congolese that they were Indian nationals and after some argument amongst themselves the Congolese released the Indian personnel. Although manhandled they received no injuries.

The Indian personnel withdrew into the United Nations Movement Control building. They saw some Congolese get into the aircraft. The Moroccans came out and were manhandled, one of them being beaten up. The Canadians followed and started to show their U.N. identifications to the Congolese soldiers. One Canadian Officer and three other Ranks were beaten up, the officer being seriously injured with rifle butts.

The Congolese later explained that they suspected the Canadians to be Belgian paratroopers. The U.N. Secretary General has sent a protest to the Congolese Government on the incident. I have myself sent a message to the Prime Minister of the Republic of Congo, expressing my deep regret at this incident. I have pointed out to him that the Government of India have, at great inconvenience to themselves, spared Indian personnel to serve the Congo in the present crisis, in order to assist the Republic of Congo in restoring peace and stability. The Government and the people of India have the most friendly and sympathetic feelings for the Republic of Congo, whose independence they have welcomed. It is therefore a matter for sorrow to us that the Indian personnel should be, given unfriendly and rough treatment. I have expressed the hope that there will be no recurrence of incidents of this type and that full facilities will be given to the Indian personnel to perform the service to the Congo State for which they have gone there.

185

INDIA USA CONGO

Date : Aug 01, 1960

Volume No

1995

Indian Personnel in U.N. Emergency Force

Replying to questions in the Rajya Sabha on August, 11, 1960, the Deputy Minister of External Affairs, Shrimati Lakshmi Menon said that at the beginning of May 1960, the total strength of the United Nations Emergency Force was about 5,000, including 1251 Indian officers and men.

She said : "All members of the U. N., whether they have sent contingents to the Force or not, are called upon to meet the same percentage of the special budget for this Force as they do of the normal U. N. Budget. On this basis India's share as a member of the U. N. has been assessed at Rs. 84,57,943 for the period since the Force was created in November 1956 to the end of 1960.

"The duties entrusted to the Force by the U.N. were to maintain quiet during and after the withdrawal of foreign troops from Egypt. Though the troops have Withdrawn, quiet still has to be maintained, and the Force may be required for an indefinite period. So far as the Government of India are concerned, the Force may continue so long as the country in which it is stationed, namely, the United Arab Republic, wishes it to remain."

INDIA USA EGYPT

Date : Aug 01, 1960

Volume No

1995

ITALY

Technical Collaboration

An agreement for technical collaboration between the Government of India and Messrs. Ing. C. Olivetti & Co., S. P. A. of Italy for the setting up of a teleprinter factory in India was signed in New Delhi on August 26, 1960.

Shri M. M. Philip, Secretary to the Government of India in the Ministry of Transport and Communications (Departments of Communications and Civil Aviation) signed on behalf of the Government of India, while Dr. Paolo Santarcangeli, Director, Olivetti Telescriventi, signed on behalf of Olivetti.

ITALY INDIA USA

Date : Aug 01, 1960

Volume No

1995

JAPAN

Agreement with Japanese Firm Signed

An agreement was signed in New Delhi on August 26, 1960 between the Government of India and Messrs. Nippon Kogaku of Tokyo for technical collaboration in the manufacture of cameras in the Government owned National Instruments Factory at Calcutta. Shri D. Sandilya Joint Secretary, Ministry of Commerce and Industry, signed on behalf of the Government of India, while Mr. N. Hamashima, Managing Director, signed on behalf of his firm.

The agreement provides for a technical tie-up with the Japanese firm for the utilisation of their patents in the manufacture of cameras and other optical instruments at the option of the Government.

For the time being, it is proposed to commence manufacture of Nikkorex, the latest model which Messrs. Nippon Kogaku are making in medium-priced cameras. This is a 35 m. m. single lens (f. 2.5) reflex camera with view finder and

built-in exposure meter. The National Instruments Factory is expected to reach an optimum production of 1,000 cameras per month within a period of two to three years.

The agreement with the Japanese firm will be current initially for a period of 10 years. Technicians from the company will visit India shortly and start training Indian engineers.

186

JAPAN INDIA USA RUSSIA

Date : Aug 01, 1960

Volume No

1995

PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA

Anti-Indian Propaganda

During Question hour in the Rajya Sabha on August 11, 1960, Shrimati Lakshmi N. Menon, Deputy Minister for External Affairs, replied in the affirmative when she was asked whether the attention of the Government had been drawn to the coverage of the correspondent of New China News Agency from Delhi about events in India—particularly the Sino-Indian border issue and the Government employees' strike as published in the Chinese newspapers, and whether it was a fact that the Peking Radio had been carrying on anti-Indian propaganda for some time past depicting India as a land of strikes and ruthless repression of discontented workers by Government.

Shrimati Menon said : "For some time now the reports and bulletins emanating from the Hsinhua Correspondent are being publicised on the Chinese radio and Press. These reports are neither objective nor fair. After having watched the activities of the Hsinhua Correspondent in Delhi, over a sufficiently long period, the Government of India came to the conclusion that

the persistently one-sided and malicious reports sent out by him from India were adversely affecting Sino-Indian relations. The Correspondent was warned to desist from such reporting, but this did not have any effect. It was, therefore, decided to terminate the visa of the Hsinhua Correspondent in Delhi. This step, which was taken with reluctance, had become necessary because his activities were hampering rather than promoting friendship between the two countries.

The Government are taking all possible steps through normal publicity media to counter such propaganda."

CHINA INDIA USA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC MALI

Date : Aug 01, 1960

Volume No

1995

SWITZERLAND

Indo-Swiss Credit Agreement Signed

The Governments of India and Switzerland have signed a credit agreement providing for the purchase of Swiss capital goods by India for India's development programmes. The credit is for a period of 10 years covering transactions of the value of 100 million Swiss francs (Rs. 10.9 crores). Of this amount, a sum of 60 million Swiss francs will be made available immediately and the balance of 40 millions Swiss francs later. The credit will be provided by a consortium of Swiss banks on mutually agreed terms. The credit will be guaranteed by the Swiss Government within the framework of their Federal Law on Export Risk Guarantees.

The agreement was signed at Berne on Saturday (July 30, 1960) by the Indian Ambassador, Shri M.K. Vellodi and Minister E. Stopper, Delegate for Trade Agreements on behalf of the Swiss Government.

Indian imports of specified capital goods under this agreement will be in addition to Indian imports under the normal import policy of the Government of India which provides for non-discriminatory licensing so far as imports financed from India's own free foreign exchange resources are concerned.

SWITZERLAND INDIA

Date : Aug 01, 1960

Volume No

1995

UNITED KINGDOM

Indo-U. K. Credit Agreement Signed

An Agreement for a credit of Rs. 13.33 crores (æ 10 million) from the Government of the United Kingdom to the Government of India, was signed in New Delhi on August 16, 1960 by His Excellency, the Rt. Hon'ble Malcolm MacDonald, U.K. High Commissioner in India and Shri L.K. Jha, Secretary to the Government of India, Department of Economic Affairs.

A third of the credit is repayable in 10 years and the balance in 20 years, the first instalment of repayment on either portion of the credit falling

187
due on May 31, 1966. The rate of interest will be the same as that currently applied by the U.K. Treasury to a loan for a comparable period out of the U.K. Consolidated Fund on the same date plus one fourth of 1 per cent for administrative charges.

India will be able to draw on this credit for a broad range of her imports from the U.K.

With the present credit, the U.K. Govern-

ment's assistance for India's Second Five Year' Plan totals Rs. 100.66 crores.

INDIA USA UNITED KINGDOM

Date : Aug 01, 1960

Volume No

1995

UNITED KINGDOM

Indian Immigrants in U. K.

Replying to questions in the Lok Sabha on August 30, 1960, the Deputy Minister of External Affairs Shrimati Lakshmi N. Menon said that the United Kingdom Government had held consultations with the Government of India about the problem of Indian immigrants in U.K. doing unskilled work.

She said : "About two years ago, the United Kingdom High Commission in New Delhi presented an Aide Memoire on the question of increasing immigration of Indian nationals into the United Kingdom. It was pointed out that this immigration was causing a serious strain on the National Insurance and Health Insurance schemes in the U. K.

"The Aide Memoire pointed out that the United Kingdom authorities would continue to welcome the traditional movement of Indians to the United Kingdom. They were, however, perturbed over the movement that has taken place of large numbers of illiterate unskilled labourers, who found it difficult to assimilate themselves.

"In their reply, the Government of India pointed out to the United Kingdom High Commission that they had all along been strict in issuing passports to Indian nationals who wanted to go to the United Kingdom and that all necessary steps had been taken to stop the flow of

illegal immigrants to the United Kingdom on irregular passports. Since then the situation has been well under control and there has been no occasion to have any further consultations with the United Kingdom Government on this matter."

188

INDIA USA UNITED KINGDOM

Date : Aug 01, 1960

September

Volume No

1995

Content

Foreign Affairs Record 1960
Volume VI SEPTEMBER No. 9

CONTENTS

PAGE

CZECHOSLOVAKIA

Indo-Czechoslovak Air Agreement Signed
189

GUINEA

President Prasad's Welcome Speech
189
President Toure's Reply
189

INDIA IN THE UNITED NATIONS

Shri C.S. Jha's Statement in Emergency Special
Session of General Assembly on Congo
190

Shri C.S. Jha's Statement on Non-self-governing
Territories
192

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

Prime Minister's Reply to Lok Sabha Debate on
Foreign Affairs
196

INTERNATIONAL BANK FOR RECONSTRUCTION
AND DEVELOPMENT

Shri Morarji Desai's Address
199

INTERNATIONAL MONETARY FUND

Shri Morarji Desai's Address
202

NEPAL

Indo-Nepalese Trade Treaty Signed
204

PAKISTAN

Indus Waters Treaty Signed
206

Prime Minister's Statement on Indus Waters Treaty
208

Hafiz Mohd. Ibrahim's Broadcast on Indus
Waters Treaty
208

Indo-Pakistan Joint Communique
210

POLAND

Prime Minister Cyrankiewicz's Reply
211
Indo-Polish Joint Statement
211

UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS

Instruments of Ratification Exchanged
212

MINISTRY OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS: EXTERNAL PUBLICITY DIVISION
GOVERNMENT OF INDIA

NORWAY SLOVAKIA GUINEA INDIA CONGO NEPAL PAKISTAN USA POLAND

Date : Sep 01, 1960

Volume No

1995

CZECHOSLOVAKIA

Indo-Czechoslovak Air Agreement Signed

An agreement between India and Czechoslovakia for the operation of air services between the two countries, was signed at Prague on September 19, 1960. Shri Bejoy Krishna Acharya, Ambassador of India, signed on behalf of the Government of India, and Mr. Karel Stekl, Deputy Minister, Transport and Communications, on behalf of the Government of Czechoslovak Socialist Republic.

The Air India International has been operating air services through Czechoslovakia since 1956 and the Czechoslovak Airlines began operating a service to India in August, 1959. The air services by the two airlines, which were being operated under temporary authorisations, would now be placed on a formal basis with the signing of the agreement.

The agreement is expected to facilitate and promote closer contact between the peoples of, India and Czechoslovakia and thereby contribute to the furtherance of friendly relations between the two countries.

NORWAY SLOVAKIA INDIA CZECH REPUBLIC USA

Date : Sep 01, 1960

Volume No

1995

GUINEA

President Prasad's Welcome Speech

Speaking at a State banquet held in honour of His Excellency Mr. Sekou Toure, President of the Republic of Guinea, and His Excellency Mr. Jozef Cyrankiewicz, Prime Minister of Poland, at the Rashtrapati Bhavan on September 23, 1960 the President, Dr. Rajendra Prasad said :

Your Excellencies, Ladies and Gentlemen,

I feel happy to welcome in our midst tonight His Excellency Mr. Sekou Toure, President of Guinea. We welcome him as our honoured guest and as Head of an African State which has recently won its freedom. His Excellency's presence here, though his stay in our country is going to be regrettably too short, provides us a welcome opportunity of expressing our gratification at the attainment of the Status of a sovereign republic by Guinea, one of the several States of the African continent which have happily emerged of late as free nations. India has never made secret of her sympathies with peoples of all countries struggling for political freedom, and since our independence we have lost no opportunity of voicing this feeling in the United Nations and other international forums. His Excellency Mr. Sekou Toure is a man of peace and goodwill and is at the moment touring various countries of the world for promoting international amity and goodwill. Being ourselves wedded to these ideals, we are glad to have got this opportunity of welcoming him and offering him our sincerest good wishes for the fulfilment of the mission he has at heart.

The occasion tonight has become doubly auspicious for us, for we have in our midst another great world figure, His Excellency Mr. Jozef Cyrankiewicz, Prime Minister of Poland, to whom I extend a very hearty welcome. Mr. Jozef Cyrankiewicz is not new to us, for three years ago he was pleased to spend a few days with us in our country. Poland and India share between themselves good many ideals and economic objectives and have the friendliest of relations. The bond of friendship has since been further strengthened by close commercial and cultural exchanges between our two countries. I hope it would be permissible if I welcome His Excellency Mr. Jozef Cyrankiewicz tonight as an old friend and the head of the Government of a very friendly country.

Ladies and gentlemen, may I request you now to join me in drinking the Toast to the health of His Excellency Mr. Sekou Toure, President of Guinea, and the President of Poland, and to the happiness and prosperity of the peoples of Guinea and Poland ?

GUINEA POLAND USA INDIA

Date : Sep 01, 1960

Volume No

1995

GUINEA

President Toure's Reply

Replying to Dr. Rajendra Prasad,s speech, President Toure said :

189

Your Excellencies, Mr. President, Mr. Prime Minister of Poland, Ladies and Gentlemen,

I wish to express to you the sentiments and the thankfulness of the President and the Delegations of Guinea to the people of India. I wish to express to you the sincere way in which we have been visiting here. As you know, we are on a visit of friendship. We think that with friendship we can find a solution to all problems. Friendship presupposes comprehension, respect for reciprocal personalities. We know very well the efforts of the people of your country towards the colonised peoples. We appreciate very much the efforts in the international forums of your leaders towards the freedom of different peoples. We have had the same experience as your people.

We know you must have had the courage and it took you generations to rehabilitate the civilisations of your country. In this way We have come together in this effort which we are making.

We are aiming at the same ideal so that the social miseries may disappear. We are also bound together as our activities are based on the same principle, the principle of human justice, which means that brutal force should yield to reason, justice and moral force. And human principle demands that strength should be gathered in friendship and fraternity so that the colour of the skin, religion or things like that may not be a barrier to human relations. If we are backward in scientific and technical progress, our contribution to human efforts is not small. The friendship which we want among our own people has no tinge of hatred towards other people. If we compare the people of a hundred years ago with the people of today we will find the great difference that has taken place in the meantime, and in another hundred years the world will become completely different. Our peoples have also got the right to bring this qualitative difference to the world. That is why our value will reside in the contribution that we bring to the world.

We are happy to meet here the Prime Minister of Poland. Ten years ago I was in Warsaw, in the World Congress as a partisan of peace; I was representing the working class and I said on that occasion that peace will depend on the liberty of the people. We think that history has proved what we had said, when different people will become independent and work freely for their own development, when we would be able to co-operate with other people on an equal footing and when injustice will have disappeared, we shall be sure of the individual peace among all nations of the world.

We are happy to meet here the representatives of all religions and all countries and all nationalities. Nothing divides us because we are all men; we have the same human needs and that is why we are supporting your efforts and the efforts of people who want peace and fraternity to reign in the world.

We have visited about ten countries; we have seen valuable historical things which may be useful to our country. We are sure that by meeting all peoples and nations the friendship will be strengthened. We take this opportunity to pay our homage to the people of India and to one of her great leaders, I mean Mahatma Gandhi, and to the efforts which the leaders, of this country are making towards world peace and in

the direction of a positive fraternity towards peace. I will ask you to have a toast for the prosperity of the Indian people, for the health of its leaders, for the prosperity of the people of Poland and the health of the leaders of the Polish Republic, in short of the peace and prosperity of the whole world.

GUINEA POLAND INDIA USA

Date : Sep 01, 1960

Volume No

1995

INDIA IN THE UNITED NATIONS

Shri C.S. Jha's Statement in Emergency Special Session of General Assembly on Congo

Shri C. S. Jha, Permanent Representative of India to the United Nations, made the following statement in the fourth emergency special session of the U. N. General Assembly on the Congo problem on September 19, 1960 :

This emergency special session of the General Assembly has been called by the Security Council to deal with the situation regarding which the Council itself was unable to reach a decision. In some ways therefore this session may be taken to have a somewhat particular purpose. The question of the Congo, the United Nations action therein and its current operations sanctioned by the Security Council, are among the most important and far-reaching activities of the United Nations.

The United Nations and the General Assembly

190

are seized of the Congo problem. The situation in the Congo itself is not altogether clear. It is a developing and rather confusing situation of the greatest complexity. My delegation would therefore like to deal with, the profound issues and problems raised by the question of the Congo, not only in its current but also in its future aspects

at the fifteenth session of the General Assembly which is due to convene in less than twenty-four hours and at which there will be no doubt occasion for my delegation to state its views. I therefore confine myself to the somewhat limited though nevertheless extremely important purpose of this emergency session.

The United Nations action in the Congo was undertaken at the request of the Central Government of the Republic of the Congo in the situation arising from the incursion of Belgian troops into the Congo. This had brought about chaotic conditions with all the internal conflicts, disruptions, and dangerous secessionist tendencies which threaten the very existence of the young Republic. My Government believes that the Security Council took the right course to respond to the request of the Central Government of the Congo through its Prime Minister, Mr. Lumumba. There is no doubt that if the United Nations had not acted at that time, not only would the Congo have suffered internal disruption and disintegration but it would have become a scene of international conflict and even endangered the peace of the world.

We believe that despite possible shortcomings the United Nations action in the Congo has been beneficial. In our view, the United Nations mission must continue in the Congo. The alternative of direct assistance by interested Powers to various groups would mean the total disintegration of the Congo. Obviously, the United Nations mission in the Congo must function in accordance with the directions given by the Security Council or by the General Assembly. If there has been any misunderstanding in the past, this could be corrected. But the United Nations mission itself must continue so that conditions in the Congo do not worsen.

It is well to remember that the entire basis for United Nations responsibilities in the Congo is the request by the Central Government. This Government must, therefore, at all times be upheld. It is essential for the success of the United Nations mission in the Congo that there should be the fullest co-operation and understanding with the Government of the Congo. The latter, on its part, should give full co-operation to the United Nations in its operations.

It has grieved my delegation, as, indeed it has grieved others, that ever since its independence on 30 June, at which the Government and the people of India rejoiced, the Congo has been the scene of bitter conflict, internal strife and disunity which have made it difficult for the Central Government to function effectively in all parts of the Congo. The Congo is a large country with a large population of varied and freedom-loving Africans and with immense natural resources.

In order that the people of the Congo should enjoy in the fullest measure the blessings of freedom which has come to them long delayed and after nearly a century of colonial exploitation nothing is more essential than the forging of unity among the peoples of the Congo. The future of the Congo indeed lies in the hands of the people themselves. So long as they are divided, so long will they be weak and unable to fulfil their destiny.

We believe that the Congo should be helped to achieve unity. The United Nations can greatly assist the peoples of the Congo in the achievement of this unity. It has a positive role to perform. It is desirable that the United Nations should set in motion the process of conciliation. Above all, we think that the Congo should be insulated from outside military assistance. The rendering of assistance by the United Nations for the maintenance of peaceful conditions ensures that extraneous factors would not disturb or retard the restoration of peaceful conditions and would help to preserve the, unity, integrity and the political independence of the Congo.

The draft resolution sponsored by seventeen African and Asian countries, in our opinion, fully meets the present situation. It embodies the general principles which I have indicated. It seeks to insulate the Congo from arms and other military assistance. It appeals to the Congolese peoples to settle their differences and internal conflicts peacefully. It underlines the importance of maintaining the unity, territorial integrity and political independence of the Republic of the Congo. It requests the States to refrain from any action which might tend to impede the attainment of peaceful conditions. It appeals to all Member States to contribute voluntarily and generously to a United Nations Fund for the Congo to provide the wherewithal for the stability of essential

and administrative services and for the economic development of the Congo.

This is a constructive approach which we welcome and support. Therefore, the draft resolution contained in document A/L. 292/Rev. 1

191

meets, as I have said, the needs of the present situation, and my delegation will support it. In doing so, we should like to make it clear, as paragraph 6 of the draft resolution seeks to do, that the sovereign rights of the Republic of the Congo should not be prejudiced in any way. Normally we would not support an injunction of this nature, but we believe that in the exceptional and dangerous situation in the Congo this is necessary and beneficial.

INDIA CONGO USA

Date : Sep 01, 1960

Volume No

1995

INDIA IN THE UNITED NATIONS

Shri C.S. Jha's Statement on Non-self-governing Territories

Shri C.S. Jha, India's Permanent Representative to the United Nations, made a statement at the six-member special committee of the United Nations on September 7, 1960 on the Non-self-governing Territories.

The following is the text of the statement :

Under Article 73 (e), statistical and other information of a technical nature relating to economic, social and educational conditions in the territories for which they are respectively responsible (other than those territories to which Chapters XII and XIII apply) are to be submitted by members of the United Nations, subject to such limitations as security and constitutional con-

siderations may require, such territories being those whose peoples have not yet attained a full measure of self-government.

Article 73 embodies a progressive concept. The obligation on Administering Powers is to promote and develop self-government. Non-self-governing Territories are contemplated in a dynamic state of evolution and progress towards complete self-government. The Administering Powers, in Article 73 of the Charter, undertake to help in this process. In doing so, they (1) recognise that the interests of the inhabitants of these territories are paramount; (2) accept their obligation as a sacred trust; (3) undertake to take due account of the political aspirations of the peoples and to assist them in the progressive development of their free political institutions—the pace of development to be conditioned by the particular circumstances of each territory and its peoples and their varying stages of advancement.

What I have just said is merely an analysis of Article 73 of the Charter. I believe, however, that if we are to extract from Article 73, the principles with the formulation of which we have been entrusted, we must understand thoroughly the underlying concepts and implications of this Article and the context in which it was drawn up.

It is contemplated that progressive development will reach a point when the peoples of a non-self-governing territory will have attained a full measure of self-government. Until this point is reached, the obligation for furnishing information of the kind mentioned in Article 73 (e) subsists. As soon as a territory and its peoples pass into the zone of full measure of self-government, the obligation ceases; but so long as this has not happened, the obligation cannot be avoided.

It, therefore, becomes of paramount importance to understand what is meant by the expression "full measure of self-government." In the past, it has sometimes been argued by some Members that there is a distinction between independence and self-government and that self-government can be something less than independence. The use of the expression "Progressive development towards self-government or independence" in Article 76, and omission of the

word "independence" from Article 73, have been cited in support of this view. My delegation is of the view that, whatever may be the semantic nuances, it is unrealistic and inexpedient to contend that the principle of Article 73 of the Charter relating to Non-self-governing Territories is anything short of independence. The progressive development of self-government is to take place as indicated in Article 73 itself with "due account of the political aspirations of the peoples" and recognising the principle that the "interests of the inhabitants of the territories are paramount.". Who can say today that the aspirations of any peoples, whether under trusteeship or under colonial administration as a non-self-governing territory, are or can be anything short of independence ? Or that independence is not in the best interests of any people ? Today the view that the aspirations of any dependent peoples are or should be something short of Independence would be regarded as an out-moded and reactionary concept. The mere historical accident of dependent peoples coming under trusteeship or remaining under colonial rule cannot make any difference so far as their aspirations or their future are concerned. Consequently, the expression used in Article 73 is "a full measure of self-government" which, in our view, can mean nothing other than full and unfettered right of the people to choose their destiny.

192

If this is the correct view, if the Charter is to respond to the changing spirit of the times, then we have to apply the above principle to particular non-self-governing territories and peoples. The Charter speaks of peoples of the territories for which Member nations have or assume responsibilities. Such territories and peoples are contemplated as separate entities and distinct from the Peoples of the so-called metropolitan territories. Such distinction, implicit in Article 73, is explicitly indicated in Article 74. This brings us to the first principle governing the application of Article 73 of the Charter, namely, that the peoples of the territory concerned are distinct racially, ethnically or culturally from the peoples of the metropolitan territories. Geographical separation from the metropolitan territory serves to underline their distinctness as separate entities. If geographically, ethnically or culturally a territory and its peoples are distinct from the metropolitan terri-

tory of the Member State, prima facie there is an obligation to furnish information under Article 73e of the Charter.

Non-self-governing territories, however, are not of the same size or population, and naturally the circumstances of each differ from those of the other. It has been accepted in the past that a non-self-governing territory can attain its goal either by becoming a completely sovereign and independent territory, or by association with or becoming part of another independent State on equal terms and in accordance with the freely expressed wishes of the people in a democratic manner. While it might be appropriate for non-self-governing territories, small in area, population and resources and not normally capable of becoming viable independent units, to choose their independence by merger with another independent state not necessarily the metropolitan country, we believe that in the case of larger territories with substantial populations and ethnically and culturally distinct peoples, - and particularly those situated far away from the metropolitan territory, which were subjugated as a result of conquest in the days of colonial expansion, independence as a distinct entity is the appropriate goal. This does not preclude independence with interdependence through free association as a distinct entity with an independent state, and involving a voluntary surrender by agreement of certain aspects of sovereignty in accordance with the freely expressed wishes of the peoples ascertained in the usual democratic manner. If a people in complete freedom choose any solution other than sovereign independence, it should later be free at any time to reconsider its decision and to choose independence.

The General Assembly in exercising its functions under Chapter XI of the Charter has to take care that no spurious independence through association or merger with another territory takes place. Any such merger to be genuine and acceptable must fulfil the following conditions :

(1) It should take place between countries which have attained a relatively advanced stage of self-government, which presupposes capacity to make a responsible and intelligent choice, with an advanced stage of development of free politi-

cal institutions within the territory ;

(2) The wishes of the people should be ascertained by democratic means. This includes a direct reference to the people on the basis of universal suffrage or a free choice exercised by self-governing institutions, which in turn have been elected on the basis of universal franchise.

(3) The merger should be on the basis of complete equality of rights of the peoples of the erstwhile non-self-governing territory and those of the independent territory of which it has become a part ; in other words the peoples of both territories should have without discrimination equal rights of citizenship and equal guarantee of fundamental rights and freedom ; both should have equal rights and opportunities for representation and effective participation in the organs of the Government.

In considering the task entrusted to us, we cannot afford to forget the historical context in which Chapter XI of the Charter was formulated. The United Nations Charter, in respect of its solicitude for dependent peoples in non-self-governing territories goes far beyond the covenant of the League of Nations or any other similar international instrument. The Secretariat in document A/AC 100/2 has given an account of the background to the drafting of Chapter XI of the Charter at San Francisco. It is not necessary to repeat the discussions and considerations that were predominant in the minds of the framers of the Charter. As the Secretariat paper has rightly pointed out, "at San Francisco it was unanimously agreed that the international organisation should extend the principle of the sacred trust"- and these words are actually used in Article 73-"to all dependent peoples, so that henceforth there should be an international instrument under which the dependent territories would 'be administered in the interest of the indigenous people." Again to quote from paragraph 27 of the Secretariat document, "Committee II/4 at San Francisco was charged with draft proposals

193

on "dependent territories" and this phrase "dependent territories" was used in the original proposals submitted by Australia and the U.K. Throughout the early stages of the debate, the term 'dependent territories' was used interchange-

ably with colonies or colonial territories irrespective of the stages of the constitutional advancement of cultural development. As the representative of the U.K. said "Anybody in the world knows the type of territory we intended". On June 20, Field Marshal Smuts who presided over Commission II of the San Francisco Conference during consideration of the report of the Fourth Committee on Trusteeship, stated, "This scheme diverts in scope very largely from that old covenant scheme. The principle of trusteeship is now applied generally. It applies to all dependent peoples in all dependent territories. It covers all of them, and therefore an extension has been given to the principle of a very far-reaching and important character. That has added largely to the difficulties of the subject, because this wide application of the trusteeship principle to all sorts of territories-to colonies of half a dozen powers and not merely to ex-colonies of defeated powers-has made the task very much more difficult ... Part 'A' of the report of the Fourth Committee deals with that larger extension and it puts countries, especially colonial powers who have colonies to look after, under certain obligations which you will find set out in the recommendations and in the report." At the same time, Mr. Forde the Deputy Prime Minister of Australia, stated, "The Australian view which was accepted by the Trusteeship Committee was that it was not sufficient to provide merely for the setting up of the United Nations Trusteeship machinery for restricted classes of dependent peoples. We felt there would be a conspicuous gap in the Charter if it did not contain a declaration applying to all non-self-governing territories that States members, responsible for such territories recognize their administration to be a 'trust to be carried out in the interests not only of the inhabitants, but also of the world at large.' Mr. Peter Fraser, representative of New Zealand, who had played a distinguished part as Chairman of the Fourth Committee, stated as follows :

"It is something that nations that have mandated territories express a willingness to frame this new means of administering that trust, of at least supervising the administration in the name of the world of that trust. It is something even more that great colonial nations or empires, like the U.K., Belgium, France, and the Netherlands were willing also to adopt Section `A, which is truly interpreted as steps toward self-expression, self-determination,

and self-government.

One could go on quoting extensively not only from the San Francisco Conference, but from the concepts that were embodied in the Atlantic Charter and other international instruments that came into being during and immediately after the second world war. All this shows the historical orientation of approach toward non-self-governing territories. The territories and peoples in respect of which Chapter XI was devised were definitely those which were under colonial rule and were known to the international community as colonial territories at that time. This is confirmed by the statement the United States representative, Mr. John Foster Dulles, in 1946. Speaking on resolution 9(1) concerning the establishment of the Trusteeship Council, he said-

"We make it clear, once and for all, that the declaration regarding Non-Self-Governing Territories contained in Chapter XI of the Charter is not merely the concern of the Colonial Powers, but also the concern of the United Nations.

"By the resolution, the United Nations, while recognising the importance of promoting the economic, social and educational aspirations of democratic peoples, is not afraid to single out for special mention the obligations of Chapter XI to develop self-government, and free political institutions as well as the goals of self-government "and independence to be sought under Chapter XII. By this resolution, the United Nations will implement the provisions of Chapter XI requiring reports from all colonial Powers."

In a study published on April 5, 1947, entitled "THE UNITED STATES AND, NON-SELF-GOVERNING TERRITORIES" the following comment is made on the question of definition of non-self-governing territories :

"In transmitting this information and in replying to the Secretary-General's letter of June 29, 1946, most Members agreed that the definition of non-self-governing territories is not easy and that the criteria to be observed require careful

consideration. Various criteria for making such a definition were suggested but no attempt was made to urge the adoption by the General Assembly of a formal and rigid definition of non-self-governing territories".

"It is readily apparent that the scope of Chapter XI includes a considerable part

194

of the world to which has been applied the principle that the interests of the inhabitants of these territories are paramount. At the present time the non-self-governing territories not affected by Chapter XI include those administered by countries such as Spain and Portugal, which are not members of the United Nations, and those of Italy and Japan, since the future status of their territories remains to be determined. Germany had no territories outside of Europe."

If at a subsequent date a Member State, contrary to the spirit of the San Francisco Conference and the provisions of the Charter brings about by a fiat of its own legislature or by any other unilateral way the integration of such a non-self-governing territory with the metropolitan territory or another State, it cannot be accepted. Sovereignty rests with the people. The Administering Powers assumed responsibility under Chapter XI as a sacred trust. The concept that a trustee becomes the owner of the property and can dispose of it at will is repugnant to the canons of all forms of jurisprudence. Hence a unilateral action amounting to an integration of a non-self-governing territory with the metropolitan or another State is totally contrary to the concepts and provisions of Chapter XI of the Charter. In this connection it is relevant to quote from the statement of Mr. Peter Fraser at the San Francisco Conference :-

"To us of the British Commonwealth, it is very difficult to distinguish between self-government and independence, for to the self-governing sovereign states of the British Commonwealth, Self-Government is independence and independence is self-government." Later at the same

meeting, Mr. Fraser said: "But whatever difficulties there are, the rule that we will be guided by-I know I speak for my own country, but I feel I speak also for every country in a similar position-is that we have accepted a mandate as a sacred trust, not as part of our sovereign territory. The mandate does not belong to my country or any other country. It is held in trust for the world."

My delegation believes that on the basis of the observations we can formulate the general principles which should guide Member States in determining whether or not an obligation exists to transmit the information called for in Article 73e of the Charter. Such principles, as the General Assembly has already held in the past, have to be applied to the facts and circumstances of each individual territory in order to determine whether an obligation exists to transmit information.

The transmission of information under Article 73e is subject to such limitations as security and constitutional considerations may require. It has been argued by some that Member States have no obligation altogether if in their view security and constitutional considerations militate against the transmission of statistical and other information of a technical nature relating to social, economic and educational conditions. This view is unacceptable for the following reasons :-

(1) The word used in Article 73e is 'limitation'. This means that the extent of the information may be limited in certain circumstances but the obligation itself cannot disappear because of security and constitutional considerations. If the contrary were the intention, then Article 73 would have had a more specific reservation in this regard. The limitation can relate only to the quantum or character of information of social, economic and educational nature.

(2) The information in respect of which there is obligation under Article 73e relates to statistics and other information of a 'technical' nature on social, economic and educational conditions. Such information prima facie, and except during the period that a State of war exists can have no security aspect.

(3) Constitutional considerations cannot be put forward as a cover for evading the obligations of Chapter XI.

(a) No considerations arising from the constitution of the metropolitan state can be sustained since international obligation of the Charter cannot be superseded by national constitution.

(b) Constitutional relations between the non-self-governing territory and the metropolitan power may have relevance; but no such constitutional arrangements can be cited as justifying limitation under Article 73 if these have been unilaterally imposed, without the consent and full participation of the people of the non-self-governing territory concerned and in accordance with their freely expressed wishes ascertained by

195

democratic means.

(4) While initially it is for the Administering State to consider whether and what security and constitutional considerations arise so as to justify limitation on the quantum or information to be submitted under Article 73e, it is for the Assembly to decide whether any such limitation is valid and justified. If this were not so then Article 73(e) itself would be meaningless and the whole of the Chapter XI would be rendered negatory.

These, Fellow Delegates, are the preliminary observations of my delegation. They are in harmony with the list of factors which were enumerated as annexes to Resolution 742(VIII) to be taken into account for determining whether a non-self-governing territory had attained measure of self-government. Although as been pointed out by the representative of United States, this resolution had a somewhat different context from the mandate with which we have been entrusted, there is no doubt that the factors enumerated in considerable details and precision can be very valuable to us in formulating and drafting the principles which should guide members in determining whether or not an obligation exists to transmit the information called for in Article 73e of the

Charter. My delegation will cooperate with other members of the Committee in finding agreed solutions and we would also like to express further views in the course of our discussions, if necessary.

INDIA USA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC AUSTRALIA UNITED KINGDOM BELGIUM FRANCE THE NETHERLANDS SPAIN PORTUGAL ITALY JAPAN GERMANY

Date : Sep 01, 1960

Volume No

1995

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

Prime Minister's Reply to Lok Sabha Debate on Foreign Affairs

Replying to a debate on foreign affairs in the Lok Sabha on September 1, 1960 the Prime Minister, Shri Jawaharlal Nehru said :

Mr. Speaker, Sir, I shall endeavour to meet some of the points and criticisms raised in the debate yesterday. Right at the beginning, the Hon. Member, Professor Hiren Mukerjee expressed a great deal of indignation at some reference I had made in the other House to the activities of the party of which he is such a shining Member. He said, rather warmly that he was not going to take what I said lying down. Well, it is entirely up to him to lie, sit or stand, it is quite immaterial to me. but I was a little surprised at what he said. He used the words, I think, that I had a phobia, a Communist phobia' Well, some people may have it. I am not aware of any phobia that I possess, and certainly not a Communist phobia.

But I do have strong feelings when our national interests are concerned. I do, in spite of my attempt not to be narrow-minded and to think in larger terms of the world, feel rather strongly about this country of mine, and I feel strongly when its interests are not only ignored, opposed, but when people of this country forget the fact

that they have a certain duty to this country and stand up for those who have aligned themselves against this country in many ways. I shall go thus far to say that I hope I am strong enough not to stand for India in a matter if I think India is wrong; I am not prepared to say India is right or wrong, I want India to be right not wrong. But where I believe India is right I am certainly going to stand for India with all my strength and might.

In this frontier matter which we have discussed here repeatedly. I am convinced of India's position, India's stand. The fact that I do not fall into line with some Hon. Members opposite who continually demand some kind of warfare immediately for the vacation of these territories of India which are occupied does not indicate, perhaps, that I feel less strongly about this matter but only, if I may say so with all respect, that I have a sense of responsibility about these things and I do not think it is good enough in such matters to talk loudly without reference to consequences, without reference to what one can do and what one cannot do.

However, the point I wish to say is this--I have given a specific instance--that the weekly organ, I believe, of the Communist Party, which is called the New Age, has carried on a consistent, a blatant, a pernicious and a false propaganda on this issue. And I use my words deliberately. I say that propaganda is meant to defame our position. Of course, it begins by saying: "Let us all be friends". Let everybody be friends, We all want to be friends. That is why we are dealing with this matter in a friendly way. I want definitely and I should have liked to know--I asked this question in the other House and there was no answer--as to whether that propa-

196

ganda in that paper reflects the views of the Communist Party of India or it does not.

I am merely pointing out the fact which I think should be obvious to any reader of that paper that on this issue it has been carrying on a consistent line of propaganda which certainly is very much opposed to the line of Indian thinking. Also, it may interest them to know that because of this, extracts from this paper are copiously used across the seas in other countries to justify

their position. It is interesting.

I would also mentioned this thing. I would prefer not to mention names-it is not proper here to mention them-but I would mention areas where they function: in the Kangra district, in Himachal Pradesh, in the Lahaul valley, in Garhwal and in the Almora district. It is some kind of an insidious propaganda being carried on in these border districts which are peculiarly delicate. Naturally, it is not quite the same thing as one might be doing in Bombay, Madras or elsewhere. In that very delicate area, for people going and carrying on propaganda on those lines which are broadly, I might say, on the New Age lines, it has certain undesirable consequences.

Now, I might add that I say this-I was talking about this business-because it is a matter which has nothing to do with any economic policy or any other policy. I do not mind if the Hon. Member opposite advancing any economic arguments, economic policies, etc. He ought to know that far from having any Communist phobia, we are as a Government, as a country, in terms of the closest friendly relations with the biggest Communist country in the world that is, the Soviet Union. It has nothing to do with communism. It has to do - with nationalism and India's freedom and India's integrity.

An Hon. Member advised us that we should develop diplomatic relations with the African States. Obviously we are going to develop them and we are developing them. Another Hon. Member referred to India's policy of "self-deception" in regard to China, the failure of that policy, etc. That is an old argument with which I regret I do not agree. I am yet unable to understand how we might have done something else ten years ago or eight or nine years ago which would have changed the course of events. People seem to imagine they might. I do not say that our policy always is perfect; that we do not make mistakes. But, in spite of every effort I have been completely unable to understand this type of criticism that is advanced every session every year by some Hon. Members opposite.

What is happening in Tibet apart from what we did ten or nine or eight years ago ? It is a fact that what has happened in Tibet has been a grievous tragedy for the people of Tibet. There

is no doubt about it in my mind. The mere fact that we have given refuge not only to the Dalai-Lama but to large numbers of persons, about 22,000, is evidence of how we felt about it and how we continue to feel about it. We regret deeply at many of the accounts and the stories which have reached us as to things happening in Tibet. That is one thing.

It is another thing for us to make gestures which can only be described as helpless gestures of indignation. We do not think—normally every case has to be judged by its merits—whether such gestures are profitable or dignified for a Government like ours to make.

An Hon. Member said that he was hurt and humiliated at my saying something about Goa and Africa. He must have misunderstood me. What I said was, that the events that were happening in Africa—a large number of now countries becoming independent—must lead, I think, to the ending of the Portuguese empire in Africa. In that connection, I said Goa also will have to go out of Portuguese possession. It surely will not go by some magic thing happening elsewhere. It will go because of our efforts and our decisions and I expect, as I pointed out, this train of events which is happening certainly has an effect on our own decisions and the steps we may take at the right moment.

An Hon. Member talked about, I understand, a place called Hupsang Khadisa village, four miles on our side of Shipki La. I can assure him and others who might be under any misapprehension, that this village is completely under our possession. There is no question of anybody else being there. It is true that it is in that small area there, which is claimed as Chinese, but it is in our possession.

Then, he said something which I was quite unable to understand, something about foreigners there and something about diplomats not paying enough attention to our border areas. I really do not understand what foreigners are there. So far as I know, there is only one foreigner, possibly two, in that area in NEFA. One foreigner is Dr. Verrier Elwin, who is our adviser. Dr. Elwin who comes from a foreign country, has now become an Indian citizen. But even if he was a foreigner, it makes no difference to me in this

matter, because he is our adviser and we attach high value to his advice and to his experience and to his great love and attachment for India, and more especially the tribal people. I am very glad that we have the advantage of having his advice. He has nothing to do with any of our other activities in the tribal areas, whether they are military or other. He advises us on social and other matters.

Some Hon. Member asked why we keep these talks that are going on with the Chinese officials secret. I really do not understand this question. They are talks going on about which I do not know the details-I get a report on the second or third day-examining papers, maps, references etc. They are not taking place in the public market place. They are confidential talks. What kind of statement am I to make, except to say, as the House knows, that these have nothing to do with coming to a settlement or anything. The officials cannot arrive at settlements. But there is a mass of material and we thought it best in the circumstances for this material to be examined carefully. It may be, of course, that there are differences of opinion about some papers or documents. Anyhow, it does help in future consideration of that matter and that examination has been taking place first in Peking and then here.

There is one little word that is often being used here; we talk about Tibet or any place like that-'buffer state'. I wonder whether it is realised by those who use it that it is rather an insult to call any place a buffer state. A buffer state means something between two strong States. Factually, it may be correct, but it is not a nice thing to say about any State that it should be buffer State or it was a buffer state. A buffer State means a helpless thing between two independent States, which cannot do anything. It may be that in the past that was its position, but it is no good using that word in this context.

Some question was put to me about the extension of the jurisdiction of our courts to Pondicherry. The Government of India have decided as a matter of policy to remove the appellate jurisdiction of the courts in France over Pondicherry and steps to that end are being

taken.

A question was raised about the registration of Goans as Indian citizens. So far as we are concerned, we are perfectly willing to do that. There are certain legal aspects involved, which are being examined. But defacto, of course, we have treated them as Indian citizens.

Some Hon. Member asked me about the canal waters agreement. I should have liked to place this full agreement before this House as soon as it is finalised. It is rather difficult to deal with it in a patchy way. Nevertheless I should like to state broadly what it is. It is generally based on the World Bank's proposal of 1954, the salient feature of which was the allotment of the waters of the Indus, Jhelum and Chenab, except for minor uses in Jammu and Kashmir, to Pakistan and the Sutlej, Ravi and Beas to India. A transition period during which Pakistan would construct canals, etc., to replace supplies hitherto received by her from the rivers going to India was to be fixed, India contributing towards the replacement works and allowing to Pakistan progressively diminishing supplies from the eastern rivers during this transition period.

The main features of this treaty are : Pakistan should build these replacement works presumably we hope, in ten years' time, and during these ten years we supply water to them, though in a progressively diminishing degree. And Pakistan is going to be helped in building these replacement works to some extent by us, that is, financially, to the extent that we are going to deprive Pakistan of the water that Pakistan has been getting so far, we are helping it to build these replacement works. But, in effect, Pakistan is going to build on a much bigger scale with the help of a number of countries and the World Bank. So, large sums of money are going to be given to Pakistan by the World Bank and by a number of other countries. We have, of course, nothing to do with it and that is not a part of our agreement. That is between the World Bank, Pakistan and the countries concerned. We are going to make an ad hoc contribution spread out over ten years.

Then, there is the transition period, as to what we should do during this ten-year period. And although this should not cause us any

difficulty, it really took a long time to decide how much water we are going to give, in what form, what the payment should be in these ten years, etc. That too, I believe, has been settled now. The ten years begin from April 1, 1960, this year, the date on which the treaty comes into effect; it is given some months retrospective effect. This period of ten years can be "tended to a further period of three years at Pakistan's request. But the extension is subject to a reduction in our contribution by 5 per cent in the first year, by 10 per cent for two years and by 16 per cent for the three years. India will have no responsibility for their canals etc. The water to be supplied by India to Pakistan from the eastern rivers

198

during the transition period is to be of a diminishing scale, and roughly these ten years period is to be divided into two phases, 1960-66 and 1966-70. I need not go into the details of the phases.

One question that troubles many people is what the effect of this agreement with Pakistan is likely to be on the Rajasthan Canal. According to present plans, the Rajasthan Canal will be ready to carry irrigation water up to 1200 cusecs in 1961, 2,100 cusecs in 1962 and 3,000 cusecs in 1963. Thereafter, it is proposed to enlarge the capacity in such a way that by about 1970 the canal would be developed to 18,500 cusecs. We are trying to provide water to the Rajasthan Canal throughout this period in an increasing degree. In the first two years, it does not matter, they can take any quantity, but much more later. But partly this will depend on some water of another scheme which is, in a sense, allied to this, that is, the Beas scheme, effecting the damming of the Beas by us. This is a bigish scheme and, although Rajasthan Canal will be getting water throughout in an increasing quantity, the full supply will come only from the Beas later. Now, because we are accommodating Pakistan to a considerable extent, the World Bank has promised us aid for the construction of the Beas dam.

Then the treaty provides for a permanent Indus Commission, consisting of Indian and Pakistan Commissioners. Each Commissioner would be the representative of his Government for all matters arising out of the treaty and will

serve as a regular channel of communication on all matters relating to the implementation of the treaty. The permanent Indus Commission will take the first steps to iron out any differences between the two sides. The treaty also provides for a neutral expert to whom differences of a technical nature would be submitted for solution. A court of arbitration has been provided to deal with the major disputes on the interpretation of the treaty. Broadly, this is the position.

May I now just refer to certain broad features to which I referred yesterday also ? One matter to which I would like to draw the attention of the House particularly is how the world is drifting more and more to violent methods and deeds. Only two or three days ago the Prime Minister of Jordan was assassinated or was blown up, and others too. Whatever one's views may be on anything, the adoption of such methods is bound to lead to chaotic conditions. In fact, we have to decide really, bearing in mind what we are aiming at, what kind of society we are aiming at. That applies to foreign policy as well as to domestic policies. If we are aiming at what one would call a good society, I submit that it cannot be built up on the basis of violence and hatred. We are, at the present moment, drifting rather rapidly from an ordered world to an anarchy. And this spirit of violence which is growing is a challenge to us. Unless we have a sense of national discipline, we cannot check this.

Before I finish, may I refer to rather an interesting passage written, I think, 125 years ago by a well-known French writer? Almost one might think it is in the nature of a prophesy. I should read out just a part of it. This was written by de Tocqueville in 1835.

"There are at the present time", he says, "two great nations in the World which started from different points but seem to tend towards the same end. I allude to the Russians and the Americans. Both of them have grown up unnoticed and while the attention of mankind was directed elsewhere they have suddenly placed themselves in the front rank among the nations and the world learnt of their existence and their greatness at almost the same time."

UNITED KINGDOM USA INDIA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC CHINA FRANCE PAKISTAN LATVIA
RUSSIA

Date : Sep 01, 1960

Volume No

1995

INTERNATIONAL BANK FOR RECONSTRUCTION AND DEVELOPMENT

Shri Morarji Desai's Address

Shri Morarji Desai, Minister of Finance,
Government of India, made the following speech
at the annual meeting of the Governors of the
International Bank for Reconstruction and
Development on September 27, 1960 :

Mr. Chairman and Fellow Governors,

It is a privilege and a pleasure to be present
at this gathering once again. Our pleasure on
this occasion is dimmed by the absence of Mr.
Black. But I am sure Mr. Black knows that the
thoughts of all of us are with him and that we,
one and all, wish him speedy convalescence and
an early return to guide the affairs of this

199

institution over which he has presided with such
unique distinction for the last eleven years. May
I also take this opportunity at the outset. Mr.
Chairman, of welcoming in our midst our new
members and the observers from prospective new
members. For us, it is a matter of particular
gratification that our good neighbor, Nepal, and
the many emergent nations from the great conti-
nent of Africa will be taking their rightful place
in our midst before long,

It has become so customary for the Bank to
present an outstandingly good performance year
after year that a casual reader of the speeches at
the annual session may easily come to think that
the appreciation of the efforts of the Management
shown in these sessions is also a merely customary
gesture. But, Mr. Chairman, we, and particularly

those of us who come from the developing countries of the world, know that our appreciation comes from our happy experience with the operations of the Bank. The activities of the Bank have come to mean something so fundamental to us that we cannot but view with deep and abiding pleasure the record presented to us year after year.

The Bank's most outstanding achievement during the last year, I am happy to say, has been in relation to the region of the world to which I belong. I am referring to the treaty which has just been signed that settles a decade-old problem of the waters of the Indus. The discussions leading to the settlement have been long and protracted and, I am well aware, sometimes wearisome to all concerned. The credit for this settlement must be substantially that of the World Bank which took the initiative over eight years ago to solve a problem which threatened to jeopardize the development of both India and Pakistan. Mr. Black's imaginative initiative and the persistent devoted and untiring efforts of Mr. Iliff through eight long years deserve our whole-hearted admiration and thanks. And I should not fail to thank those governments also who have made this settlement possible by their readiness to grant or to lend money for the development of irrigation works in Pakistan.

We from India must also refer with sincere appreciation both to the initiative of the Bank in sponsoring the mission of the three "wise men" to visit India and Pakistan and to the role that the Bank has continued to play in mobilizing and coordinating assistance from a number of countries for our development plans. While this is not the occasion to go into the details of our plans and requirements, I should not fail to say that we attach the greatest importance to the role of the Bank in organizing a cooperative forum for the furtherance of our plans.

That the World Bank has seen fit to undertake such diverse activities as facilitating the settlement of the Indus waters problem and the organization of cooperative action to help the development of countries such as India and Pakistan underlines, I think, two important facts. The first is that there are often hindrances to development of other than purely financial which it is the task of those interested in development to

remove. The second and perhaps more important fact is that the requirements of the underdeveloped world as a whole have changed substantially in character and in magnitude since the inception of the Bank so that it is only as the Bank seizes every opportunity of promoting new forms and forum of international cooperation, extending beyond its own immediate means as well as narrow jurisdiction, that it can fulfil its ultimate responsibilities in a changing world. The emergence of Africa as a continent of independent countries, the continued and even accelerated growth of population in Asia unmatched by adequate economic progress, the magnificent natural resources of Latin America still awaiting their fullest exploitation-these and many other factors combine to pose a problem which has become more urgent, more dangerous and a good deal more complex than was the case at the end of the second world war. It is, therefore, with particular satisfaction that we observe that the only international institution which the world has created with the specific mandate of developing the underdeveloped world should have continued to explore every avenue for new initiative and to assume new and growing responsibilities.

The capital and technical assistance required to meet the needs of the underdeveloped world are, of course, very much greater than what the World Bank can provide. The fact that World Bank loans can only be hard loans limits further the ability of the Bank to give the kind of help that is needed by many of the developing countries. The Bank must necessarily operate within the limits of the creditworthiness of the borrowing country. In general, however, the poorer a country and the larger, therefore, its needs for external capital, the less its creditworthiness. The consequence is that in the very areas in which most help is needed the World Bank has, because of the limitation of its charter, to keep its aid well below the limits of the country's needs.

It was the recognition of this difficulty that has now led to the creation of the International

200

Development Association. Unfortunately, the funds made available to the I. D. A. at present are wholly insufficient for the task that it is required to perform. It is a well-known and

generally accepted principle in ordinary business finance that monies invested in amounts insufficient to make a corporation a going concern are in the end wasted. In the case of the underdeveloped countries also there is a great danger of insufficient capitalization causing the money invested to be similarly Wasted. if a job is worth doing, it is worth doing well; half-hearted efforts with a mistaken idea that they are economic can only lead to wastage and, in the ultimate analysis, to infinitely greater expense.

I sincerely hope, therefore, that member countries will see their way to increase their contribution to the I. D. A. long before the expiry of the initial five years. I also hope that they will, in the meantime, increase their bilateral activities in the realm of aid so that the totality of funds available to the less developed countries from the World Bank, from the I. D. A. from governments and last, but by no means least, from private business and banks, be sufficient relation to the needs of the underdeveloped world.

Mr. Chairman, in your thought-provoking and to me, at any rate, very gratifying remarks yesterday you had occasion to refer to the fact that there is a shortage of capital all over the world and that there is not capital enough to meet all the needs of the developing nations. In the nature of things, Mr. Chairman, capital must always be in relation to needs for it must compete always with the demands of consumption. The question before us in the present world context, however, is precisely this: What priority should we attach to the needs of the developing countries in apportioning the fruits of progress everywhere between more consumption and more investment in the richer parts of the world on the one hand and greater investment on the other in Those which are still condemned to abysmal poverty ? The present shortage of capital to meet the needs of the developing countries which reflects our present over-all priorities in this regard cannot, I am sure be taken as an inescapable datum. For the task of statesmanship, if the challenge of world development is to be met, is precisely that of 'altering these priorities as rapidly as' we can.

If all the sources of finance available are to be devoted to the one end of developing the

underdeveloped world, there is undoubted need for coordination among international institutions and governments as also of the emergence of a philosophy of aid which so far has not really existed. Too often have discussions in this field of international economic effort tended to be ad hoc in nature, calculated to ease the pressures of the moment, to the extent that the world means business in this regard and the stakes are much too high for it not to mean business-the whole effort has to be made more choate and coherent. And this is an area where the World Bank can play a very useful part.

If I may make some suggestions based on our own experience in India, I should say that, whenever possible, economic aid should be related to a sound scheme of long-term development covering the entire economy. In the ultimate analysis, the objective of international assistance to the developing countries can only be to set them on their feet, to help them to reach the stage from whereon they can continue to develop further on the basis of their own resources, i.e. without the aid of extra-ordinary forms of external assistance. But such a conscious long-term objective can hardly be pursued efficiently without some long-term perspective of the needs and potential of each country.

Wherever there is a valid and reasonable scheme of development, it should not be overlooked that the final recipient of external assistance is not some specific project, or even a set of projects but the whole economy itself. The ability of an economy to be viable and to service debts is also related essentially to its over-all progress and not to the completion of a few isolated projects. There should, therefore, be a general preparedness to commit aid in terms of the economy as a whole. By the same token, the import needs of a developing economy even for current purposes-i.e. apart from its needs of capital equipment-often tend to outturn possible export earnings. Refusal to finance the maintenance requirements of an economy, therefore, often has the consequence of reducing the fruitfulness of the investment already undertaken at a time when new capacity is being added.

I might also mention, Mr. Chairman, that aid for development should be distinguished from

financing of trade and there should be a clear recognition that what can facilitate the course of everyday trade cannot equally serve the needs of long-term investment any more than equity investment can be made out of short-term bank overdrafts. If development aid is to give the recipient country a reasonable chance to get on to its feet, it should be long-term enough to

201

permit this. Indeed, in the present world context, the terms on which assistance is made available are as important as the quantum of assistance; and it is a serious gap in our present arrangements for developmental assistance that apart from a few notable exceptions, there are no national institutions for extending the kind of assistance that the developing countries need.

Again to the extent that a developing country is in a position to demonstrate maximum performance internally and best utilization of the aid received, it ought to be put in a position to plan its future development sensibly by advance commitment of aid over a number of years. This is a problem which arises even internally for the developed countries in regard to their long-range strategic and other 'programs, and it might not be impossible, once there is the intention and the willingness, to devise comparable methods for the assurance of long-term development funds.

Finally, as far as deemed possible realistic appraisal, and consistent with in viability, lending countries should try to maximize the value of every allocation of aid they make by enabling the borrower to buy on competitive terms.

The few suggestions I have made, Mr. Chair, man, are neither an exhaustive nor a novel guide, to a rational approach to international assistance for economic development. My only excuse for making them here is that they represent significant departures from current practices which I am sure need adaptation in future as they' have done in the past.

INDIA USA NEPAL PAKISTAN LATVIA

Date : Sep 01, 1960

Volume No

1995

INTERNATIONAL MONETARY FUND

Shri Morarji Desai's Address

Shri Morarji Desai, Minister of Finance, Government of India, made the following speech at the annual meeting of the International Monetary Fund in Washington on September 28, 1960 :

During the discussion on the Annual Report last year, Mr. Chairman, many of us had occasion to recall the general economic progress of most of the Fund members and the growing realization of the objectives of the Fund. It is a matter of great satisfaction indeed that as evidenced by the excellent Report of the Executive Directors which is before us, this record of progress has been maintained, by and large, over the past twelve months. From Mr. Jacobsson's inspiring and constructive remarks the other day we had not only a confirmation of this progress but a number of valuable suggestions for the consolidation of this progress as well.

The continued revival in economic activity and international trade, the improvement in the reserves position of many members and the reinforcement of external convertibility by reduction in discrimination are all pointers to a healthier system of trade and payments. The very fact that purchases from the Fund during 1959-60 were substantially less than repurchases for a second successive year bears testimony to the general improvement to which I have referred.

That despite the progress already made, there is much that still remains to be done for the Fund as well as for its members is, I think, abundantly clear. The recent increase in the resources of the Fund and the improvement in

the reserves position of European countries, welcome as they are, have not yet conclusively put to rest misgivings on the part of many members about the adequacy of their international reserves, and for most of the developing countries, including mine, at any rate, their present level of international reserves is uncomfortably low. Under these circumstances, the need for deploying the resources of the Fund with alacrity and flexibility in the light of emergent circumstances remains as great as ever.

It is, however, not enough to think merely of meeting these difficulties as and when they arise. We must even more concentrate on possible ways of preventing these difficulties from arising. It is now a known and accepted fact that for many of the Fund members and particularly for poor countries struggling to achieve a satisfactory rate of development, balance of payments differences are an inevitable concomitant of certain basic weaknesses and the efforts to remove them. These difficulties, therefore, cannot be set right merely by fiscal or monetary or exchange policies. Such countries will need to resort to the provisions of Article 14 for a considerable time to come. They will have

202

to continue with restrictions-and here I am making no distinction between restrictions which way or may not fall within the jurisdiction of the Fund-until such time as their economic structure has been strengthened. The question which, therefore, needs to be considered in respect of these, continuing restrictions is whether they are of a kind which facilitate and accelerate the restoration of a sound economic structure or whether, as is very often possible, they in effect impede the progress.

One of the things which, unfortunately, seems to be happening today is that restrictions imposed by one country in balance of payments difficulties aggravate the problem for others. The widespread use of restrictions by less-developed countries very often has the effect of weakening the economies of others in a similar stage and thereby making their overall position worse rather than better. A certain amount of thought needs to be given by the experts of the Fund to see whether and to what extent damage is being

caused by restrictions imposed by one under-developed country to the economy of others and what ways such damage can be minimized and avoided. It is not for me to anticipate the results of such a study. But perhaps it would not be irrelevant, in this connection, Mr. Chairman, to remind ourselves of what my esteemed friend the Governor for France, Monsieur Baumgartner, said last year, viz., that dissimilar routes often converge in the end and that progress towards the objectives of the Fund has often been spurred by measures which on a narrow legalistic view appears at variance with these objectives. It would be surprising if this observation which is undoubtedly based on the experience of Europe with mutual liberalization of restrictions had no relevance to the problems and prospects of countries which are still confronted by basic structural weaknesses.

What is important in the ultimate analysis is the dedication to the common objectives enshrined in the Articles of Agreement of the Fund and the determination to build up the economic strength which alone can guarantee the achievement of these objectives on an enduring basis. The membership of the Fund reflects a rich diversity of economic conditions and social and cultural traditions. And yet, over the years, we have come to use a common language in the discussions of problems of mutual interest. When it comes to matters such as monetary and fiscal policy, or inflation and growth, or the general principles that ought to govern economic relations among nations, the differences of accent among us are far less important than the often unstated but nonetheless firmly held beliefs and codes of conduct. It is this growth in mutual understanding even more than the general progress of the members of the Fund which gives reason to hope that the problems that still remain for the members of the Fund and for the Fund in relation with its members will be solved in a truly international and cooperative spirit.

When we speak of the progress towards the objectives of the Fund, Mr. Chairman, it is also well to remember that economic cooperation as embodied in the Articles of Agreement of the Fund is but one part-albeit a vital part-of the total design of international economic cooperation. Cooperation in matters of exchange which fall

within the jurisdiction of the Fund cannot be dissociated from progress in international economic cooperation in other areas such as trade or the provision of finance for economic development. That is why, Mr. Chairman, I am particularly gratified to see in the Annual Report many excellent statements regarding the mutual obligations of members of the Fund not only in regard to the pursuit of sound monetary, fiscal and exchange policies but also with respect to the promotion of rapid economic development among all its members. That the Fund cannot remain indifferent to or a mere passive observer of the wider sphere of international economic cooperation is, I think, generally appreciated. And in this connection, I must express my sincere appreciation to Mr. Jacobsson for so cogently adding his voice in support of a broad-based system of economic cooperation among nations not only at this gathering on Monday but earlier in July this year at the Thirtieth Session of the Economic and Social Council and indeed on many other occasions.

While I am still on this general plan of Fund policy and attitudes, I should not fail to pay a tribute to the wise and statesman-like decision adopted by the Executive Board under the able guidance of Mr. Jacobsson regarding the transition from Article XIV to Article VIII. It is our sincere hope that members will cooperate fully with the Fund as suggested in this decision - in keeping the Fund informed of their import restrictions. I am very happy also, Mr. Chairman, that there is a general consensus of opinion in favour of periodic consultations with Article VIII countries. The nature and scope of these consultations we can well leave to the good sense of members and the wisdom of the Fund's staff and management. But I think it is only fair to presume that apart from purely jurisdictional questions, consultations with Article VIII

203

countries will follow the general lines established in Article XIV consultations. Even today, Mr. Chairman, Article XIV consultations range beyond matters within the direct or strict jurisdiction of the Fund; and this is as it should be. If the forthcoming consultations with Article VIII countries were not to be imbued by the same spirit of free and frank discussion of problems of common concern, it will invariably have an im-

pact on the course of consultations with Article XIV countries as well.

Turning to developments in the Indian economy, Mr. Chairman, the year that has just ended has been one of some progress accompanied by continuing stresses and strains. While Production, particularly Industrial Production, has been at a satisfactory level and Investment has continued to increase in keeping with our Plans, there have been signs of excess demand in the economy resulting in pressure on prices. We have, tried over the last two or three years to reduce progressively the extent of Deficit Financing. In framing our Third Plan also we have kept in view the need to restrict monetary expansion to the requirements of real expansion in the Economy. Resort to bank credit by the Public Sector has been reduced sharply, but there has been a rather large increase in bank credit to the Private Sector. The Reserve Bank has tightened considerably its credit policy. It has sought not merely to restrict credit expansion in certain specific fields; it has also tried to limit the total expansion in bank credit. Our major problem is of course that of securing a large and continuing increase in the production of Food and raw materials. Nevertheless, fiscal and monetary discipline have an important role to play in our situation. There has been considerable additional Taxation in India during the Second Plan and I dare say there will be more of it in the Third Plan. During the current year our Foreign Exchange Reserves also have been under renewed pressure. This is partly due to seasonal factors and the payments to the Fund; but we consider it imperative to build up our reserves to the extent possible to a more satisfactory level. To this end and to keep prices under control we intend to use all the fiscal and monetary devices and techniques that are available.

Taking a somewhat longer view of developments in India, Mr. Chairman, we are just completing a decade of Planned Development of our economy and are about to launch our Third Five-Year Plan next April. This is not the occasion to go into the details of the Third Plan, the Draft Outline of which has already been published. But as we look at the progress we have made over the past decade and survey the tasks that lie ahead a few things are abundantly clear to us. While we have made considerable

progress in expanding the productive base of the economy over the past ten years, we will have to maintain and even accelerate the tempo of development over many years to come, if any impression is to be made on the extreme poverty of our people. It is inevitable that in this task we would need the good-will and assistance of more fortunately placed countries on a generous scale for many years to come. But simultaneously it is even more imperative that we deepen and widen our own efforts to increase productivity, and savings to enlarge our export earnings and to economize on imports, Mr. Chairman, we have no illusions regarding the difficult nature of the task that is still ahead. But we know the stakes are high and we are determined to live up to our destiny. Above all, we are determined to avoid all illusory and indeed perilous short-cuts, be they the short-cuts of excessive credit creation or of excessive reliance On the continuing good-will of our friends abroad.

INDIA USA FRANCE

Date : Sep 01, 1960

Volume No

1995

NEPAL

Indo-Nepalese Trade Treaty Signed

A Treaty of Trade and Transit was signed at Kathmandu on September 11, 1960 between the Government of India and His Majesty's Government of Nepal.

Shri Harishwar Dayal, Ambassador of India in Nepal, and Shri Ram Narain Mishra, Commerce Minister of Nepal, signed the Treaty on behalf of their respective governments. The Treaty will come in force from November, 1, 1960.

The following is the full text of the Treaty :

Whereas the Government of India and His

Majesty's Government of Nepal (hereinafter referred to as the Contracting Parties)

Being animated by the desire to strengthen

204

economic cooperation between the two countries, and convinced of the benefits likely to accrue from the development of their economies towards the goal of a Common Market.

HAVE RESOLVED to conclude a Treaty of Trade and Transit in order to expand the exchange of goods between their respective territories, encourage collaboration in economic development and facilitate trade with third countries.

They have for this purpose appointed as their plenipotentiaries the following persons namely,

THE GOVERNMENT OF INDIA
HIS EXCELLENCY
SHRI HARISHWAR DAYAL, AMBASSADOR
OF INDIA IN NEPAL
HIS MAJESTY'S GOVERNMENT OF NEPAL

who, having exchanged their full powers and found them good and in due form, have agreed as follows :

TRADE

ARTICLE I

The Contracting Parties shall promote the expansion of mutual trade in goods originating in the two countries and shall to this end endeavour to make available to each other commodities which one country needs from the other. The Contracting Parties shall further take care to avoid to the maximum extent practicable diversion of commercial traffic or deflection of trade.

ARTICLE II

Subject to such exceptions its may be mutually agreed upon, goods originating in either country and intended for consumption in the territory of the other shall be exempt from customs duties and other equivalent charges as well as from quantitative restrictions.

ARTICLE III

Notwithstanding the foregoing provisions, either Contracting Party may maintain or introduce such restrictions as are necessary for the purpose of

- (a) protecting public morals,
- (b) protecting human, animal and plant life,
- (c) safeguarding national treasures,
- (d) safeguarding the implementation of laws relating to the import and export of gold and silver bullion.
- (e) safeguarding such other interests as may be mutually agreed upon.

ARTICLE IV

Payment for goods and services between the two countries will continue to be made as heretofore.

ARTICLE V

The trade of the Contracting Parties with third countries shall be regulated in accordance with their respective laws, rules and regulations relating to imports and exports.

ARTICLE VI

Payment for transactions with third countries will be made in accordance with the respective foreign exchange laws, rules and regulations of the two countries. The Contracting Parties agree to take effective steps, in cooperation with each other, to prevent infringement and circumvention of the laws, rules and regulations of either country in regard to matters relating to foreign exchange.

TRANSIT

ARTICLE VII

Goods intended for import into or export from the territories of either Contracting Party from or to a third country shall be accorded freedom of transit through the territories of the other party. No distinction shall be made which is based on the flag of vessels, the place of origin, departure,

entry, exit, destination or ownership of goods.

ARTICLE VIII

Goods (including baggage) shall be deemed to be in transit across the territory of a Contracting Party when the passage across such territory, with or without transshipment, warehousing, breaking bulk' or change in the mode of transport, is only a portion of a complete journey beginning and terminating beyond the frontier of the Contracting Party across whose territory the traffic passes. Traffic of this nature is termed "traffic in transit."

ARTICLE IX

Traffic in transit shall be exempt from customs

205

duty and from all transit duties or other charges imposed in respect of transit, except reasonable charges for transportation and such other charges as are commensurate with the costs of services rendered for the supervision of such transit.

ARTICLE X

The procedure to be followed for traffic in transit to or from third countries is laid down in the Protocol hereto annexed. Except in case of failure to comply with the procedure prescribed, such traffic in transit shall not be subjected to unnecessary delays or restrictions.

ARTICLE XI

Traffic in transit through the territories of one Contracting Party from one place to another in the territories of the other Party shall be subject to such arrangements as may be mutually agreed upon.

GENERAL

ARTICLE XII

Nothing in this Treaty shall affect any measure which either of the Contracting Parties may be called upon to take in pursuance of general international conventions to which it is a party or which may be concluded hereafter relating to the transit export or import of particular kinds of articles such as opium or other dangerous

drugs or in pursuance of general conventions intended to prevent infringement of industrial, literary or artistic property or relating to false marks, false indications of origin or other methods of unfair competition.

ARTICLE XIII

The Contracting Parties shall take appropriate measures to ensure that the provisions of this Treaty are effectively and harmoniously implemented and to consult with each other periodically so that such difficulties as may arise in its implementation are resolved satisfactorily and speedily.

ARTICLE XIX

This Treaty, which replaces the Treaty of Trade and Commerce between the two countries of 31st July, 1950, shall come into force on 1st November, 1960. It shall remain in force for a period of five years. It shall continue in force for a further period of five years thereafter, subject to such modification as may be agreed upon, unless terminated by either party by giving notice of not less than one year in writing.

Done in duplicate in English, Hindi and Nepali, all the texts being equally authentic, at Kathmandu on September 11, 1960. In case of doubt, the English text will prevail.

(Signed) Ram Narain Mishra
FOR HIS MAJESTY'S GOVERNMENT
OF NEPAL

(Signed) Harishwar Dayal
FOR THE GOVERNMENT OF INDIA.

NEPAL INDIA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC USA

Date : Sep 01, 1960

Volume No

1995

PAKISTAN

The Indus Waters Treaty, signed by the Prime Minister of India and the President of Pakistan at Karachi on September 19, 1960, brings to a close the 13-year old dispute regarding the waters of the Indus system of rivers.

Under the Treaty, the waters of the Indus, Jhelum and Chenab, except for essential uses in their own basins while they flow in India, are allotted to Pakistan ; and the waters of the Ravi, Beas and Sutlej, except for a transition period, during which Pakistan will build works to replace the waters received by it from the rivers, are allotted to India.

This division is based on the proposal made by the World Bank in 1954. It divides the total waters of the Indus system in the proportion of 80 : 20 between Pakistan and India.

India guarantees to let flow for all time to come all the waters of the Indus, Jhelum and Chenab to Pakistan, except for essential uses in India to be made in accordance with detailed regulations specified in the Treaty.

The present irrigated areas in India (Jammu and Kashmir, Punjab and Himachal Pradesh) from the rivers are approximately one million acres.

206

These will continue to get water supplies from them.

In addition, provision is made for development of new irrigation facilities for another 0.7 million acres from these rivers in India.

Further, India may undertake measures for flood control and drainage in these basins (as long as these do not adversely affect Pakistan) and use these waters for generation of hydro-electric power in accordance with the criteria laid down in the Treaty.

In addition to storage for flood control purposes, India will be entitled to store on the Western Rivers for various purposes a total of 2.85 M. A. F. This storage will be mainly on

tributaries.

India will continue to give water from the Sutlej, Beas and Ravi, allotted' to her under the Treaty, to Pakistan during the Transition Period only and at a diminishing scale. The transition period will be 10 years from the date the Treaty comes into force, i. e., April 1, 1960.

This period may be extended for a further period of 3 years at Pakistan's request, but the extension is subject to a reduction in Indian contribution towards Pakistan's replacement works by Rs. 42 lakhs if the period is extended by one year, by Rs. 86 lakhs if by 2 years, and by Rs. 131 lakhs if by 3 years.

The transition period cannot be extended beyond 1973.

Under the Bank's plan of 1954, the transition period was estimated to last five years.

The U. S. Government has agreed to lend India a sum of Rs. 157,000,000 (dollars 33 million) and the World Bank Rs. 110,000,000 (dollars 23 million) to meet the foreign exchange costs of a dam on the Beas. This has been done taking into consideration the long transition period agreed to by India in order to accommodate Pakistan, and will enable India to avoid undue postponement of the perennial supplies to the Rajasthan canal, as would otherwise have been the case.

These loans will be the subject of separate agreements, between India and the U. S. Government and India and the Bank.

Pakistan is undertaking on the Western Rivers a comprehensive system of replacement-cum - development works comprising storage reservoirs, barrages, link canals, tubewells, drainage and hydroelectric installations.

As the purpose of part of this system of works is the replacement from the Western Rivers of water supplies for irrigation canals in Pakistan, which were dependent on water supplies from the Eastern Rivers, India has agreed to make a fixed contribution of Rs. 83 crores (₹ 62,500,000) towards the cost of the replacement element of these works.

The United States of America, United Kingdom, Canada, West Germany, Australia and New Zealand and the Bank are financing the remaining costs of this large plan of works. Their aid to Pakistan will be worth Rs. 333 crores (≈ 250,000,000).

Apart from making the fixed contribution mentioned above, India is not concerned with the planning, construction and financing of the replacement-cum-development plan in Pakistan.

The detailed arrangements for the financing and construction etc., of these works are the subject of a separate Agreement between the Bank, Pakistan and the participating countries mentioned above.

The Treaty provides for a Permanent Indus Commission consisting of an Indian and a Pakistani Commissioner. Each Commissioner will be representative of his Government for all matters arising out of the Treaty, and will serve as a regular channel of communication on all matters relating to the implementation of the Treaty.

The Permanent Indus Commission will first iron out any differences between the two sides, that may arise in connection with the implementation of this Treaty.

The Treaty also provides for calling in a Neutral Expert, when necessary, to whom differences of a technical nature would be submitted for decision.

A Court of Arbitration will deal with major disputes, if any, on the interpretation of the Treaty.

The Treaty contains provision for future cooperation with regard to specific works, such as building dams to control floods or drainage works which may be required to be built by one party in the territory of the other. These will be

207
built at the request and cost of the party which benefits from them under separate bilateral agreements.

The Treaty terminates the Indo-Pak Agreement of May, 1948. Pakistan has agreed to pay

all the 'undisputed' charges due to India and agreement has been reached to settle the 'disputed' charges by a payment by Pakistan of about Rs. 62 lakhs.

The total sum thus due to India, excluding the disputed amount lying in escrow with the Reserve Bank, comes to Rs. 58 lakhs (≈ 440,000). This sum has been set off against the Indian contribution of ≈ 62,500,000.

PAKISTAN USA INDIA LATVIA AUSTRALIA CANADA GERMANY NEW ZEALAND

Date : Sep 01, 1960

Volume No

1995

PAKISTAN

Prime Minister's Statement on Indus Waters Treaty

The Prime Minister, Shri Jawarharlal Nehru made the following statement before signing the Canal Waters Treaty at President's House, Karachi (Pakistan), on September 19, 1960:

This is indeed a unique occasion and a memorable day, memorable in many ways; memorable certainly in the fact that the very difficult and complicated problems which have troubled us, India and Pakistan, for many years have been satisfactorily solved. Memorable because inspite of the complexity of the problem and sometimes of the sense of frustration that has accompanied it because of the delays in solving it, yet success has come, at last. It is also memorable because it is an outstanding example of a co-operative endeavour between, not only the two countries principally concerned, but also other countries and notably the International Bank.

As for India we are all entitled to congratulate ourselves. I congratulate you. Mr. President, and I congratulate you, Mr. Iliff, for representing the

International Bank here. I know how Mr. Black and you have laboured these past many years. Indeed I often marvelled at your patience and your persistence in spite of all manners of difficulties. But in particular this is memorable because it will bring assurance of relief to large numbers of the people, farmers, agriculturists and others in Pakistan and India. All of us in spite of many scientific improvements still depend upon the good earth and good water and the combination of these two lead to prosperity for the peasant and the countries concerned.

And now by this arrangement we have tried to utilise to the best advantage these waters connected with the Indus river which have flowed down for ages past and the greater part had gone to the-sea without being utilised otherwise. So this is a happy occasion for all of us. The actual material benefits which will come from this are of course great. But even greater than these material benefits are the psychological, perhaps the emotional, benefits that come from such a treaty, which is a happy symbol not only in this domain of the use of the Indus Valley waters, but in the larger cooperation between the two countries, Mr. President, yours and mine.

I should like to express my deep gratitude to the International Bank and to all those who have laboured within Pakistan, in India or the other friendly countries, who have come to our assistance in this matter and generously made contributions to that end.

I feel sure, Sir, that if we approach this, or any world problem, in the spirit of cooperation and cooperative endeavour, it will be much easier of solution than it might appear to be. Therefore most of all, I welcome the spirit which, in spite of all difficulties and obstructions and obstacles, triumph in the end. Ultimately the spirit does triumph even in the material age. So I should like to express again my deep satisfaction at the happy outcome of many years' labour and express the hope that this will bring prosperity to a vast number of the people on both sides and will increase the goodwill and friendship for India and Pakistan.

PAKISTAN USA INDIA

Date : Sep 01, 1960

Volume No

1995

PAKISTAN

Hafiz Mohd. Ibrahim's Broadcast on Indus Waters Treaty

Hafiz Mohammed Ibrahim, Union Minister of irrigation and Power, gave a broadcast talk from the All India Radio on the Indus Waters Treaty on September 19, 1960.

The following is the text of the broadcast:

The Prime Minister of India has, a short while ago, signed with the President of Pakistan a Treaty regarding the use by India and Pakistan of the waters of the Indus system of rivers and matters incidental thereto.

In signing this Treaty, Pakistan has agreed that after a transition period of 10 years, India

208

may retain for its own use about 12 million acre-feet of water of the rivers Sutlej, Beas and Ravi which was being delivered to Pakistan for the irrigation of about four million acres in the districts of Lahore, Montgomery, Multan, and in the former State of Bahawalpur. In return, India has agreed to pay to Pakistan, over the next 10 years, a fixed sum of Rs. 83 crores to enable Pakistan to construct such works as it may consider necessary to replace from the Western Rivers i.e. the Indus, the Jhelum and the Chenab, the waters which were previously being supplied to Pakistan canals from the Sutlej, the Beas and the Ravi.

The fixed sum of Rs. 83 crores which we have agreed to pay to Pakistan represents, in the view of our engineers, a fair estimate of the costs of the replacement to be effected.

During the transition period, some waters of

the Eastern Rivers will continue to be delivered to Pakistan; the quantity of water to be delivered under the terms of the Treaty represents a substantial reduction from that given under the last ad-hoc agreement and this quantity will further be reduced progressively after five or six years until the deliveries are discontinued on the expiry of the transition period.

It has been agreed that the waters of the three Eastern Rivers shall, for all time to come, be available for use by India and the waters of the three Western Rivers, except for essential uses in India within their own catchments, shall be allowed to flow down for all time to come for use by Pakistan. These essential uses in India include such domestic, municipal and industrial uses as we may consider necessary, the supplies required for the irrigation of about one million acres of land already irrigated from these rivers in the States of Jammu and Kashmir, Punjab and Himachal Pradesh, and the supplies required for the development of irrigation to a further area of about 700,000 acres in these States. Ample provision has been made for the storage of water for purposes of flood control. Additional provision has been made for the storage by India of about three million acre-feet of water on the Western Rivers for various purposes including hydroelectric development.

This broad division of the waters of the Indus system rivers-Eastern Rivers for India and Western Rivers largely for Pakistan-will enable each country to plan its own development in accordance with its own requirements and its own resources. In this manner the waters of these rivers will be developed for the maximum advantage of the people of both India and Pakistan.

Provision has been made in the Treaty for full and complete exchange of data of river supplies and canal withdrawals in both countries, and for undertaking works, on a co-operative basis, for the development of water resources, flood control and drainage in the interests of both countries. Appropriate Provision has also been made in the Treaty for the resolution of such differences and disputes as may arise during the course of its implementation.

The signing of this Treaty concludes a series

of protracted negotiations with an agreement which follows not only the general principles proposed by the World Bank in 1954 which the Government of India had then accepted but also the principles underlying the agreement reached in May, 1948 between the Government of India and the Government of Pakistan. During all these long negotiations, the Government of India have always recognised the fact that the waters of the Indus rivers are important for both countries and must therefore be developed for the benefit of both. Whereas in discharge of our obligations to our own people we have been anxious to increase the use of these waters on our side of the border, we have never been unmindful of the interests of the Pakistan cultivators.

In accordance with our plans, we hope to open the Rajasthan Canal for non-perennial irrigation from kharif 1961 and as new channels are constructed and new lands are broken for cultivation, increased supplies will be available for them under the terms of the Treaty. Rabi supplies for this canal will, however, not be available from the flow waters of the Beas until after the end of the transition period or from storage until the Beas Dam is built. Work on this dam will begin very soon.

On the entry into force of the Treaty, the agreement of May 4, 1948 will lapse. The 'undisputed' charges due under this agreement are being paid by Pakistan in full and it has been agreed to accept from Pakistan a sum of about Rs. 62 lakhs in full settlement of the 'disputed' charges.

I trust that the signing of the Treaty will bring a new era of co-operation between India and Pakistan in harnessing the large natural resources of the Indus and its tributaries in the interest of the people of both India and Pakistan.

In conclusion, I would like to express my gratitude and that of the Government of India

209

to Mr. Black, President of the World Bank, and Mr. Illif, Vice-President of the Bank, for the great interest they have taken in securing this settlement.

PAKISTAN USA LATVIA INDIA

Date : Sep 01, 1960

Volume No

1995

PAKISTAN

Indo-Pakistan Joint Communique

The Prime Minister, Shri Jawaharlal Nehru paid a five-day visit to Pakistan in September, 1960. During his stay there, Prime Minister Nehru signed the Indus Waters Treaty and held talks with President Ayub Khan on matters of mutual interest. On the conclusion of the Prime Minister's visit, a joint communique was issued simultaneously in Karachi and New Delhi on September 23, 1960.

The following is the text of the joint communique :

The Prime Minister of India Shri Jawaharlal Nehru arrived in Karachi on the morning of the 19th September on a five-day visit to Pakistan on the invitation of Field Marshal Mohammad Ayub Khan. The Prime Minister was accompanied by Hafiz Mohammad Ibrahim, Minister for Irrigation and Power, Shri Jaisukhlal Hathi, Deputy Minister for Irrigation and Power, and officials of the Government of India.

In the afternoon, the Indus Waters Treaty, 1960, was signed by the Prime Minister of India and the President of Pakistan on behalf of their respective countries and by Mr. W. A. B. Iliff on behalf of the International Bank of Reconstruction and Development.

The Prime Minister and the President left Karachi on the 20th September for Murree. visited Nathiagali on the 21st and left for Lahore via Rawalpindi on September 22nd. The Prime Minister visited the site of the now capital, Islamabad, on his way to Rawalpindi. The Prime Minister of India left for Delhi on Sep-

tember 23.

The two leaders, during these five days, discussed matters affecting Indo-Pakistan relations and exchanged informally views on current international questions.

The President of Pakistan and Prime Minister of India were convinced that the primary need of the two countries was the rapid development of their resources and the raising of the living standards of their people. The two leaders acknowledged that the settlement of the Indus Basin Waters question and the elimination of their border disputes presented to their two Governments an unparalleled opportunity to direct their policies towards the promotion of mutual understanding and friendly co-operation between their two countries. They agreed that their Governments and people should work for the promotion of friendly and co-operative relations between their two countries and eliminate old emotional strains and tensions. They recognised that reduction in tension and development of friendly neighbourly co-operative relations will enable each of their countries to devote its energies to the achievement of their basic objectives of economic and social development.

In furtherance of these common objectives, the Prime Minister and the President have also agreed to the Following

(a) A meeting between the Ministers of Finance of the two countries to consider further and resolve the differences on financial matters between the two countries.

(b) A Minister-level conference between India and Pakistan to review the implementation of the border agreements and to resolve the outstanding differences on border matters.

(c) An early meeting of the High-Level Implementation Committee set up under the Moveable Properties Agreement.

(d) Promotion of cooperation between the two countries on scientific and technical matters and exchange of information on agricultural research.

(e) Evolving of procedures for exchange 'of information with regard to the projects for utilization of water resources of the common rivers in India and East Pakistan.

(f) Exploring possibilities of increasing trade and economic exchange between the two countries and examining the need for opening new offices to further this objective. It was suggested that Pakistan, inter alia, should buy cement, iron and steel from India and could sell to India jute, cotton, rock salt, Sui gas, etc.

There was a frank and friendly exchange of views between the Prime Minister and the President in regard to Kashmir. The talks were

210
conducted in an atmosphere of cordiality. They came to the conclusion that this was a difficult question which required careful consideration of all aspects. The President and Prime Minister agreed to give further thought to this question with a view to finding a solution.

The President of Pakistan and the Prime Minister of India welcomed this opportunity of renewing their personal contact and of having friendly and fruitful discussions. They have agreed to keep in touch with each other in furtherance of their common objectives.

The Prime Minister of India has invited the President of Pakistan to visit India. The President of Pakistan has accepted the invitation.

PAKISTAN USA INDIA LATVIA UNITED KINGDOM CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC

Date : Sep 01, 1960

Volume No

1995

POLAND

Prime Minister Cyrankiewicz's Reply

Replying to President Rajendra Prasad's speech* on September 23, 1960, the Polish Prime Minister Mr. Cyrankiewicz said :

Your Excellencies, Mr. President of India,
Mr. President of the Republic of Guinea,
Mr. Prime Minister, Ladies and Gentlemen,

First of all I would like to thank very cordially the President for his kind words about my country, about my people, about myself and about our relations: Amicable bonds uniting Poland and India are not mere kind words or any abstraction. Those bonds result from the common feeling of our historical past. Both our peoples suffered the shackles of thralldom and both our peoples have succeeded in winning back our freedom. The peoples of both our countries exert their great efforts today in order to make up for the backwardness of centuries together in order to raise their countries. Both our nations who suffered very great and painful experiences in the course of war have no greater desire than peace between nations regardless of their systems. The common objectives of today and our common experiences in the past, these are the foundations of our friendly relations of today. I thank very cordially Prime Minister Nehru for his kind invitation that made it possible for me to visit for another time, India, and once again to renew my acquaintance with my Indian friends. , It is great joy for me that during my stay id, India I have the opportunity to meet an outstanding leader of Guinea, an eminent leader and a fighter for freedom of the nations in Africa. Our nation that knows very well what freedom is, with all its heart expresses its solidarity with the nations, with the people of Guinea, and welcomes with great joy the emergence of the new independent country of Guinea. We are deeply convinced that the more colonialism all over the world is collapsing, the more the cause of peace all over the world is strengthened. I want to express my great joy that the relations between Poland and India are developing more friendly. Apart from implementation of our common objectives which unite our countries despite the different conditions prevailing in them, apart from the common struggle for peace and coexistence, our mutual economic relations are developing ever more

favourably. I am convinced. that friendship between Poland and India will go on strengthening and that our relations in the fields of economy and culture will grow and widen and develop to the benefit of both our countries.

Allow me to raise my glass to prosperity of the great Indian nation, to the health of the President of India, to the health of Prime Minister Nehru, our old and well-known friend, to the health of all leadership of India, to the Government of India and to Polish-Indian friendship. I would like also to raise my glass to the health of the President of the Republic of Guinea, Mr. Sekou Toure. I would like to raise, my glass also to the solidarity of the peoples in their aspirations for peace, to India and to peace.

POLAND INDIA GUINEA USA

Date : Sep 01, 1960

Volume No

1995

POLAND

Indo-Polish Joint Statement

His Excellency Mr. Jozef Cyrankiewicz, Prime Minister of Poland, paid a visit to India from

* The speech was made by President Prasad at a Banquet given by him in honour of the President of Guinea and the Prime Minister of Poland.

211

September 20 to 27, 1960. During his stay in New Delhi the Polish Prime Minister had talks with Prime Minister Nehru on matters of mutual interest. After the talks a joint statement was issued in New Delhi on September 27, 1960.

The following is the text of the joint statement :

Taking advantage of the second visit of the

Prime Minister of the Polish People's Republic to India, talks were held between him and the Prime Minister of India. These talks covered Indo-Polish relations and the increasing co-operation between the two countries in the economic and cultural fields, which both Prime Ministers welcome, as well as important international questions. Among these questions discussed were the importance and urgency of achieving disarmament in this nuclear age and the latest developments in Africa.

In the course of discussion of European problems, the Polish Prime Minister also explained the views of his Government with regard to the problems of Germany, Berlin and the inviolability of the frontiers of Poland. Reference was also made to the working of the International Commissions for Supervision and Control in Indo-China of which both India and Poland are members.

The two Prime Ministers were happy at the growth of friendly co-operation between the two countries in many fields and expressed the hope that these friendly relations would grow.

POLAND INDIA GUINEA USA GERMANY CHINA

Date : Sep 01, 1960

Volume No

1995

UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS

Instruments of Ratification Exchanged

The agreement on cultural, scientific and technical co-operation between the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and the Republic of India has come into force from September 10, 1960, following the exchange in Moscow of the Instruments of Ratification of the Agreement.

Mr. G.M. Pushkin, Deputy Foreign Minister of the U.S.S.R. and Shri K.P.S. Menon, Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of India in the U.S.S.R., exchanged the Instruments of Ratification on behalf of their respective Governments.

The Cultural Agreement was signed in New Delhi on February 12, 1960.

In accordance with the Agreement, the Soviet Union and India, desirous of further developing the friendly relations existing between them, will strengthen and promote mutual cultural exchanges and encourage the development of ties between educational, scientific, technical, cultural, sporting and research institutions of the U.S.S.R. and India.

212

INDIA RUSSIA USA

Date : Sep 01, 1960

October

Volume No

1995

Content

Foreign Affairs Record 1960
Volume VI OCTOBER No. 10

CONTENTS PAGE

INDIA AND THE UNITED NATIONS
President's U.N. Day Broadcast 213
Prime Minister's Statement in the General Assembly 213
Prime Minister's Reply to Australian Amendment

| | | |
|---|-----|-----|
| to Five-Power Resolution | 220 | |
| Prime Minister's Speech Withdrawing Five-Power Resolution | | 224 |
| Shri Krishna Menon's Statement in the Political Committee on Disarmament | 225 | |
| Shri Krishna Menon's Statement in the General Assembly on Representation of China | 246 | |
| Shri Krishna Menon's Speech in the General Debate of General Assembly | 253 | |
| Shri Krishna Menon's Statement on Admission of Nigeria | 271 | |
| Shri B.K. Nehru's Statement on Economic Development of Under-developed Countries | | 273 |
| Shri IN. Sahni's Statement in Administrative and Budgetary Committee | 280 | |
| Shri J.N. Sahni's Statement on Report of Committee on Information from Non-self-governing Territories | | 285 |
| POLAND | | |
| Trade Arrangement Extended | 293 | |
| SWITZERLAND | | |
| Instruments of Ratification Exchanged | | 293 |
| MINISTRY OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS: EXTERNAL PUBLICITY DIVISION GOVERNMENT OF INDIA | | |

INDIA AUSTRALIA USA CHINA NIGER NIGERIA POLAND SWITZERLAND

Date : Oct 01, 1960

Volume No

1995

INDIA AND THE UNITED NATIONS

President's U.N. Day Broadcast

The President, Dr. Rajendra Prasad broadcast on October 23, 1960 the following message from the All India Radio on the occasion of the United Nations Day:

It gives me a great pleasure to greet all members of the United Nations on the occasion of its birth anniversary.

During the 15 years of its existence the United Nations has never before been so much in the news as today. In itself, the fact that it is attracting more and more attention every day is a happy augury. As the number of free nations increases and the problems calling for solution multiply, the U. N. as the accredited organisation of 99 nations is gradually assuming an importance which not many could have foreseen. Complications and entanglements notwithstanding, there is reason to feel gratified that the U. N. has come to be associated with the hope of tackling peacefully, and let us hope successfully, international disputes of all kinds.

From this role of the United Nations also flow the problems it is busy tackling at present. Whatever the difficulty or delay involved in arriving at a peaceful solution of the current problems, it is now universally acknowledged that the U. N. has proved its growth as a constructive and reliable shock-absorber in the midst of divergent claims and growing tensions.

The case of Congo is a typical example illustrating both the nature of an international dispute at its worst and the capacity of U. N. to cope with an inflammable situation. Sharp differences of ideology and approach towards problems are reflected in the stand taken up by nations on questions like that of Congo. While one can see no harm in full freedom of expression it is to be hoped that the very divergence of views and the very sharpness of ideological differences will eventually convince member-nations of the desirability of peaceful co-existence. It is an ideal which we can never hope to escape if we desire a workable solution of disputes international or even national. Let us hope the day is not far off when this fact would be recognised and this ideal accepted by all nations. That would be the day when it will be possible to say that war and aggression as means of settling disputes among nations have been outlawed.

Let us hope meanwhile that the thorny questions that loom at present before the U. N. and which continue to agitate the minds of several nations will draw a greater measure of agreement than they have been able to do so far. Perhaps the most important of these is the question of disarmament on the desirability of which all nations are agreed, though the approach

of individual nations differs. We must not lose patience, for disarmament is a major issue and on its successful tackling would rest the nations' hopes and the very existence of the United Nations.

We in India have full faith in the ideals which promoted the framers of the U. N. Charter in 1945, even though it may be found necessary to alter or amend that Charter so that it fits in better with the present day world conditions. Our faith in peaceful settlement of international disputes is unshakable and we believe that the United Nations is the foremost organisation capable of translating that ideal into practice. Whatever the view that member-nations may be taking of the various questions under discussion at present, it is the duty of each one of them to do all that is possible to strengthen this, world organisation so as to make its working more and more effective and successful.

On this happy day which marks the foundation of the United Nations, I send my greetings to all member nations and their peoples.

INDIA USA CONGO

Date : Oct 01, 1960

Volume No

1995

INDIA AND THE UNITED NATIONS

Prime Minister's Statement in the Assembly

The Prime Minister, Shri Jawaharlal Nehru made the following statement in the General Assembly on October 3, 1960 :

Mr. President and Distinguished Delegates,

I am a newcomer to this august Assembly and not accustomed to its ways and conventions. I seek, therefore, your indulgence, Mr. President, and the indulgence of the Members of the Assem-

bly for what I have say.

I have listened attentively and with respect to many of the speeches here, and sometimes I have felt as if I were being buffeted by the icy winds of the cold war. Coming from a warm country, I

213

have shivered occasionally at the cold blasts.

Sitting here in this Assembly Chamber, an old memory comes back to me. In the fateful summer of 1938 I was a visitor at a meeting of the League of Nations in Geneva. Hitler was advancing then and holding out threats of war. There was mobilization in many parts of Europe and the tramp of armoured men was heard, but even so the League of Nations appeared to be unconcerned with the shadow of war and discussed all manner of topics, but not the most vital subject of the day.

War did not start then. It was a year later that it descended upon the world with all its thunder and destructive fury. After many years of carnage that war ended and a new age, the atomic age, was ushered in by the terrible experiences of Hiroshima and Nagasaki. Fresh from these horrors the minds of men turned to thoughts of peace and there was a passionate desire to put an end to war itself.

The United Nations took birth on a note of high idealism, embodied in the noble wording of the Charter. There was this aspect of idealism, but there was also a realization of the state of the post-war world as it was then, and so provision was made in the structure of the Organization to balance certain conflicting urges. There were the permanent members of the Security Council and the provision for great-Power unanimity. All this was not very logical, but it represented certain realities of the world as it was. Because of this we accepted it. At that time many large areas Asia, and even more so in Africa, were not represented in the United Nations as they were under colonial domination. Since then the colonial part of the world has shrunk greatly and we welcome here many countries from Africa in their new freedom. The United Nations has become progressively more representative, but we must remember that even now it is not my so.

Colonialism still has its strong footholds in

some parts and racialism and racial domination are still prevalent, more especially in Africa.

During these past fifteen years the United Nations has often been criticized for its structure and for some of its activities. These criticisms have often had some justification behind them, but looking at the broad picture I think that we can definitely say that the United Nations has amply justified its existence and repeatedly prevented recurrent crisis from developing into war. It has played a great role, and it is a little difficult now to think of this troubled world without the United Nations. If it has defects, those defects lie in the world situation itself which inevitably it mirrors. If there had been no United Nations today, our first task would have been to create something of that kind. I should like, therefore, to pay my tribute to the work of the United Nations as a whole, even though I might criticize some aspect of it from time to time.

The structure of the United Nations when it started was weighted in favour of Europe and the Americas. It did not seem to us to be fair to the countries of Asia and Africa, but we appreciated the difficulties of the situation and did not press for any changes. With the growth of the United Nations and with more countries coming into it, that structure today is still more unbalanced. Even so, we wish to proceed slowly and with agreement and not to press for any change which would involve an immediate amendment of the Charter and the raising of heated controversies. Unfortunately, we live in a split world which is constantly coming up against the basic assumptions of the United Nations. We have to bear with this and try to move ever more forward to that conception of full co-operation between nations. That co-operation does not and must not mean any domination of one country by another, any coercion or compulsion forcing any country to line up with another country. Each country has something to give and something to take from others. The moment coercion is exercised, that country's development is not only impaired but also its growth suffers.

We have to acknowledge that there is great diversity in the world and this variety is good and it is to be encouraged, so that each country may grow and its creative impulse might have full play in accordance with its own genius.

Hundreds and thousands of years of past history have conditioned us in our respective, countries, and our roots go deep down into the soil. If these roots are pulled out, we wither, but if those roots remain strong and we allow the winds from the four quarters to blow in upon us then they will yield branch and Bower and fruit.

Many of the speakers from this forum have surveyed the world scene and spoken on a variety of problems. I should like to concentrate on what I consider to be the basic problem of all. If necessity arises we may, with the permission of the President, intervene later with regard to other problems. My own mind is naturally filled with the problems of my own country and our passionate desire to develop and put an end to the poverty and low standards which have been a curse to our hundreds of millions of people. To that end we

214

labour as indeed other underdeveloped countries are also doing.

Seated here in this tremendous and impressive city of New York, with all the achievements of modern science, technology and human effort, my mind often goes back to our villages in India and my countrymen who live there. We have no desire to imitate or to compete with any other country, but we are firmly resolved to raise the standards of our people and give them the opportunities to lead a good life. Even though this fills our minds, I do not propose to speak to you on this subject here because there is something else that is of even greater importance, that is, peace.

Without peace all our dreams vanish and are reduced to ashes. The Charter of the United Nations declares our determination "to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war," and "to reaffirm faith in fundamental human rights and for these ends to practise tolerance and live together in peace and with one another as good neighbours"

The main purpose of the United Nations is to build up a world without war, a world based on the co-operation of nations and peoples. It is not merely a world where war is kept in check for a balancing of armed forces. It is much deeper

than that. It is a world from which the major causes of war have been removed and social structures built up which further peaceful cooperation within a nation as well as between nations.

In the preamble to the Constitution of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization it is stated that war begins' in the minds of men. That is essentially true, and ultimately it is necessary to bring about this change in our minds and to remove fears and apprehensions, hatreds and suspicions.

Disarmament is a part of this process for it will create an atmosphere helpful to cooperation. But it is only a step towards our objective, a part of the larger effort to rid the world of war and the causes of war. In the present context, however, disarmament becomes of very special importance for us all, overriding all others. But we must always remember that even in pursuing disarmament we have to keep in view our larger purpose.

For many years past there has been talk of disarmament, and some progress has undoubtedly been made in so far as plans and proposals are concerned. But still we find that the race of armaments continues, and so also the effort to find ever-more powerful engines of destruction. Fear and hatred overshadow the world. If even a small part of this effort was directed to the search for peace, probably the problem of disarmament would have been solved by this time. Apart from the moral imperative of peace, every practical consideration leads us to that conclusion, for as everyone knows, the choice today in this nuclear age is one between utter annihilation and the destruction of civilization, or of some way to have peaceful coexistence between nations. There is no middle way.

The world consists of a great variety of nations and peoples differing in their ideas and urges and in their economic development. All of them desire peace and progress for their people, and yet many of them are afraid of each other and therefore cannot concentrate on the quest of peace. We must recognize this variety of opinion and objectives in the world and not seek to coerce or compel others to function according to our own particular way. The moment there is an

attempt at coercion, there is fear and conflict and the seeds of war are sown. That is the basic philosophy underlying the attempt to avoid military or other violent methods for the solution of problems. That is the main reason which impels those countries who are called "unaligned" to avoid military pacts.

If war then is an abomination and the ultimate crime which has to be avoided and combated, then we must fashion our minds and policies accordingly and not hesitate because of our fears to take steps forward. There may, be risks but the greatest risk is to allow the present dangerous drift to continue. To achieve peace we have to try to develop a climate of peace and tolerance and to avoid speech and action which tend to increase fear and hatred.

It may not be possible to reach full disarmament in one step, though every step should be conditioned to that end. Much has already been done in these discussions of disarmament; but the sands of time run out and we dare not play about with this or delay its consideration. That, indeed, is the main duty of the United Nations today, and if it fails in this, United Nations fails in its main purpose.

We live in an age of great revolutionary changes brought about by the advance of science and technology. Therein lies hope for the world and also the danger of sudden death. Because of these advances the time we have for controlling

215

the forces of destruction is strictly limited. If within the next three or four years effective disarmament is not agreed to and implemented, then it may be too late and all the goodwill in the world will not be able to stop the drift to certain disaster. We may not, therefore, delay or postpone the consideration of this vital problem.

In the context of things today, two great nations, the United States and the Soviet Union hold the key to war and peace. Theirs is a great responsibility. But every country, small or big, is concerned in this matter of peace and war and therefore every country must shoulder this responsibility and work to this end.

It is easy to criticize the action or inaction of any country ; but this criticism does not help us

much ; it only increases tension and fear, and nations take up rigid attitudes from which it is difficult to dislodge them. The issues before the world are too vital to be left to a few countries only or to be affected by personal likes or dislikes. In order to deal with these big issues effectively we have to take big and impersonal views. It is only the United Nations as a whole that can ultimately solve this problem.

Therefore, while all efforts towards disarmament must be welcomed, the United Nations should be closely associated with them. The question of disarmament has been considered at various levels. There is general disarmament and the ending of test explosions of nuclear and thermonuclear weapons. So far as test explosions are concerned, considerable progress has been made by the Committee which has been meeting in Geneva. Indeed, it would appear that an agreement has been reached there on many basic issues and only a little more effort is needed to complete this agreement. I suggest that a final agreement on the subject should be reached as early as possible. That is not, strictly speaking, disarmament, but undoubtedly any such agreement will bring a large measure of relief to the world.

Disarmament must include the prohibition of the manufacture, storage and use of weapons of mass destruction, as well as the progressive limitation of conventional weapons. It is well to remember that there is a great deal of common ground already covered, and the various proposals made by different countries indicate this common ground, but certain important questions have not yet been solved. Behind all this lies the fear of a surprise attack and of any one country becoming stronger than the other in the process of disarmament. It is admitted that disarmament should take place in such stages as to maintain broadly the balance of armed power. It is on this only that success can be achieved and this vading sense of fear countered.

There is an argument as to whether disarmament should precede controls or whether controls should precede disarmament. This is a strange argument, because it is perfectly clear that disarmament without controls is not a feasible proposition. It is even more clear that controls without disarmament have no meaning. The whole conception of controls comes in only because of dis-

armament. It is not proposed, I hope, to have controls of existing armaments and thus in a way to perpetuate those armaments. It must therefore be clearly understood that disarmament and a machinery for control must go together, and neither of these can be taken up singly. It seems very extraordinary to me that great nations should argue about priorities in this matter and make that a reason for not going ahead. Therefore, both questions should be tackled simultaneously and as parts of a single problem.

Success may not come immediately, but it is, I think, of the greatest importance that there should be no gap, no discontinuity, in our dealing with this problem. Once there is discontinuity this will lead to a rapid deterioration of the present situation and it will be much more difficult to start afresh.

A proposal has been made that this question of disarmament should be referred to a committee of experts. One can have no objection to such a reference, but, in fact, experts have been considering this matter during the past many years and we have the advantage of their views. In any event, any reference to a committee of experts would not lead to any postponement of the major issue. Any such delay would be disastrous. Possibly while the major issues are being considered by the United Nations commissions or other committees, a reference of any particular special aspect might be made to the experts. What is important is that the United Nations at this present juncture should ensure that there is adequate machinery for promoting disarmament and this machinery should function continuously from now onwards.

The fear of surprise attacks or accidental happenings leading to dangerous consequences is undoubtedly present. That itself is a reflection of the climate of cold war in which unfortunately we are living. The best way to deal with this fear is to reduce this international tension and create an atmosphere which will make it very difficult for any surprise attack to take place. In

216

that atmosphere, even some accidental happening may not lead to a final crisis.

In addition to this, such other steps as may

be considered necessary for the prevention of surprise attacks should be taken. Thus, if there is an agreement on the subject of nuclear tests and the use of carriers, immediately the danger from surprise attacks will be greatly lessened.

While disarmament is by far the most important and urgent problem before the United Nations and is a subject which brooks no delay, we have to face today a situation-in Africa, in the Congo, which has led the United Nations' assume heavy and novel responsibilities. Everyone present here, I am sure, warmly welcomes the coming of independence to many parts of Africa and to many peoples there who have suffered untold agony for ages past. We see very well that the United Nations has shown its readiness to help them in various ways.

There are three aspects of these African problems. Firstly, there is the full implementation of the independence and freedom that have been achieved. Secondly, there is the liberation of those countries in Africa which are still under colonial domination. This has become an urgent task. Today, some of these countries are almost cut off from the outside world and even news is not allowed to reach us. From such accounts as we have, the fate of the people there is even worse than we have known in other parts of Africa. Thirdly, there is the question of some countries in Africa which are independent, but where that freedom is confined to a minority and the great majority have no share in it and, indeed, are suppressed politically, socially and racially in defiance of everything that the United Nations and the world community stand for. Racialism and the doctrine of the master race dominating over others can be tolerated no longer and can only lead to vast racial conflicts.

Recent developments in Africa have indicated the great danger of delay. It is not possible any longer to maintain colonial domination in any of these countries, and I think it is the duty and the basic responsibility of the United Nations to expedite this freedom. There is a tremendous ferment all over the continent of Africa, and this has to be recognized and appreciated and met with foresight and wisdom.

The question of the Republic of the Congo has especially come before us and cast on the

United Nations difficult responsibilities. The first thing that strikes one is the utter failure of the colonial system which left the Congo in its present state. Long years of colonial rule resulted in extracting vast wealth from that country for the enrichment of the colonial Power while the people of the country remained utterly poor and backward.

What is the role of the United Nations in the Congo ? The situation there is a complicated and frequently changing one, and it is not always easy to know what is happening. Disruptive forces have been let loose and have been encouraged by people who do not wish well to this newly independent State. Some footholds of the old colonialism are still engaged in working to this end. It appears that many thousands of Belgians, including military men, are still in the Congo, more especially in Katanga Province. Because of past colonial history, this is particularly unfortunate and is likely to be considered a continuation of occupation, by whatever name it may be called. Also, it is an encouragement to the disruption of the State. We must realize that it is essential to maintain the integrity of the Congo for, if there is disintegration of the State, this is bound to lead to internal civil war on a large scale. There will be no peace in the Congo except on the basis of the integrity of the State. Foreign countries must particularly avoid any interference in these internal affairs or encouragement to one faction against another.

The role of the United Nations is a mediatory one : to reconcile and to help in the proper functioning of the Central Government. Help in the development of the Congo is again a tremendous and long-term problem. Ultimately it is the people of the Congo who will have to produce their own leadership, whether it is good or bad. Leadership cannot be imposed, and any attempt to do so will lead to conflict. The United Nations obviously cannot act all the time as policeman, Nor should any outside Power intervene. There is at present an elected parliament in the Congo, though it does not appear to be functioning. I think that it should be the function of the United Nations to help this parliament to meet and function so that, out of its deliberations, the problems of the Congo may be dealt with by the People themselves. Decisions must be those of the parliament as representing the people of the

Congo, and not of others. The functioning of parliament may itself lead to the ironing out of internal differences. I hope that it will be possible soon for the Congo representatives to take their place in this Assembly of the United Nations.

The Security Council has repeatedly laid stress on Belgian military personnel's leaving the

217

Congo. These decisions have apparently not been given full effect. This is highly undesirable. It seems to me of great importance, in view both of past history and present conditions, that every type of military or semi-military personnel of Belgium should leave the Congo. The General Assembly might well consider sending a delegation to the Congo to find out what foreign troops or other personnel, apart from those sent on behalf of the United Nations, are still there and how far they are interfering in local affairs.

Recently an emergency session of the General Assembly considered the situation in the Congo and made certain suggestions. I think that the resolution adopted by the emergency session has rightly indicated the broad lines of approach, and the basic principles laid down in it should be implemented.

The Congo situation has emphasized the increasing responsibilities of the United Nations. Not only have military forces been sent there but the problem of the development of a huge country has become partly the responsibility of the United Nations. These responsibilities cannot be shirked, and it may have to be considered how best to shoulder these responsibilities.

Two aspects have to be borne in mind. The broad policies in these grave matters must be laid down by the General Assembly or by the Security Council. In so far as executive action is concerned, it would not be desirable for the executive to be weakened when frequent and rapid decisions have to be made. That would mean an abdication of the responsibilities undertaken by the United Nations. If the executive itself is split up and pulls in different directions, it will not be able to function adequately or with speed. For that reason, the executive should be given authority to act within the terms of the directions issued. At the same time the executive has to be

keep in view all the time: the impact of various forces in the world, for we must realize that unfortunately we live in a world where there are many pulls in different directions. The Secretary-General might well consider what organizational steps should be taken to deal adequately with this novel situation. It has been suggested that some structural changes should take place in the United Nations. Probably some changes would be desirable, as I have indicated above, and because of the emergence of many independent countries in Asia and Africa. But any attempt at bringing about these structural changes by an amendment of the Charter at the present juncture is likely to raise many controversial questions and thus add greatly to the difficulties we face.

It should be possible for us, even with terms of the Charter, to adopt the United Nations machinery to meet situations as they arise, in view more especially of the increasing responsibilities of the United Nations.

If, as I earnestly hope, disarmament makes progress, then another domain of vast responsibility will come to the United Nations. It will have to be carefully considered how this responsibility is to be discharged. Possibly several special commissions, working together under the umbrella of the United Nations, might be charged with this task.

I have referred to the situation in Africa and to the Congo, as it is an immediate issue for us, but I should like to make it clear that even this immediate issue or any other should not be allowed to delay the consideration of what I consider the most vital issue facing us in the world, that is, the disarmament issue.

I do not propose to deal with many other matters here but, in view of the controversy that is at present going on in this General Assembly, I should like to refer briefly to the question of the proper representation of China in the United Nations. For a number of years India has brought this issue before the United Nations because we have felt that it is not only improper for this great and powerful country to remain unrepresented but that this has an urgent bearing on all world problems, and especially those of disarmament.

We hold that all countries must be represented in the United Nations. We have welcomed during this session many new countries. It appears most extraordinary that any argument should be advanced to keep out China and to give the seat meant for China to those who certainly do not and cannot represent China.

It is well known that we in India have had and are having a controversy with the People's Government of China about our frontiers. In spite of that controversy, we continue to feel that proper representation of the People's Republic of China in the United Nations is -essential, and the longer we delay it the more harm we cause to the United Nations and to the consideration of the major problems we have before us. This is not a question of liking or disliking but of doing the right and proper thing.

In this connexion, I should like to mention another country, Mongolia. When we are, rightly, admitting so many countries to the United

218

Nations, why should Mongolia be left out? What wrong has it done, what violation of the Charter? Here is a quiet and peaceful people working hard for its progress, and it seems to me utterly wrong from any point of principle to exclude it from this great Organization.

India has a special sentiment in regard to Mongolia because our relations go back into the distant past of more than fifteen hundred years. Even now there are many evidences of those old contacts and friendly relations between these two countries. I would earnestly recommend that Mongolia be accepted in this world assembly of nations.

There is one other matter to which I should like to refer and that is Algeria. It has been a pain and a torment to many of us in Asia, as in Africa and possibly elsewhere, to witness this continuing tragedy of a brave people fighting for its freedom. Many arguments have been advanced and many difficulties pointed out, but the basic fact is that the people have struggled continuously for many years at tremendous sacrifice and against heavy odds to attain independence. Once or twice it appeared that the struggle might end satisfactorily in freedom by

the exercise of self-determination, but the moment slipped by and the tragedy continued. I am convinced that every country in Asia and Africa and, I believe, many countries in other continents also are deeply concerned over this matter and hope earnestly that this terrible war will end, bringing freedom in its train for the Algerian people. This is an urgent problem to which the United Nations must address itself in order to bring about an early solution.

Two or three days ago I presented, on behalf of Ghana, the United Arab Republic, Indonesia, Yugoslavia and India, a draft resolution to the General Assembly. That draft resolution, is a simple one and requires little argument to support it. It does not seek to prejudge any issue, does not seek to bring pressure to bear on any country or individual. There is no cynicism in it. The main purpose of that draft resolution is to avoid a deadlock in the international situation. Every representative present here knows how unsatisfactory that situation is today and how gradually every door and window for the discussion of vital -issues is being closed and bolted.

As the draft resolution says, we are deeply concerned with the recent deterioration in international relations, which threatens the world with grave consequences. There can be no doubt that people everywhere in the world look to this Assembly to take some step to help to ease the situation and lessen world tension. If this Assembly is unable to take that step, there will be utter disappointment everywhere, and not only will the deadlock continue but there will be a drift in a direction from which it will become increasingly difficult to turn back.

This Assembly cannot allow itself to be paralysed in a matter of such vital importance. The responsibility for this deadlock has to be shared by all of us, but in the circumstances as they exist in the world today a great deal depends upon the two mighty nations. the United States and the Soviet Union, and if even a small step can be taken by them the world will heave a sigh of relief. We do not expect that by the renewal of contacts alone between these two great countries some solution is likely to emerge. We do not underrate the difficulties of realizing all this, and after giving a great deal of thought- to these

matters we decided to share our apprehension with this Assembly and to suggest this step which undoubtedly will help to ease tension.

The draft resolution has not been placed before this Assembly to add to the controversies already existing, nor to embarrass anyone, but solely with the desire, anxiously felt, that something must be done. We cannot meet here in this Assembly and sit helplessly by, watching the world drift in a direction which can only end in catastrophe.

Last night I received a letter from the President of the United States in which he was good enough to deal with this draft resolution. I presume that the other sponsors of this draft resolution have also received a similar reply. This reply has appeared in the Press. I am grateful to the President for writing to me in reply immediately after receiving our communication. Although this reply does not indicate that any contacts such as we have recommended are likely to take place in the near future, I should like to point out to this Assembly that the President has not wholly rejected the idea.

The door is still open for consideration, and the President has expressed his deep anxiety to help in the lessening of international tensions. The President has pointed out that :

"...the chief problems in the world today are not due to differences between the Soviet Union and the United States alone, and therefore are not amenable of solution on a bilateral basis".

219

"The questions which are disrupting the world at the present time are of immediate and vital concern to other nations as well".

May I respectfully express my complete agreement with what the President has said ? We are convinced that these great questions cannot be dealt with on a bilateral basis, or even by a group of countries. They are of intimate and vital concern to the entire world and to all those who have gathered here at this General Assembly session from the four corners of the earth. It was because of this feeling that some of us ven-

tured to put this draft resolution before the General Assembly. If the matter were of concern only to two countries, then perhaps no necessity would have arisen for us to raise it here. Nor did we think that a mere renewal of contacts would lead to some magical solution. Such a solution will come only after long and arduous labour in which many countries participate. But we did think that, in this present situation of dangerous drift, even a small approach on behalf of the two great representatives of two great countries would make a difference and might mark a turn of the tide.

Oppressed by the growing anger and bitterness in international relations, we wanted to find some way out so that further consideration might be given to these problems. We have suggested no remedy, no particular solution, in our draft resolution. But we did feel, and we still feel, that the General Assembly should consider this problem and try its utmost to find a way to remove the new barriers that have arisen.

As the President of the United States has rightly stated, the importance of these matters is such as to go beyond personal or official relations between any two individuals. We are dealing with the future of humanity, and no effort which might improve the present situation should be left undone. It was with that intention that we put forward the draft resolution, as a part of the efforts that should be made to open the door for future consultations, not only between the two eminent individuals who are mentioned in the draft resolution, but by the world community.

I earnestly appeal to the General Assembly to adopt the draft resolution unanimously at an early date, and I trust that it will do so.

In this world, enveloped and bedevilled by the cold war and all its progeny, with problems awaiting urgent solution, I have ventured to add my voice in appeal. I do believe that the vast majority of people in every country want us to labour for peace and to succeed. Whether we are large or small, we have to face large issues, issues vital to the future of humanity. Everything else is of lesser importance than this major question. I am absolutely convinced that we shall never solve this question by war or by the mental approach which envisages war and prepares for it.

I am equally convinced that if we aim at the right ends, right means must be employed. Good will not emerge out of evil methods. That was a lesson which our great leader, Gandhi, taught us --and, though we in India have failed in many ways in following his advice, something of his message still clings to our minds and hearts.

In ages long past, a great son of India, the Buddha, said that the only real victory is one in which all are equally victorious and there is defeat for no one. In the world today, that is the only practical victory. Any other way will lead to disaster. It is therefore this real victory of peace in which all are winners that I should like this great assembly to keep before it mind and to endeavour to achieve.

INDIA USA SWITZERLAND CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC JAPAN PERU RUSSIA CONGO BELGIUM
CHINA MONGOLIA ALGERIA GHANA INDONESIA YUGOSLAVIA

Date : Oct 01, 1960

Volume No

1995

INDIA AND THE UNITED NATIONS

Prime Minister's Reply to Australian Amendment to Five-Power Resolution

Replying to the Australian amendment to the Five-Power draft Resolution in the U. N. General Assembly debate on October 5, 1960, the Prime Minister, Shri Jawaharlal Nehru made the following speech :

I should like right at the beginning to say that I welcome the small amendment which was proposed by the Foreign Minister of the United Arab Republic. This amendment makes no effective change, but I think it is a happier way of putting forward the idea contained in the resolution.

Some three or four days ago, when it was privilege to put forward this resolution from

nations before this Assembly, I expressed hope that it would be unanimously accepted did not seem to me reasonably possible that Member of this Assembly could object to resolution. It was simple. It was straightforward. There is nothing contained in it against this person or that person or this group or that group. But it did represent a strong desire, a passionate desire, to get things moving. It did represent that this Assembly should not sit by helplessly matching, paralysed, as if it could not act. It

220

represented something to do-not much, may be; but it might come to something.

Nothing can be worse than this Assembly arriving at a stage where it cannot move and just deliver speeches about general problems. Therefore, it was with considerable surprise that I received the next day or the day after this paper containing an amendment on behalf of Australia.

I read it with care. I found some difficulty in understanding it. I read it again. And the more I read it the more surprised I was that any Member of this Assembly should have put this forward as an amendment.

I venture to place before this Assembly my reasons for this.

First of all, it seemed to me, quite patently, that it had nothing to do by way of amending the proposition which we had put forward. It is not an amendment. I do not know the rules, perhaps, of this Assembly, but it is not an amendment. The Prime Minister of Australia, in his speech, made it quite clear that it is not an amendment, although he may call it so. Therefore, it was not an amendment.

It may be, of course, a separate resolution in some form or another. It might have been brought forward and considered by this House. Of course, if it was so considered, I would have much to say about it and against it; but, anyhow, it might have been considered separately. It is not an amendment to this draft resolution which the five nations have put forward.

I could not understand this not being used in the normal workings of this august Assembly.

I could not quite understand what meaning lay behind this so-called amendment.

I have the greatest respect for the Prime Minister of Australia, more especially for his keen mind and ability. I wondered if that keen mind and ability had not tried to cover up, with a jumble of words, something which had no meaning at all- or the wrong meaning. So I was particularly keen and anxious to listen to the Prime Minister of Australia in order that he might throw some light on this aspect of this question which I had failed to understand. And I listened to him with great care. And the more I listened the more confused I grew. And the more I listened the more I realized that there is no substantive idea in this motion, but some idea of just dislike of what the five-nation resolution had suggested. Why dislike it? That, I could not understand.

He said, clearly, that he dissented from the last paragraph of that resolution--a very big paragraph, a very innocuous one; nevertheless, a paragraph with very considerable meaning. In fact, the whole resolution led up to that; the rest is a preamble.' Therefore, he dissented from the very basis of this resolution.

He came forward with his amendment of it, and he said that the effect of this resolution, if carried, would be undesirable, I wondered if I had understood him correctly or if I had made some mistake in regard to what he said. Why, I ask the Prime Minister, from any point of view, from any approach, could the passage of this resolution possibly be undesirable? I have given thought to this matter, and I am quite unable to understand this reasoning.

Therefore, it must be undesirable from some point of view of which I am not aware. It must be undesirable from some point of view which has nothing to do with this resolution. That is the conclusion I arrived at.

I would put to this distinguished Assembly, with respect and without meaning offence, that this is a rather trivial way of dealing with this not only important question but vital question which is shaking the world--the question of world conflict and how to avoid it--proper, by calling it an amendment of the resolution?

I submit that we are discussing-although we are using simple words here-very important matters, matters affecting this Assembly, matters affecting the world.

The Prime Minister, in his argument, talked about a conference. Why does our resolution suggest a meeting or a conference? I would beg him to read the resolution again and again, because he has failed to understand it. It does not necessarily suggest a conference or a meeting. It suggests a renewal of contacts.

Then again, he asked, "Why should two people meet? Why should not four meet? Why dismiss the United Kingdom and France? Why omit them from summit talks?" These are quotations which I took down when he was speaking. "Why all this?" he asked. Well, simply because there is no "Why?" about it-because nobody is dismissing anybody, or pushing out anybody, or suggesting it. He has again missed the point of the draft resolution and has considered, possibly, that there is some kind of, shall I say, secret

221

motive behind this. I really regret that any such idea should have gone abroad.

The draft resolution was put forward in all good faith for the purposes named in it, and to suspect it of some secret device to push out somebody, or not to pay adequate respect to some country, is not fair for the honourable gentleman. Indeed, I greatly regret to say that the Prime Minister of Australia has done very little justice to himself in proposing this amendment or in making the speech he did. And I am sure that this Assembly will not look at this matter from the superficial points of view which the Prime Minister put forward, but will consider it from the basic point of view which is of the highest importance to this Assembly and to the world.

Let us look at this amendment, which I think is not an amendment. The wording is interesting. In the second paragraph it says :

"Recalling that a Conference between the President of the United States of America, the Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the President of the French Republic and the Prime Minister

of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland was arranged to take place in Paris on 17 May 1960,"-now note the words-

'in order that these four leaders should examine matters of particular and major concern for their four nations,'

It is a private matter between the four nations, according to the Prime Minister of Australia., What has this Assembly to do with it ?

"Then, later on, this amendment says

'Believing that much benefit for the could arise from a cooperative meeting Heads of Government of these four nations in relation to those problems which particularly concern them,.

Now this is a very extraordinary idea to put before this Assembly--that is, that these matters, these so-called summit meetings and the rest, are private, concerns of the four eminent dignitaries, Heads of State or Prime Ministers, of these four countries. Where does this Assembly come in ? Where do all of us who happen to be in the outer darkness come in ?

The Prime Minister of Australia then said that we, the sponsors of this draft resolution, had fallen into some communist trap which was aimed at describing the world as being divided up or dealing with two great protagonists and ignoring the world.

What the communist technique may be regard to this matter I am not aware. It may it may not be : I am not particularly concerned with these techniques. But it seems to me that the Prime Minister of Australia's technique is obvious. It is, "There are these four great Powers"-whom we respect, of course, whom we honour-"so leave it to them. What business has this Assembly to deal with these matters ?" It is obvious-his amendment says so. Now surely this kind of thing cannot, should not, must not be accepted-this idea, this approach.

When we suggested that these two distinguished Heads of great States should renew contacts it was not with an idea that they should discuss the affairs of the world and finalize them. I,

personally, would not agree to any finalization of these matters with two Powers, or four Powers or ten Powers. Only this Assembly should finalize them. But it is true that in dealing with these tremendous questions, it is convenient and desirable for matters to be discussed in small groups and-more particularly in a question such as disarmament-by some of the countries which have most to disarm. Most of the people sitting here have nothing to disarm, or practically nothing, although we are greatly interested in the disarmament of others so that war may not break out and destroy the world.

So that it is right that two Powers, or four Powers, or ten committees or commissions may consider these matters quietly-not always making speeches at each other, as is done in this Assembly, but from a constructive point of view. That is all right-but remembering always that in a matter of this magnitude no group of Powers, however big, can dispose of the destiny of the world.

But that appears to be the idea behind the mind of the Prime Minister of Australia, and because he has that idea that four Powers should dispose of this he was, naturally and rightly, somewhat irritated that only two Powers should do so. Well, it is not my intention that any two Powers, or four or six or more, should do so. Therefore, I should like to disabuse him of this wrong opinion that he has in his mind.

My difficulty in dealing with this amendment is that it proceeds, I imagine, from some kind of basic suspicion that there is a trick. The Prime Minister cannot put his finger on what the trick

222

is, but there must be a trick because the idea has not come from him or his group. That kind of thing may sometimes happen. Personally I am rather innocent of the working of this Assembly. I do not know if the Members who come here often play these tricks on each other. I do not know. But certainly I can assure the Prime Minister, with all earnestness, that there is no trickery in this draft resolution. However, there is something which I would like him to appreciate and that is that there is passion in this draft resolution. It is not a question of words. The Prime Minister said-and I was happy to hear

it-that he prayed daily for the avoidance of armed conflict. I earnestly hope that his prayers will have effect, and that our prayers will have effect. But even prayers require some action and we meet here not merely to pray-although prayer is good-but for action, to give a lead to the world, to induce people, to request people, to urge people to act in a particular way and sometimes to push people to act in a particular way. That is the only thing we can do.

And this draft resolution that we have ventured to put before this Assembly, in its simple form of words, represented that passion and that conviction that something must be done, or that, at any rate, the beginnings of something must take place so that it might take effect later on. Above all, it seemed to us that ;or this Assembly to meet, with Members coming here from the four corners of the earth, and to avoid discussing this matter was a confession of helplessness and of paralysis for a great Organization which was intolerable. I submit that it would be an intolerable position that this great Assembly could not deal with these matters because some people were angry with each other. Now, anger may be justified ; nevertheless, it cannot override the major considerations that we have to deal with. We realize that this resolution cannot lead us into the path of a solution, cannot lead even to a basic consideration of these problems. As things are, we must recognize the facts, and the facts are that this cannot be done at this stage. But what we were concerned with was the hope that this glacier, as it were, that had come to surround us, might be pushed a little or might be made to melt here and there so that in the future discussions could take place at suitable times. At the present moment they cannot. Let us be frank about it : this great country, the United States of America, is engaged in a great election and it is not convenient for them--I quite recognize it--to enter into these basic talks. That is true. But even now, if nothing is done to arrest the process of deterioration, then it can become more difficult even at a later stage to have those talks. That is a fact to be borne in mind. Therefore we suggested that this small but highly important step might be taken as an urgent step to the renewal of contacts. Remember that.

We think we were perfectly right. Let us consider what the effect would be if the advice of

the Prime Minister of Australia were to be followed. It would mean-it says so quite clearly-that this renewal of contacts would not take place, that the negative view prevails and that we should wait for some future occasion, which obviously is a fairly distant occasion now, for some kind of summit conference to be held. Now, I am all in favour of a summit conference, but I realize and this Assembly realizes that it cannot be held in the next few months. Therefore, we should have to wait and spend our time, presumably, in daily prayer that this might take place and that war might be avoided.

I submit that this position is not only a completely untenable position, but it verges on absurdity, and I am surprised that a man of the high ability of the Prime Minister of Australia should put it forward. Also, this amendment, I regret to say, does have a tinge of the cold-war approach, and it is obvious that if we are to seek solutions for these mighty problems it is not through those approaches that we shall do so.

Charge and counter-charge, accusation and counter-accusation-we have had plenty of them and perhaps we shall go on having them. But the fact remains that if we are to deal with serious questions it is not by accusing each other or by bringing counter-accusations in reply. We are out to achieve something, and if we want to achieve something we have to recognize facts as they are and deal with the problem as it is. We cannot merely satisfy ourselves by making charges and counter-charges.

There is, I feel-though I hope I am wrong-some of this cold-war approach in the so-called amendment of the Prime Minister of Australia. I am anxious, therefore, that this resolution that has been sponsored by the five nations should be passed-passed unanimously, or, if not unanimously, nearly unanimously. Not to pass it would be a dangerous thing from the point of view of the objectives we have and those for which the United Nations stands, from the point of view of creating some kind of disengagement, some kind of detente in this matter-the beginnings of it, at least; not a solution-solution will come later-but some little movement in the right direction. It would be dangerous, it would be harmful, it would be wholly unjustifiable not to pass it. Therefore it should be passed, and I still

hope that the Prime Minister of Australia will realize that his amendment is not what he apparently imagined it to be and that it is a harmful amendment which shows a certain lack of care as to what should or should not happen. The amendment would say that we should let months pass and then those four great countries can meet together and possibly renew their charges and counter-charges. Now, that is not good enough. Even we of the humbler countries, without vast armies and nuclear weapons, may sometimes unburden our hearts, I hope; and if we cannot unburden our hearts and our minds in this Assembly, what are we to do ? Are we just to be shepherded into this group or that group and say what we are told to say here and there, and not be allowed to express even our innermost feelings ? I do submit that this would not be right, this kind of approach, for any of us.

The Prime Minister of the United Arab Republic has moved a small amendmets. We would not object to small amendments if they bettered the resolution and if the purpose of the resolution remains and is not distorted and changed completely into something entirely the opposite of it. Therefore, I beg again to press for the passage of this draft resolution, if not unanimously but nearly unani-
mously.

INDIA AUSTRALIA USA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC FRANCE IRELAND

Date : Oct 01, 1960

Volume No

1995

INDIA AND THE UNITED NATIONS

Prime Minister's Speech Withdrawing Five-Power Resolution

Announcing the withdrawal of the five-Power draft Resolution in the U. N. General Assembly, on October 5, 1960, the Prime Minister, Shri

Jawaharlal Nehru said :

Mr. President, you were good enough to allow us an opportunity to consult amongst ourselves—that is, the sponsors of the draft resolution—on the position that has been created because of certain changes that have been made in this draft resolution. The sponsors have taken advantage of this opportunity and have consulted amongst themselves and with others, many others, who have supported this draft resolution. We feel that the changes that have been made are of such a character as to make a difference to the purpose of this draft resolution. I ventured to say earlier today that if any verbal changes were made without affecting the substance of it, we would gladly accept those changes. But the present changes that have been made, according to our thinking not only make a part of this draft resolution contrary to fact, as we ventured to point out earlier today but also make an essential change which, according to our thinking, takes away, as I have said, from the main purpose underlying that draft resolution.

That draft resolution was drafted under great stress of feeling, of oppression almost, at what it describes as "the recent deterioration in international relations". And further, all over the world people will be looking to this august Assembly to give them a lead, to indicate some step to prepare the way for the easing of this world tension. Again, the draft resolution refers to "the grave and urgent responsibility that rests on the United Nations to initiate helpful efforts". As it has now been changed, it seems to us that that essential urgency has gone, that that passionate feeling that something should be done has away in the wording of the draft resolution is. And something has been said in it which is not true to fact, that is to say, that these great countries, the United States of America the Soviet Union, should renew their contact and I stated before, there has been no break in those contacts politically, diplomatically or otherwise. Therefore, it is not a correct statement. It does not seem proper that this Assembly should be responsible for a statement which is so patently incorrect. At any rate, the sponsors of this draft resolution do not wish to associate themselves with such a statement. But that is a relatively minor matter. The major point is that the draft resolution as it stands now lacks that sense of

passion and energy and dynamism which we thought this situation required.

We have had a considerable discussion over procedural matters. It was far from our intention to take up the valuable time of this Assembly in discussions about procedure. But, as has become evident during these discussions, behind those procedural matters lay high questions of policy. We held certain opinions about the procedural matters also, but I shall not refer to that now. It transpired throughout this late hour in the evening that there were differences of opinions on basic matters, and those differences were sought to be brought about in these changes which now form part of this draft resolution. For us, therefore, the purpose for which we had submitted this resolution is not being served. It may indeed create an impression of, shall I say, this Assembly taking up these matters without that sense of urgency which we thought was necessary.

From another point of view, all this discussion has seemed to us to raise major moral issues. I

224

shall not go into them in any detail and take up the time of this Assembly in regard to them, but we do consider that this resolution did involve a moral issue and the way it has been changed has deprived it of that moral approach.

Because of all these reasons the sponsors of this resolution feel that they cannot, after these changes, associate themselves any longer with this resolution as it is now after these changes. Therefore, I would like to withdraw this resolution because its sponsors are unable to support it as it is.

INDIA USA

Date : Oct 01, 1960

Volume No

1995

INDIA AND THE UNITED NATIONS

Shri V.K. Krishna Menon, Leader of the Indian Delegation to the United Nations, made a statement in the Political Committee on Disarmament on October 27, 1960.

The following is the full text of the statement:

Mr. Chairman, it is my first and pleasant duty to convey to you the good wishes and congratulations of my delegation and my country on your election to this high office. We are also glad to see you back, restored to a condition in which we can expect from you a great deal of energy and enthusiasm. Those of us who have had the privilege of knowing you for a long time are aware of the fact that you bring to this Committee a vast fund of experience covering several decades and, what is more, in more recent times, the valuable experience gained in the workings of the Security Council, in particular, and the United Nations in general.

We should also like to congratulate the Vice-Chairman similarly on his election to office and also, if one may say so with respect, the very tactful and efficient way in which he operated in your absence over a whole day of procedural wrangle. We should also like to convey our congratulations to the Rapporteur.

Today my delegation wishes to address itself to the first item on our agenda and sub-items (a), (b), (c) and (d). First we should like to introduce our observations by what may appear to be a truism in regard to the importance of this matter which has been in this Assembly reiterated in resolution after resolution, including the last one, when, in deciding the priority of items, the entire Assembly regarded this as so important that even the very urgent problems of the continent of Africa, where millions of people call for the making of compensation for the retarded development of past centuries, had to take another place, and there were no dissenting voices in this Assembly. But if that stood alone it would not be so important. This is the 1094th meeting of this Committee. Disarmament and its allied problems have constituted the one single item on which the largest

number of sittings of this Committee have taken place in the past ten or twelve years. We have had a series of committees of various kinds. There has been resolution after resolution. I do not wish to quote myself, but in the observations my delegation made before the General Assembly we had the opportunity to read an extract from an American publication, of the Carnegie Endowment, which referred to the controversy between the two sides in regard to disarmament as "game-smanship," that is to say that each side puts forward a proposal each year, and the other side finds in the something they can object to-and the side that puts forward the proposal takes care to see that there is something in it that the other side can object to. The extract I quoted from refers to this as the "joker in the pack". It says :

"Every plan offered by either side has contained a set of proposals calculated to have wide popular appeal. Every such step has included at least one feature that the other side could not possibly accept, thus forcing a rejection. Then the proposing side has been able to claim that the rejector is opposed to the idea of disarmament in toto. The objectionable feature may be thought of as the 'joker' in every series of proposals."

And this tactic accounts for the paradox that over the past fourteen years the two sides have appeared to be narrowing their differences on some issues, even though fundamental differences have prevented them from consummating an agreement. The proposals were never meant to be considered in isolation. If the negotiators could afford to come closer at times, it was only because the "joker" had outlived its usefulness and had been discarded. Meanwhile a new one would be introduced, that would again make all-out agreement impossible. Some of the "jokers", of course, may have been intended as bargaining points; others may have been reflections of incompletely resolved conflicts in bureaucracies of the proposing Governments. No reflection on bureaucracies, Sir. The fact remains, however, that they served to prevent agreement. This pattern is clearly more evident in the case of the Soviet proposals than in those of the United

the Soviet opposition to most aspects is greater, nevertheless.

The last part, of course, is naturally to be expected from a publication coming from one side, but the first part is very important in the sense that there are still very hard facts which have to be overcome, and this year we in this Assembly face the fact—at least my delegation does—that the day and the time have passed when a mere formula of words which tries to cover up differences would ever get us anywhere. Equally, as we shall try to point out later, there are changes in circumstances in regard to the problem which we are discussing in detail, and also changes in the nature of the world, which make a new approach necessary. Therefore, we submit that there is a great danger that, with the vast amount of literature that has grown up and the large numbers of resolutions some of which are not distinguishable one from the other, we are losing sight of the woods on account of the trees. My delegation therefore intends to start this set of observations by referring to three resolutions : first, the resolution passed by the General Assembly last year, on 20 November 1959, 1378 (XIV); second, the resolution passed by the Disarmament Commission sometime this year; and third, the resolution passed only a few days ago, A/L. 320. These are three resolutions which we have to bear in mind, because last year's resolution, we believe and the world believes, marked a milestone in the progress of disarmament discussions, because it accepted, without dissent, that this Assembly regarded general and complete disarmament as the purpose before us.

Therefore, we are now faced with the position of examining why we have not made progress and what is necessary for that purpose. Therefore, since the area to be covered includes all these four items and the time is limited, I would like to indicate to the Committee the way we propose to proceed in this matter. We would like to examine what are the objectives, and when I say objectives I do not mean in the sense of distant goals which may or may not be achieved, but what is the purpose and the content of the phrase, "general and complete disarmament" and add some clarification on this matter.

Secondly, it is essential that we take notice of what the lawyers would call the conditions which

lead to doctrines tangibus, that is to say, the changed circumstances both in regard to the quantity and the quality of the instruments of war and the numbers of people who are affected by it and are conscious of it in the relations which exist between countries and the vast advances in technology, including the technology which expands the dimensions of man's conscious world.

Thirdly, we have to take full account of the fact of the role of United Nations and of what are called the smaller countries, the countries that are not possessed, fortunately, of the instruments of mass destruction, either in the way of high explosive molecular weapons or the nuclear and thermo-nuclear weapons. This is important because we were one of the countries which perhaps departed from the usual ways of thinking and welcomed the idea of the negotiations of the Ten-Nation Committee outside the United Nations. We were not at all perturbed or moved by the fact that it was not within the organizational competence of the United Nations because it came within the purposes of the Charter. But we have now advanced to a stage where not only have these ten Power bilateral negotiations become deadlocked, but we have also moved on to a position where the purpose and content of disarmament itself is one which would affect every country in the world not in the remote future, but even in the process of making an agreement, because it is well-known that this scheme must include ideas not of collective security as in the old days or the contribution of part of their armed forces which would still be retained if war were retained as an instrument for the conduct of international negotiations, but a position where the security of each country is guaranteed by the world and, as a condition precedent, that it abandons its own defences. Therefore, every country is concerned.

While it is recognized that the amount of radium that is used in the treatment of some malignant condition is somewhere about a quartet of a gramme, one of those big bombs releases the equivalent of what may be produced by 300 grammes of radium. That is to say, the capacity for the infliction of evil in the world is such that there are no people in the planet exempt from it. There is no way of emigrating, of moving away from the impact of modern weapons. Therefore, the role of the United Nations can be viewed in the sense that every Member State is equally

concerned.

In addition, from the period since 1957 onwards there have been continuous deadlocks which have only been interrupted or sought to be remedied by other methods, and the Disarmament Commission itself has functioned now for several years merely as a post office, meeting probably the day previous to the General Assembly and transmitting reports. While the Disarmament Commission figures here in the very important position as

226

item "report of the Disarmament Commission", the report of the Disarmament Commission is merely the transmission of reports about negotiations or the lack of them. Therefore, as we pointed out last year, if the Ten-Nation Committee was to negotiate, it ought to be under the umbrella of the United Nations and continual reports should be made. What is more, Member Governments should be kept closely informed by both sides, not necessarily as a matter of instruction for the United Nations, but as one of the steps which would bring the whole world in the ambit of its concern.

Next, in dealing with these matters we want to proceed to the most important of them, and that is that the time has come and we believe that the only way and the imperative way is that this Assembly has to give directives as to what has to be done and why. Secondly, it has to give some directives in regard to the machinery that may be able to operate it. These directives also have to contain matters relating to the various details that have been set out in the resolutions.

We propose next to deal with the problem of disengagements and the negotiations under plenary decisions. My delegation also wants to take this opportunity of covering, at least in a preliminary way, items (c) and (d) on the agenda.

The political, military as well as the economic aspects of a totally disarmed world has attracted the attention of this Assembly, and my delegation had the opportunity of drawing the attention of the Second Committee to this last year. And while this may appear somewhat remote, even those who were sceptical are gradually coming to the view that sooner than later the world will happily be faced with the situation when all the

energies that now go into armaments or, to put it in a different way, with the social and economic consequences of a disarmed world.

This is the general programme I propose to follow in the observations I would like to submit to you. I referred to the fact that we have not been able to see the wood on account of the trees, because while we are at the whole of this scene, what we see mostly before us are the bracken and the brambles and the thorns through which we cannot pass. But there is the whole picture before us of a world that is going, even over twelve months, from greater to greater disarmament or more destructive and still more destructive weapons, from great rigidity to still more rigidity and the fear of the powerful nations of each other increasing every day. Secondly, the consequences are spreading into areas in which they were not nearly so spread before.

Therefore, when addressing ourselves to these problems we will take all these new circumstances into account. It is not the intention of my delegation to go into the reasons why these negotiations stand deadlocked, nor to seek to apportion blame or praise in this matter. We regard this as evidence of the toughness of the problem and also of the endeavour and the efforts that must be put into it hereafter in order to overcome them.

War itself, as historians tell us, is somewhere about 6,000 years old. I do not know why they left out the 600,000 years before. Anyway, there has always been war since people were people. Even their ancestors, even more remote than the chimpanzees, started scratching each other's eyes out. But we have at least come to the situation when civilized humanity does not regard it, I hope, as inevitable, and that it is only an aspect of the development of the human race. As Lord Russell said the other day, the ancient institution which has existed for at least 6,000 years was always wicked and usually foolish, but in the past the human race managed to live with it, and, I would like to add, outlive it.

Modern ingenuity has changed all of this. Either man will abolish war or war will abolish man. To secure this in an end which results in peace, we need to persuade mankind to look upon international questions in a new way-not as a

contest of force when victory goes to the side which is most skilful in massacre, but by arbitration in accordance with the great principles of law. Unless such drastic changes in policy take place, fairly soon the march towards mass suicide will continue with blind momentum.

In the general debate, my delegation put forward the elements of the approach that we intend to put forward this afternoon.. which has been another consideration of my Government. I am asked to put it forward.

Ever since the beginning of this century, at least with regard to more recent history, there have been conscious efforts between nations, particularly among the nations of the Western world, to establish relations between nations on the basis of what is called pacific settlement. But all the others are pacific settlement, very much like some other speakers in our Committee who too often are torn between their dreams and their schemes. So at the end of the century when Czar Nicholas went to the Hague and said, "We must have pacific settlement of disputes", that

227

appeared to some people as the dawn of a millenium. But afterwards came other factors which ended in the first world war, and the process continued in the second; and now we are in the process of trying to avoid a third.

But pacific settlement is composed of two concomitants, one being that nation-States must enforce settlements through collective security, whether regarded by the possessing Powers during the interwar years that they had the security- and here I refer to the Italians in Abyssinia-to collect. But that should not be the position. The position is not holding the reigns for the more powerful nations of the world.

Over and above that, collective security in modern times-I referred to changed conditions-must of necessity take on a new meaning, because it is not possible in modern conditions to leave nations armies, however, disarmed, however low that level be, because, as I shall show, later on, that would not lead to conditions of peace, but only to a world balanced on weapons' horror. That, therefore, is the second concomitant of collective security. The third is the disarmament

of the world. This power is concomitant unless we are going to pursue the laws of the jungle.

The moment we decide on pacific settlements, there is no alternative except to use community force in order to maintain those settlements and to give up individual arms as in a municipal community.

That being the position, while the first still remains our ideals because it is embodied by more than one clause in the provisions of the Charter, it is not sufficient at the present moment merely to sentimentally and romantically refer to the clauses of the Charter but to see how it makes an impact upon modern conditions.

There is a general tendency to think that if some resolution is put forward from one country to another—East, West, Middle, North or South—this is something new, which has been thought out by someone, and, therefore, there must be something in it. Therefore, it is not the content of a resolution but where it comes from, quite legitimately, that creates trouble.

It is for this reason that I would like to draw the attention of this Committee to the first resolution of the General Assembly, Resolution I 1, which calls for a disarmed world in this day of atomic development.

My own country and Government, the Government of India, has, from the earliest times participated in disarmament discussions. The two things which they have always urged—from 1948 to 1949, in the third session, in 1950, in the fourth session ; in the fifth session ; and afterwards, in 1951, in the sixth session—have been the conclusion of some kind of convention or agreement between nations to disarm and the utilization of human resources in the pursuit of peace.

But these earlier stages were left behind in the years 1952 and 1953. We met in the eighth session, devoting a great deal of time to disarmament. Now, this year 1952 is more important than some other aspects which concern us today. As I said a while ago we are going to put forward ideas, not proposals, which I hope, will find expression in the way of proposals from the General Assembly whereby the Assembly will

give directives for the information of the world, for the information of Member Governments, the Powers principally concerned and the parties who may take part in negotiations.

It is interesting to remember that in 1952 earlier disarmament commissions were deadlocked in the same way as we are deadlocked today. had come to a stage where there was no movement forward. And I would like to draw your attention, therefore, to resolution 502 of the sixth session, dated 11 January 1952. It is not important to read the contents of it because, as I say, conditions have changed. At that time disarmament had been translated and paraphrased into what was called the "balanced reduction of arms" that is to say, war, and the methods of deciding disputes by war, were a part of the mechanism of social organization and of nation-States. Therefore, the content is related to that even though It refers to the elimination of major weapons.

But the relevant point here is this : that in this resolution-and in that situation we were trying to resolve deadlocks which could not be resolved by the parties concerned-the Assembly, on 11 January 1952, formulated a resolution where each paragraph began with the word "Directs". There were six "directions" given in that resolution to those concerned. This was followed in 1953 on the initiative of our delegation at that time. This was very strongly supported by the delegation of France. This resolution called for the establishment of the machinery for negotiations in the Disarmament Committee.

We have something of a parallel today. It is necessary, therefore, for the Assembly to give serious consideration to the necessity of taking its

228

responsibilities very seriously-not only taking it seriously, but seeking to pronounce upon them expedition, if I may say so, with courage, and place our responsibilities to the Charter over and above any other smaller consideration.

With regard to the resolutions to which I have referred, this was the situation up to 1951. In the eighth, ninth, tenth, eleventh, twelfth, thirteenth and fourteenth sessions of the Assembly, the delegation of India put forward various suggestions. They were not put forward

with any sense of egoism, but they have become relevant in the contexts of today's discussion.

I believe it was the delegation of Canada- or someone here-who pointed out that the suggestion made in this Assembly must be noted by others. There are operative or procedural resolutions in the Assembly year after year which ask the Disarmament Commission, the Secretariat and the powers concerned to take these proposals into account; and later on, instead of saying, in jumbled terms that these proposals had been taken into account, the resolutions, by number, were noted. But there has been very little attention paid to this and that is why one refers especially to the role of the United Nations, because no longer are the two great Powers and their near allies-I specifically said "their near allies"- probably more immediately concerned because they have the arms to give up, which we have not-thank God-that these resolutions were so referred.

For example, in 1956 there was referred to the Disarmament Commission a resolution involving our request to deal with the suspension of nuclear tests and an armaments truce-the budgetary reduction and voluntary submission of information-I say this because this is not a Soviet item-budgetary reduction, prohibition of the further use of fissionable material, token public destruction and dismantling of bombs. There are various other things. I will not go into details about them. Ultimately, our resolution had been referred to the Disarmament Commission around 1954. The Disarmament Commission could not find the procedures for two years to call upon the proposing party to explain its position.

Ultimately the delegation of India, in 1956, was invited and the proposals were put before it, and it was met with the position that while the statements were made, as I am making them now, without a script, the answer was made immediately afterwards from a script, which means that so consideration is given to these matters. I am not saying that any country, and least of all ours, has either any extraordinarily wise ideas or anything of that character, but since this is a matter which makes its ruinous impact upon everyone else, and since, as Members of the United Nations, we carry the responsibilities, it is only right that there should be a collective approach to this problem,

and we tried, as a last attempt, to put everybody on the Disarmament Commission. The Assembly did that, and there is a Disarmament Commission of eighty-four, but I am afraid that it always remains in a state of hibernation. It meets only to forward documents.

Therefore, this is the position, and today I want to take all this into account and seek to deal with these matters one after the other. Towards the end of my observations I intend, on behalf of my delegation, to go into this question of what we understand by general and complete disarmament" and what the position of the Assembly is in this matter.

We have had in regard to this the work of the Disarmament Commission and of sub-committees, deadlocks, attempts at compromises and technical studies-which it is important to me because it is not a new idea. Technical studies have been undertaken and there is a vast amount of literature on this problem, particularly from the early days of the Sub-Committee of five, and there are the two special problems of nuclear disarmament and the spread of atomic weapons, and the later one of surprise attack.

All this has been studied and dealt with in various places. There have been conferences as summit, in the foothills, midway between, on the top of the hill, in the plains and everywhere else, and now we are back here before the Assembly and the Assembly cannot abdicate its responsibilities.

Therefore, we come to the resolution 1378 (XIV) of last year, and that resolution, in our humble submission, was specific because it said that it arose from this striving to end completely and for ever the arms race. It went on to express the desire "to promote the creation of relations of trust and peaceful co-operation between States", and to state that "the question of general and complete disarmament is the most important one facing the world today". and to call upon Governments-Governments, not merely these powers-to make every constructive effort.

It would be entirely wrong for us to place an undue amount of responsibility-and certainly it would be wrong to place blame-upon the Powers immediately concerned in these discussions

because the responsibility must be equally shared by the world since the consequences of failure and success have their impact on the survival or otherwise of the world.

My Government, through the voice of our Prime Minister, set out only last week the position of the Government of India. What is the objective ? Before you start thinking of ways or means you should know where you are and where you are going. I think it reminds one of the saying of a great President of the United States, Abraham Lincoln, who said, "So long as we know in what direction we are going we can afford to make mistakes now and then". But is the direction right ?

The objective, according to the Chapter of the United Nations, is to have a world without war, and I would like to say that, irrespective of whatever else he said this morning, Mr. Wadsworth has given expression to these words from which we may go somewhere else. But this is something more than reducing armaments or doing away with armaments, although disarmament is the first part of it. It has become necessary that a world without war should be created, for a variety of reasons. Quite apart from idealistic reasons it has become necessary because of the consequences of modern war, which can yield no substantial results for any party and can lead only to very wide-spread destruction.

I think it was Mr. Winston Churchill who said the, other day, talking about the balance of power, that he had learned as a schoolboy that when numbers were added beyond infinity the plus became minus. Security positions are like that. In this connexion we were glad to hear the Minister of State of the United Kingdom speak on 24 October in this way :

"I do not know whether the prophet Isaiah was the first apostle -of a disarmed world,"-

nor do-I

"but the need to find a way to "beat our swords into ploughshares" is essentially the same today as when those words were first spoken; only it is now infinite-

ly more urgent and the price of failure vastly higher. The history of successive unsuccessful attempts in the League of Nations, the fifteen years of abortive discussion in this Organization, is common knowledge. This knowledge should only spur us on to greater effort for I agree with the representative of Poland-and, indeed, with much of what was said by the representative of Yugoslavia this morning that science and technology have changed the whole character of war in a revolutionary manner. It was still possible even in 1939 for some people to think that a war deliberately embarked on could gain a material advantage for their country. With the advent of nuclear weapons, only a mad man or someone unaware of the true facts could possibly believe in such a proposition. No one could gain a material advantage. No one would gain a victory. All humanity would suffer a defeat. The failures of the past are therefore largely irrelevant. The stakes for which we are playing are quantitatively and qualitatively of a totally new order. We must, therefore, bring about a reversal of present trends, and that is why we must all feel a sense of deep disappointment at the story of events since this Assembly met last autumn."

Apart from the last phrase about disappointment-that is none of our business-may I say, with great respect to the United Kingdom, which has vast experience in these matters, that here is the statement of a conservative statesman from the United Kingdom and we entirely agree. We will only ask him to follow this to its logical conclusion. This is an analysis. What does it mean? It means that all talk about balance reduction and about finding a situation where people, if it were a municipal society, would be permitted to duel with lethal weapons-that should go, and we have to interpret the content of the world of "general and complete disarmament" as a world in which war is no longer possible and, what is more, is outlawed, as an instrument for the settling of disputes between nations.

So Mr. Ormsby-Gore's analysis is one with which my country hardly agrees, and we retain

the hope that the great influence of the United Kingdom will be thrown behind this idea of a break from the past. The British have a history of bloodless revolutions—at least, one of them—and this revolutionary outlook is what is required in this matter. While we may quote resolutions of the past in the conditions that existed, we have today an entirely different situation on account, as I said a while ago, of the technological advances. The armaments race today is not between one country and another, but each country is competing with itself in the armaments race because the weapons it makes today are out of date before they leave the production line. Therefore, it is

230

competing with itself because technology and the fear of man that his weapon may be weaker or less efficient than the others leads on to this competition of a country with itself.

Therefore, in the directives that the Assembly will give, we have to take account of this fact, not because it is idealistic, not because it is the better of two alternatives, but because, in the submission of my Government, there is no alternative. There is no hope of the survival of this world in conditions where the instruments of war are retained by nations, however much they are reduced. The previous resolutions, from 1952 onwards, at various places talk about reduction to a level which will not endanger the peace of the world. Our submission is that there is no level of armament today which does not endanger the peace of the world, except in regard to civilian production, because supposing, as an argument, we reduce armaments in the European world—or the whole world if you like—to the level of 1870, or to the level of the time of the peace of Westphalia, in 1670 or whenever it was. It would not take more than six to nine months before the countries were armed not only with the modern weapons of today but with what will be the modern weapons of that time.

There is no instance in recent history where peacetime generals have conducted a war or won a war or faced failure in a war. That is to say the generals who command in peacetime are soon replaced by other generals. The same is true of weapons. The weapons that are in operation at the beginning of a war are soon replaced by others. At the beginning of the Second World War there

were no V-2 bombs or explosives of the kind that ultimately were used in that war.

Therefore, if we retain this idea of balanced reductions as the end and perimeter of a disarmament, we run up against the difficulty that although this type of disarmament-if exercised in a good way-may do some good, may create a degree of confidence and understanding among people, the position remains the same : trust in God but keep your powder dry.

Hence, we must keep in mind the havoc that modern instruments of death can create-not for individuals, not for nations, but for the entire world. No nation can stand still; its armaments race must go on with a degree of inevitability in the present world. That is why we say that an entirely new look at this matter is necessary.

We must examine and take into account the reasons why we are in this position. It is no use our saying that an institution that has existed for at least 6,000 years has had no objective and no purpose. Therefore, we must look into this point. We find that the reasons for the retention and increase of armaments are the following : The first is national security and national ambition. The second is the desire to expand. To national security considerations must be added considerations of what has mistakenly been called prestige. This is one of those things that ought to be defined under the United Nations Charter. The third reason is ambitions of colonial expansion. During the last 200 or 300 years the advance of civilization has meant the advance of arms. Trade has often been followed by the flag, and not, as it should be, the flag by trade. As the fourth reason, people would give-historically incorrectly-the fact that there has always been war in the pursuit of ideologies. Whether it has been to rescue the Holy Land, as in the case of the Crusades, or for other reasons, the Gospel has been carried at the point of the sword. Therefore, there have been conflicts of ideology in the past, as there are today-although there are perhaps not so many today as in earlier days. Fifthly, there are economic causes-the scramble for markets, the scramble for raw materials, the idea of creating monopolies, and so forth.

We are in the happier position today that, as regards the retention and utilization of armed

strength for national purposes, for colonial expansion, the area has become increasingly limited. The liberation of large areas of Africa and Asia and other parts of the world, the realization through the example of countries like the United Kingdom that it is more profitable to be without an empire than with one, the increasing dissemination of ideas of that kind, the operation of the Trusteeship System, the effect of publicity by the United Nations itself, the expansion of constructive ideas of education, health, and so forth, through the work of this International Organization and its specialized agencies: all this has resulted. not in liquidating. but in increasingly removing this particular factor. We hope that the time is not far off when colonialism, like slavery, will be not only out of date but a rather horrid memory.

I do not want to dwell on this point. I would merely point out that there is no longer any justification for all the King's horses and all the King's men to be used for retaining empires on which the sun never sets. There is no requirement today-and there should be no requirement today-for the retention of armed force for colonial expansion.

231

We then come to this question of ideologies. It is true that ideological conflicts are promoted by the modern methods of publicity. Nevertheless, through trade, commerce, cultural and other relationships and the resolutions adopted year after year by this Organization itself with regard to coexistence, even the most fanatical will gradually come to realize that this planet is a compulsory society; one cannot escape from it in spite of the latest discoveries, practically speaking. To go out of one country we have to go into another. We escape from one ideology, one fanaticism, only to find another. Ideologies are often mistakenly used, as the extract from the Carnegie publication mentioned, to find a reason for certain actions.

So far as my country is concerned, we would leave the ideologies to the disciples of ideologies. We would hope that the electric nature of the human mind the impact that an idea must take upon another idea, will in the course of time make reconciliation possible, make people willing to

live side by side and agree to differ. Only two years ago at the midnight hour, the General Assembly unanimously adopted a resolution calling for coexistence-what an ugly word; I prefer "neighbourly relations".

Thus, this ideological basis for the retention of the instruments of war also disappears. We then come to the economic causes. The peoples who were formerly hewers of wood and drawers of water, whose lands were regarded as dumping grounds for cheap manufactured material and for the production of raw materials under sweatshop conditions of labour are evolving. Things are changing with that evolution of mankind, through the dissemination of political institutions and social ideas, and, what is more, through the competition between the producing countries themselves. To a certain extent organizations like ours and the specialized agencies are bringing about economic agreements. Thus the economic causes have not been entirely eliminated but people are realizing that they should not lead to the use of the instruments of war.

Hence, all that remains of the reasons for retaining arms is what is called national security; that is still the real cause. Now, it is quite easy to say that if one wants one world or a free world or an open world national sovereignty must be surrendered. To a very considerable extent national sovereignty has been surrendered. This is an open question. I, myself, think that the exercise of national sovereignty in the interests of international co-operation is an instrument or strength rather than of weakness. After all, any decision that is reached has to be implemented. It can only be implemented in areas where that implementation makes a proximate impact upon the people concerned. Therefore, in the present, conditions of the world-and particularly in the context of the United Nations-we must accept this position of nation States. Whatever we may do to bring about co-operation, whatever we may do to make their personalities such as not to mar progress, we must accept this position of nation States and we must consider this question of national security.

This idea of national security has, in the nuclear age, led to new ideas ; that is to say, national security can only be retained by what is called the balance of power. My delegation has repeatedly stated in this Assembly, and in various places that,

contrary to the schoolboy conception of "balance of power", the balance of power is not a happy equilibrium. For those who conceived "balance of power", the word "balance" was used as an accountant uses a balance ; that is to say, the person concerned must have a favourable balance. That was the idea of balance of power. And we have good authority on this matter. In -the United States, for example, there have been Presidents in the past and the present who have talked, not about a balance of power but about a community of power. Today we do not talk about a community of power, but a world community where power is not the most important matter, but co-operation.

As early as 1919, when the discussions of the League of Nations were going on and the Treaty of Versailles and European countries were still insisting upon a balance of power, these words occur :

"There must be, not a balance of power but community of power a community of civilized nations, at that time :

"not organized rivalries, but an organized, common peace".

That, unfortunately, did not come about. I go back to the authority on which, on account of one's background and education, one largely relies ; that is the history of the United Kingdom. I am sure Mr. Ormsby-Gore will regard this as a compliment or otherwise. One of the earlier Conservatives, a more progressive one-not a philosopher-Sir Robert Peel, said :

"Is not the time come when the powerful countries of Europe should reduce their armaments ... when they

232

should be prepared to declare that there is no use in such overgrown establishments ? What is the advantage of one power greatly increasing its army and navy ? Does it not see that other Powers will follow out its example ? ... no increase of relative strength will accrue to any one Power; ... the true interest of Europe is to come to some common accord, so as to enable every country to

reduce those military armaments, which belong to a state of war rather than of peace."

Considering this was said 120 years ago, and since then there has been the Franco-Prussian War, the First World War and the Second World War, we still have not moved towards what some great men predicted and saw. Then there were statements of this character also coming, from the United Kingdom, which at that time led the world in diplomacy and was also regarded as probably the greatest Power in the world. Lord Gray was the Foreign Minister, the predecessor of Mr. Ormsby-Gore, at that time. Speaking soon after the end of the First World War, he said:

"What was the underlying cause which had been working for years to bring about war? From one aspect it was, in my opinion, the great growth of armaments before the war. Before the war it was often said that great armaments were a protection against war. Now, if we have grown wiser after the event, we should never say that again."
That was only in 1922.

"They might be a protection against defeat; they were not a protection against war. The moral of the last Great War, and the state of Europe before it was that great armaments did not prevent war; they brought war about. That was one lesson. Another lesson was that if war came on a modern scale, no victory would enable the conqueror to escape from the awful sufferings which war caused. And the next war, if it ever came, would be far more terrible than the last."

And we have all had experience of that one way or the other.

He went on to say :

"I would ask the people to consider to what consequences the growth of armaments has led. The great countries of Europe are raising enormous revenues, and something like half of them is being spent on naval and military preparations.

You may call it national insurance, that is perfectly true, but it is equally true that half of the national revenue of the great countries in Europe is being spent in what is after all preparation to kill each other."

It is quite true that in that age and time these things were probably largely dictated by sentiment and by budgetary and other necessities. But today we have come to the situation when, as Bertrand Russell said, 'Any attempt to use armaments would be sheer folly'. Therefore, we look at the position as it is. It is not some commentary on modern times that I have read publications during this week where no one is talking in terms of millions of people killed? Just as the book talks of megatons, it talks about mega-corpses ; sixty mega-Corpses means sixty million corpses. If humanity has reached that way of looking at things, then the time has come to call a halt

In this matter there are various factors which you have to take into account, some of which are probably close to the items under paragraphs (c) and (d) ; that is, with regard to the spread of these weapons. In the testimony given before the Foreign Relations Committee in the United States-I have not got the date here : it was the year before last, I think-Mr. Colin Davidson said :

"If we believe that our civilization must not be interrupted, then progress towards disarmament, is essential. Yet the failure to make such progress and the growing worldwide reliance on nuclear weapons each contributes to the other. It is the absence of progress toward disarmament which drives men to the belief that security can be achieved only by their having control of more destructive weapons ; and the acquisition of these weapons by more powers makes progress toward disarmament more difficult."

I will deal with that matter later on :

"As a result, the world situation is spiralling downwards towards destruction. To avoid this, it is necessary for us to be concerned with more than the

immediate effects of our actions upon a world which is otherwise static. Instead,

233

we must also consider the effects of our acts upon others, and upon the stability of future events. It is for these reasons that we oppose the proposed agreements."

May I at this stage dispose of the two other items for this particular purpose. As I said in the beginning—at least, I should have said—my delegation reserves the right to intervene on the resolutions taken on these matters. So far as nuclear weapons testing is concerned, the first proposals were made in the Indian Parliament in 1954 and were brought before the Assembly the same year, and the majority of members will recall the derision with which these were received. The United Kingdom delegation held at that time, and for successive years, that the suspension of explosions was no part of disarmament. But anyway, the Assembly, after appointing large numbers of committees and everything else, first made the suspension, and now I hope the permanent abandonment of the testing of explosive weapons is necessary. We are all glad to think that progress has been made in the talks in Geneva. We think that, even if all the explosions stopped, it would not be a measure of disarmament; it would be a measure of arms control. Even the control of arms would be an exercise in co-operation, and if the arrangements made were carried out it would also create a degree of confidence. My delegation, therefore, will request that these negotiations must be brought to a close very soon; and the two items on which there is no agreement, to the mind of any person outside that Committee does not seem to be a thing that should bring about this degree of delay.

We are, therefore, in general support of the sentiments expressed in the Polish resolution, while at the same time we think that it is not necessary to call the Assembly again to consider this, because agreements would be reached, and after all it is better to approach these propositions saying that what should be done is something that is not done, rather than to take the view that it will never be done.

Therefore, my delegation congratulates the

people concerned. though it has been delayed. At least we have moved towards a difficult matter. At one time it was said that it was not possible to discover whether anybody had weapons or not, and so on. I shall deal with that matter when we come to the question of controls. But we want, at the same time, to enter a reservation on behalf of the Government of India. The Government of India does not support the idea of the retention of explosions underground. It may appear at the present time that this matter is impracticable. So was the suspension of nuclear weapons. We believe that for industrial, economic or other advance there should be methods which in the long run do not create the harm to humanity which explosions would create, and if the progress of humanity depends upon a regression on the other side, then we should think twice before adopting them. Therefore, the Government of India, while welcoming the progress made, does not subscribe to what appears to be the agreed position between the two sides, for continuing underground explosions.

Secondly, we should like to say that, while any method of control, inspection or safeguarding may not be water-tight, in the sense that any laws, even income-tax laws, can always be evaded, while there are always evasions of one kind or another, for all practical purposes it is possible today, with the knowledge we have and through whatever further research is conducted by scientists, to stop this kind of testing of these explosive weapons, for the reasons which have been set out year after year in this Committee--not merely because of damage to the health of humanity and of generations to come on account of genetic consequences but also because the stopping of these tests is a step in arms control, that is to say, it reverses the process, as we said three years ago, of nuclear armaments. That is why we put this forward.

This second item is in regard to what has been usually called the "nth country" problem. There is, I suppose, a potential queue--or a line, as it would be called in America--for entering the "nuclear club". It is regarded as a great distinction to have a little bomb so that one may go about and say, "I have also got a bomb." So we think that our world is in very great danger.

This Committee of Mr. Davidson referred at that time to the fact that the countries in the world, including my own, were capable, if they so desired, of producing nuclear weapons and had sufficient fuel and all other material knowledge required for the purpose of doing so in a few years—three, four, or five years, as the case may be. Our studies in this matter lead us to the conclusion that this year there are not ten but probably twenty countries capable of doing so. It would not be right in the United Nations to say that what is good should be the monopoly of a few people, and those who pursue evil will say that evil also should not be the monopoly of certain countries. Therefore, on the basis of national sovereignty, it would be quite impossible

234

to restrain any country from having these diabolical weapons if it wanted to have them. This Assembly, almost unanimously, has reiterated our position. Only two years ago, I think it appealed to France not to carry out atomic explosions in the Sahara in the proximity of African communities. It was not successful. But here my delegation wants to put certain factors forward. Three years ago, when it was submitted that, with the progress of technology and science, nuclear and thermonuclear weapons would become more portable and more available and become capable of private manufacture, an important delegation whose exponent we all treat with the highest respect characterized the remark as scientific fiction. Today we are told that, while the baby bomb that was dropped at Nagasaki, was supposed to be a 20,000-ton bomb, such a bomb is now used only to trigger bigger bombs. At the same time, science has discovered that it is possible to make nuclear weapons of a fifty-five ton capacity and now, as further evidence of it, it has brought it down to a ten-ton capacity or a five-ton capacity. This means that these nuclear weapons will become available, I suppose, even for gang wars. That is to say, they can be reduced so much that they can become very much widespread. While great countries like the Soviet Union, the United Kingdom and the United States and so on that are now the great nuclear Powers can be expected to exercise restraint—if nothing else, by the consequences that the release of these bombs would bring to themselves and to the world—the same thing may not be expected of countries which probably may use them not for international purposes

but for other purposes. The capacity for the production of these lower-capacity type weapons as tactical weapons and for the use of destructive nuclear power in other ways in the world makes it necessary that there should be a complete abandonment of them, the destruction of stock-piles, the prohibition of their manufacture and their use and everything else.

We should like to say, at the same time, that there are three or four concrete matters that must be considered by this Assembly. One is the news--though I do not have accurate details, here, it has not been contradicted--that a process has been found by German scientists which shows promise of being able to produce appreciable amounts of fissionable material at acceptable costs.

This report states :

"A once-discarded process for producing atomic weapon materials is threatening to complicate efforts to control the atomic arms race as well as to stir up the test ban issue in the Presidential campaign". I must not say that. "The process, based on the principle of a cream separator, uses a centrifuge to separate enriched uranium for manufacturing bombs." (The New York Times, 11 October 1960)

The net conclusion we draw from that is that, through the ingenuity of German scientists, who were among the first pioneers in the world in this matter, before the Allies captured them--before they could produce the bombs--and had them comfortably interned in England, it is said that they are on the way to finding methods of producing these weapons more cheaply and, no doubt, in smaller sizes.

If it is the case, as I said a while ago, that even the fifty-five-ton bomb is only one-four-hundredth of the Nagasaki bomb, and if such bombs become widespread, it is not a prospect to which we can look with equanimity. I submit that there is no way of prohibiting a free country, a sovereign State, whatever may be its -internal organization, whether it is a Member State of the United Nations or not, from utilizing its own energies and its own resources and capacity for whatever purpose it wishes, unless there is a

world agreement to which that country would have become a party against the use of those weapons. Therefore, any argument to the effect that there is so much radiation-the argument that used to be used here always-that there is so much natural radiation in the body that a little more really would not do any harm, is beside the point. This has now become a universal menace to mankind, and therefore we must deal with it accordingly.

Further-and we may not find the same degree of agreement with regard to this-there are countries that still have vast colonial possessions. There are countries that are waging colonial wars, that are prepared to wage wars in order to retain their colonies. If they possess not necessarily all these very big megaton bombs but a degree of nuclear power so that they can argue in the same way as that in which the war with Japan came to a close, on account of the use of atomic weapons, some colonial Powers that I will not mention by name can also be drawn in, in the same way, by the use of these weapons. Then we are in a situation where the less-developed peoples, the underprivileged peoples of the world, are at the mercy of these atomic weapons.

I think it is not a bad reflection but a good

235

one, as regards the United States and the Soviet Union, that it is most unlikely that they would provoke a world war because of some breaches of this character, because one thing has to be weighed against the other. While they may not say so, it would be most unlikely that these countries would be deterred by the fear that the great instruments of death would be operated against them. Thus the nuclear weapon will practically become a conventional weapon. This is a matter which we cannot very well ignore: the spread of knowledge of new techniques. While at the beginning, when Baruch was talking about atomic materials and so on, there was a scarcity of them, now there is no question of a scarcity of raw materials. There are other raw materials, and I believe we may even come to the time when the fusion processes are of such a character that, unless there is a total ban, it would be impossible to control the devastating effects of these, wherever there is a surplus of plutonium or other atomic fuel. There-

fore, the spread of these weapons and the control of them have to be a concern of ours.

While we have not made detailed studies of the matter, my delegation is not only in sympathy with this idea set forth in this item but will give general support to it and will support any draft resolution that helps to prevent the spread of these weapons to other places.

We have also read in the newspapers that France-which, I regret to say, has not given us the benefit of its views either in the general Assembly or here, though I hope it will do so-has also talked about atomic isolation. Atomic isolation has been made possible because there is no atomic agreement. If there were an atomic agreement and if this thing called 'gamesmanship' had not been used in the past, it would not be possible. If there is to be atomic isolation, then the danger when any country indulges in it becomes greater.

Now, since I am running against time, I should like to come to the more important part of the observations I want to make. My delegation will spin propose, as it has done before, that there must be some halt to this armaments ram. As I have said, there must be some halt to this amaments race, partly by arms control in the ways mentioned-by not extending the area of potential war in the colonial and ex-colonial areas, by preventing the spread of the capacity for waging wars to those areas.

In this connexion my Government wishes to appeal to the new, free countries not to allow their freedom to be limited by any persuasion of any kind, not to allow their territories, by any appeal to their fear, to be used in that way.

Therefore, the arms truce in this way can take various forms. One form could be by arms control, by, for example, the abandonment of these tests and not spreading nuclear weapons. Another, awkward as it may sound, would be by the agreement on the part of the great Powers that the designs on the drawing-boards shall not be used ; that is to say, that the arms race come to a dead halt where it is, because there is enough killing power in the world to destroy it once. There is no need to destroy it twice over; nothing is gained by it. Therefore,

there should be a halt in the development of weapons of any kind pending agreement in a general way.

As I said, my Government would look to the newly liberated countries particularly not to allow their territories to be used for this purpose. We have held this view for a long time. That is why my Government would not be a party to a common agreement in the peace treaty with Japan, because there we thought that they should be at liberty to do it themselves in their own way.

Secondly, we should like, if it were possible, to see the extension of the areas of military pacts limited. We should like to see the "pactomania" come to a halt somewhere. If the great countries did not project their pact apparatus into the proximity of the uncommitted areas, their uncommittedness would be more secure-and in the last two or three years even the committed countries have found uncommittedness in certain parts of the world for the promotion of co-operation or of peace, or even for their purposes in that which they intended.

We also support the motion that has been put forward by various countries, including Ghana, through its President, Mr. Nkrumah, that Africa should be regarded as a zone free from the employment of atomic weapons. Perhaps they have already forgotten that bombs have been exploded in the Sahara.

We likewise support the suggestion put forward by that young and very brilliant statesman from Asia, Prince Norodom Sihanouk of Cambodia, who, in the small number of years he has been here, has contributed many good ideas-the suggestion that that part of Asia should be a zone free from the operations of the cold war. This would mean that if the great Powers, with all their other troubles, would keep out of these areas and not involve those populations in their com-

236

petition but go elsewhere, and if they would try to assist them, if they can, in their development, then the existence of that free zone would be a factor contributing to peace.

We also would welcome the proposals put forward by the representative of Poland with

regard to a free zone in Europe. Wherever free zones can be established-though we realize there is no limiting of ionized radiation-these areas would at least be prevented from becoming bases of operation. All this, perhaps, would be conducive to a climate of peace, to what is called the lowering of tension. My Government has often spoken in this Assembly about the lowering of tension, and in a small way has made whatever contributions it has been able to make by whatever influence it can exercise. But I think we have now come to a state of affairs in the world where the mere stopping of intemperate language or the sending of cultural missions, or anything of that kind, is insufficient to bring about this climate. The only thing that would bring about a climate of peace or a lowering of tension is a cessation, or at least some retardation, of the armaments race. Therefore, if there was a cessation of nuclear tests, if there were no more bases, or perhaps the dismantling of one or two, if there were no projections of the war apparatus into the uncommitted areas, then perhaps this would all lead to the lowering of tension and the creation of confidence. All this would mean that we would have to re-write all our conceptions in regard to what is called general and complete disarmament.

I hope it will not be considered that what we are now going to put forward is either utopian or unmindful of the history of the past. As I said, we have to take a new look at this problem. We cannot achieve our goal, we cannot accomplish what is required to guarantee the survival of this world, merely by the limitation of armaments. Therefore, to us "general and complete disarmament" means just what it says. It does not mean merely a balanced reduction of armaments unless as a step to something else. It is not sufficient to agree only to partial measures and phases with the final details to be decided after the agreement. When we come to the matter of these directives, we shall try to spell it out more. But we think the whole of this perimeter must be agreed to ; there must be an engagement by the great nations, those that are powerful enough-and, we hope, have courage enough-to come forward and commit themselves to a totally disarmed world, because the alternative is not to have faith in the whole of this scheme, which will not give rise to the confidence that is required that any path to disarmament will not put our people in great difficulty. What

is more, the alternative will not rid the world of war and it will make the work and even the survival of this Organization very difficult. But if the content of general disarmament is spelled out-and I am glad to say that many speakers whom I have not time to quote have gone into this question thoroughly, and we shall later on say what is required in this matter of its components --it is necessary that the Member States of the United Nations, and more particularly the nations most involved in this matter, the great Powers, should engage themselves to a total commitment. Those nations should engage themselves to a disarmed world, to a world without war. I was very glad to see Mr. Wadsworth using these words this morning. A world without war naturally means a world that cannot make war, because if you have limited armies, under whatever guise, with the growth, as I said, of technology, with the technicians remaining, with the advances that go on in the world, it is easily possible to become very fully armed. Therefore, with the disarmament-I do not mean a full disarmament treaty, but a disarmament agreement or convention-there must be an engagement by the member States, between them and the United Nations and among them, each with the others, to the effect that they are committed to bringing about a general and complete disarmament, which would merely be working out what Mr. Ormsby-Gore said this morning. That is why I said that this analysis must be pursued to its logical conclusion.

This does not mean that anyone in the world who has any common sense believes that it is possible within a very short time to spell out all the details in connexion with this matter. The difference is this: one is an agreement for a phase, however substantial it may be, in the hope that it will lead to another. But that is not the goal; that is merely an agreement to pursue a path which, if it takes us to the goal, makes us happy. But that is not sufficient. Today, in view of that I have said -in view of the state of nuclear armaments, in view of the fact that war can come by accident or because a small nation thinks it probably an advantage to promote a big nation in a war-for rational or irrational reasons there are so many things that can happen in this world. Therefore, the engagement must be with regard to a world without war where war is no longer possible and is not to be utilized as

an instrument for the settling of disputes. And that commitment should, at the same time, guarantee that the first phase of it is sufficiently large, sufficiently attention-arresting, to create confidence. We would not be satisfied, for
237

example, with the first phase that was put forward by Mr. Selwyn Lloyd last year, which amounted to no phase at all. We would like to see this first phase an agreement for the preparation of reduction on a large scale, with each of these stages directed towards the final end.

We think that this requires the negotiation of an agreement by the great Powers and others to which we must stand engaged. We are equally clear that this directive must include the fact that no implementation of disarmament is possible without the full machinery of inspection and control. But, at the same time, while for political reasons, while for reasons of confidence, the fullest machinery of inspection and control without any reservations has to be accepted and enforced, it must be equally clear that there can be no machinery of inspection and control which any scientist or mathematician can say is 100 per cent perfect. What is required is for practical purposes.

Secondly, we also have to take into account the fact that technological advance is so great and the speed with which destruction can be brought about is so vast that today it is not the inspection that catches up with the weapons, but the weapons which catch up with inspections. Therefore, while we in no way abandon our insistence upon inspection and control, because all eliminations must be maintained, similarly I would submit there has to be some provision for creating a degree of confidence with regard to the Powers that are fully armed committing deprecations in the form of what I call surprise attacks.

All this has to be limited and conditioned by the time factor. It is not the desire of my Government at this stage to state that time in terms of years. My Prime Minister has mentioned something like three or four years. I was happy to bear Mr. Wadsworth speaking this morning about five or six years, and saying that this could be reduced. I would ask this Assem-

bly, if it is possible to collect all this material for large scale war in a shorter time, it should be equally possible to get rid of it. If it is possible for the United States, for example, to demobilize something like 12 million men in less than eighteen months, given the agreement, given the understanding and, what is more, given the great technological knowledge, this should be possible. We have been told that inspectors are not available and that machinery cannot be put into operation. I must say that my Government stands unconvinced. These men do not have to be sent to universities or technological institutes to be trained to be inspectors, they exist in the armies, the administrations, the laboratories and every where else. It is only a question of enlisting them for this purpose and establishing them in the machinery that has to be created.

May I say that the procedure we follow in this Committee is that of a debate, on the subject and then a stage for resolutions, and this was originally intended-and I hope the spirit of it will be continued-so that ideas could be, put forward without too much rigidity with regard to phraseology, so that like-minded people could approach those others who were also interested so that resolutions would come up which would not incur unnecessary hostility. There are three or four draft resolutions on the table in which there are many common items, but in the draft, resolutions of the great Powers there is the proverbial joker. But, in any cast, we would submit for the Assembly's consideration the following thoughts.

First of all, it is necessary for us to remind ourselves of the resolution of last year. If this Assembly really means business, if it is to keep the confidence of the world that the United Nations is not merely a talking shop which passes resolutions because it dare not go away without them, then last year's resolution, 1378 (XIV), is, in the view of my Government, a full and complete commitment for us to engage ourselves to create a world in which war will be a thing of the past, that is, in which war will not be part of the normal mechanism of international relations or the way of settlement of disputes. Secondly, that directive should contain a request, or whatever it is, to take steps towards the ending of what has been called the armaments race. And, as I said a while ago, the armaments race

is not merely a race in armaments between countries, but the country racing with itself, or, as they used to say in the last war, producing bigger and more beautiful bombs. Therefore, this great haste to improve armaments also will have to come to an end, realizing that even from the point of view of the fallacy of the security of what is called negotiating from strength, the positive deterrent and what not, there is enough power in the world between the contending parties to deal with the other, if that is the proper method. Therefore, comes the step towards the ending of the armaments race and towards peaceful co-operation.

There, again, we have to remind the Assembly some time of the resolution it passed only a few days ago where the nations committed themselves without any dissent whatever to refrain from

238

action that would lead to lack of co-operation in the world.

Only the other day, just a few days before the General Assembly met, the Disarmament Commission, in which not a few countries but every Member State is represented, also expressed itself in this way. After recalling its resolution of 10 September 1959, welcoming the resumption of disarmament negotiations, it went on to state;

"Noting with regret that these negotiations have not yielded the expected positive results,

"Reaffirming the continuing and ultimate responsibility of the United Nations in the field of disarmament,

"Taking into account resolution 1378(XIV)....

"Recommends to the fifteenth session of the General Assembly"-to us-"to give earnest consideration to the question of disarmament ;

"Considers it necessary and recommends that in view of the urgency of the problem continued efforts be made for the earliest possible continuation of international negotiations to achieve a

constructive solution of the question of general and complete disarmament under effective international control."

The resolution also recommended to the General Assembly that the Disarmament Commission should continue in being.

We supported this resolution. This means that we are to implement the fullness of general and complete disarmament. General disarmament means that it applies to all weapons. Complete disarmament means that there are no exceptions, in view of the circumstances I have mentioned, we all know that what was possible last year is not possible this year. What is possible this year may not be possible next year. My Government, as has been expressed by my Prime Minister, is of the opinion that if disarmament of the complete and general type is not achieved by the discipline of humanity and by the work of this Assembly in the next four or five years, it may well become impossible to achieve it. Therefore, it is a matter which is not only imperative, but urgent.

Then we also have to take account of the fact that in the negotiations that have preceded, there were certain areas of agreement before deadlock was reached. It is quite true that in those areas of agreement there are certain aspects on which there is no agreement, and we should call upon the parties concerned, encourage them or whatever it may be, to implement those areas of agreements and to add to those areas of agreement whatever is required for implementation.

Pending a disarmament convention, pending an agreement on disarmament,--and my delegation does not merely say this this year, it has said it from the very beginning--there should be a complete prohibition of the manufacture and the use of weapons of mass destruction. We have never had any reservations on this matter ; there is only one thing to do with nuclear, thermo-nuclear and similar weapons. We cannot mend the situation, only end it.

We also have to realize that all these delays and deadlocks in this matter constitute a serious threat not only to the peace of the world as it stands today, but also to the future in the sense, as I said a while ago, that it might not be possible to bring about disarmament at all.

My Government yields to no one in stating, without any reservations whatsoever, that the implementation of disarmament requires full inspection and control, and we do not quite understand the conundrum of which comes first and which comes afterwards. Inspection and control can only be after we have decided what is to be controlled and what is to be inspected. My Government does not Call for the throwing away of weapons or their removal until that throwing away and removal be inspected. An agreement on disarmament does not necessarily require the completion of the inspection machinery, but there can be no implementation without full inspection and control, and, what is more, of a character that will not only bring about reduction or abandonment, but also will maintain it. If some weapon is by agreement and on instruction removed, and then brought back because there is no adequate inspect-on, then the purpose of disarmament is lost. Therefore, we would like the General Assembly to recall what was done in 1952 in a similar situation. when the position was deadlocked. The Assembly took a hand and it gave directives. It gave directives for general and complete disarmament which would involve the elimination of all war materials, war personnel, war production, and war preparation of various kinds. We shall spell it out later if the time becomes available. We were committed to a treaty, and all nations were committed to this treaty.

239

We are engaged today not merely in a pilot project, however big it may be. We are committed to bring about a disarmed world, and immediate measures, therefore, have to be adopted also to work toward a substantial phase, to create confidence and also to bring about the kind of relations that make further negotiations possible.

We also point out to the Assembly that in the negotiations which have taken place in Geneva and elsewhere both parties agreed that no phase or part of the discussions should give a military advantage to the other side and that control should equally apply to every stage and phase so that there cannot be any loopholes-because the strength of this chain of disarmament is as strong as the weakest link.

We are, therefore, fully committed, as a Government, to the idea that each of these phases, even if they are small, must be covered by the machinery of inspection and control. The various other details will have to be worked into this directive-that is, the means of delivery, the placement of weapons, which would include the bases of the world. There should be a commitment on the part of those concerned, by the nations that have the land and the facilities not to permit the use of those bases by themselves or others.

We suggest that whatever machinery exists for the purpose of negotiations-whether it be the Ten-Nation Committee bilateral negotiation or whatever else it is-a report should be made to the full body of the Disarmament Commission at a fairly early period, so that we do not wait until the sixteenth session of the General Assembly for the Disarmament Commission to function as a post office. Therefore, in the next few months, when political conditions are perhaps better, in important parts of the world, the full Disarmament Commission should receive a report in regard to the implementation of those directives. In the meanwhile, the agreement on the suspension of nuclear tests-not to supply those weapons to other parts of the world, to other peoples, or the means of making them-should go on.

We have also thought in terms of a proposition which, perhaps, should be thought over by the great Powers and not be regarded as something which does not have any meat in it. That is to say, they all agree on this problem of surprise attack on which they have been working; and it is quite true that a surprise attack can be prevented only-if it can be prevented-by properly organized and agreed upon machinery ; and it is also true that it will take sometime. But since, in spite of all our conflicts, we are living under certain kinds of international relations-a degree of international law. international action, whether it be regarded as territorial waters or freedom of the seas or the skies, or whatever it is-nations should engage themselves in the United Nations and should not indulge in or prepare for surprise attack on other countries. The preparation for surprise attack should be regarded as a serious violation of international law. And if that understanding

comes about, then even today a certain amount of machinery exists for the implementation of it. We would make an appeal to everyone concerned in this regard. All of this, of course, requires that the United Nations, as an organization, has to be able to deal with this problem.

I have expressed all along, on behalf of my delegation, the view that the responsibilities of the United Nations cannot be abdicated. What is more, at the present time, in a disarmed world there must be machinery for keeping order, or what may be called in modern conditions, collective security. In the opinion of my Government, this cannot take place by the retention of national armies but by police forces which are not of an armed character. If that is so, considerable organization is required.

Here, may I say, the general conception is that disarmament of this character has to be undertaken because it saves money which can be spent in feeding under-developed countries. In spite of being misunderstood, I would like to say this : that is not the main argument because no Government keeps a lot of money somewhere, it raises money for particular purposes. Therefore, if it does not want it for arms, it does not raise it. No taxpayer is going to give the Government a lot of pin money for contingencies. Therefore, the idea that Governments will have surplus money which can be made available is entirely wrong.

But over and above this economic consideration, in my view, in the submission which I am making at this time-which is perhaps worthwhile considering-world disarmament, the outlawing of war, the creation of a community where nations are afraid and disarming the world by complete and general disarmament perhaps will cost more, in terms of expenditure and efforts, than the maintenance of arms, because it requires large number of people, enormous quantities of machinery, a great deal of propaganda-that is the education of the populations-the conversion

240

of existing plants of production for other purposes and, what is more, finding avenues of occupation for various people who purvey arms. All these things are necessary.

Therefore, in this session of the General Assembly we should not accept, formulate or take shelter wider illusory statements. We should not go around the world and say that if the world is disarmed, the underprivileged people of the world will be better off. They will be better off because there is a greater sense of security, there is a greater sense of hope, there is less neurosis in the world-all kinds of things like that. However, national budgets will not immediately be reduced, because administrators, technicians, engineers and offices of various kinds have to be maintained, whether it is for one purpose or another.

Therefore, I would like to put this in a very realistic way. It is not a question of saving military budgets. This may happen in the far future, but right now it may cause further demobilization of armies which, I would not say, is not far less expensive than recruiting armies. Therefore, let us face this fact. This is an expenditure that is worthwhile. It is an expenditure for peace and not for war. Let us not put it on a lower ground, that we are going to run the world cheaply if we have no war. That is not the issue.

Secondly, we should not believe that scaring people is going to bring about the abandonment of war, because the whole of the war apparatus, the whole of the accumulation of these weapons, is based upon fear ; and the stronger the nation, the more afraid it is of somebody else. . I don't know why it is. I must ask some prize fighters about this, whether they are afraid of their opponents. The stronger the nation, the more afraid it is. Therefore, since armaments" themselves are based upon fear, it is no use appealing to the fear of people and saying. "If 'X' country sends a missile to IV country"-under the new phraseology---"16 'megacorpuses' will be produced in so many hours." That is not going to scare anybody, because after all, that is just statistical.

As one person said to me yesterday, "When one man is killed, it is a great tragedy. When a million people are killed, it is statistics."

It is no use appealing to the people of the world, talking about leukemia and cancer and about the destruction of the 'world, and so on. It may appeal to some people. No nation today

can be scared into coming away from what may be called a "fortress nation" concept. I would not use the name of any particular nation. It is like the Maginot line which was found to be so extremely vulnerable when the war broke out. It is "Maginot line" mentality to think that it is possible to protect a country by the accumulation of armaments. Surprise attacks certainly cannot be prevented through the superiority in arms of another country. What is more, the whole concept of a deterrent is the defensive weapon, and if it is only going to be produced for defence purposes-that is to say, not be used at all-then it has no value.

It is an idle threat. You place your confidence in the other side that they will not be so foolish as to go to war. And if you have sufficient confidence in the other side to think that-for the sake of humanity, for the sake of their own kins, or for the sake of their prosperity-they will not go to war, why do not we use that confidence in negotiation? On the one hand, we develop confidence to think that nobody is likely to do it, so the deterrent theory, in my humble submission, is played out. It has passed infinity, when plus has become minus. The more deterrents, the more the country is a target. The more deterrents, the greater the accumulation on the other side. What is more, I was reading the other day that if country X is in possession of powerful instruments, and if one of its own submarines, shall we, say, releases these weapons by accident on the home land, then that itself may lead to international war because the other countries will begin to think that the release of weapons has begun. And there is no time to wait-they push the button and there is war. Or, on the other hand, if a mistake has been made they will not want the other fellow to think that they were ready to make a mistake. Therefore, whichever way it happens the possibilities of mistakes and errors in this matter are so great, as are the possibilities of comparatively chauvinistic countries or self-seeking countries driving other big countries into positions where they may use intemperate language or be forced into their commitments, that what may be called cataclytic war is a great possibility. For all these reasons we should address ourselves to this ideas with great urgency.

As I was saying, the United Nations has to be

able to meet these contingencies. Whereas in 1945, when it was established at San Francisco, we had fifty members, today we have over one hundred members. The Organization covers many more millions of square miles of territory than it used to before. Its activities' whether it be in the field of atomic energy or in the fields

241

of health or education, or whatever it is, are considerable. For the first time in the history of the United Nations the Organization has intervened-I do not say by force-in the form of forces in a dispute not between countries but within a country, that is to say, in Gaza, in Korea, and in Indo-China, although that was not under the United Nations. But in Lebanon and various other places, emergency forces have gone in to keep the peace between two-nation States. For the first time in our history, circumstances have come about in the world where these forces are now in evidence in the territory of one country which is not in dispute with any other country. This phenomenon may spread and the Organization's responsibility will be greater. Those who formulated the Charter envisaged a situation where the machinery of the United Nations would have to meet these contingencies, and I think that this development is a healthy development which must respond to the geographical and other factors, including the political factors, in the world, and the aspirations of the peoples. The negation of racial and other considerations in these matters, the idea that there are some people who are fit internationally to administer others who are not-these things will have to disappear. And it would be a great pity if it were lost in the cold war controversy or in "gamesmanship", as this gentleman has called it, because it is plain to the common sense point of view that if the world were really to disarm, and if some 30 million troops were to be demobilized, the vast panoply of war, which is costing \$100 billion a year. would mean, if it is to be reconverted or otherwise engaged, that millions of people in very expert occupations would have to be engaged. As has been envisaged in the resolutions submitted by a number of countries, including the United States, in the past, and by publications of the United Nations, it will require very considerable organization of its own, and, subject to what may happen here, the view of my country now is, and ever has been,

that this is a matter of world security, which is the responsibility of the Security Council.

The Security Council, therefore, has to respond to this new situation, and we think that the American statesmen who met at San Francisco built better than they knew when they insisted, perhaps against logic, perhaps against the idealistic views of their own people, that the United Nations could survive only on the basis of all-Power unanimity which is now called the veto. Therefore, while the Security Council takes charge of this organization, it is my submission-and we make no secret of it-that this veto will be at a very high political level, which would obtain in any case. That veto can be exercised only in the terms of the Charter, but the general operational disarmament machinery will go on, and therefore it protects the great nations and the small nations against a rush vote of any kind, and at the same time does not deadlock administration by processes which build in deadlocks into the machinery itself. But that is a thing for the future. All we say is that this old bottle will not take all the new wine, and therefore it is necessary for us to consider the matter 'seriously. And I hope that the countries, particularly the Soviet Union which has for the past several years in the Special Committee and so on-I do not say for bad reasons, and we have supported it in this because we have balanced the good with the evil in this matter-been against the alteration of the composition of organs such as the Security Council and other bodies, will take a new look at the situation and will not become the victims of their own initial ideas. I hope that they will realize that this operation cannot be carried out either by the existing machinery or even with what is called the Military Staff Committee-a few generals, and so on, who have been here for a long time. That sort of thing will not work because it is a great world operation involving millions of people, as I said, and millions of dollars worth of equipment, together with large numbers of agreements which require lawyers, doctors, and all kinds of others, because people become very neurotic in this. All the doctors in the world also would be required. So, in the security function, there are provisions of the Charter which deal with this vast machinery.

It is a very interesting exercise to make an

analysis of what has been said by the United States, on the one hand, and by the Soviet Union on the other. It is a good thing they do not remind each other of what was said in different years. I believe that in 1928 the then United States Government made a proposal to the League of Nations which is identical with what the Soviet Union has been proposing for a long time. But then that was in a different period. Anyway, here in document A/C.1/L.250 the United States speaks of "an international disarmament organization within the framework of the United Nations" and of "the maintenance of international law and order in a disarmed world by strengthened international peace keeping machinery within the United Nations". And within the United Nations there is only one machinery for security-that is, the Security Council. The Security Council operates under what, I am sorry to say, has been called by the newspapers a veto, but is a healthy principle of

242

great-Power unanimity. In the exercise of this veto the Soviet Union, the people who take the place of China in the Security Council, the United States, the United Kingdom and France have participated, except that when the United States exercise the veto it does so in common with the United Kingdom and France, and therefore it does not look like a veto. That is all there is to it. But it is a veto just the same.

So, we are ardent advocates of the veto. It is our safety for small nations. After all, history in the Past is replete with instances of-in fact, most of it is written about-arrangements between the great Powers to carve up the world. Therefore, we cannot just sit back and say that it is none of our business.

On the other hand, the Russians -also have said "an international control organization shall be established under the United Nations". It is the same copy, I am sure. One did not copy from the other. That would be very bad, would it not. But there it is. This is document A/C.1/L.249, the other was document A/C.1/L.250. I do not know whether the numerals have any significance, but the Soviet draft resolution is in document A/c. 1/L.249 and

the United States draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.250.

Then the Soviet Union draft resolution goes on to say,

"...in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations ... to make available to the Security Council ..contingents of police (militia)", and so on.

As the United Nations, however, we are concerned with Charter provisions, and in this respect the Charter says :

"All Members of the United Nations, in order to contribute to the maintenance of international peace and security, undertake to make available to the Security Council ... armed forces...

"Plans for the application of armed force shall be made by the Security Council...

"There shall be established a Military Staff Committee to advise and assist the Security Council..."

Thus, the Charter is quite clear on this matter.

My Government thinks that there are no practical difficulties in this respect. As I have said, scientists and others talk today in terms of "megacorpuses", of profitable atomic weapons and things of that character. We have come away from the highly explosive stage. First there was the Nagasaki-Hiroshima type-of atomic bomb. Then came nuclear weapons and thermonuclear weapons. Fusion processes were played around with. And now we are in the space age. What is left? I hope that there will be no conflict between the Soviet Union and the United States in regard to the possession of Mars. If there is such a conflict, however, I hope that they will wage their war on Mars and not on the earth. Unfortunately, the present position is contrary to the theological doctrine that the troubles in Heaven are solved on earth the problems of the earth are not solved in Heaven.

The fact is that we have come to a position in which thinking people are seriously writing of

such things as "doomsday machines"-I do not want to read out the entire extract to which I have referred; it is pretty gruesome. The idea of these "doomsday machines" is that a country buries a large quantity of explosive material and if it is attacked by another country it blows up the world. Another method is called "mutual suicide arrangements". These are things that are an outrage on the conscience of humanity.

The time has come for us to realize that we are here not merely as representatives of Governments but as human beings interested in the opportunities and perhaps the responsibilities of enabling human wisdom to match its ingenuity. Today power has become limitless. There is no question of the exhaustion of oil, or of fuel, or of coal, or of anything of that kind. It is said, I believe, that every gramme of matter contains 23 million potential kilowatts of power. Thus, there is limitless power; there is limitless ingenuity; there is a limitless capacity to make use of peace instruments for war purposes. After all, no aircraft has been manufactured that could not carry bombs. We are told by the people concerned in military blocs, "You know, these weapons are not intended to be used against you, but against somebody else". Our answer is that guns which fire in only one direction have not been made; it all depends on who is behind the gun.

So, with Einstein, we would say:

"Science has brought forth this danger, but the real problem is in the minds and hearts of men. We will not change the hearts of other men by mechanism, but

243

by changing our hearts and speaking bravely".

The appeal here is mainly to the United States and the Soviet Union, which have the great moral responsibility, and to the United Kingdom because of all its past experience in the liberation. As a great philosopher has said, the Englishman has a great sense of fact, if he has nothing else. And the fact is that it is not possible to have a world of balanced armaments. If the world is to survive it must get out of the context of war.

Einstein went on to say :

"We must be generous in giving to the world the knowledge we have of the forces of nature, after establishing safeguards against abuse.

"We must not be merely willing but actively eager to submit ourselves to the binding authority necessary for world security.

"We must realise that we cannot simultaneously plan for war and peace.

"When we are clear in heart and mind-only then shall we find courage to surmount the fear which haunts the world".

There are only two aspects of this question to which I would still refer. The first is the role of the smaller nations. We are a smaller nation; we have only 400 million people. As I have said, the smaller nations are equal beneficiaries of destruction; that is to say, destruction makes its impact upon us. But if the smaller nations think that this matter can be settled by others and that they can just reap the profits, or otherwise, they are making a great mistake.

I think that both the United States and the Soviet Union are taking note of the fact that the area of uncommittedness is increasing in the world today. Every single colonial country that has been liberated says, "We do not want the spectre of a cold war on our territory". The uncommitted nations can play a part in this question if the conditions are favourable.

The second aspect with which I have not dealt is that of the machinery to break the dead lock. This takes us into somewhat smaller politics. So far as my country is concerned, we should like to see these negotiations carried out in any way and at any place. They can be carried out on the summit. We have a few high hills-, although there may be some other people there at the moment. We do not care whether the negotiations are carried out at the summit or in the foothills. We should be delighted if the Ten Nation Committee would meet again, whether outside the United Nations or inside the United

Nations.

If, however, it is the desire of the parties to draw into the negotiations people who are not directly concerned, I think certain principles have to be observed. First, these must be people who are not directly or indirectly committed to one of the great Power blocs. Secondly, they must have a certain amount of experience in this question and must have taken part in the discussion of the disarmament problem over the last years. It would not do just to pull names out of a hat. These people must be able to serve competently. They must have a tradition of courage and impartiality. They must be able to act courageously, according to their own convictions, whether it is the Soviet Union or the United States which is involved. To act in such a way is also good business. We have made better friends with the Americans and the Russians by insisting on our own views rather than giving way. Equally, these people should be able to command the confidence of both sides that they will not be carrying tales from one side to the other but will be a repository of doubts and difficulties. Another function that these people could have would be to bear witness to the bilateral conversations so that there would be no recriminations in this Committee. And then there is the function of finding ways of reconciliation.

I have deliberately refrained from going into details concerning the machinery. Our hope is that there will be agreement on a directive to Member States-and we are responsible to the world-that the functions of the negotiators are as I have set them out. Once the purpose and the directives are known, all the smaller difficulties will, I think, disappear. It may not even be necessary for the uncommitted nations to come in. If the parties know the job they have to do, they will probably do it. In any case, so far as we are concerned the function is-clearly understood. The function is not to promote the purposes of the cold war or to establish a new political theory or to go into academic arguments. The function is a practical one. The two sides, which hold rigid positions, have come into head-on collision, to the detriment of our purposes. Therefore, the main problem relates to the adoption of a directive by the United Nations

ment to carry out complete disarmament. We should not merely leave it in the air as a hope that this disarmament will be attained, while thinking that it never will be attained. It must come within the perimeter of an engagement, and then all other things will be possible.

Speaking for myself, on the basis of the limited contacts I have had with the great people, I have not the slightest doubt that the amount of concert in their minds is far greater than the amount of concert in our minds. They have a clearer understanding of the potentialities of good and evil in this matter. I also have no doubt whatever on the point that there are no people in the world who are not influenced by facts, by arguments and by the desire to make common progress.

It is in that spirit that we have submitted these observations. If any of these ideas find favour in the eyes of a great number of Member States, that will be the time to bring forward more concrete proposals. It is not part of conciliation and of service to the Assembly to multiply the number of resolutions merely in order to add confusion. I say quite frankly that unless the United States and its friends, on the one hand, and the Soviet Union and its friends, on the other, are in general sympathy with the approach I have set out, it will be futile to submit resolutions and to have them adopted by even overwhelming majorities. What is required is agreement, an agreement by the parties which alone can make a solution possible.

It is right to submit proposals here, including the one made by Prime Minister Macmillan with regard to technical experts. But in this connexion I would say that it is my Government's view that no technical committee can substitute for the political decision. We must resolve what we are going to be technical about. We cannot examine all the instruments and so forth. This is not a new conception; we ourselves have introduced it in the past; it has a history of its own. A technical committee, however, is no substitute for the political decision. That decision must be to disarm wholesale—that is, to commit ourselves to a world without war, a world where war is not possible in practice and has been outlawed by agreement. The decision must also be that this disarmament shall take place within a measurable

time, within a time that has been specified; it shall take place in phases and at no phase shall any side have an advantage; each of the phases shall lead to the completion of the project - I do not say "goal", because that is a misused word. We must realize that this is not the better of two alternatives, but is the only choice-and not because my delegation says so, but because the facts point in that direction.

If it is possible for the Assembly to be convinced that there is some salvation for this world in the retention of arms, which may begin a war quietly but then automatically increase it to something bigger, then the Assembly in its wisdom must do something. Our submission is that these directives should be given and then private negotiations should go on both in regard to fitting our Organization to these purposes-and I personally do not see any unsurmountable difficulties-and in regard to reconciling past and present difficulties with a view to breaking what looks like a deadlock.

My Government has specially instructed me to say that in regard to the existence of a gap, a break in the continuity of negotiations, this would be catastrophic, because once negotiation stops the reopening of it creates a fresh problem and a large number of questions either put on one side or already solved may be reopened. It is possible that Governments may find it difficult to take any steps in regard to a fresh start as such. Therefore my Government is of the view that however progressive it has to be, in whatever way it may begin, in whatever form, there should be no gap in disarmament negotiations. It was for this reason that a draft resolution was presented to the General Assembly on behalf of five Heads of States and Governments but unfortunately while it gained a majority it did not gain the necessary support from the whole body-not in order to prove that one country or the other was wrong, but that there should be no kind of freezing of relationships. There should be a flow of understanding, however small, and I therefore make this submission. Perhaps I have repeated some of my points because the matter of these directives, the matter of finding the machinery, the matter of our objectives, all are of great importance; if my delegation finds there is any support, if it finds there are any other like-minded people in regard to these directives as shown by the draft resolu-

tions, it may be to the profit of the General Assembly that these proposals should come before it. This is not in order to have priority by an hour or so, my delegation does not subscribe to the view that the great countries, with all their facilities, should formulate these resolutions even before the Assembly meets in order to establish a place for them. Our procedures are devised in a different way. We discuss this matter and then comes the resolution stage. That is the proper way to do it, although it is not for me to lay down

245

the law in regard to this, but that how we understand it. I do not wish to say anything more about that, because if there is understanding the procedures will fall into their place.

INDIA USA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC FRANCE MALI OMAN CANADA POLAND YUGOSLAVIA
RUSSIA SWITZERLAND JAPAN GHANA UNITED KINGDOM PERU CHINA KOREA LEBANON

Date : Oct 01, 1960

Volume No

1995

INDIA AND THE UNITED NATIONS

Shri Krishna Menon's Statement in the General Assembly on Re representation of China

Shri V.K. Krishna Menon, Leader of the Indian Delegation to the United Nations, made the following statement in the plenary meeting of the 15th Session of the General Assembly on October 3, 1960, on the representation of the People's Republic of China in the United Nations :

The debate on which the General Assembly is at present engaged would appear to arise from item 86 of the provisional agenda, which is the submission for consideration of the question of the representation of China, but this is only remotely so because if the item had been either negative or voted upon, the long debate perhaps would not have ensued. The real, immediate and proximate cause of the discussion is the draft

resolution before us moved in General Committee by the United States and which is part of the General Committee's report. Therefore, I would like to deal with the resolution and while this question is substantive, political and far-reaching, its face is procedural. It is necessary to look both to the procedural part and to the substantive part.

I am constrained to repeat what I have said to your predecessors, Mr. President. Sometimes I wish that Presidents of the General Assembly could continue in office for two or three years, because then perhaps the impact of representation would have some effect upon their minds. We have tried to plead to your predecessors that this error of distorting procedures of the General Assembly in order to suit particular political purposes spells evil which will be used for other purposes. I regret to say that in spite of the high record you hold, in giving your current rulings this error has been repeated. I say with great respect that an error becomes no less an error because it is an error repeated. If you are going to rely merely on precedents, if you make a mistake six times, then that mistake becomes a non-mistake. That is an absurd state of affairs, because under the rules of procedure of the General Assembly, the General Committee has no right whatsoever to usurp the functions of the General Assembly. The General Committee is a steering committee; it is merely an antechamber, it is merely a preparatory body to which is delegated certain functions. I would ask you to look at rule 41 of the rules of procedure. It states :

"The General Committee shall make recommendations to the General Assembly concerning the closing date of the session

I have no objection to that, it is a date which we do not keep. It also states :

"It shall assist the President and the General Assembly in drawing up the agenda for each plenary meeting, in determining the priority of its items, and in the co-ordination of the proceedings of all committees of the General Assembly. It shall assist the President in the general conduct of the work of the General Assembly which falls within the competence of the President. It shall not,

however, decide any political question."

Therefore, when it makes a decision it can only apply to those various specific items that are mentioned in rule 41. It is a well-established rule of law that when specific mentions are made of items, you do not have an over-all power to include anything else unless it is specifically stated.

I therefore submit that in ruling as you did in the General Committee, Mr. President, you were relying on the error of the past, and the repetition of the error has merely led to its perpetuation.

Let me now turn to the resolution.

If paragraph 1 of the resolution stood alone, it could perhaps be argued that it was merely a negative vote; that for purposes of effect or because some people are more extroverted than others, three lines were used to spell it out when a simple "No" would have done. Paragraph 1 merely says that the item should not be included in the agenda. In substance there can be no objection to that.

But I submit that paragraph 2 is quite a different matter. It begins with the words "Decides not to consider." Now, the General Committee has no right to decide anything except that an item shall or shall not be included in the agenda, shall be discussed in this or that Committee, and things of that nature. This paragraph uses the words "Decides not to consider, and its fifteenth regular session". Thus the General Committee is usurping the Assembly's powers of

246
discussion. What right has the General Committee to say what we shall consider and what we shall not consider? It has no right to make such a recommendation. If we were to adopt it we should merely be adopting an error.

The resolution states not only that the Assembly may not consider this matter, but that it may not consider it for a particular period. The representative of the United Kingdom made it clear that his delegation has in mind an idea that the matter must be considered some time but the decision is to be made for us that we shall not consider the matter for one year. It is like suspen-

ding a bad schoolboy from class for one day or three days or more.

The resolution does something else. It usurps the powers of the Credentials Committee. Again I ask representatives to look at the rules of procedure. They are not very helpful; they are rather badly written; but they will have to do. Rule 29 states that :

"Any representative to whose admission a member has made objection shall be seated provisionally with the same rights as other representatives, until the Credentials Committee has reported and the General Assembly has given its decision".

Thus, even assuming that the wrong representatives were sitting here, the normal procedure would be to allow them to sit in obscurity and then, after the Credentials Committee had reported, the General Assembly would make its decision. But because you, Mr. President, have permitted this erroneous provision to be included in the resolution, a red herring has been drawn across the debate and this more or less procedural part of our work has been converted into a substantive discussion.

The second error that has been committed is the anticipation of the powers of the Credentials Committee. I do not know whether the rules explicitly say so, but by its very nature the Credentials Committee is rather like a semi-judicial body. This resolution anticipates its conclusions. If we decide that someone should not be seated, why should there be a Credentials Committee ? We could eliminate that procedure and anyone could pick out twenty-five representatives and say they should be seated. All that would be necessary would be to canvass the previous years-as is being done for various other matters-in order to say who should be seated and who should not be seated. The Credentials Committee would have no function.

In anticipating the work of the Credentials Committee, the General Committee has committed an error and transgressed in carrying out its duties. It has committed a violation of the function of another properly constituted organ of the general Assembly. Indeed, the Credentials

Committee is not an ad hoc body : it is a creature of this Assembly; we elect it, we give it certain functions. Now the General Committee comes forward and says, "You may charge the General Committee with certain functions, but we shall carry out some of those functions in advance.

Therefore, the real culprit in this matter is the General Committee. I think that we really ought to pass a vote of censure on that Committee.

There are, in addition, considerations which have been used for a long time to mislead the Assembly. The Assembly has a very healthy respect for the Charter. If anyone stands up and says that the provisions of the Charter have been violated, we feel uneasy. That is why those who are accustomed to the ways of this Assembly are using the magic words of the Charter wrongly. For in this issue, irrespective of its merits, the provisions of the Charter are not involved. The Charter says that "peace-loving States" shall be admitted, States that are "able and willing to carry out" their obligations. But in this case the admission has already taken place. If, under the definition of those who oppose the proper representation, China is not a peace-loving State, then the Formosans cannot sit here either because they do not represent a peace-loving State. The admission of a peace-loving State has already taken place; it is a question only of who occupies that State's seats here. Some gate-crashers have come in, and we must remove them; it is really a function of the guards here.

Thus, there is no question of throwing the Charter at us and saying that because China is not a peace-loving State the Assembly must not admit it to membership. Actually this situation is partly our fault. Some of us, including my own delegation, have very often carelessly referred to this' questions as "the admission of China". But the admission of China does not come into it because there could be no United Nations without China : China was a founding Member of the United Nations and its representation on the Security Council is required for that body to function. Therefore the argument that there are certain defects in this State cannot apply because the State is already represented here.

If this argument stood alone, it might not be so comic. But I would ask representatives to look at the statement on this subject made by my distinguished friend, Mr. Wadsworth, who is always very reasonable, very calculated and very deliberate in his expression. Let us read what he said-perhaps it is a Freudian error :

"In the Taiwan Strait Communist China has been using armed forces intermittently since 1950 as part of its violent campaign to seize Taiwan and the Pescadores, and thus to destroy the Republic of China."

(A/PV. 881, page 13)

If one reads those lines carefully, one finds that in Mr. Wadsworth's mind the Republic of China is Taiwan and the Pescadores. In his mind the Republic of China is not that large continent stretching from the borders of Mongolia to the Yellow Sea; it is not the China of 650 million people : it is merely Taiwan and the Pescadores-and it may well be only the Pescadores in a short time. Mr. Wadsworth says that there is a violent campaign to seize Taiwan and the Pescadores, and thus to destroy the Republic of China. Therefore, the seizing of Taiwan and the Pescadores would destroy the Republic of China. Therefore, again, the Republic of China is synonymous with Taiwan and the Pescadores. Now that cannot be said of one of the five great States which are permanent members of the Security Council.

I turn now to some other aspects of the matter. There are large numbers of new countries here to which no appeal in this question should be necessary. Perhaps, however, it has become necessary because they have not shared the experience of my friends from Ceylon and other countries who had to press their claims to become Members of the United Nations in the face of unjust decisions by the Organization.

But because their paths have been easier on account of the efforts of their predecessors, the fact should not be forgotten that those who particularly come into the arena of the United Nations should feel even more enthusiastic to extend its universality. And I am sure that that is so in this case.

But listen to what is going on in these lobbies. There again another fallacy is circulated, that if China-in this particular thing that we are now discussing which I shall come to later on, that is, China in relation to the United Nation, shall we say-if a favourable view is taken about China, the representation of China in regard to the Nations, there is a fear in the mind of some I am told, that that may anticipate or prejudge the question of recognition of the People's Government by them. Nothing is further from the truth, and I will give you the respectable authority. That is the United Kingdom-nothing more respectable than the United Kingdom in my mind. The United Kingdom recognizes China and won't allow it to come here. Therefore, if a country can recognize China and be against their coming here it is equally true that you can be for their coming here and not recognize them. So there may be no fear in the minds of people.

And what is more, the international law is replete in instances where the United States has set the example in regard to principles of recognition.

Now, we have always said that the membership of the United Nations does not involve any obligation on the parts of States to recognize other States. For example, there are numbers of countries here who do not recognize one State or another. I don't want to go into detailed instances. The United Nations cannot say you must recognize every fellow Member. It would be desirable if they did so, but that is not the case.

So a country who takes a reasonable, a just, a sensible view and a view that does not make us look ridiculous in history, that country does not thereby subscribe to the economic, political, ucltural, non-cultural or anti-cultural systems that China; it does not subscribe to recognizing them obtain in nationally; it does not thereby agree to trade with them or anything of that kind. For example, it might even participate, as in the Korean war, in some action which may be objected to or may be against China. All these things do not come into it. We are merely considering whether, in accordance with the principles of universality, in accordance with common sense, this Assembly can be called an Assembly of the world when it excludes one quarter of its population.

The population of China today is 670 million. At the end of this century it will probably be 1,200 million. But whatever it is, one quarter of the world's population and a great part of its area, stretching from the Pacific Ocean up to the Mongolian boundaries and from the top of the Himalayas-I deliberately say this, from the top of the Himalayas-up to whatever they want to stretch, is a vast territory. If that is excluded, then we are the smaller; our empire, the empire of-that is a bad word, isn't it, empire-the empire of the United Nations is shrunk by this self-deny-

248
ing ordinance.

No one suggests that any of these Powers that do not like China or do like China should bring that consideration into this matter. As I repeatedly said on this platform, we are here merely ignoring the facts.

There are stories said-I must not mention names in this-about a comparatively small country in a continent which committed an offence against the ambassador of another big country in the world, and the good lady who ruled that country got very angry and asked for the map of this particular continent and said, "Where is country 'x'?" It was pointed out to her. She took an ink bottle and threw it and said "This country does not exist any more."

In this way, by shutting our eyes, we are adopting the tactics of that bird that is typical of South Africa, that sticks its head in the sands. We do not thereby erase its existence; we remain ignorant. If we shut our eyes, they say, the world does not become dark; we don't see, that is all. So that what we are doing is to shut our eyes to reality. It does not respond to the call of either logic or reason or the requirements of prudence or of security.

We will discuss here, I am afraid somewhat unrealistically the problem of world peace and of disarmament. Here is a country with large legions of men in her armies and even larger legions in the reserves, with a vast potential power of the manufacture of weapons of destruction and the capacity to contribute either negatively or positively to the maintenance of peace or the reverse. Now, how is it possible to discuss any of these

problems, with any view towards settling them, unless, of course, the whole of our disarmament discussion is either academic or not, taking into account realities ? How is it possible for us to have any assessment of the situation without taking into account a large country like this? It would mean that the arms that China possesses, the resources that she possesses, would be outside the agreement. It is almost like disarming all good citizens and all citizens outside' the law having possession of fire-arms.

And it is recognized by responsible persons. The Secretary of State for the United States said on 21st January-this is from the New York Times, so I suppose it must be true-it said :

" Secretary of State Christian A. Herter said today that Chinese Communist participation was 'inevitable' if a disarmament agreement were to be concluded between East and West."

I don't know what the inference of this is, that a disarmament agreement should not be concluded for this reason, or the other way around whatever it is. Here is the Secretary of State of the United States-and in this case there is one difference between previous Secretaries of State and this : this gentleman said this when he was Secretary of State; the previous Secretary of State was in favour of doing the right thing by China when hC was not Secretary of State and wrote a book and forgot about it afterwards. But in this particular case, he is Secretary of State when he makes this demand.

The same thing would apply to many other problems of international trade or development.

It is necessary for the delegation of India to make its own position clear. We have even been told this afternoon as to what our ideas are on the resolution that was moved by my Prime Minister. It has been spread around that we really don't want this resolution to go through. That is why we introduced it, you know. Strange are the ways of the United Nations, but not so strange. We are told that because we had controversies, and conflicts, with China in regard to our frontier therefore, we have abandoned the principles of our foreign policy, we have abandoned considerations

that are applicable to our membership of the United Nations, and, what is more important, that we reversed the views which were applicable at a time when this was not the case.

It is quite true that China, in disregard of neighbourly considerations, in disregard of a very formal decency, has violated the frontiers of India. My country will take every step that is required in order to resist such aggression and to guard the security of our land. We make no reservations on this. We have told the world that this is an act which is against the relations that exist between our two countries, against our desire for peaceful and friendly neighborliness, and, what is more, it is against the interests of peace. But in a role of that kind however painful it may be to us, however much it may be a violation of the principles of coexistence, it will not push away from the fundamental things that govern us in regard to the United Nations. I say this because my colleague from Panama says

"One fact was particularly significant : in recent years it was India that had requested inclusion of the item. The

249

Indian Government's sense of responsibility was beyond question and the members of the Committee might well bear its position in mind and consider whether it was not better to refrain from recommending inclusion of the item."

It is surprising how important we have become. In previous years, we have not regularly submitted this item. Sometimes we have submitted it, sometimes we haven't. I have no recollection of Panama having voted for it last year. So long as the item is on the agenda, it does not matter who submits it.

Some people think that it is not the content of the item but who submits it that is important. That is a very bad thing to do. At any rate, this item was submitted last year after the Chinese made incursions into our borders and the disintegration of relations had begun. What we did was done with great deliberation and I said so on this platform.

In the course of his address the Prime Minister of India made the following statement :

"I do not propose to deal with many other matters here but, in view of the controversy that is at present going on at this General Assembly, I should like to refer briefly to the question of the proper representation of China in the United Nations. For a number of years India has brought this issue before the United Nations because we have felt that it is not only improper for this great and powerful country to remain unrepresented but that this has an urgent bearing on all world problems, and especially those of disarmament.

"We hold that all countries must be represented in the United Nations. We have welcomed during this session many new countries. It appears most extraordinary that any argument should be advanced to keep out China and to give the seat meant for China to those who certainly do not and cannot represent China."

He has the authority of Mr. Wadsworth to say that it is not China that is represented by Taiwan.

It is well known that we in India have had and are having a controversy with the People's Government of China over our frontier. In spite of that controversy, we continue to feel that: "proper representation of the People's Republic in the United Nations is essential; and the longer we delay it, we cause more harm to the United Nations in the consideration of major problems that confront us. This is not a question of liking or disliking, but of doing the right thing. This is justified by the fact that many other questions of representation also suffer from this same malady.

For example, there is what is called a "gentlemen's understanding" in regard to the representation of States in the Security Council, which is honoured or breached only in certain directions.

That which my Prime Minister stated this morning applies to Mongolia. The people of this country, by dint of hard work, have converted inhospitable lands into fertile regions. The people of this great country cannot be kept out because

people do not know them or because people think they do not like them. This approach to the United Nations is something to which my country cannot subscribe.

We come again to the obligation of this Assembly to pay attention to its previous decisions. The rule of this Assembly is that once a decision has been taken, it remains the rule unless it is rescinded by a two-thirds majority.

Mr. President, since you are a comparative new-comer to the United Nations, it is my duty to draw your attention to the proceedings of this Assembly, because this matter has a long history.

The United Nations, under its previous Secretary-General, had been commissioned to study this problem in great detail, the facts of which were set out very succinctly by the representative of Nepal.

But the fifth session of the Assembly passed resolution 396, and there the principles are very well laid down. I think I will read the whole of it because we would like it to go into the record

"The General Assembly,

"Considering that difficulties- may arise regarding the representation of a Member State in the United Nations and that there is a risk that conflicting decisions may be reached by its various organs,"

"Considering that it is in the interest of the proper functioning of the Organiza-

250

tion that there should be uniformity in the procedure applicable whenever more than one authority claims to be the government entitled to represent a Member State in the United Nations, and this question becomes the subject of controversy in the United Nations,

"Considering that, in virtue of its corn-

position, the General Assembly is the organ of the United Nations in which consideration can best be given to the

views of all Member States in matters affecting the functioning of the Organization as a whole,

"1. Recommends that, whenever more than one authority claims to be the government entitled to represent a Member State in the United Nations and this question becomes the question of controversy in the United Nations, the question should be considered in the light of the Purposes and Principles of the Charter and the circumstances of each case ;"

Now, that particular clause is sufficient for our purposes because what we are now really considering is whether or not it should be discussed. And said the General Committee : "You shall not discuss it for one year."

So the General Committee has not only violated the rules of procedure, not only disregarded this Assembly, but has violated this resolution. It has enjoined us from discussing this matter. What is more, there is the fact that at this time of the night so many people are being kept awake and standing up-fifteen speakers have preceded me, and, unless the chairman rules otherwise, ten will follow, and I have no doubt that the late hour will make no difference to the length of the speeches-and the fact that this resolution definitely says that if there is a controversy then it must be discussed. But the General Committee says "No, you shall not discuss it for a year."

Not only can we not express our opinion, but we may not even think. It is like a certain Government who some years ago wanted to try people for dangerous thoughts. We are not even permitted to consider them. I think this is a violation of our fundamental right of debate.

The resolution continues :

"2. Recommends that, when any such question arises, it should be considered by the General Assembly, or' by the Interim Committee if the General Assembly is not in session;-

And that is exactly what you are not allowed to do This resolution was passed after a great

deal of debate, not by a snap vote or anything such as that, but on receipt of a memorandum prepared by the Secretariat at that time, under the direction of the General Assembly.

The resolution continues

"3. Recommends that the attitude adopted by the General Assembly or its Interim Committee concerning any such question should be taken into account in other organs of the United Nations and in the specialized agencies;

"4. Declares that the attitude adopted by General Assembly or its Interim Committee concerning any such question shall not of itself affect the direct relations of individual Member States with the State concerned;"

That is what I said a while ago. Therefore, the decision of the General Assembly places the obligation upon us to consider this matter. The decision of the General Committee places us in the position of not considering this matter.

Apart from all these considerations, gentlemen, we are up against this. Are we to bear, on the one hand, the dictates of common sense, the general rules of decent behaviour, the universality of this Assembly and the declared intentions, after deliberation, of the Assembly itself, or are we to carry out the orders of the General Committee, made possible by an erroneous ruling of successive Presidents of the Assembly.

This is an error that must be corrected. This is a very dangerous doctrine. If we were to follow this line of reasoning, a person who commits a theft and gets away with it sets a precedent for committing another theft. We have to make a choice between the illogical, erroneous, unjust, and, what is more, unconstitutional decision of the General Committee and the express mandate of the Assembly.

I have just set forth, perhaps, the legal or constitutional aspect of the matter. We turn now to the political side of it.

Some thirty-five or forty countries now recognize the People's Republic. Not all of them are

friendly to it. There are people like us who, in spite of their best efforts at friendship, do not deviate from that friendship in spite of provocations. On the other hand, there are people such as the United Kingdom, which recognize and trade with them but all not vote for their representation here. There are still others who have recently recognized them. There are large numbers of countries which have recognized this nation today.

The People's Republic of China played a very important role in the Asian-African Conference at Bandung, and assisted in the formulation of policies which have helped Asian and African countries achieve solidarity under the umbrella of the Charter of the United Nations.

These are the various considerations we ought to have in mind when we look into this matter.

Now we are told that there has been a violation of the Charter. We have never dealt with this matter before. I believe that there is a violation of the Charter and that it is by Mr. Wadsworth's China, not by the real China, because Formosa, that sits here, has violated the Charter by misrepresenting itself to be able to carry out obligations. When a Member State which knows that it is here by its capacity to carry out obligations by representing a particular area of territory, when that position is past and it still occupies that seat, it is false personation, punishable in civil law-but, of course, here you cannot punish anybody. So when Mr. Wadsworth says that there has been violation of the Charter, I say that this violation of the Charter was by the gentlemen who presumed to represent China by representing to ourselves by implication in his presence here that they are capable of carrying out obligations, carrying out the duties of the General Assembly, capable of carrying out treaty obligations and, what is more, speaking in the name of the people of China. As my Prime Minister said this morning, this China does not and cannot speak in the name of China because the Chinese people repudiated them, and their refuge on the Island of Taiwan is only protected by the fleet of the United States.

Mr. Wadsworth said

"Let it be remembered that what is proposed here is not only that the United Nations should seat the Chinese communists, but in order to make room for them, the United Nations should, in effect, expel the Republic of China."

(A/PV. 881, p., 19-20)

There is no question of expelling the Republic of China-the only thing is that two people cannot occupy the same chair.

Then he refers to persistent violations and we are told that Formosa has never violated the United Nations Charter ; in fact, the occupation of the territory of a charter State is itself a violation, but over and above that there is the fact of false personation. They have not fulfilled the obligations of the Charter.

Then Mr. Wadsworth says

"And, finally, it is sometimes argued that refusal to seat the Peiping regime in the United Nations denies representation in the world body to 600 million mainland Chinese." (ibid., page 21)

This is a new definition-'mainland Chinese'. There are various divisions in China-the Cantonese and others-but I have never heard of "mainland Chinese". Mr. Wadsworth continues

"In view of the long record of aggressions and threats of war by the Peiping regime, this argument would have no validity under the Charter even if it were true. But the truth is that the rulers of Peiping do not represent the Chinese people." (ibid.)

I am reading from the text ; it is not imagination. It may well be that they do not represent the Chinese people in the sense that their system of Government may be different, but in the sense of the State and international law it is very difficult to understand. But he gives the reason, and that is rather dangerous-I hope that no schoolboy in America reads it-

"The Peiping regime was imposed

by military force, and in ten years, etc."(ibid)

The first thing was that the Peiping regime was imposed by force. I have a vague recollection of a thing called the "American War of Independence". Apart from humble countries like our own, there are not many regimes that have not been imposed by force. I ask my friends from the continent of South of America to recollect their own history. How many of their regimes were not imposed by force, and would they feel like men and women if previous regimes had not been overthrown and new ones imposed by force ? The fact of a State coming into existence as a result of a popular revolution has been known. For example, one may not mention names, but

252

there are many in this Assembly who are the creatures of para-revolutions-revolutions from the top. There are Members of the United Nations which have forms of government ranging, on the one hand, from communist to other forms of authoritarian dictatorship; there are parliamentary democracies ; there are presidential democracies ; there are guided democracies, and misguided democracies. Every one is here. So we do not look at these internal questions, and I submit that it is insulting the intelligence of ordinary people to turn round and say that a State cannot be recognized because it has been imposed by force.

In 1917 the Russian revolution was not imposed by force but came as a result of the action of those who thought that the time was ripe for taking things over; and for many years great parts of the world refused to recognize it.

Now we speak on this matter. at this time of night and at this late stage of the general debate, even more forcibly because of the misconduct of China in relation to India ; not that we want to appear to take upon ourselves a kind of position of imposed virtuosity, but we remember our obligations to the United Nations are not to be conditioned by pains which we suffered ourselves; that is to say, our national difficulties or international difficulties with relation to one State should not make us undertake any approach to war or peace, which would become impossible.

Then, for example, a peace system has to be established. If one country were to come along

and say, my grandfather was killed in that country twenty years ago and, therefore, we cannot have peace with you, the situation would be impossible. In that way, therefore, my Government has wanted its position to be fully explained, and we stand full square for the representation of China, and we think that this draft resolution should be rejected, as suggested by the amendments of Nepal. Also we subscribe to what, in fact, Guinea says, that the consideration of the representation of the proper government of China should take place in the calendar year.

This problem will be forced upon us by facts if we are not to go drifting around towards an armaments race larger than anything we have known until now.

For these reasons, and still not penitent for charging the President with giving a wrong ruling, I submit that the recommendation of the General Committee should be rejected and the amendments of Nepal and Guinea accepted by a large majority.

INDIA CHINA USA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC TAIWAN MONGOLIA KOREA SOUTH AFRICA
RUSSIA PANAMA NEPAL INDONESIA GUINEA

Date : Oct 01, 1960

Volume No

1995

INDIA AND THE UNITED NATIONS

Shri Krishna Menon's Speech in the General Debate of General Assembly

Shri V. K. Krishna Menon, Leader of the Indian Delegation to the United Nations, made the following speech in the general debate of the U. N. General Assembly on October 17, 1960 :

At this fifteenth session of the General Assembly of the United Nations, which began some four weeks ago, charged with expectation and concern, enlarged not only in its size by the welcome addition of part of the world hitherto almost excluded from political competence but

also by the presence of Heads of State and of Government and Foreign Ministers who represented nearly half the number of delegations present here, my delegation, in the person of my Prime Minister, intervened with the set purpose of drawing the pointed attention of representatives to the great urgency of the problems that appear and our approach to them, and at the same time he reminded the United Nations of the parallel of the League of Nations just before the outbreak of the Second World War. At that time my Prime Minister informed the Assembly that he desired to address himself to the urgency of the problems facing us and our responsibility as an Organization, in regard to the lack of progress, to our failures, as well as to the consummation that must be reached. We can, therefore, as far as my delegation is concerned, be in doubt as to the responsibility severally and collectively borne by the Member States of the United Nations. At the same time the Prime Minister reserved the position of my delegation in regard to these problems themselves and to the detailed and special aspects of them.

Three weeks have passed, three weeks of intensive, sometimes acrimonious, but, so far as my delegation is concerned, in the long run fruitful discussion. My delegation, therefore, does not regard these weeks as either wasted or being productive of merely acrimony, because it is in the cut and thrust of these debates, in our capacity to face each other with points of view that are diverse and perhaps with methods of presentation that are also diverse in different countries, that we make progress. Therefore, we intervene once again at the fag-end of this debate, and I am sure the Assembly wants no more speeches for the sake of speeches, but with the realization that perhaps we have a function to perform which we must do.

253

It would be a truism to say that this Assembly, though it met with great hopes, faces a situation where, while I hope there is no despair, there is a great deal of the heart-searching and mind-searching in this world, and problems far more basic than formulae put forward by one delegation or another have come to be the propositions on which we have to decide. It reminds me of the lines by the poet Browning

"It's wiser being good than bad ;
It's safer being meek than fierce ;
It's fitter being sane than mad.
My own hope is, a sun will pierce
The thickest cloud earth ever stretched."

Even in this Assembly, as I had occasion to say in a previous intervention, there were some silver linings in this cloud when the two nations of Africa, who cannot claim the kind of modern political experience that others have, came before us, having resolved their differences by peaceful methods, and showed us the way in which even sharp differences-differences between neighbours are always sharper than other differences-were resolved in that way.

It is customary for my delegation in these addresses first to refer to the Secretary-General's report. Owing to the lateness of the date and also to the particular circumstances that obtain this year in regard to the work of the United Nations itself, it is not necessary for me to go into a detailed analysis of the reports either of the Security Council or of the Secretary-General. Suffice it to say that it is not an accident, it is not any particular bias in any way, that prompts the Secretary-General in his report to pay great attention to Africa and to the problem of the Congo. Much has been said about the new entrances into this Assembly, and in the course of this morning I hope to address myself again to the problems of the dependent peoples. But my first duty is to express the views of my delegation as of today on the problem of the Congo.

It will be remembered-and no one in this Assembly, whatever their views, can deny the urgency of the problem, by the very fact that, even three or four days before the General Assembly was about to meet, the Security Council in its wisdom came to a decision-the Assembly by its own expression of opinion decided on this as a matter of emergency. Although we were to meet on the twentieth, three days before an emergency meeting was called, the issue was discussed threadbare, and we came to decisions. We have to ask ourselves, while we know what the necessary work of the kind to which the Secretary-General made reference this morning was being carried on : are we any nearer any understanding of the details of this Congo problem or are we nearer a solution ? Are we nearer progress, or

are we nearer settlement ? Therefore, while we have been sitting three or four weeks here, after convening an emergency meeting on a problem which would not wait for the regular Assembly session, we have not acted fast enough to bring this to a fruitful conclusion. Therefore, I am instructed by my Government-and I speak in the name of my Government and people-to say that we must address ourselves to this problem with a greater sense of urgency and imperative-ness than has been possible so far. In that connexion, I should like to say this. It is not the desire of my delegation to seek to apportion blames or responsibilities or to dwell on the past. Neither individuals nor nations can look in two directions. We either look backward or we look forward, and if we are wise we will look forward and use what is behind us only as inspiration or experience or as a warning.

So far as the Congo is concerned, the United Nations stands engaged, that is to say, every Member of this Assembly, the whole of the Organization, has been engaged with the problem of the Congo. Some countries, like ours, have probably been engaged even more by the presence of our personnel in large numbers, and the entire world is engaged because there in the Congo is presented a spectacle where the liquidation of imperialism presents problems of a character never presented before. I would not like today to go into the causes and reasons, which will come up in committee when we are discussing this questions but we should like to make these concrete requests to the Assembly and to see that they are carried out. First of all, we have to remind ourselves that no government of a people, no management of the affairs of a people by an other nation or by all of us together, is any substitute for management by themselves. And therefore there is no alternative but for the Congolese to run their affairs in their own way, which means, as was requested by my Prime Minister when he spoke at the time, that the convocation of the Parliament of the Congo, elected by the people and representing them, must take place without further delays. I beg to submit that further delays will cause further deteriorations ; it will give room for those political tendencies that are undesirable, where the expressions of opinion, non-conditioned by circumstances which should not enter into it will not become possible. So, the first request is that the Parliament of the

Congo must be convened without any further difficulty. It is one of the urgent and imperative

254

responsibilities of the United Nations.

Secondly, we would like to suggest that irrespective of any legal argument in this matter, that all personnel in the Congo which is not there in pursuance of United Nations purposes and directives or are not engaged in humanitarian purposes such as in leper colonies or in hospitals should, of their own volition, withdraw from there, because the presence of those people who have been associated with the history of the Congo is not likely to help in solutions. Therefore, if there are large numbers of non-Congolese personnel in that area which are not connected with the purposes of the Charter, then they will be a hindrance to the solutions.

Thirdly, we think that the United Nations must place it beyond doubt that we are not there as arbitrators to intervene between rival claimants, because the Charter does not enjoin us to do that. We should also remember that this is the first time that the forces of the United Nations have been used not as between nations, but within a nation. We should also remind ourselves that if there are problems in law and order, the policing of the Congo will have to be done by the Congolese people. The greater part of our attention should be directed to the fact that from now on, the administration, the policing of the country, the economic developments and the personnel is to come from that area,

So, having laid so much stress on the urgency of this Congo problem, it is not my intention now to go into any specific proposals before us, but these are the principles that should guide us. If it was fit that we should discuss them in emergency session, in spite of the proximate meeting of the Assembly, there can be no question of the urgency of it. As I said, we are no nearer an understanding of it, no nearer an acquaintance of the details of it than we were four weeks ago. That means, while I would not like to say that the situation was drifting, we have to apply ourselves in a way that some disengagement of the United Nations takes place so far as the present phase of it is concerned. The engagements should be of a character to which Mr. Ham-

maruskjold referred a while ago, which are all on the constructive side.

Finally, I would like to say that while no one can and should prevent assistance, aid or sympathy going into the Congo by any part of the world whatsoever, in the present circumstances in these troubled waters it would not be to the interests of the world for very powerful people to fish; and, therefore, whatever aid, whatever support may be given in this way-I do not say it should necessarily be channeled through the United Nations, it may not always be possible-but it should be with its cognizance, so that everything will be above board, and the Congolese people will, consistent with the basic ideas of liberty and national government, be able to settle their own affairs themselves. This is the position as we see it.

Next, there is another urgent problem of a specific character to which I should like to refer; it goes away from the continent of Africa to the continent of Asia, in South East Asia, with regard to our close neighbour in the Kingdom of Laos. In the whole of Indo-China where there was a situation also arising as the aftermath of an empire, where by the efforts of the people, the former imperial Power decided to agree to relinquishments and agreements by the famous Geneva Agreements of 1954 with regard to the settlement of Laos, that is, the problem of Laos and Indo-China.

In the history of the four or five years following, my country and Government has had great responsibilities with regard to this situation. These responsibilities are not isolated from the purposes of the Charter or the objectives of the United Nations, but they are responsibilities undertaken under the international agreements, at the request of the other parties concerned, with the permission of those on whom it made its impact. The Geneva Agreements, with all its limitations, have kept peace in that part of the world. On 11 August 1954 guns were silenced in the world for the first time in twenty-five years. From the time of the Japanese bombing of Manchuria before the war, until 11 August 1954 there was fighting going on somewhere; and when an armistice was declared on the line of the seventeenth parallel, wherever it was, there was for the first time at least a day of peace. Machinery was established for the withdrawal of an empire;

and whatever difficulties did arise, in the context of an empire withdrawing, it must be remembered that no agreements are perfect in that way.

The Commission for Supervision and Control was charged with certain responsibilities which I do not want to go into detail. As I said, however much we may agree or disagree with the position of Viet-Nam, with that country divided into two, however much we may sympathize or otherwise have opinions about the complaints of Cambodia with regard to the incursions on its territories, its internal problems, I am sure my Cambodian friends will agree that as a result of the Geneva Agreements the presence of the Commission,

255

the co-operation and the exercise of it in the past has kept that part of the world free from actual war. The Geneva Agreements which were brought about by four of the Western Powers and China and in its final declaration the United States was associated, is based upon the idea of non-interference in the affairs of these people. There is no hope for an Asian country particularly a small country, there is no hope of peace in Asia unless the parties to the cold war keep out of our territories, That is our main objection to military pacts. We are not saying that they Are evil or that they are good, or that their motives are bad or anything of that kind.

What we are saying is : take as our own history from, shall we say, the beginning of the seventeenth century to the beginning of the nineteenth century; whenever there was a war in Europe, whenever the British and the French quarrelled there was a war in India for no reason. Therefore, when the machinery of conflict--cold war or otherwise-is projected in our areas, these troubles arise. My Government and my delegation does not want to add to complications by referring to individuals, parties or whatever it is. The future of Laos lies in the non-interference of the great Powers or parties to the cold war, whoever they may be, either in open or disguised form in the affairs of Laos.

They may run a good Government, they may run a bad Government. They may run a coalition Government or a non-coalition Government. They may associate with peoples whom others regard as untouchable. They may

perhaps act in such a way as is not approved of by some other country, but so long as they do not infringe the Geneva Agreement, so long as they keep under this conception of disengagement, and so long as they belong to the areas of peace, they are to be assisted.

I have no desire to go into the details of recent developments in the last few days. But there has been evidence of some interference in these matters, and we deeply regret it. Two years ago—and I would like to say, not by the volition entirely of the Royal Government of Laos with whom the Commission has had very healthy, very cordial and very courteous relations—it was found necessary to withdraw the Commission from the territory of Laos. But at the same time, the Commission for International Control and Supervision, which is not a piece of busy bodiness on the part of the three members of the Commission, but as a result of international agreements with the United Nations, its bounden duty it is necessary to take account of—they still exist. They are machinery established by international consent. There are two chairmen of this Commission: the Foreign Minister of the United Kingdom and the Foreign Minister of the Soviet Union who are charged with this supervision in the last analysis, and what is more, provide the resources that are required for the purpose. No country finds money for things in which it is not engaged. Therefore, this machinery, which to a certain extent has been shaken by these circumstances, is creating a situation there.

It is not my purpose to bring this as a special item, but the Assembly must be aware that irritation in small places leads to larger irritations. It is very important that in this part of the world, where there are circumstances, to which I have no desire to mention, that very powerful blocs of humanity, where there is room for ideological conflicts of various kinds, that they should be left alone. In the long run, whether one belongs either to the Eastern side or the Western side, it will be found that non-committedness by peoples like ourselves is to the advantage of both.

It is impossible, in any part of Asia, to commit entire peoples to one side or the other, and if one side tries to commit any country to the other side, then at once it will create a reaction.

It is surprising that, while the so-called Eastern and Western blocs are antagonistic to each other, one attracts the other. That is the contradiction in the situation.

In the problem of Laos, while it is not organizationally a direct United Nations responsibility, I would like to take advantage of my presence here-and I think that it is my duty-to refer to this rather combustible area, where today there is a government which is a constitutional government seeking to get the best support of the people. They should have assistance ; indeed they should have the assistance of their neighbour, Indo-China. If they are to draw any assistance, they will draw it from their own neighbours, and not from any one else. That is the position.

Next, I come to the problem of dependent territories. Much has been said about the subject at this session of the Assembly, so it is not my intention to express the general opposition and to use phrases that may not be entirely historical and certainly not welcome to certain parties concerned in the matter.

The problem of dependence-I do not want to use any other word-the problem of dependent territories is part of human history. All parts of

256

human history are not either welcomed or complimentary-we would not like them repeated but it happens that, either by conquest or settlement, newer civilizations have penetrated the areas of older civilizations, as in Asia and Africa, and have been brought into its context. In the last two years this area of liberation has become larger and larger. A few years ago there were nearly ten million square miles of territory still under colonial rule. Today there are about 4 1/2 million square miles of territory, with a population of 72 million, still in a state of dependence, or tutelage under the trusteeship system. And here, one must pay one's tribute to those countries, particularly the United Kingdom which, in the last generation, have, either by experience or perhaps by the association of liberated countries such as Ceylon, Burma, Pakistan and ourselves, found that it pays dividends to liberate peoples. Empires gain by terminating imperialism. Today there is a higher of life in the United Kingdom; there is no unemployment; there are better relations

between the former dependent countries and themselves, and, so far as our country is concerned, there are more United Kingdom nationals in India today than there were under imperial occupation. Therefore, friendship and co-operation pay.

The position today is, however, that under the British system there are thirty-seven units occupying 1,346,000 square miles with a population of 34 million out of which the greater part of them will become free in the next few months.

Then we come to the French Empire, with a population of about 12 1/2 million and a square mileage of 1 1/4 million. If the problem of Algeria were settled, the greater headaches of France-and I say deliberately "France"-would be over because there would be a vast ally occupying the greater part of Africa from the Sahara to the northern coast, where there are many people of multiracial stock and origin, accustomed to the ways of life of both East and West Africa, Asia and Europe, who would make a great contribution to civilization. So what would remain would be the remnants of the Empire of the past; and I have no doubt that if the voice of the United Nations goes forth in unmistakable fashion, and with the impact of the liberty that would be established on the African continent, the example set by Asian neighbours during the last generation, where liberty has been used for constructive purposes and not for practising racial discrimination in the reverse or for continental compartmentism, the world would begin to realize that the liberation of peoples adds to the social, economic, moral and security power of the world.

It is the same way in countries where the women were disenfranchised, and then when they were enfranchised the electorate doubled and the result was an increase in the capacity of those countries, involving at least half as much again of the population.

So our own approach to this problem is to deal with the factual situation as it stands and not to apportion blame or responsibility. I would be the last to say that, in the context of history, even these unfortunate events, even the oppressions, even the conquests, have not in some strange form brought them into the ambit of modern life.

But today we have to look at the problem of independence-and I speak more from the point of view of people like ourselves, formerly dependent peoples. Independence has no meaning if it is exclusively the removal of foreign rule. In India we always say that on 15 August 1947 India did not attain independence in actuality, but it opened the doors of independence by removing its main obstacle, namely, foreign rule ; because independence for a people means more food, more education, more sanitation, more opportunity, more leisure. These are things that make independence. This vast continent of Africa particularly-and we are no exception either-is in a state of backwardness in all these aspects, whether in the form of nutrition, or of education, or of opportunity, or of political advancement. These are the things that have to be implemented in the time to come, and it should be the concern of the United Nations and of the populations themselves not to regard the ending of empire as something that is forced upon them, but as a conscious effort of modern policy. Indeed-and I am making no very striking comparison-even like slavery of old, it is unhistoric to argue that every slave-owner of three hundred or four hundred years ago was essentially a cruel man; he was the victim of a cruel system. But today no one would like to go back to it. The values of the world have changed and, equally as yesterday, the ownership of man by man, the ownership of a country by another country, will be detested in the next few years. Therefore, we would support anything that comes here which speeds up the termination of the system, even as a hundred years ago, if my delegation had the opportunity, and with the present way of thinking, we would have supported the termination of domination of man by man.

It is not possible to paraphrase Abraham Lincoln's words. "It is not possible," he said, "for a government to be half slave and half free."

257

But we could say that it is not possible for a world to be half slave and half free. Therefore, there can be no spot in this world, in Asia or Africa or anywhere else, where there are territories and peoples who are not entitled to become free members of this great society of ours, the United Nations. That is the test of independence and

from that test we must go forward with the idea of implementing independence.

Here may I say that there is, particularly for the understanding or at least for the information of Western delegations, fundamental difference in the development of dependent territories and the development of Western Europe. In Western Europe industry and economic progress, however slow, came first, and political liberty came after by the demands of the people who worked at the machines. The economic revolution came first. And then came the franchise-in the United Kingdom, for example, it took over a century before people finally were enfranchised. But in all of Asia and, I am glad to say, in Africa, full-fledged political revolutions came first, in which every man and woman irrespective of class, colour, tribe, group or whatever, has political freedom-which means that it will require an enormous amount of aspiration and expectation and, what is more, realization that it is a function of the community to keep the community happy. So this contradiction, this division between Western development and ours creates social problems. That is to say, in the whole of this area about 177 million people have been liberated and, if we take Asia, it means that some 600 million people have been liberated.

Our present large quantum of aspiration and determination, our large degree of likely frustration if their position is not met is obvious and, therefore, it is necessary for the United Nations, not merely by the time-honoured ways of seeking aid here, there and everywhere, not in ways likely to include economic domination in the politically independent countries, to think of other ways. And at the right time and in the right context my delegation proposes to put forward proposals regarding these ways.

If this world is to be in peace, these imbalances have to undergo rectification. I said a while ago that, politically, half the world cannot be slave and half free-and I do not, of course, mean a mathematical half. That statement is equally true from the economic point of view. Unless there is a rise in standards of living, unless there is industrial advancement and, what is more, a consciousness of political equality, social equality and dignity, the world is not likely to go forward.

I deliberately wish to exclude from these observations this morning mention of any particular countries, either dependent or dominating countries, and merely to refer to the problem as such.

We must consider whether, while there must be bilateral or multilateral or other specific arrangements and while the United Nations itself can take credit for a great deal in this direction, the time has come for the United Nations to take note of either the expressed or the unexpressed views of the former dependent peoples of Africa and Asia that this development has to be a co-operative effort, in which those people which benefit by it have equal pride : in other words, from each according to his ability-it is a Christian maxim-and to each according to his needs.

It should be possible for the United Nations to make a Levy-a percentage of national income of countries, related to their capacity to pay-which would probably, although I would not like to go into figures, a very large quantum of money. The national income of the world is probably somewhere between \$1,200 billion and \$1,500 billion. If the United Nations is able to obtain agreement from the nations to submit themselves to a United Nations levy, it would be not merely for what are called underdeveloped countries. The under-developed countries would be participants in the levy, but naturally not in the same proportions because of their lower standards. However, they must come into it and, side by side with the others, create international pools of technicians and experts. It is not all a one-way flowoftraffic. So far as our country is concerned there is a receiving and giving of aid. But that is a multilateral or bilateral arrangement. We would convert ourselves into a co-operative organization for this purpose, in which each country, whether giver or taker, would not be exclusively a giver or taker. As the world develops, it will be necessary for developed countries also to have the advantage of the experience of others. Problems of the distribution of raw materials and of markets, the necessity for the advanced countries to be able to keep up their production apparatus in the face of the competition of newer countries, both in raw materials and in finished goods-all these problems will come up.

The time has therefore come to make a re-

quest on a very large and ambitious scale, particularly to the more advanced countries, the United States and the Soviet Union-the national income of the United States is getting on to 800 billion-to submit themselves to a United Nations levy, collected by the United Nations and

258

administered by special organizations established for that particular purpose, so that there can be no question of unconscious trends of thought creating situations which are not acceptable, so that a new system will develop whereby some of the problems we have been talking about, involving the incapacity of the Organization to respond to newer situations, would also disappear.

We should therefore like to stress the economic aspect of what should no longer be talked about by way of banter or argument. The greater part of the world has become free-the Trusteeship Committee, I suppose, will soon be out of business, and we will be glad when that is so-and we address ourselves to these problems of food, of education, of sanitation, of administrative ability, the problem of the employment of leisure, the advancement of the production of raw materials and the solution of the problem of markets in such a way that humanity as a whole will be developed.

This is one of the submissions that my delegation would like to make in regard to this problem.

I think that a subject people are entitled to use every method to liberate themselves. If others do not like what they may regard as unpleasant methods, it is open to them to avoid the necessity for those who are dependent to employ such methods. Subject people, I say, have the right to use every method to liberate themselves. But a wise world would avoid the necessity of violent conflict, because violence leads to violence.

We also would not like to see in the world a situation in which an empire which has been responsible for the rule of large numbers of people' sometimes not for decades or for generations but perhaps for a century or more, finds that, when it departs, there are no people to take over. There can be no greater criticism of imperial rule than

that.

I hope that in this matter my delegation has put forward suggestions that are not of a destructive character. However free politically certain territories may be, particularly small territories in backward condition of industrial, technical and economic development, that political freedom cannot be sustained unless they can hold their own socially, morally, economically and otherwise. That is why we have suggested this system whereby each country can make its own humble contribution, measured by its capacity to pay, with the aid being distributed to all without exception. Even a powerful country, if it requires some assistance to fill a certain lacuna, must be free to draw from that pool. The time is soon coming when no country in the world will be able to say: "We know everything and we do not want to learn from anybody else."

That is how my delegation looks at this colonial problem.

I now come to the question of our own Organization. The Secretary-General said this morning that much has been said here, one way or the other. It is not my purpose to follow that line of argument. But we have to remember that the United Nations was founded some fifteen years ago, when the greater part of the world was politically, economically and socially not competent. In other words, the political dimensions of the world, the social dimensions of the world have become larger, as I said a while ago, with the liberation of countries and peoples and with the advance of human ideas. Today, therefore, though we are dealing with a world which has shrunk because of methods of communication, we are dealing at the same time with an expanded and expanding world. Both the political liberation of peoples and the advance of technology have created a situation in which progress has to be fast, progress can be fast and of considerable dimensions.

I mentioned a little while ago the difference between the evolution of the former dependent areas and the evolution of the Western world, and I want to say that, in this matter, time is not with us. We have to take account of the aspirations, the hopes, the demands of people and, what is more, we must realize that the knowledge that conditions which are not suitable can be

changed by human effort, and that humanity has the right to demand the giving of co-operative assistance, has become a conscious part of our thinking.

As I have said, the United Nations was founded so many years ago and is the successor to so many previous efforts. But at no time did anyone think, when the Charter was formulated, that the last word had been said: that institutions are unchangeable, and that the Charter was to be a steel frame from which there would be no escape when it was necessary to respond to modern needs. Needs have changed through the vast expansion of the economic functions, the security functions, the peace functions and other functions of the United Nations. From being an Organization with about fifty Members, we have become an Organization with

259

about one hundred Members. There are very few parts of the world which are outside this Organization. As we look back to San Francisco, we find that even those who formulated the Charter were conscious of this. The President of the United States, Mr. Truman, who was taking a leading part at that time, said :

"This Charter, like our own Constitution, will be expanded and improved as time goes on. No one claims that it is now a final or perfect instrument. It has not been poured into a fixed mould. Changing world conditions will require readjustments, but they will be readjustments of peace and not of war".

I think that both the first part and the second part are important. The most important document in this context at San Francisco was the report of a commission presided over by the famous Belgian jurist, Mr. Rolin, which had as its rapporteur a colleague of ours at this session of the Assembly, Mr. Delgado of the Philippines.

This Committee, under the presidency of Mr. Roland, made the following report at a meeting presided over by a former Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs of the United Kingdom, Lord Halifax. This is not an individual's opinion, it is the report of the Committee appointed for this purpose. The report reads :

"Taking cognizance of the facts that the Charter being prepared at San Francisco could not be perfect and that the delegates could not foresee all eventual developments in international affairs, Commission I recommends for inclusion in the Charter provisions for a special conference on the revision of the Charter. This conference may be held at a date and place to be fixed by a two-thirds vote of the General Assembly with the concurrence of any seven members of the Security Council. It is also provided that in case the conference is not held before the tenth annual meeting of the Assembly following the entry into force of the Charter, the proposal to call such a conference is to be placed on the agenda of that meeting of the Assembly and the conference maybe called by a simple majority of the Assembly with the concurrence of any seven members of the Security Council."

As the Assembly will note, we have taken all these steps. My purpose in reading this extract was to bring out that it was in the minds of those people, who were conscious of their great idealism and competence, that one-half of the world was not there. The defeated Powers at that time were not present as members. The last parts of the colonial empires-countries like our own-were still sitting on the doorstep, participating and not participating. Therefore, it was in the minds of those people that these things should be changed.

From those generalities we now come to the present situation. If we take each of the organs of the United Nations and put them into relation with the countries concerned, we find that the original membership from Africa was 4, whereas the present membership is 26. The membership from Africa, therefore, has increased between 6 and 7 times.

The membership from the Americas has remained stationary : there were 22 Members at that time and there are 22 Members at present.

From Asia there were 9 Members. In this case we lost one Member, as far as numerical

calculations are concerned, when Egypt and Syria, as a result of a plebiscite held in both countries in 1958, became the United Arab Republic. But other Members were added, and within a few years they became 14, and today they number 22.

From Western Europe there were 10 Members, which afterwards became 9. Today there are 19.

From Eastern Europe there were six original Members, and the present membership is 10.

So that we find in all these cases membership has multiplied by from three to six or seven times. This must certainly create problems in regard to organization, and we get some rather bizarre conclusions if we take, for instance, the Security Council. Our country then and now, as expressed by the Prime Minister, has always been of the opinion that, logical or otherwise, it is necessary for the United Nations to be based upon unanimity of the great Powers, because they represent the objective facts of the world, and no great nations can, merely by a majority vote, be asked to take on security functions. Therefore we are not in the least quarrelling with the position of the great Powers in the Security Council. That is not the purpose of this.

But let us take the position as it is today. Western Europe has one representative for its 19 Members, whereas when it had ten Members it

260

had also one representative. Eastern Europe has one representative for its 10 Members, whereas at the time of joining it had one representative for only 6 Members. When we come to Asia and Africa, we get even more bizarre conclusions. The whole of Asia was at first provided with no Member. Asia was, as it were, distributed between what is called the Middle East and the Commonwealth-and I am sorry to say, but for myself I do not understand this area which is called the "Middle East". It depends on where you are looking from. In my part of the world the Middle East would be somewhere in the Pacific. We must not take the view that all political meridians and longitudes are necessarily measured from Greenwich. However, the Middle East had one seat and the Commonwealth had one seat, and the Commonwealth at that time had one Asian Member,

namely, India. So Asia had practically no representation, but the Middle East-meaning, I suppose mainly the Arab countries-had one representative Latin America had two, and it has two and it will have two.

Africa at that time had no representation on the Security Council, except for Egypt which is in Africa but which was included, once again by some strange geography, in the Middle East.

But our present position is this. Take India, for example. If it were desired to give membership on the Security Council to the Commonwealth group, we would be there, in the present state of membership, once in 24 years, and from the end of next year, India would be in the Security Council once in 48 years. An African country under this system, unless the Asians and Africans came to some arrangement among themselves would not be there at all; but even if some arrangement were reached, they would be there once in 70 or 80 years. That is to say, a two-year term is to be distributed among all. Perhaps this is not a completely fair way of describing the situation, because not every country may want membership; but in any case, it takes a very long time-some ten to thirty years-before a given country can be on the Security Council.

Now, joining the Security Council does not mean being invited to social parties. It means distribution of responsibilities; it means that large and small countries in different parts of the world must all feel the sense of belongingness. Otherwise the Security Council functions, in one compartment the Assembly functions in a separate compartment, and the Secretary-General and other organs function in other compartments. This to a certain extent is inevitable, but it would be accentuated.

Therefore, looking at these purely geographical and physical facts, the necessity becomes apparent for finding ways and means of dealing with this problem calling for an amendment of the Charter. My country has been a consistent opponent of any amendment of the Charter without getting agreement among the great Powers because it can lead only to cold-war controversy otherwise. Agreement, unanimity, of the great Powers is required to expand the organs of the United Nations. But in the same circumstances,

I am sure that the great Powers, whether they belong to the East, to the West or to Europe, would recognize that the Security Council lives in a political vacuum that is unconnected with the realities of the modern world and, what is more, will create in the Assembly a caste system of nations that may get into the sanctum sanctorum and nations that may not. And this applies equally to other organs of the United Nations which we shall be discussing in special committees.

General Smuts, who was one of the formulators of the Charter and who is quite a good authority for us to quote, said, in the concluding address at San Francisco :

"Unless the spirit to operate it is there, the best plan or machine may fail. ... It is for our peace-loving peoples to see that this great peace plan is backed with all their energy, all their hearts, and all their souls."

That is, when we try to change this system it is not sufficient for us to be logical, it is not sufficient for us to approach the task with the aim of tearing things down; we must rather respect the principle of unanimity, that union of hearts and minds that is required to so fashion the organization as to breathe the breath of life into it, so that it can respond to the needs for it, whether they be economic, political, matters of security or other. wise. This is the submission that my delegation would like to make.

Next, though it may seem somewhat removed from the United Nations, my delegation feels it necessary for my country, even if it may be regarded as, perhaps, special pleading, to give some exposition, some expression of view, as to our own approach in these matters. We are not a neutral country. We refuse to accept responsibility for the appellation "neutralist", which is purely a newspaper invention, originally produced as an epithet by people who did not like our policy. We are not neutral in regard to war or peace. We are not neutral in regard to domination by imperialist or other countries. We are not

261

neutral with regard to the greatest economic and social problems that may arise. Neutrality is a concept that arises only in war. If we are neutrals,

the Soviet Union and the United States are belligerents-and I don't think they want to plead guilty to that. Therefore, we are not a neutral country. We would take part, we would participate, we would express our views. Even that expression "positive neutrality" is a contradiction in terms. There can no more be positive neutrality than there can be a vegetarian tiger.

Therefore, our position is that we are an unaligned and uncommitted nation in relation to the cold war. That is to say, in relation to the great international issues, we think it is good for sovereign nations, in conformity with international law and with their own historic backgrounds, to project into international relations their own internal policies in regard to toleration, democracy and neighbourliness. And the Charter provides the guide-lines that are required.

It is not necessary for us to belong to this school or to that school and to sacrifice our convictions, for ultimately our convictions lead us to some alignment in this way. Secondly, we believe that in the circumstances, where the balance of the world unfortunately rests on what Mr. Winston Churchill called "the balance of horror", it is good for nations, and not only for the nations of Asia-and while I take up no position of telling other nations what to do, the greater the increase of the area of peace in the world, the greater the non-committedness, the greater amount that the so-called committed nations have to canvass for the moral support of others, the greater are the chances of peace. No country which relies upon power or negotiation from strength should be able to take for granted any other country. That is, we should be able to decide, either in our wisdom or otherwise, as to what is good for ourselves in the world. We should be open to persuasion. because if we are not open to persuasion we should never be able to persuade anybody else.

Therefore, our position is that we are uncommitted in regard to sides. We do not belong to one camp or another. That does not mean that where these issues are involved to which I have referred we would simply sit on the fence and not take sides. What is more, this uncommittedness is not an attempt to escape international responsibilities. My own country, in regard to the situation that arose later in Korea-or even during the Korean war-in Indo-China, in the

Lebanon, in the Gaza Strip, and now in the Congo is heavily committed, committed far beyond our capacity. We committed ourselves because we think it is in the interests of peace at this time, We want it understood that we do not welcome this appellation of being, called a neutral, or neutralist, whatever it means. It means that, even if we accepted that, then first of all one would accept the freezing of the cold war or the power blocs, which we do not want to see in the world. In this world we cannot continue to live in peace and security, or even survive, unless the great countries of Europe and America come together, not necessarily with an identity of thinking, but with tolerance and co-operation and lay down their arms. This is not possible if there are two sides ranged against each other, each canvassing against the other. If they are successful, there will be no areas in the world that are not pre-committed to forceful action. This is a tragic state of affairs.

We are happy to think that, while at one time this being non-aligned was regarded-as I have been told- so many times-as sitting on the fence, or pronouncing a curse on both houses, or trying to canvass assistance from both sides, that day has fortunately disappeared and today in the world, even in the United States of America, the Soviet Union or European countries, there is a greater appreciation for the integrity of purpose involved in this ; and even for the political profit and the profit of the world that might arise from independent countries exercising their policies independently. This is not a counsel for anarchy, or a counsel against co-operation between peoples. We do not regard military alliances between Member States of the United Nations outside the Charter, and as against another group of nations as sanctioned by clause 51.

But at the same time, we have not carried on a campaign against it. As the world stands at present, these systems have come into existence and we hope that with the evolution of proposals for disarmament and collective security they will disappear little by little. Therefore, our position in this regard is what is dictated by the Charter; the policy of the good neighbour, the policy that we try to practice in our own country by our democratic institutions, tolerance for difference of opinion. Then, while one does not want to speak for other countries who more or less follow the

same policy, speaking for ourselves, our peoples are never able to accept the idea of exclusive good and exclusive evil. There are no individuals, no nations, no groups of people who can say that their policies, their actions, their thoughts, their commitments, or whatever they are, are exclusively one thing or the other. In this changing world of ours it is always necessary to have observation and examination of proponents' proposals.

262

There is always a chance that the proponent may be right, and if he is right and you reject him out of hand, you lose his contribution. Therefore, we will not contribute our strength, for what it is worth-it is worth very little in economic or military terms-for the promotion of world factions. We shall not be a party at any time to intervening in any way, economically or otherwise, in the developing continent of Africa and other parts of Asia with a view to profiting ourselves or in a way to stifle their progress, or anything of that character.

There are no troops, there is no soldier, no aeroplane, no horse or no gun belonging to the Republic of India anywhere outside our frontiers except at the behest of the United Nations or international agreements. The last of these were withdrawn on the last day of August 1947. Therefore, we stand, without any reservation whatsoever, as a country that does not want to be involved in the war blocs.

This takes me to another, perhaps more controversial question-the whole appellation of blocs. We are against the formation of isolated blocs in the United Nations, because it means that this Assembly has no capacity to decide in freedom ; that decisions are reached elsewhere beforehand and that all that happens is a degree of masterminding. This would not lead to the prosperity of this world. Co-operation among like-minded nations, co-operation among people with like-minded experience past or present is both necessary and useful. But to say that we are a third force, or a neutralist bloc, the panacea for everything, is beside the point.

At the risk of being misunderstood, my country does not stand for the formation of blocs, because blocs mean isolationism. 'We stand for the universal world. In fact, the position the

United Nations is facing is what humanity has faced from almost the pre-Christian era, where on the one hand there was the doctrine of universalism, one world and one family, whether on theological, political or other grounds-and that includes the whole idea of graft and power for oneself. This has been the contradiction the whole time. Then in the sixth century the Chinese tried to bring about some degree of understanding among the people of the Yangtse on the basis of peaceful settlements, and they ended up by imposing domination in the Yangtse region. After that, in the Christian world at various times there were moves in this direction, and ultimately there resulted the Congress of Vienna. Czar Alexander preached to the world the universal doctrine of Christendom and the great dreams that he had for the whole world, for the great human family. But history was torn between his dreams and his schemes, which ultimately resulted in the Holy Lands. So here also is the great universal doctrine that has been explored by the fathers of constitution, including Mr. Gromyko, whose speeches at the United Nations Assembly in San Francisco I just read. On the one hand they try to reach universalism, and on the other hand keeping out a poor little country like Outer Mongolia ; and, on the other hand, not allowing the free play of independent nations through fear of one nation or the other.

So unless this Organization remains in this way not only universal in its membership, but universal in the conception pervading it, not of factionism, we are not likely to get much further.

This is also the feeling of those who framed the Charter at San Francisco, and I have some extracts of speeches that I will not take time to read now. But the more we move in this direction, the better. I am happy also that both by the independence of uncommitted nations, by their numbers being largely added to by newer nations, whatever may be the present situation liberty carries its own consequences. You cannot set a man free and expect him to remain unfree forever. That would be like countries who say, "You can have self-determination provided you determine as we want you to determine". Therefore, once the blaze of freedom comes to a place and it is followed by the material sustenance that is necessary to maintain itself economically and socially free, certain consequences follow. There-

fore, the presence of these free nations here is not only-as I said a while ago-something for which they have to congratulate themselves and rejoice in, but it is a great contribution to the world.

I come now to the next of the problems, the most important of them, that is, the problem of disarmament. I hope that the Assembly will forgive me if I take most of the rest of my time for this point. It is not the intention of my delegation to go into very accurate details on this question before it goes to the First Committee. But it is the desire of the Government of India to put forward its approach in these matters. First of all, we think that it is essential for us to remember that ideal disarmament has not come to us overnight but has been born in the context of human evolution. There have been always wars in the past, but that is no reason why there should be war. In our time, in the last generation or two, there have been two great world wars, and at the end of each, efforts have been made to

263

create a League of Nations and afterwards a United Nations.

As I said some time ago, the attempts to establish disarmament have a very long history. In our own country right through, when you go from north to south you see engraved in stone and metal and timber by the great emperor Asoke whose emblem we carry on our national flag today, "the councils of peace after his victories in the great war and pacification has been established".

I am not referring to our own history. Then came, as I said, the Chinese instance. There has been the history of Europe, which is a more modern history. From the middle of the fifteenth century onwards attempts were made in this way from time to time, but I will not take the time of this Assembly to repeat history except to point out that we have now reached situations when we should remember that disarmament is part of a family tree almost, that is to say, since humanity became organized in national groups and national rivalries, there have emerged within the conflicts the concomitant idea of the pacific settlements of disputes. Therefore, pacific settlement of disputes in the Western world from the time of Bodin

and from the world wars onward makes its appearance at various times in conferences and its advocates have kept their own reservations, whether they be Czar Alexander or Lord Castlereagh themselves ; but when you have pacific settlement of disputes, then it follows inevitably that we must have collective security because if there is a pacific settlement of disputes then there must be some guarantee that it will be enforced or it will not endure, and therefore collective security, which has been accepted in the world, follows--ever since the beginning of the century anyway. If there is pacific settlement of disputes, then collective security follows in its train. It equally follows that there must be disarmament because it is not possible for any great Power, for any Power at the disposal of the United Nations, or any other bloc to be so powerful as to impose its will by force upon anyone else. The corollary of collective security is disarmament.

Having said this much, I want to make the position of my own country very clear, as we did it by instructions of our Government in San Francisco. We regard disarmament only as a means to an end. The end is the avoidance of war. What we seek is not merely disarmament, that is to say, the limitation of arms, the categories of arms that should be avoided and so on, which all have their own purposes, but what we seek is a world without war, where war will be no longer regarded as an instrument of settling disputes, particularly in modern times when large populations are subject to the cruel consequences of war itself. Fortunately, the time has passed in the world where there are nations which regard war as a kind of muscle development, and here I should like to read an extract which I took from a book I read recently. This is an extract from the editor's preface note of "Daedalus":

"Until two generations ago, war was widely regarded as a biological and sociological inevitability-even a necessity."

You may remember that there was a gentleman who said this during the war years.

The quotation continues :

"To most theorists and statesmen, war was not the desperate last resort for settling conflicts ; rather it was the mechanism that prevented society from

slipping into degeneration' and that served as a supreme arbiter for testing the virtue and worth of that society".

Then we come to the great American philosopher, the father of modern pragmatism, William James. He said : "History is a bath of blood," but war is "the gory nurse that trains society to cohesiveness" and provides the "moral spur" to develop the essential, manly virtues of "intrepidity, contempt of softness, surrender of private interest, obedience to command".

That is the formal view of war as an exercise to tune up our muscles. This was the idea of previous times, but now we have reached the situation in which, if the world were to enter into war there would be no muscles to be developed, and apparently this philosopher had the foresight to recognize this even at that time when he said :

"When whole nations are the armies"-that is the position today-"and the science of destruction vies in intellectual refinement with the sciences of production"-that is what is happening to us now-"I see that war becomes absurd and impossible from its own monstrosity. Extravagant ambitions will have to be replaced by reasonable claims, and nations must make common cause against them".

Today these two sentences reflect what every thoughtful person believes. But what I am trying

264

to point out is this : whatever may have been the justification for wars between nations or wars to end wars and what-not, today there can only be wars in a global sense, only to end the world. We are told that we do not know what the basis of calculation is, that if the degree of thermonuclear and nuclear power by the world at the present time persists, on a conservative calculation it equals the power of twelve tons of TNT per head of the population of the world. Therefore, the destructive power is so tremendous that any kind of outbreak of war would be difficult. Therefore, that is why we say that the idea of total disarmament, a world without war, is no longer a Utopia, it becomes an imperative necessity because in a world that is disarmed, where war is still the instrument of policy, only

common sense to think that if war were to break out the men who made the thermonuclear weapons, the machinery that could make it would still be available to nations. The experience of history shows that neither the generals nor the weapons that were prevalent at the outbreak of war are the people and instruments which will prosecute or end the war. It has been a commonplace that peacetime generals soon give way to wartime generals just as peacetime weapons also give way to wartime weapons. So today in our world, with the developments which are taking place, to which I will address myself in a minute, any limitation of armaments which makes large-scale war possible would not be an end in itself to the extent that it goes on to the next phase where speed is of great value because the effort has to begin somewhere. If you asked a person whether he prefers to be destroyed by such and such a weapon or by another kind of weapon, whether the size of the gun should be this, that or the other, I suppose he would be in the position of the fish that is asked, "would you like to be fried in margarine or in butter?" It makes no difference to the fish whether you fry it in butter or in margarine, it is fried. Therefore, the world is not satisfied with being told that we are using more humane weapons. Therefore, my delegation wishes to place this in context, perhaps rather abruptly, because we are likely to lose sight of the importance, the necessity, and today, the possibility of total disarmament in the world within a short and measurable time. We stand foursquare for the complete abandonment of all weapons of mass destruction and by speedy progress towards their abolition. Today therefore, in discussing disarmament in this general debate, and without going into great detail, I should like to refer to the background of disarmament in regard to the Charter itself. In San Francisco General Smuts said :

"Men and women everywhere, including dependent peoples still unable to look after themselves"-that is, according to him-"are thus drawn into the vast plan to prevent war, to prevent it not only by direct force but also by promoting justice and freedom and social peace among the peoples".

Therefore, looking at the disarmament problem, we would say, first of all, that there are large areas of agreement, and my delegation can-

not be regarded as being escapists, as trying to escape the reality of conflict that exists between the two sides. But in spite of all this, there is no doubt in our minds that there are large areas of agreement and we have not quite exhaustively put down some of the areas in which there is agreement, even though it is of a general character.

In resolution 1378 (XIV), which was passed unanimously, not by acclamation, we agreed on total and complete disarmament. For the first time in a resolution, we laid it down that it was to be a world without war, that disarmament should be general and complete. Secondly, there was agreement on the fact that disarmament should be carried out in agreed stages and completed as rapidly as possible within specified periods of time. That is to say, the Assembly, in a practical and reasonable way, has accepted the view that we should not throw out the good because we want the best. Phased disarmament is accepted, but not phasing in order to avoid reaching the ends we want to reach. Thirdly, it is common ground between the two sides that disarmament measures should be so balanced that neither side has at any time any significant military advantage. Fourthly, it was agreed that the implementation of the disarmament measures should be carried out from beginning to end under effective international control through the establishment of an organization within the United Nations. Finally, it was agreed that as the disarmament steps are implemented there should be an international force within the United Nations for the maintenance of international peace and security.

Those are the common grounds, and while the substance of this will be discussed in committee, I want to draw attention to Article II of the Charter, which definitely lays down disarmament as part of the purposes of the United Nations. This purpose is to discuss principles governing disarmament and the regulation of armaments and make recommendations with regard to such principles to the Security Council, and so on. Having said that, we would like to put forward the position of our Government,

265
especially with regard to this.

First of all, we would like to express our

opinion that much of the differences about which there is a great deal of noise made, especially where there is a modern medium of publicity, where, of course, disagreements between great peoples are better news than agreements between them, lack substance when looked at in the cold light of reason. Coming from a country like mine or from an individual like me, it may be regarded as tendentious phraseology, therefore, I will refer to what may be called sources which will be unimpeachable in a great part of this Assembly. In a publication of the Carnegie Endowment which was issued the other day, it was stated "In effect, disarmament negotiations themselves have become a weapon in the cold war."

That is to say, instead of our trying to reach an agreement, we make use of it to show that one party is opposed to and the other party for war.

"Speeches made in commission, committee and plenary Assembly have more often been designed to influence different segments of opinion than to reach an accommodation with the other nations represented at the conference table. Both East and West have become masters of the art of appealing directly to peoples over the heads of their governments.

"Beginning with the proposals for international control of atomic energy, both sides have developed and refined the technique of utilizing the discussions for propaganda purposes. This might be described as the 'gamesmanship' of disarmament negotiations. A cardinal feature of this 'game' has been to reject the proposals of the other side without appearing to sabotage the discussions.

"Every plan offered by either side has contained a set of proposals calculated to have wide popular appeal. Every such step has included at least one feature that the other side could not possibly accept, thus forcing a rejection. Then the proposing side has been able to claim that the rejector is opposed to the idea of disarmament in toto. The

objectionable feature may be thought of as the 'joker' in every series of proposals."

That is to say, disarmament discussions have gone on in such a way that one side has agreed on one thing one year and next year has objected to the same thing, and we have to get away from this position, realizing the consequences for the world. While we are not alarmist, we have to remember that the so-called "brinkmanship" is not a very safe device or strategy. The world stands poised with these great armaments on the edge of a precipice, and with the great armaments of the powerful nations the decision may be of such a character that it is based upon ignorance of circumstances and, what is more, out of fear. Fear makes people hate each other, leads to violence and makes negotiation and settlement of any kind impossible, because we always ask how we can know that the other side will keep the bargain. People little realize that if that is the real conviction, then why negotiate at all, because that applies to all negotiations. In the disarmament negotiations, therefore in our opinion, in the Assembly there must be a full statement every time, by those who believe in it, that the substantive discussions must deal with the final objective so that there can be no question of this going on for umpteen years.

Then we have to refer ourselves to the increasing dangers of delay, and I would like to refer to one of these dangers to which your own country, Mr. President, has applied its mind. That is what has been called the problem of the nth power. There is a report of a committee of American scientists, to which Mr. Khrushchev made reference last year, which points out that there is a large number of countries today, including my own, capable of producing nuclear weapons. The advance of nuclear science and technology is sufficient that in two, three or four years they could produce these weapons. The number of those countries, which was about ten last year, has become twenty this year. We have read in the newspapers that one country has now stumbled across or come to discoveries which make the production of these things very economical and very speedy. Three or four years ago, when something of this kind was said in the First Committee by my delegation, one of the great savants of disarmament said that we were indulging in science fiction. But, whatever it is,

the production of weapons of mass destruction by a number of countries, and by smaller countries with lesser responsibilities and perhaps with smaller quarrels, is increasing and in three or four years time it may be quite impossible to introduce controls or inspection in the ways we want it.

Secondly, we of the former dependent world

266

and the less fortunate countries have another fear in this matter. Supposing one of the possessing countries-I will not mention anyone-in order to qualify themselves for membership in the nuclear club were to be possessed of one of those instruments, they would know very well that neither the Soviet Union nor the United States is likely to precipitate a world war in the interests of a particular local quarrel. That is the hard fact of life, and, therefore, they can with impunity and with safety perhaps use this weapon in the same way as at the end of the war the atom bomb was used at Hiroshima and Nagasaki. Suppose that were to happen to a country with a large colonial revolt, it would mean the use of atomic weapons for purposes contrary to the purposes for which this Assembly stands.

More than that, the spread of these weapons, along with the technology that goes with it, makes it very dangerous even for the great Powers when they will no longer have the control of the destructive processes that would be let loose in a world war. Therefore, the spread of nuclear knowledge by itself may create the conditions for this disarmament and total prohibition of and destruction of all existing stocks so that there will be no half-way house in this matter. There must be complete totality. That is our position.

It is necessary that we consider the ways and means of preventing a break in the disarmament discussions. Since the founding of the United Nations, from 1946-onwards, there have been various things done to make it possible for these discussions to continue. I will not go into the history of it. My delegation, although this may not always appear in resolutions, has taken a considerable part in helping to devise machinery of this character. We had the Committee of Five, and when that Committee stopped working, we had the Disarmament, Commission of twelve members.

Then we had the Ten-Nation Committee and my delegation, quite illogically, perhaps, and many people at that time had reservations on the matter, agreed that these discussions should go on between the two great Powers and their supporters in what was called the Ten-Nation Committee even outside the United Nations, because it was the purpose of the United Nations. Now the committee of ten has been stymied; it is not negotiating any more. It is the view of my delegation that no efforts can be spared. In fact, we cannot accept a situation where there is a gap in disarmament negotiations, because once those negotiations are left to have a gap in that way, the beginning of it would be even more difficult. It would be difficult, for example, for a new President of the United States to begin from a position of total negativity or something else, whoever he may be. Therefore, we are most anxious that, whatever may be the procedures, there should be some method by which this is kept going, whether the committee of ten will meet again.

None of these things can happen unless the United States and the Soviet Union and their allies and participants on either side, their colleagues on either side, agree, because they have the possession of arms. Therefore, any kind of resolution that we pass which does not attract their co-operation at some stage would be of no value.

If the committee of ten can continue its negotiations, my delegation will be pleased, even if past experience was against it, even if there were misgivings on one side or the other. But we would not swear by this committee or that committee; we want negotiations. What we want is that the traffic for disarmament should go on, and, therefore, if the proposal is that the committee of ten should have other people added on to it or that the committee of ten should be replaced by a committee of another composition where more than ten nations or less than ten nations join, in order that the present suspicions should be removed, it should be the purpose of this Assembly to use its influence mainly on uncommitted nations in order that the world may feel that the United Nations has not abandoned the fight for disarmament. I want to say with all the strength I can command that the effect of not allowing this machinery to operate would be to create despair and despondency in the minds of the masses of the peoples of the world; that even though we have thrown away not very fruitful negotiations, if you like, we can-

not now throw away negotiations. That is one of the purposes of the introduction of the resolution by the five Heads of-State sometime ago, which unfortunately did not get the total majority that it should have had.

So there should be some replacement of it. That replacement is either possible by the continuance of the committee of ten in some form or other, with additions to it, by its replacement, or, alternately-and I don't put this forward as a proposition ; if you will permit me, it may be regarded as thinking aloud-it may be considered whether, on account of the tens on that now prevails between the two sides, as an immediate and prominent step the Assembly may not be able to find a group of nations who would be able to talk to these two sides separately-I don't mean moderate -pending a more convenient committee being formed. This is a third suggestion which I would like to try out in the First Committee. So whatever the process be, there must be the continuation of disarmament negotiations.

267

We have spoken about two things. Therefore, my request, the request of our delegation is that the First Committee this year, instead of merely being satisfied with resolutions put from one side or another, amended or not amended, and going through in order to avoid greater harm, should definitely give directives. It is necessary that the Assembly should take greater responsibility. This applies to the Secretary-General as to anybody else.

If I might digress for a moment : if the Security Council passes a resolution, the Security Council must support with courage and actively the responsibility for giving directions in regard to implementing, and not turn afterwards and say it was not implemented. It is open to the Security Council to devise the machinery as to how it should be carried out.

As by way of example, the Disarmament Commission this time must give directions to whatever body there is or request the great Powers and say, firstly, the first directive should be the object before us, the total abolition of all arms so that we can live in a world without war; secondly, that disarmament should be accomplished within measurable time. I purposely said measurable

because it must be done with speed and a time should be largely mentioned. As I mentioned a while ago, if there is too much delay, then it becomes impossible. So it means three or four years. It must also give a directive, since the areas of agreement are so large, that progress should be made within those areas of agreement instead of putting those on one side and seeking for the difference. The present approach seems to be to agree on something, put it on the one side and see if we can find a difference:

Then it should be necessary, if in a crisis of confidence or anything else, in order to create that confidence, that the Assembly must formulate some kind of code which afterwards would become part of our international law and behaviour whereby the attack on one country by another country—not only the great Powers—the surprise attack by two neighbours, if you like, without adherence even to the older laws of war, that that would be regarded as a violent breach of international obligations. I am not saying that in the event of atomic war it means anything at all ; but to introduce into our international life the outlawing of the idea of surprise attack, as we did in the case of various weapons by the Geneva Convention, and so on and so on, that may create the climate. This is not a reference to a technique for preventing a surprise attack. I think we are getting rather involved in techniques and forgetting the purposes.

I think technical examinations are necessary, but technical examinations must be directed towards a particular purpose, and this directive must include the idea that the preparation for surprise attack or holding out surprise attack as a weapon for domination is against the code of nations. That must become part of the accepted doctrine of international order. It may appear Utopian for the time, but unless we create this climate, we are not likely to succeed.

Secondly, the directive must include the inclusion of speedy agreement in regard to the termination of test explosions. Unless this is done, the danger to which I referred a while ago, the spread of these nuclear weapons and, what is more the effects of ionizing radiation will vastly increase as to endanger humanity. Therefore, it is our request that at the end of these disarmament discussions there should be directives from this Assembly. The Assembly must find some medium,

some machinery, some device whereby there will be no total gap. It is possible to create greater difficulties by allowing such a gap to grow. If those directives are given, then the Assembly which devised the method, even before its rising, can see to it that those directives, by negotiations, can be implemented.

It appears to us that all this is probable, all this is possible, if we are conscious of the fact, that what is required is, as President Roosevelt said in 1945, when war was still raging : "More than an end to war, we want an end to the beginning of all wars." That is what we have been trying to do.

Therefore, we must in these negotiations approach it with a new mind and, realizing that we have come to a situation when this Assembly, where great Heads of State and Heads of Governments and Foreign Ministers were gathered, had no easy approach to these problems, but, at the same time, a realization that in all conscience the troubles of the world were great and its disguises might lead to catastrophe. We must get against the idea of men's natures wrangling for the inferior things though great ones are their object. This is the position that we must accept, and accept the responsibility this time for giving directives.

Until now the Disarmament Commission has been a post office. The sub-committees have met and wrangled, as I said here when I read out from the Carnegie Foundation Report, and then met either the day previous or two days previous to the Assembly meeting merely to' pass on the report of the sub-committee. I submit that the

268

Disarmament Commission has defaulted in its activity. Whether it be the disarmament commission of eighty-four or the disarmament commission of twelve, that should be the position, that once these are achieved, we should also give a directive to this negotiating body or the committee, whatever the machinery, and it must make a report to the total disarmament commission within three or four months so that the disarmament commission can decide the calling of a session of the General Assembly to carry on with the work. We are not supporting one proposition or another in this matter, but we believe the

greater association of all Members of the United Nations, the repeated expression of their concern, the greater knowledge of the world of what is involved and the progress that we are making, and, what is more the publicity that will come upon what some of the public may regard as activities of obstruction, that that would speed the way to disarmament. That is all I wish to say at this moment in regard to disarmament, because I propose to take this up in detail in committee.

Now I come to the last part of my observations this morning which has fallen to my lot, because representatives will see before them document A/L. 320, which is a draft resolution sponsored by some fifteen or sixteen countries, including my own, whose names it bears. Just before where I came to speak here Cambodia, Ceylon, Ethiopia, Guinea, Nepal, Nigeria and Sudan asked me to say that they wanted to be added to the list, and I believe other countries also have put down their names. The Assembly will see that this is not an express on of aspirations or an expression of opinion that comes from one part of the world. Here are countries not only of Asia, where I come from, and Africa, with which my delegation is closely associated-and from where I feel sure, with one or two small exceptions. everyone would have been willing to co-sponsor the document-but also countries from Latin America, whose part in disarmament discussions has been notable, and not countries who have not been known to participate in them either. There are also the countries of Europe which are not involved in the present arrangements or Power groupings. There are Austria, Finland and Yugoslavia, on the one hand, and, on the other, Bolivia, Venezuela, Panama, Mexico, Ecuador-and I hope that I have not forgotten any. All these countries are also in it. There are the Arab countries, the African countries and the Asian countries.

This draft resolution has come before you not only with their good wishes but also with the appeal they make to the Assembly for its adoption. I do not think it is necessary for me to argue this at great length, but I would like to say that my delegation does not regard this as a kind of form of words with little meaning. It is not what is called a general resolution so that everybody may have a feeling of escape into unreality. it has been put forward because we all know that

tensions have increased in this world. The proceedings of the Assembly up till now have not been of a character which has left its mark by creating a different climate with regard to this, and some of us felt that it was necessary, both for ourselves and for world opinion outside, so that confidence in the United Nations might remain, so that the peoples of the world should not feel frustration and so that their expectations and aspirations would inspire even those who do not see eye to eye with each other to realize that there is a compulsive force outside which will not take account of their individual peculiarities, or even of their individual fears, and that this is a world problem where the world stands before a catastrophe, where its economic and social progress also is being delayed by the continual threat of war and where relations between nation and nation, instead of becoming more tolerant and friendly, are becoming more grouped on one side or the other, and where the new nations which come into this Assembly should have a chapter of co-operation rather than a conflict of faith. Therefore, we have put forward this draft resolution without any desire to apportion blame or responsibility but to enunciate positions which are in total conformity with the Charter and which take into account the factual situation. For example, the draft resolution says :

"Deeply concerned by the increase in world tensions,"

and

"Considering that the deterioration in international relations constitutes a grave risk to world peace and co-operation".

In the course of informal discussions on this matter-naturally, one looks at every side-the problem we posed ourselves was, "Does it constitute an alarmist statement on affairs ?" It is not an alarmist statement, but the world does give cause for alarm. That is to say, it is right for a responsible body such as ours to say that the increase in world tension ... whether we take it among the countries represented here or elsewhere-is so serious that in the present state of technical advance, and with, as I have said, the crisis of lack of confidence, there is grave risk to inter-

national peace. Even though it may not arise in the form of a declaration of war or anything of that kind, there is a grave risk to international peace. So we say that in fact it would be wrong not to face the situation. The right thing to do by the world is to take the world into confidence, if you can do so. Therefore, we do not stand for any reservations with regard to this.

We have said also that greater harmony among nations, irrespective of their economic and social systems to which there are references in the Charter, would contribute towards greater harmony and tolerance between nations, and also that the United Nations should act as a centre for harmonizing the conflicting interests. These are among the fundamental purposes of the Charter, and therefore the fourth paragraph of the preamble fully sets out our position. Then we have asked that all countries, in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations, shall refrain from actions likely to aggravate these tensions. If we want to lessen tension it is obvious that we should not aggravate them, and aggravation may be by psychological warfare, it may be by preparations, it may be by forms of intrusion and threats to safety in one way or another-any of these actions and it is not for the United Nations to prescribe who shall do what, but simply to appeal to the good sense of nations and their loyalties to and obligations under the Charter.

Then we have gone on to operative paragraph 2, which we think is essential in the circumstances because, while we all recognize that the United States and the Soviet Union are the two great major Powers of the world-though the other Powers which have been involved in these discussions are equally concerned-the Organization itself cannot escape its responsibility, and its responsibility and its power come not from anywhere else but from its Member States. That co-operation must be forthcoming in full measure so that it may become an effective instrument for safeguarding the peace and the promotion of the economic and social advancement of all peoples. At the present time one of the great achievements of the United Nations has been that-in spite of all that has gone on in the world, in spite of all the great conflicts, in spite of the technological capacity for mass destruction and in spite of the crisis of confidence-this Assembly and this Organi-

zation have survived. Its survival is a great achievement, and we may therefore do nothing which does not assist towards its greater strength.

The Secretary-General referred this morning, and also in his report, to various aspects-to the more silent and less advertised work in the social and economic spheres. For all those purposes it is necessary that there should be a reaffirmation of these things which should go out to the world to the effect that, whatever may be the difficulties, we, the representatives here in this Assembly and the Member States, have not only not lost confidence but place our reliance in the United Nations to carry on, and will make our best efforts.

Now we come to the appeal. I hope that this draft resolution will be taken cognizance of and accepted and that the Assembly will become seized of it, and therefore I move it. I hope that the Assembly will give not merely a vote that is without opposition but a positively unanimous vote, so that the world will know that, irrespective of all the differences, the aims are harmony and toleration, the creation of the necessary machinery for strengthening the United Nations and the necessary support, and also that we shall, in the coming weeks, address ourselves to the particular problems, some of which I have referred to.

That is all I wished to say Mr. President. I referred to the other nations which wish to co-sponsor the draft resolution, and it must be left to your discretion and your wisdom how to proceed with this matter. But we would request that, before the general debate is technically concluded, the Assembly should be invited to express its opinion on this so that it goes out to the world with some positive contribution by way of its support, and, as one of the co-sponsors of the draft resolution, I would take the liberty of requesting that every vote in this Assembly should be positively cast in its favour.

At the beginning of my observations I referred to this fifteenth session of the Assembly meeting in conditions of concern and expectation. I think it would be only right and appropriate-in fact, if I did not do it it would be inappropriate-that I should refer also to the fact that, while there is concern, while there is expectation and while there are, perhaps, doubts, suspicions and so on, there is also in this Assembly the determination for us

to keep together, the determination to pursue the ends of the Charter and the determination that the ills of the world arising from exploitations and imbalance, the ills of the world arising from threats of war, should be removed. We should proclaim that in that way so that we may conclude the general debate and go on to our work with the feeling that, irrespective of all our difficulties and irrespective of the heat sometimes generated, there is also the determination in the minds of people that while people may strike they do not wound, that here is a medium created by men after so many failures, and that even if, unfortunately, failures should

270

occur here or there we shall not be daunted by them in the sense of throwing in the sponge but shall go on from endeavour to endeavour and, in the words of the poet, say,

"Ye rigid plowmen bear in mind
" Your labour is for future hours.
" Advance! spare not ! nor look behind!
"Plow deep and straight with all your powers."

I say this in all humility-the humility of a nation that does not seek power and does not seek to prescribe a remedy, but seeks to express its own positions and to make its humble contribution to the world, irrespective of the risks for peace that we may have to take.

INDIA USA CONGO CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC LAOS CHINA SWITZERLAND JAPAN
CAMBODIA BURMA PAKISTAN ALGERIA FRANCE OMAN PHILIPPINES EGYPT SYRIA KOREA
LEBANON AUSTRIA MONGOLIA TOTO PERU ETHIOPIA GUINEA NEPAL NIGER NIGERIA SUDAN
FINLAND YUGOSLAVIA BOLIVIA ECUADOR MEXICO PANAMA VENEZUELA

Date : Oct 01, 1960

Volume No

1995

INDIA AND THE UNITED NATIONS

Shri Krishna Menon's Statement on Admission of Nigeria

Shri V.K. Krishna Menon, Leader of the Indian Delegation to the United Nations, made the following statement in the General Assembly on October. 7, 1960 welcoming the admission of the Federation of Nigeria :

My delegation is privileged to be associated with other Commonwealth countries and to be associated on behalf of the Government and people of India in the good wishes expressed from this rostrum both to the people and Government of Nigeria and the peoples and Government of Great Britain for the present occasion when Nigeria has become an independent country.

I have also the great privilege of speaking on behalf of our neighbour countries of Burma and Nepal, who asked me to do so.

We from India have special reason to feel gratified on this occasion, because the current of political evolution which was released by the emancipation of India-the oppressed colony of conquest-to be independent under the British Empire at that time, that process, though sometimes obstructed by the smaller-minded administrators, has progressed, and today we have large numbers of these territories which were formerly colonial countries that have become independent. Not only have they become independent, but they have become independent on the one hand, by the process of resistance, and, at the same time, by following that resistance along routes that are not violent.

In Africa, this current manifested itself in the liberation of the colony of the Gold Coast, now the great Republic of Ghana, which regained its territories that it had a thousand years ago in the great Empire of Ghana.

Now, Nigeria, though its name and its present geographical boundaries are the result of those pages of history which we desire to forget for the four hundred years that preceded British settlement, and though its territorial boundaries are the result of imperial occupation and conquest, that land and its peoples who were then resident there came into the context of international relations in the first millennium before the birth of Christ. From the ports of Egypt and India sailed the ships of the Phoenician Empire into Nigeria in order to conduct trade, and so did the

Carrageenans. So from all times there have been relations.

And while one does not want to be romantic about it, it is well to remember that when these new countries come into the context of what is popularly called Western civilization, they come in, as my Prime Minister described the other day, with roots struck deep into their own soils. Even in the history of the last six or seven hundred years, there have been relations between established dynasties or regimes at that time for the conduct of relations with the new commerce.

There is at the present moment a comparatively unknown period between the Phoenician traders and, so far as I know, the later period when the French made an incursion into these territories, only halted by internal troubles in France itself. Then I say I would like to draw the curtain over the period that follows, because it is not the occasion for it. Then comes the challenge to the Portuguese monopoly, when the Portuguese protested to King Edward IV of England because some of his men had gone on to the coast of Guinea and they said they had a Portuguese monopoly in this area and no one should go there. So began the conflict between empires, which is always the hope of dependent peoples.

Then came the great liberal movements in England which were responsible-and I say this deliberately-which were responsible for the overthrow of slavery and the liberation of a large number of African peoples from the status they then had either in their own homeland or in other parts of the world. The British Empire settled down Nigeria; the present boundaries began gradually to emerge. It is a matter of congratula-

271

tions to the British people and a matter of satisfaction to the Nigerian people that, unlike some other parts of the world, their many institutions, tribal systems, and so on, for various reasons, which we need not go into now, were left comparatively free and intact. The liberal administration of West Africa enabled the emergence of the present Federation with its territorial particularity and, at the same time, a great sense of unity. I think, if the United Kingdom will

forgive me, it is an occasion not only to pay tribute' to the British Government and British State as such and the Nigerian people, but also to the large number of liberal administrators who administered West Africa-different from, administrators in some other parts of the Empire who pushed for the conception, though perhaps paternalistically, of the peoples participating themselves.

Thus, we do not need to impose upon the Secretary-General or anybody else the kind of burden that the United Nations has had to undertake in the Congo, because here are people educated, trained, and, perhaps, made to look forward to the assumption of responsibility.

Nigeria is the largest of the dependent territories in population and extent in West Africa.

The relations of our own country with Nigeria have been of an economic character. It is singular that that area, like the rest of West Africa, is singularly free from any trace of racial discrimination. It is a happy thing that in the former British Empire, those dependent countries which are now independent and entirely independent members of an association which we call the Commonwealth, wherein each of these territories all power and authority is solely derived from their own people, there is no racial discrimination in reverse. My own country would dislike to see that, either on account of past history or on account of a newer form of colonialism, there should emerge in any of these territories a practice against a non-indigenous minority which spells of the apartheid practice in the Union of South Africa. Discrimination in one direction or another is against the principles of the Charter and all elementary conceptions of human relationships.

Together, therefore, we welcome into this community of nations another great African territory, its boundaries shaped perhaps by pages of history over which everybody need not necessarily be proud-but progress always had the diverse elements in it-and they come here through progress made by their own efforts very largely respo *** leaders said in the Conference in *** peoples and the Government *** politan country by various degre *** pers of the popula-

tion liberated in Africa, they have brought it up to a total of 178 millions in the past twenty years.

In 1950, there were only four independent countries in Africa-that is, counting the Union of South Africa as an independent country by virtue of her membership in the United Nations, not in the sense that the majority of peoples are independent. Since then have come some twenty-five countries, making altogether a liberated population of 178 million out of an estimated total of 220 million. Out of the older colonial Empire of France, of four and a half million square miles, and the colonial Empire of Britain-smaller in extent, but larger in population-only three-quarters of a million square miles remain.

This makes us address ourselves to the political aspects of this case, because it is neither a credit to Britain, nor to Nigeria, nor to ourselves, to treat this occasion merely as one of sentimentally expressing our views. The liberation of Nigeria-indeed, as of the rest of the countries-reads to us the lesson that there are no people anywhere in the world who are not fit to govern themselves,

If only-I would not have liked to have referred to this-if only five centuries ago, the good ship DE Jesus had sailed in for other purposes.

Over a hundred years of peaceful administration have brought into existence a federation-and a federation is a far more difficult political structure to work than a unitary government-which is today functioning. In the continent of Africa the struggle for that independence has been carried on comparatively peacefully. What justification on earth can exist for the continued domination and suppression of vast territories either by one country over another ?

The United Nations, therefore, can point to all these territories as witness of the success of its gospel and also as justification for the demand that it must make upon other colonial countries.

At the end of the year perhaps others also will join until on that great continent which has now become so significant in the history of the development of peoples there alone will remain the empires of Portugal and of South Africa dominating over other peoples. We have not the slightest doubt that the sense of liberty and the passion

for freedom that rests in the minds of peoples, the example of the greatness of these nations, their

272

proximity, and the development-economic, social and spiritual-they will make will be a force which no empire in the world can resist. This is the hope that we must have today, and I, on behalf of my Government and the people of India and of my colleagues of Nepal and Burma, tender congratulations to the Kingdom of Nigeria-the Queen-dom of Nigeria-and to the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, and to the United Nations itself, for being able to welcome to our ranks a new nation with new contributions to make.

INDIA NIGER NIGERIA BURMA NEPAL USA GHANA EGYPT CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC OMAN
FRANCE GUINEA CONGO SOUTH AFRICA PORTUGAL IRELAND

Date : Oct 01, 1960

Volume No

1995

INDIA AND THE UNITED NATIONS

Sri B.C.. Negro's Statement on Economic Development of Under-developed Countries

Sri B. K. Near, India's Commissioner General for Economic Affairs in Washington, made the following statement in the Economic Committee of the United Nations General Assembly on the economic development of the under-developed countries on October 28, 1960 :

Mr. Chairman,

We have had the privilege of listening to an excellent summary of last year's economic conditions in the world given to us by the distinguished Under Secretary for Economic Affairs and we have also had the benefit of voluminous and very useful information on various aspects of the world economy provided to us in the report of the Economic and Social Council and in various other

reports placed before us by the Secretary-General. The picture that has been presented to us has become rather familiar because it tends to repeat itself from year to year with only minor variations. That picture, broadly speaking, is of a steady and substantial advance in the economies of the developed countries, with the underdeveloped countries trailing far behind with the exception of those with centrally planned economies which have achieved some spectacular rates of growth.

It is not surprising then that the proceedings of the Second Committee of the General Assembly also tend to assume a familiar and somewhat repetitive pattern. The under developed countries bemoan their lot and the developed countries listen with great sympathy, list all the steps, major or minor, that have been taken during the preceding year to help the underdeveloped countries and then go on to plead a shortage of resources, which though they go on increasing at a rate of \$ 40 to 50 billion a year are apparently all required for uses of a higher priority than the abolition of chronic human misery. Having thus shoved the problem under the carpet we all go home and wait another year to resume the process. I have wondered as I sat listening to the debate whether we would in this Fifteenth Session of the General Assembly repeat this performance or whether we would attempt to give a lead to the Governments of the world which might help, in some measure at least, to tackle this, the greatest problem of the second half of the twentieth century. If we did not, Mr. Chairman, we would, I submit, be betraying the trust that the nations of the world have placed in us. We represent here the collective conscience of humanity and it would disclose a sorry state of affairs if that collective concerned were found to be so dulled as to seek ways and means of securing its responsibility.

The facts about the underdeveloped world are well known and certainly need not be repeated before this sophisticated and well-informed body. In essence, they are that in the present day world there are disparities in levels of living between nations of such proportions as would not be tolerated within the confines of any national community. The average per capita income of the developed world is about \$ 1200 per annum; that of the underdeveloped world is about \$ 125 per annum. But the whole story is not told till

we look at the figures of the countries at either end of the scale, for we find at one end the figures of \$ 2700 and at the other of no more than \$ 50 per annum. What is even more striking is that these disparities of income are increasing and not decreasing. Nor is this surprising, because the growth of income is often a direct function of the investment of capital which poorer societies find more difficult to undertake than richer ones. We, in India, for example, hope through a national effort of stupendous proportions, through extreme austerity and self-sacrifice, and in the expectation that we will be supported very substantially from sources outside the country, to be able to invest in the economy over the next five years the equivalent of \$ 21 billion. This is a figure that is invested in the economy of the United States every three months ; and it is not, therefore, surprising that the American national income grows every three months by an amount equal to that by which the Indian national income will grow in five years, if all goes well. Unless, therefore, a rapid and radical change takes place in the attitude of the world, the difference in another 10 or 20 years will become, even more glaring than it is today.

The continuance of this state of affairs

273

has three implications. The first, is an increasing dullness of conscience; for when human beings can continue to contemplate with equanimity, misery, ignorance, disease and poverty over large parts of the world and are not prepared to undergo even a small sacrifice for their removal, then indeed human beings may have gained the whole world but would have lost their own souls.

Secondly, the continuance of this state of affairs is, in terms of pure economics, almost as harmful to the richer parts of the world communitatively as it is to the poorer. The greatest single obstacle to the growth of world trade today is not tariffs, quotas or discriminatory practices, though undoubtedly they play their part and have been the subject of international discussions for many years, but the stark fact that there are well over 2000 million people in this world, who cannot purchase the goods they need because of their inability to produce the goods which are required to pay for them.

The third consequence of the continued

poverty of the vast majority of the human race is the danger-and the very real and imminent danger-of grave political and social instability in many parts of the world. Many of the underdeveloped nations, barring those in Latin America, regained their political independence only during the last 15 years. When people awake from that slumber which makes foreign domination possible, their first desire is for political independence from external domination. For the achievement of political independence they are prepared to make every conceivable sacrifice and all their economic aspirations are held, as it were, in abeyance, till the foreign yoke is removed. We in Asia have achieved our political independence ; our brothers in Africa are now achieving theirs. But what they will find, as we have found, is that once the people of the erstwhile-colonial territories have regained their independence, they tend to revolt against the conditions of poverty and stagnation in which they live. It has become a matter of universal knowledge now that poverty is no longer inevitable, that it can be removed by human action, with the result that an improvement of living standards through economic development has become for all underdeveloped nations a categorical imperative from which there is no escape. No form of society, no system of government has the slightest chance of retaining the loyalty of the people if it does not respond adequately to their need for economic development.

One of the problems of the underdeveloped countries, therefore is to find for themselves that form of social organisation which gives the best response to this categorical imperative. Historically, none of the present industrialised countries had to face this problem, when they started on their career of economic development, because with the one exception of those vast empty spaces which are now the United States, Canada and Australia, the other industrialised countries accomplished most of their development before democracy became truly effective so far as they were concerned. The United Kingdom during the period of the Industrial Revolution was no democracy; nor were the states of Europe in the nineteenth century ; nor till recently was Japan. The Soviet Union and the countries of Eastern Europe are developing, and developing rapidly, under forms of social organisation which are different from those prevalent in the under-

developed areas ; so also is China. In Europe in the earlier stages of its development, the hardships attendant on industrialisation were to some extent, alleviated by the foreign aid that was received through the possession and exploitation of colonies as also by the opportunities for migration. Even so, the nineteenth century saw in Europe a period in which the contrast between the rich and the poor as well as the absolute misery and degradation in which the poor lived caused discontents which, if corrective measures had not been taken, would have led to the destruction of the social system on which the nation state was at that time based. No truer word was said than that a system under which the rich grew richer and the poor poorer had within it the seeds of its own destruction. And if western capitalist society was not destroyed but, on the other hand, flourished and grew from strength to strength. the reason was that it transformed itself beyond recognition into a society which, through the organised power and will of national governments, accepted and carried out the dictates of social justice and brought about the necessary transferences of wealth from the rich to the poor and from the better developed areas to the less developed ones.

I submit that the trials and tribulations through which the world is passing today, which express themselves in a variety of forms, are the exact counterparts on an international scale of the discontents within the nation state in the nineteenth century. And I would humbly suggest to you that if organised world society is to continue and if the world is not to be split up even further into hostile factions, if wars and revolutions are not going to be needed to prod our social conscience, the remedy to be applied to the present state of affairs is exactly that which has been applied to the nation state during the last hundred years. The basic differences in the

274

world today are not really between those who believe in one or the other form of government but between those who have and those who have not. And if a polarization of the world on this basis, a basis which cannot but destroy world society, is to be avoided, then action on a very substantial scale to remove the causes of these discontents must be undertaken immediately.

The urgency of the problem is great. The

increase in the populations of Asia and Latin America make it imperative for these continents to run very fast in order to be able to standstill. Any slowing down of the pace of economic development in this area must necessarily reduce the whole social system of these countries to chaos. This is particularly true for countries where economic development has achieved a certain momentum and where, therefore, the psychological shock caused by any setback in the rate of growth will be great. In Africa, the emergence of political independence immediately brings to the forefront the problem of economic development and if the newly emergent states are not to be swamped by the discontents of their people, they also must tackle the problem without delay. We cannot, therefore, afford to wait till all other problems of the world are solved, till disarmament has been achieved, till national budgets are balanced, till there is a plethora of savings in national capital markets, till national balances of payments have achieved equilibrium of developed surpluses. Cooperation in the world economic development must become an obligation of the richer nations and should be treated by them on the same basis as any of their other national obligations, so that the vice-skirted of their budgets and balances of payments cease to have any overriding relevance in this matter. The plain fact is that the world community is now rich enough, and is getting richer at a rapid enough rate, to be able to lay aside a small proportion of the annual increase in its wealth for performing this task which, on grounds of humanity, on grounds of sheer commercial self-interest and, above all, on grounds of maintaining the political stability and peace of the world, it has become essential and urgent to perform.

If it is accepted that the conditions of the world demand that the world community should immediately jet together to act rather than to discuss, study and defer action to a highly uncertain and possibly explosive future, it is desirable to have a clear idea of what the international effort should aim at. I have earlier mentioned the growth of the discrepancy between the rich and the poor nations as an undesirable feature of the present trends. Let me, however, frankly admit that I see no prospect in the immediate future of correcting this imbalance. The richer countries have, over the years, built up such large accumulations of wealth, from which further wealth accrues, that it is not within the

realm of practical politics to aim at reducing international inequalities to any significant extent. But what can immediately be done-and I suggest that this should be the goal of international action is to help each country which does not at present have the resources to perform the task singly and unaided, to develop itself to the point from which it can continue its development out of its own resources. The objective of international action should, I suggest, be the aiding of countries up to the stage at which they achieve a self-generating and self-sustaining economy-a stage which, in modern economic parlance, has come to be known as the point of take-off. The international community has helped nation states to achieve their political independence; what is needed now is international help for the achievement of economic independence; for, without economic independence political independence is meaningless and cannot for long continue to exist.

If this goal of international action is accepted, then it follows that the first action that the international community should take is to help developing countries to formulate plans and programmed of economic development designed to attain the objective of economic independence in the shortest practicable time. This is one of the major uses to which external technical assistance can be put and the organisation for giving this assistance already exists whether in the United Nations or in its specialized agency, the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development. Such plans and programmed which assess and determine priorities are, to my mind, wholly essential if progress is to be made most rapidly and resources, whether external or internal, are not to be frittered away.

If developmental programmed of this kind are drawn up, it will become obvious what the shortages are which, in any particular case hamper the growth of a particular economy. Economic growth is not wholly a matter of investment of capital. It presupposes a whole complex of conditions-a stable political government, a good administration, managerial ability and technical know-how, in addition to an adequacy of capital. Before capital can usefully be invested, these other conditions have to be created, for otherwise the capital made available is not likely to result in the maximum benefit. If surveys of the kind I have suggested are made, it will be

discovered that practically all the under-developed countries need both technical and capital asses-

275

dance but in vastly varying proportions; also there will be great variations in the kind of technical assistance that is required. Some countries have basic needs, such as the training of teachers or administrators; others need basic technical education. Some others have got these but are in need of knowledge of the more complex technical processes that the world has evolved. In Paris-culler, the emergency of the nations of Africa as politically independent states who must respond to the categorical imperative of economic development, demands that the existing technical programmes, whether international or bilateral, which are insufficient to take care of even present needs, should be vastly expanded, both in terms of the money available to finance them and in regard to the scope of their activities.

With technical assistance programmed designed to operate in such a manner as to fill the lacunae, other than the lack of capital which hamper economic growth, there will remain the need to fill the vacuum in the supply of capital, which is common to all underdeveloped countries. The amounts in which capital is required and the time over which various economies will require it will vary very greatly from country to country. The shortage of capital springs essentially from the existing poverty of the underdeveloped countries; for poor societies are hardly likely to be able to save out of their meagre incomes the capital required for development. The poorer the society' the greater obviously its need for external capital. Further, the greater the absorptive kappa-city, the greater again will be the requirement of external capital.

My Delegation believes firmly that by far the greater proportion of capital required for development should come from the efforts and sacrifices of the people of the developing countries themselves. We believe this not on economic grounds but on moral grounds for we are firmly convinced that economic independence, like political independence, is neither likely to be appear-cited and cherished nor likely for long to endure unless it is achieved through the efforts and sacrifices of the people themselves. We do, how. ever, recognize that in order to avoid placing an

intolerable burden on people who are already suffering from grinding poverty and in order to retain a form of social organisation in which the liberty of the individual is, least interfered with, there must be external support. We believe, therefore, that external assistance should be used to supplement and not to supplant national effort; and that any society which is not making the maximum effort that its own conditions permit, forfeits to that extent its claim for external assistance.

That is why, Mr. Chairman, we emphasize that the first thing the industrialism countries can do in order to help the developing countries to help themselves is to remove the present obstacles to the exports of these countries. Many countries still retain tariffs and quota restrictions and internal fiscal levies on the produce of the developing countries. In some cases the products taxed are not even produced at home so that even the protectional argument is not tenable for their continuance, In most cases the argument for this state of affairs is a protectionist one. It seems to my Delegation wholly unjustifiable that in the second half of the twentieth century rich and industrialism controls, whose techniques and capital resources give them a natural advantage in producing the most complex products of modern industrial society, should continue to subsidize simple industries where they are relatively inefficient at great cost to themselves and considerable harm to the developing countries.

Several Delegations have pointed out the harm caused to the underdeveloped countries through fluctuations in the prices of primary commodities and the continued movement of the terms of trade in favor of the industrialism countries. As has been said this movement is capable of more than swallowing up all the external assistance that has been given by the industrialised countries over the years. Efforts have been made for a long time to find a solution for this problem but no success has yet been achieved. We will support any fresh initiative for the removal of this drag on development.

It is in the area of capital assistance, however, that the industrialism countries have shown the greatest unwillingness to face up to the magnitude and nature of the problem. There are, no doubt, international institutions and bilateral

programmed for the grant of capital assistance. The International Bank for Reconstruction and Development and the International Development Association are two international institutions which have funds for this purpose. But all efforts to establish a capital fund within the United Nations itself have foundered on the rock of sustained opposition by the industrialism countries. Bilateral assistance programmed provide in the aggregate a much larger amount of capital than international institutions and among these, the programmed of the United States are by far the most important, not only because of their magnitude but because these funds are provided on terms which do not throw an appreciable burden on the balance of payments of the countries

276

receiving them. Unfortunately, however, there are a large number of other countries, who are in a position to help similarly and whose position is improving day by day, who have either taken no steps at all or have taken only hesitant or faltering steps quite out of proportion to their economic strength, their standard of living and their obligations to the world community.

How much external capital the underdeveloped countries require and how much they can absorb has not yet been precisely determined and cannot be so determined till individual programmed of growth have been drawn up for all the underdeveloped countries in the world. The estimate made by the United Nations Group of Experts in 1951 assessed the requirements of external capital at \$ 14 billion per annum. Mr-Hoffman estimated these at \$ 7 billion per annum and an estimate made by the Action Committee of the United States of Europe gives a figure of \$ 7.5 billion. The United Nations has also made various area studies; so have many academic and other groups and the estimates, more or less, tally. I see, therefore, no escape from the proposition that the net capital inflow-and I use the words "net" and "capital" very advisedly-into the underdeveloped countries must approximate \$ 7 billion a year, in order to help these countries to develop to the stage of self-sustaining growth at a rate which is politically not too slow. The present net capital inflow into the underdeveloped world does not reach anywhere near these proportions. We have before us two documents presented by the Secretariat, one on the inflow of public capital

and the other on the inflow of private capital to the underdeveloped areas : and the figures there mentioned are apparently respectable. But in order to correct the picture, three factors have to be taken into account. The first. is that these figures are gross and not net. If a country gives a seven year credit to another, the entire amount of credit is chalked up against economic assistance. But there should be a deduction of one-seventh of the credit each year as also of the interest charges payable for the duration of the credit. Similarly, if a firm invests a million dollars in an underdeveloped country, that amount is included in figures of capital inflow, but the profits that it remits back home are not set off against the initial capital transfer. Secondly, there has been included in economic assistance an item known as defence-support. Defence support by definition consists of funds made available to an underdeveloped country to counteract the economic impact of increased military expenditure. Even though some measure of defence support funds might over-flow into economic development, there is basically no net gain to the economy from these funds because they are provided merely to compensate the economy for the sacrifice it has to make on account of a non-developmental effort. Funds transferred to underdeveloped economies for defence support should, therefore, be excluded from the computation, because they are not capital assistance for development. Thirdly, the commodity includes at its full value the cost of surplus agricultural commodities made available to the underdeveloped countries. The receipt of these commodities is of great benefit indeed to the underdeveloped world ; we ourselves have benefitted from these programmes and attach great value to them. We recognize also that the availability of surplus agricultural commodities helps in the mobilization of internal capital and in that way adds to the total resources of the country, and this should entitle them to be included in some measure in an account of external capital inflows. But to include them at their full value is obviously incorrect, for the valuation put on surplus commodities by the supplying countries bears little relation to the additional reserves they help to mobilize for development in the countries receiving such commodities. If these corrections are made to these figures and my Delegation would urge that before the presentation of the next edition, these corrections should be carried out, I fear that the net figures of capital inflow will shrink to very

small proportions in relation to the task confronting us.

The record of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development has, in the matter of helping the underdeveloped world, both by way of capital and technical assistance, been outstanding. But the fact remains that the International Bank is a hard-money institution. What it lends it must get back together with interest charges which are by no means negligible. Its total lending to any' country must, therefore, depend on the external creditworthiness of that country, in the sense of the repidity with which the country can achieve a surplus in its balance of payments sufficient to discharge its external financial obligations. The bank is consequently now rapidly getting into a position where many of its borrowers have already reached the limit of their creditworthiness in this sense but are still in urgent need of funds for carrying out projects about the priority and intrinsic economic soundness of which the Bank itself is in no doubt. Faced with this dilemma, the Bank has been the first to advocate that further assistance to such countries from other sources should be made available on terms which place the least burden on their balance of payments.

It was to meet this kind of situation

277

that the International Development Association was set up. But I must express the extreme disappointment of my Delegation at the paucity of funds that have been placed at its disposal. The total capital of the I. D. A. is \$ 1000 million. Of this, about \$ 250 million is unusable, as this is the capital to be contributed by the underdeveloped countries themselves. A sum of \$ 750 million is, therefore, available to look after the soft loan needs of the entire membership of the I. D. A. covering a population of around 1200 million people for a period of five whole years. When the proposal was first mooted, there was a suggestion to fix the capital at a much higher figure. It was urged, however, that \$ 1000 million should be enough to start with, and that as soon as these funds were exhausted, they could be replenished. However, the provisions regarding the subscription of capital were eventually so framed as to make it impossible for the I. D. A. to get, and therefore to spend more than about

\$150 million a year. This provision was adopted because it was argued that any other basis for subscriptions would create accounting and budgetary complications for the richer countries. It is obvious, of course, that it would; but the real question in this case was whether the developed countries as a whole were willing to face up to the problem of poverty in the world, and the answer clearly was that they were not.

The world Bank and the I. D. A. and the Inter-American Bank, on a regional basis, exhaust the list of international institutions providing capital for development. The effectiveness of the International Bank being greatly hampered by the fact that it is a hard-money institution, the funds available to the I. D. A. being so demonstrably insufficient for the task assigned to it, and the United Nations having no funds for this purpose, the underdeveloped countries have to fall back on bilateral assistance. This is not an altogether satisfactory situation, because economic aid provided through an international body, whether it be the United Nations or a specialised agency thereof, has the advantage of being free from the suspicion that sometimes attaches to bilateral assistance, viz. that it is given for political motives and with political strings attached. My delegation would, therefore, support any suggestion to establish a United Nations Fund for capital development.

However, what is even more important than the agency through which the funds are transferred is the amount that is made available. If the developed countries prefer, for whatever reason, to finance the development of the underdeveloped countries mainly through bilateral arrangements, my Delegation would be willing though reluctantly to accept the position. But the point for decision is whether they are, in fact, willing to sacrifice some part of the annual growth in their wealth for this purpose. As I have said the annual net capital inflow which can usefully be absorbed by the underdeveloped countries is of the order of \$ 7 billion per annum. The gross national income of the developed parts of the world is somewhere around \$ 1000 billion per annum and even on a net basis the total should be between \$ 800 and \$ 900 billion. If countries with highly developed and rich economies were to lay aside one per cent of their net national income for this purpose and in view of the

balance of payments difficulties of the recipient countries, make a substantial part of this available in the form of sort loans, the sacrifice demanded of them surely could not be called too great. And a sacrifice of this order, even with some adjustment to take account of differences in per capita income among the industrialised countries, is all we need to set country after country among the less developed group of nations on the road to self-sustaining growth. My delegation would suggest that this General Assembly should go on record that this is what it considers the world community should do.

In talking about this transfer of wealth I do not mean to suggest that only government to government assistance should be counted. There are many societies whose systems are such that they would prefer these funds to be made available from the private market. My Delegation would have no objection to this for what an underdeveloped country is concerned with is the availability of funds and not the source from which they come. To this, there is only one qualification which I have already touched upon, viz. that a large part of external capital should be available on terms which imply no great future burden on the balance of payments of the developing countries. And inflow of private capital, let us not forget, can and often does impose a heavy burden on the balance of payments over time. Nonetheless, we recognise that private foreign capital has an important part to play in world development. My Delegation, therefore, accepts that it is incumbent on all underdeveloped countries to afford reasonable incentives to private foreign investment and to see that no unnecessary obstacles are placed in its way. But it must be remembered that private capital, no matter what incentives are offered to it by the underdeveloped countries, does not flow to them to any significant extent. Consequently, if the developed countries wish to lessen the burden of foreign aid on the tax-payer by transferring a part of it to the private

278

investor, they will themselves have to take certain major steps towards this end.

The next question that arises is how the totality of the funds made available for economic development should be distributed among the various countries that need them. The World

Bank's criterion is the existence of economically profitable projects and its limitation is the credit-worthiness of the country. Consequently the richer the country the more the International Bank is able to lend to it. Private capital naturally flows where conditions are stablest and profits are highest and is, in any case, not interested in building up the infrastructure of economic development. For the rest, there is no discoverable pattern at all in regard to the distribution of bilateral aid. What countries get from bilateral programmed seems to depend largely on political factors and on their ability to get into crises which excite public attention. It is curious that people are much more willing to put out a fire than to take the pedestrian and much less costly steps to prevent one. My Delegation would suggest that in the distribution of funds under bilateral programmed the factors that the capital exporting countries should consider are the population, the extent of poverty, the measure of self-sacrifice, the existence of a well worked out development programmed, the absorptive capacity and the nearness to the take-off. Having made these recommendations and having urged further that as much as possible of capital assistance should be channelled through the United Nations or its specialised agencies, I would leave the distribution of bilateral assistance for the capital exporting countries themselves to decide. One has to recognise that many of the great powers are interested in some territories more than in others, perhaps, because they feel that these territories aided them in their own development in the past and they owe them some return; perhaps, because they feel a greater moral obligation towards some than towards others; perhaps, for some other reason. These considerations have in the past produced extraordinary results. In the twelve years, 1948 to 1959, the per capita aid received by underdeveloped countries from all sources varied from dollars 158.2 per capita to dollars 3.9 per capita; and it might interest the Committee to know that in this list India occupies the last but one position with dollars 6.5 of aid per capita. Nevertheless, I would not go beyond drawing attention to these discrepancies and leave their rectification to the aid-giving countries themselves.

One final point in this context needs to be made. Apart from an insufficient appreciation of the magnitude of the funds involved, it is also

not generally appreciate & that continuity of aid and an assurance of the amount which will be available in a reasonable future period are essential for the best utilization of the money given. The present system of bilateral assistance under which some countries have an annual appropriation and others go about the business in an even more haphazard and sporadic manner certainly does not help the receiving countries in planning the best use of the resources at their disposal. The suggestion that the industrialised countries should lay aside annually one per cent of their national income will assure also the continuity of the aid programmed.

To summaries, Mr. Chairman, the point of view of my Delegation is that the problem of economic development is now so urgent that a fresh and immediate initiative should be taken at this Assembly to solve it. Though admittedly a great deal has been done over the past few years to help the underdeveloped countries to help themselves, neither the magnitude nor the complexity of the problem has been sufficiently appreciated and the funds available both for technical assistance and for capital development have borne little relation to the needs and the absorptive capacity of the underdeveloped countries. We feel that funds for capital assistance and technical assistance should be immediately raised to a figure of dollars 7 billion per annum that these funds should be raised from the developed countries in proportion to their national income corrected for variations in per capita incomes, the base of calculation being one per cent of the net national income, and that a substantial part of capital assistance should be made available in the form of soft loans. In computing the dollars 7 billion figure it should be recognized that this is the net outflow of capital and there should, therefore, be excluded from it the funds returned by the developing countries to the developed countries and assistance by way of defence support. Assistance given in the form of surplus commodities also should be valued in relation to its contribution to capital formation in the developing countries. We suggest further that as much as of these funds as possible should be channelled through the United Nations and its specialised agencies; in particular, we would urge a substantial expansion of the Expanded Programme of Technical Assistance as well as the expansion of the Special Fund with a view, Paris-

scullery, to helping the new countries of Africa. In addition we would urge the creation of a U.K.. Capital Fund. Further, we would suggest the immediate doubling of the capital of the International Development Association and a change

279

in the method of paying in the capital subscribing to that Association to ensure that 50 per cent of the increased capital is made available to it straightaway. The rest of the capital transfers needed to conform to the standard of one per cent of the national income may be made through bilateral arrangements or through private foreign investment or through the capital markets.

And may I say this, Mr. 'Chairman, in conclusion ? I am well aware that the suggestions I have made today might appear to some as visionary and impractical. But there is nothing impractical about taking a trite measure of our problem, the problem of setting two-thirds of humanity on the road to progress in peace and in self-respect. Confused and complex as the present world situation seems to most of us, it is still a situation where hope in an ampler future for all is brighter than at any other time in human history. Even more important than the progress of science and technology, there is now a new upsurge of the human spirit--in Asia, in Africa, in the Middle East and in Latin America. Within a framework of international cooperation on an adequate scale, mankind could be rid of poverty, misery and want in the foreseeable future. But time is running out on us fast. And the cost of trying to salvage a situation in which hope and energy would have given way to despair, bitterness and worse as a result of short-sighted and penny-pinching policies now would be far greater in dollars and cents as well as in hula suffering than the cost of the proposal I have ventured to make.

INDIA USA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC AUSTRALIA CANADA JAPAN CHINA FRANCE UNITED KINGDOM

Date : Oct 01, 1960

Volume No

1995

INDIA AND THE UNITED NATIONS

Sri J. N. Zanies Statement in Administrative and Budgetary Committee

Sri J.D.. Ashen, Member, Indian Delegation to the United Nations, made the following statement in the Administrative and Budgetary Committee of the General Assembly on October 27, 1960 :

Mr. Chairman

The astronomical figures to which our budgetary appropriations are fast approaching create an element of irony. Our efforts towards trying to effect economics and to stabilize the budget reminds me of the story of the young man who was trying to explain the reason for his coming late to school on a particularly rainy day. He explained to his teacher that every time he took a step forward the roads were so slippery that he slipped two steps backward. The astute teacher wanted to know how, even if he was late, he could at all come to the school by slipping backwards. The witty student remarked that finally he decided to walk homewards and slipped towards the school. During the four years I have had the privilege of sitting in this Committee, we have recommended various steps to streamline the activities of the Secretariat, to stabilize expenditures, and generally to economize in various directions. But each year every forward step has taken us two steps backward to quote the story of the truant schoolboy. In fact, the apprehensions expressed by my delegation last year have turned out to be more than true and we have practically slipped down a landslide, considering the increase in the regular budget to nearly \$ 70 million, the supplementary appropriations, the budget of the UNIFY of \$ 20 million, aid to Congo of \$100 million and the likely expenditure, quoting only speculative reports in the press of about \$ 170 million for 1960 and 1961.

Speaking last year my delegation observed

that we were and I quote : "unable to share the complacency of the Secretary-General with regard to the Budgetary situation of the Organization. In para 33 of his statement before the Committee, Dec. A/C.5/782, the Secretary-General stated before the Committee, that base for the year 1960 would be 3 million dollars lower than in 1959 and that itself was a pleasant prospect before the Budgetary Committee. While not denying the arithmetic, my delegation desires to point out that the comparison obscures the fact that the situations are not comparable and that the abnormal political and security situation of 1958 necessitated supplementary appropriations of over 6 million dollars in the year 1959. On the contrary, as pointed out by the Advisory Committee in para 9 of Dec. A/4170 the real increase in 1960 initial estimates over 1959 appropriate-things is 2 million dollars and there are further prospects of increase in the estimates arising out of

- (a) revision of the initial estimates
- (b) additional expenditure arising out of decisions of the current session of the General Assembly, and
- (c) possible unforeseen and extraordinary expenditure during the Budget year.

280

The need for vigilance and economy is therefore constant and compelling."

In facing the situation that confronts us this year, the best we can do, as the distinguished delegate of the United Kingdom pointed out, is to try to take care of the pence in the hope that the pounds will take care of themselves. In approaching the budgetary figures from this angle, two facts have to be recognized :

- (1) That serious efforts have been made in various directions to stabilize the budget, to effect economies, to streamline the Secretariat activities, and to generally give effect to some of the constructive proposals made in this Committee;
- (2) That the increase in expenditure, even though steep, arises primarily

from decisions of the Assembly, or the Security Council, and can be chary-sterile as of an "unforeseen and extraordinary character."

In this connection, we feel that due consultation should be given to the observations made by the Advisory Committee in para 3 of its report Dec. A/4408, and I quote : "The budgets of the United Nations and the other organizations reflect the growth of international action, through cooperative efforts, in the economic and social fields, directed primarily towards the creation of conditions of stability and well-being. If the case for such increasing international efforts is accepted, the basic issue is that of facilitating and regulating this growth in an orderly manner, so as to ensure the maximum effectiveness of the resources applied to those efforts."

Taking first the form of the budget itself, we note with satisfaction that a serious effort has been made to furnish in several places some comparative figures of expenditure for the last three years. The Secretary General's foreword is more detailed and explanatory, the information annexes are more comprehensive, and the ghosting of estimates is of a more rational character. Although these changes are of an 'ad hoc' character and not relating to specific activities in different departments, they are certainly helpful. We, however, cannot help quoting an observation of the Advisory Committee in para 19 of its report, Dec. A/4408 in which it says and I quote: "The changes that have been introduced in the sectional break-down of the estimates and in the coverage of individual sections may render comparison with budgets of prior years somewhat difficult, although they make for a more rational presentation." We do realize that there is an element of unreality in comparing figures of expenditure in relation to enlarging activities and expanding appropriations, even then it would be desirable to give a comparative picture to enable delegations to assess the position better and to draw their own conclusions. While not claiming to be an expert myself in the realm of budgetary presentation, I do feel that at some stage, the Secretary General may consider the desirability of presenting a separate five yearly comparative statement with an itemized breakdown for the various sections

and departments and activities of the United Nations.

We are glad to know, Sir, that serious and Substantial efforts have been made by the Secretary General to utilize available staff with an element of flexibility which the present budgetary system has made possible, thereby, securing greater utilization of personnel with reciprocal economy. Since economies in this sphere are likely to be of a latent character, it would be in the interests of the Secretary General himself, and it would afford us a better appreciation of the results achieved, if at some stage, it was thought advisable to issue a brief note giving more specifically the results of these internal operations. Taking a six months period as base, it may be useful to know the number of people functioning, the number of unfilled posts and vacancies, and the number of persons who would have during that period been normally required if the present arrangement of flexibility was not available to the Secretary-General.

Our delegation endorsed the view shared by several others that the entire budget of all the organizations connected with the United Nations, should undergo a consolidated scrutiny by the Advisory Committee. We are happy to note that this is being done and the Advisory Committee has been able to scrutinize the entire consolidated budget of the United Nations and its allied organizations, and to make valuable suggestions.

My delegation, Sir, also suggested two years ago that the pattern of conferences should be carefully gone into and some of the commissions and bodies which had hitherto been meeting once a year may without much dislocation of activities meet once in two years or if acceptable even staggered further in accordance with the wishes of the bodies concerned. We are glad to know the progress made, resulting in better utilization of staff, improved conference facilities and economies.

281

We are also glad to know that the date and location of meetings as a rule is now being left to the discretion of the Secretariat to enable a better utilization of conference facilities. We also note that substantial progress has been made in enlisting the co-operation of various bodies for the purpose of economy in documentation with substantial

results. At the same time we are gratified by the assurance given by Mr. Evens that such economy is being effected without immuring effescience, and that efficiency in presentation still continues to be the primary consideration.

It is satisfactory to note that rationalization of activities and utilization of resources is being carried out in accordance with the principle of priorities and that as the Advisory Committee observes "priorities will still have to be exercised in order to ensure that resources are directed to the more important and urgent needs among the many that will continue to arise". The Advisory Committee also observes that the Secretary General has assisted the subsidiary organizations of the Economic and Social Council and I quote : "...in a continuing process of detailed examination of their work programmed with a view to a deferral of projects that are less urgent and elimination of others which have ceased to be of importance."

Mr. Chairman, this by no means exhausts the list of steps taken by the Secretary General in different spheres relating to the budget, but it is certainly illustrative of the responsive attitude of the Secretary General to constructive suggestions made by the Fifth Committee. For all this Sir, we would like to express our appreciation to the Secretary General and to the Controller on whom to a great degree also falls the burden of budgetary formulation.

At this stage, I would also like to take the opportunity of expressing our appreciation of the excellent work done by the Advisory Committee, whose laborious and careful scrutiny of budgetary proposals has as usual lightened considerably the task of this Committee. I would also like to convey to the Chairman of the Advisory Committee a word of personal appreciation for his own wise and individual contributions in offering us useful explanations to help in a better understanding of the budgetary proposals.

Coming now to the budgetary proposals themselves, Mr. Chairman, we would be bordering on the unrealistic if we did not share with several of the distinguished representatives who have already participated in the debate, the gravest concern for the steeply rising bill of expenditure - disturb the arrears in contributions, the cash

position, and the ways and means to meet the situation. In saying this we are not unmindful of the fact that a greater part of the increase in the budget has been necessitated by urgent operations undertaken either in the interest of maintaining peace and security, or from offering economic and technical assistance in areas of need and as a result of decisions of the Assembly. If the United Nations has to implement the purposes of the Charter, such political and economic operations only reflect the urgent problems with which the various nations of the world are faced and must hence constitute an unavoidable obligation. At the same time, Mr. Chairman, it must be frankly stated under-developed countries, like my own, have their own colossal problems of economic rehabilitation and development, and if their limited resources are to be further strained to meet mounting international obligations, this strain would necessarily impair their capacity to meet very essential indigenous obligations. Lest we are misunderstood, I may point out, that India has not been unwilling or reluctant to make its fullest contribution consistently with capacity towards the United Nations. Whether the calls had come for service in Korea, in Indo China, in West Asia, or in the Congo, India has responded unhesitatingly. We have willingly offered substantial contributions in technical assistance and technical aid, according to our capacity. This year India has pledged two million dollars to the United Nations expanded programme of technical assistance and special fund. The same, I am sure, is true of several of the other underdeveloped countries.

The Advisory Committee has pointedly drawn attention to this aspect of the situation in para 25 of its report Dec. A/14408 when it asks the General Assembly in appraising the estimates for 1961 to take account of among other things: "The overall outlook for 1961 in terms of the financial burden that will be placed on member states, in respect of their participation in the United Nations family of organizations." Countries like mine with underdeveloped economies would not like to shrink their responsibilities nor would we suggest that any of the important programs of rehabilitation, technical aid and economic assistance should be curtailed. If it had been possible to agree to a program of progressive or total disarmament, it would have been more appropriate to utilize economics in armament expenditure towards

raising the standard of living of the underdeveloped people of the world. But the situation being as it is the only practical method we can suggest is to apply the Christian maxim. "From each according to his ability and to each according

282

to his needs." During the present period of affluent economy and prosperity through which some of the more fortunate countries are passing, it should be possible to raise very substantial voluntary contributions, and otherwise to assess the burden in relationship to capacity. By this means alone the miracle, which the distinguished delegate of France hoped for, could come about. In finding such formula to meet our immediate requirements we should also keep in mind the future which is likely to bring increased burdens and even greater responsibilities for the United Nations.

Mr. Chairman, once again reverting to the doctrine of pennies against pounds, when we take a look at the cash position of the organization, the table of arrears shows that balances due from member states amount to over 18 and a half million dollars. Incidentally, I have already stated, and I may again mention for the purpose of record that while my own country is indicated to be in arrears, in actual fact and taking into account the unsettled amounts due to it under UNIFY, it is very substantially on the surplus side. Nonetheless, the suggestion was made by us last year that in order to improve the cash position and working capital fund, a request may be made to countries economically better placed than the rest, to make a greater part of their contribution in the beginning of the year. This suggestion is still worthy of consideration. Another suggestion has been made by the distinguished delegate of Austria that some of the countries may find it feasible to make their contributions in monthly instalments. So long as this process enables balances to be cleared expeditiously, its practical-pilot deserves to be canvassed.

Considering that we will have to await a miracle to meet the obligations currently being incurred in Congo, it seems rather unrealistic for our delegation to share the concern of several others in respect of the rather distressing position where funds for UNIFY are concerned. I can only repeat what my delegation said last year and

endeavor only to underline the implications of that statement: "The Indian delegation has always maintained," we said, "that peace is the concern of all the nations of the world and problems like disarmament are not confined to major powers. In financial terms 'this must include a readiness on the part of all to share the legitimate costs emanating from such actions initiated by the United Nations.'" The payments in respect of the United Nations emergency force show an unpaid liability amounting to more than 18 million dollars. I cannot do better than to quote in this connection the views expressed by the Advisory Committee in para 15 of the report, Dec. A/4408 wherein it says : "The arrears relating to regular budget assessments are not the most serious. It is the amount of arrears in the payment of the UNIFY assessments which is causing the serious deterioration in the cash position." The Advisory Committee in Paragraph 67 outlines the different reasons and circumstances which have resulted in the building up of these arrears, and we join in endorsing the last sentence of this paragraph where the Advisory Committee says : "Obviously these points need to be further explored."

At the appropriate time we will take up, along with other delegations, a more thorough and intensive study of the question of geographical distribution of staff in the Secretariat. We find that an expert committee has been examining problems relating to the organization and work of the Secretariat. We will await with interest the report of the committee, and will reserve our comments on such proposals of organization till then. What we do hope is that in any scheme of organization, due account will be taken of the fact that the United Nations is rapidly expanding in its membership, thereby increasing as much its influence as its representative character, and the obligation of the Secretary General to reflect in the Secretariat personnel, the geographical orientations and changing emphasis in the composition of membership. If this result has to be achieved, it may be both prudent and desirable to retain a certain amount of flexibility, in terms of permanent posts, and to foresee in making new appointments what the impact of promotions and recruitments over a given number of years would be to avoid any undue imbalances, at the same time bringing about a more effective geographical distribution. While we do not disagree with the Secretary General in respect of

the criteria of integrity, competence, and ability, we do feel that due regard should be given to a global approach in the Secretariat.

Here, Sir, I would like to take the opportunity of clarifying one particular matter. We of the Indian delegation do not share the view that geographical distribution should be based on ideological concepts or ideological divisions. In any case even so far as the world at large is concerned, while we do not recognize our own role to be of neutrals, or of members of a neutral group, our position of unaligned is very well-known. Even then, it would be unwise to interpret geographical distribution in terms of a proportionate representation of various political sectors in the international field. In fact a member of the United Nations Secretariat, should essentially be a person with an international outlook and

283
should not project the prejudices or the political affiliations of his home country. We do, however, subscribe to the view that a truly international Secretariat should reflect the background of the people and the cultures of the world to enable the Secretary General to have at its disposal talent, knowledge, and ability drawn from various, geographical areas. We may say in passing that during a process of organization and at a time when new posts are likely to be created and some old posts are likely to fall vacant, the Secretary General keeping in view these criteria could usefully apply his mind to remove some of the imbalances, not only at the lower levels, or in the over-all picture, but also in the upper levels by adopting appropriate steps. These are matters which are not so much concerned with geographical distribution, as to the manner, methods, and procedures relating to the re-organization of the Secretariat, and that is why we have referred to them in passing at this stage.

We will have occasion, Mr. Chairman, to refer at a later stage in greater detail to the office of public information, its budget and its activities. We have taken very keen interest in this activity of the United Nations for the last few years, and I only wish to take this opportunity, first to welcome the now Under-Secretary, Mr. Towers ; and secondly to express our satisfaction over some of the changes which are evident from a hurried reading of the report.

It is evident that a serious effort has been and is being made to implement quite a few of the suggestions made by the Indian delegation, the Committee of Experts, and this committee. We are also pleased to note that the Secretary General has been able to select a panel of advisors who have been consulted in determining priorities and matters of Policy, and we would certainly like to know the scope and character of these consultations, and to what extent they have influenced the Secretary General.

Coming now, Mr. Chairman, to the appropriations, we are glad to note that in utilizing available funds and available personnel there has been an increasing emphasis on rationalization. While we will take the opportunity of such interventions as may be necessary during this discussion of items relating to expenditure of various sections of the budget, we feel that the Advisory Committee has given considerable thought and consideration to the various items of expenditure and we will support the views, and the recommendations of the committee.

There is only one matter on which we have had some hesitation. The Secretary General in his statement contained in the AC.5/828, referred to a cut in posts recommended by the Advisory Committee and said that if he had to distribute ten posts recommended by the Advisory Committee, he would allocate 5 posts against 21 for headquarters, 2 posts against 6 for ESCAPE, 3 posts against 12 for ECLAT, and none against 1 posts for Economic Commission for Europe.

In his statement (Dec. A/C 5.829) the Chairman of the Advisory Committee pointed out and I quote : "The Advisory Committee's recommendations in this regard under section 3 should be considered in their totality, including the elements relating to established posts, consultants and experts and special technical posts. Based on the considerations which I have already outlined, the Advisory Committee has made the following recommendations in respect of the Fifty-nine additional posts requested for the economic, social and human rights fields : First, the approval of an increase of twenty-nine posts on an established basis ; Secondly, the inclusion in the credit for consultants and experts of a money provision equivalent to the cost of securing the services

represented by some further ten posts; and Thirdly; the transfer, as opportunity arose in the later part of 1960 and during 1961, of posts from declining areas of work and, in particular, from the trusteeship field. On this last point, the Advisory Committee recognizes of course, the difficulties in the way of making too rapid a redeployment of resources from one area to another. Nevertheless, it appears to the Committee that there is scope in the next several months for the release of substantial resources, having regard to the fact that the provisional staff tentatively included for the Department of Trusteeship and Information from Non-Self-Governing Territories in 1961 numbers fifty-five, that is only one junior officer post less than the number in 1960."

The impression created on our minds after listening to the statement of the Chairman of the Advisory Committee is that while the Advisory Committee did not commend the proposal of the Secretary General for a total of 59 established posts, they had in mind the clear possibility of certain staff becoming available from other spheres of activity in the United Nations during the year and also the desirability in view of the pending recommendations of the Secretariat Reorganization Committee to avail of recruitment on a temporary basis. To put it more positively, it appears to us from the statement of the Chairman of the Advisory Committee that these posts would not remain unfilled, and that the Secretary

284

General will have at his disposal posts, or recommend professional staff release from other spheres of activity, which with temporary experts and consultants could effectively fill up the gap. We have been supported in this view by the Chairman of the Advisory Committee. If by chance the expectations of the Advisory Committee are belied, and that could only be in respect of a couple of posts, we would support the Secretary General in any steps he takes to fill up the gap.

Mr. Chairman, in conclusion let me take this opportunity of expressing our great appreciation of the work which in spite of its limitations and shortcomings is being performed day to day by the large number of silent workers employed in the United Nations at the headquarters and in various parts of the world. With the increasing tempo of our activities and the enlarging

sphere of our membership, they have to carry a heavy load, and have to perform some difficult and delicate tasks, and we wish to assure them that their silent labors are fully appreciated.

INDIA USA CONGO FRANCE CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC CHINA KOREA AUSTRIA

Date : Oct 01, 1960

Volume No

1995

INDIA AND THE UNITED NATIONS

Sri J. N. Zanies Statement on Report of Committee on Information from Non-self- governing Territories

Sri J. N. Sahni, Member, Indian Delegation to the United Nations, made a statement in the Trusteeship Committee of the General Assembly on October 19, 1960 on the Report of the Committee on information from Non-self-governing Territories.

The following is the text of the statement :

Mr. Chairman,

In its examination of the Ten-Year Progress Report on Non-Self-Governing Territories, this Committee has the benefit of the observations and conclusions prepared by the Committee on Information. We have carefully perused these observations and conclusions, and I am glad to say that we consider them to be fair and objective. During these last few days we have had several occasions to note with satisfaction that the work of the Committee on the Progress Report has commended itself to numerous other members as it has commended to us. I should like to acknowledge our debt to the Committee on Information, and I should particularly like to offer our thanks, as, indeed, our felicitations to the Committee Chairman, Ambassador Quai-Sacked of Ghana, to its Vice-Chairman, Mr. Goedhart of the Netherlands, and Mr. John

Bacon of the United States of America, the Committee's Reports. I gratefully acknowledge the kind references that have been made by several members to the Indian Chairman of the Sub-Committee Mr. Ragout, which prepared the observations and conclusions on the Progress Report for our consideration and wish to add my own words of appreciation of the work of the Sub-Committee.

Despite the fact that information on developments of political and constitutional character in a large number of Non-Self-Governing Territories was not available in the Progress Report, the Committee on Information has done well to include in its Report, some general observations of a general political character in Part I of the Report as well as in Section II of Part II thereof. (Document A/4371). In the final analysis the progress of dependent or Non-Self-Governing Territories must be measured in terms of their forward march towards the goal of "full measure of self-government" or independence. For this reason, as for many others, the presence in our midst at this Session of 14 new member states, who were till recently Non-Self-Governing Territories has given us cause for very great satisfaction. Their coming here represents a substantial shrinkage in the areas of dependence in the world. Their presence here has also in it the message of hope that very soon other non-self-governing countries will also achieve independence, and be among us. We believe that to the extent the area of freedom has expanded in these last 14 or 15 years, the peace of our world, with which the Charter' of the United Nations is primarily concerned, is securer today than at any time before.

While acknowledging and welcoming the progress achieved thus, it is appropriate for us to recall that there are still some 45 Non-Self-Governing Territories, large or small, the aspirations of whose peoples to independence have yet to be fulfilled. The responsibilities of the United Nations General Assembly, are hence far from the point of fulfillment.

In terms of economic, social and educational advancement, there is evidence of progress in these territories. With respect to those Territories on which information of a political character is transmitted to the United Nations, we are aware

that they are moving forward, however slowly,-
and to this pace I will refer later-in the political

285

field also. Information on political and constitute-
thine developments on a majority of the remain.
eng Non-Self-Govering Territories which are
under the administration of the United Kingdom
continues to be withheld much to our disappoint-
ment, despite the Assembly's renewed appeal of
last year that such information should be trans-
mitted to better enable the Assembly to assess the
advance of these Territories towards the goals of
Chapter KS. The belief, if belief-it be, is mistaken
in our view, that the United Nations must not
concern itself with the political situation of these
Territories, or with the manner of fulfillment of
the political objectives of Chapter KS of the
Charter. In recent months the United Nations
has been faced with grave consequences of deli-
Quincy on the part of one Administering Member.
If the United Nations is to face responsibilities
of the kind it faces in the Congo, or if emergent-
ices of this kind are to be avoided altogether it
must be placed in a position, with regard to the
remaining Non-Self-Govering Territories, of
being able to examine and advise on their political
and constitutional advancement.

Lastly and worse still there are still vast
territories in Africa in the possession of Portugal,
on which we receive no information, and which
continue to live in a state of undisclosed and
unchanging undeveloped. The fate of a few
mall Portuguese Territories in Africa and Asia
should not be forgotten. There is also the absurd
anomaly of Ghaul which its people, their kin in the
rest of the sub-continent of India, and my govern-
ment continue to tolerate with our proverbial
patience in the hope that wiser counsels will
prevail.

The context in which we discuss the affairs of
these territories, in 1960 is so different from the
context of preceding years. While it is true, as
the Committee on Information points out in
paragraph 4 of Part II of its Report that during
the 10 years under review approximately 100
million people demonstrated their capacity to
govern themselves, and that since the end of that
period another 45 or 50 million people have
achieved the goal of independence, it is equally
remarkable that belief should persist in certain

quarters that the remaining 50 or 60 million people, who are still in a status of Non-Self-Government are not yet able to govern themselves. Our knowledge of the achievements of the people who have overthrown the yoke of colonialism during the last 15 years points to the contrary. Not only have all these countries and their people demonstrated the ability to govern themselves, they have in fact governed themselves rather well. Great advances in economic, social and educational sectors of national activity have been registered almost in each one of these countries. There are numerous examples of this in Asia and in Africa, but perhaps the most remarkable case is that of Guinea which has had to struggle hard in circumstances of great adversity accompanying its independence. In fact, reading through the report, the manner in which "sacred trust" has functioned and is now functioning in the non-self-governing territories, we are reinforced in the belief that the longer the independence of these countries is delayed the slower will be their advancement in economic, social and educational fields. The United Nations, or even the former administering countries, can play an advisory role offering help, aid, and expert advice, but it is the people themselves who should really determine the best manner and the most appropriate plans for their development.

In our view it is, therefore, not valid any longer to argue that a certain territory is not sufficiently advanced, economically, socially or educationally to merit independence or is not sufficiently prepared for it. While we acknowledge the contributions made by Administering Members to the economic social and educational advancement of the territories for which they are responsible, it is common experience that progress in these fields multiplies many times more after the advent of a Territory's independence. There is no substitute for being in a position to look after oneself.

In paragraphs 24 and 25 of Part 11 of its Report, the Committee conscious of these consultations of over-riding importance has sounded a timely note of warning. It states

"the aspirations of peoples towards self-government or independence have too often far outstripped the pace of their

social advancement for that fact to be ignored".

This, Mr. Chairman, becomes all too apparent when one sees that while the world is marching forward with the speed of a Jet 707, there are areas under trusteeship which are moving at the speed of a snail. That fact, Mr. Chairman, can be ignored only at the peril of us all and our organization. The winds of freedom are sweeping the continent of Africa and other parts of the world. Their force cannot be ignored, nor can their course be diverted to offer cover to one territory or the other. The right to independence of the remaining Non-Self-Governing Territories must inevitably be recognized now and without

286

delay. The time has come to take urgent steps to bring independence within their reach so that the people themselves wherever they may be, can determine their future destiny. Every effort must therefore be concentrated on preparing these Territories for this goal in the shortest possible time, and means suitable for this purpose should be adopted without delay.

These territories, as all newly independent countries, will certainly need outside assistance to build their economic, social, and educational structure and their future prosperity. The requisite assistance in the "take off" of new countries must necessarily come from outside, but it does not have to come in a relationship of dependence. It can come more profitably and more effectively in the state of mutual dependence in a relationship of equality and independence. In fact there is a danger that such assistance in a state of dependence may create vested interests and problems which will retard and not accelerate the pace of progress in the future.

In dealing with the functional fields I should, first of all, like to offer a few observations on social conditions prevailing in Non-Self-Governing Territories. The Committee's observations and conclusions present a mixed picture of commendable activity and achievements in some fields and of a disappointing absence of activity and lack of accomplishment in others. Compared with what existed in these territories of general social welfare, family care, child welfare, care of public health services at the

time of the founding of the United Nations, the picture today is brighter; and in some of these fields notable advances have been made by the Territories often worth the assistance of the Administering Members and also of the United Nations and its Agencies. On balance however, it would appear that the definition of policy received greater attention than the implementation thereof. The whole trend in this field however seems to be born of a sense of benevolent patronage and racial superiority. In this field, more than in any other the essential need is of people's participation at all levels in the programmes and plans for social welfare. In the absence of such active participation these plans and programmed must remain ineffective.

Paragraph 110 of part II of the Committee's Report points out that the share of social developments in the total expenditure planned often remained static and in some cases diminished. A particularly notable lacuna exists in the field of community development. The section of the Progress Report dealing with community development is largely academic or theoretical. We regard to note from the observations of the Committee that "there is no statistical information or other material evidence in the Progress Report to show that extensive community development plans had been successfully implemented in the Territories during the period under review." We should like to see a vast expansion and rapid extension of extensive community development plans since through these programmed can these countries build up the broad base on which progressive economic development and sound political freedom must rest.

The picture presented in the Committee's Report of the status of women in these Territories is depressing. We should like to draw special attention to the following remarks in paragraph 193 of the Committee's Report :

"If women are not only to attain but also fully to exercise equal rights with men and to discharge their responsibilities on equal terms with men, it is essential that they receive equal opportunities in education and vocational training".

In our view the backwardness of women in these

communities is not due so much to the social and other barriers of tradition, as to ununderstanding attitudes and behavior on the part of the Governments, predominantly foreign. In India-genius societies such as those of Africa or Asia the role and status of women is, in essence, not less important than that of men. It is another matter that the economic activity in these territories namely subsistence agriculture, is one which seldom lends itself to the full exercise of feminine capacities. The foreign rulers of these Territories have not always shown the inclination to trust women readily with the exercise of basic political rights, such as the right to vote, and this denial has often times aggravated the situation concerning the status and rights of women. We therefore, welcome the observation of the Committee on Information (Paragraph 196) that "even though much remained to be done, the progress achieved reflected a change in social and official attitudes"-This is not enough, Mr. Chairman. If the change has taken place, in fact, then It has taken too long. The women of Africa, as the women of the rest of the world, cannot wait endlessly to take their proper place of leadership in the social, economic and political life of these countries.

About race relations-or the absence of proper relations between races-I shall speak at

287

length a little later. In one particular field of social activity, namely labour-management relations and the organisation of workers into trade unions, the policies and practices of discrimination have persisted in several territories. Not only are there difficulties, legal and other, as the Committee notes in Paragraph 201 of Part II, in the "formation, recognition and registration" of indigenous trade unions, separate trade unions organised on racial lines exist in several territories; and their continuance in separate racial compartments seems still to be actively encouraged in some. It is our view that this state of affairs should be brought to an end forthwith, and we would commend to the Administering Members concerned the recommendation of the Committee in Paragraph 202 of Part II that "trade unions should be constituted without regard to race, national origin or political affiliations, and that they should be persuaded and encouraged to determine their trade union objectives on the basis

of common economic and social interests of all workers".

The Progress Report furnishes ample evidence to show that in most of the Territories trade unions are not as yet in a position to perform one of their basic functions, namely negotiation of collective agreements between employers and workers concerning wages and other matters. The Committee will no doubt take note of the observation of the I.L.O., which is reproduced in paragraph 200 of Part II of the Report that "in the British Central and East African Territories, the collective bargaining between workers and employers organisations was virtually unknown, and a number of reports of the labour departments of the Territories concerned gave instances of the unwillingness of particular employers to meet trade union representatives for the purpose of negotiations". "It was clear", the I.L.O. adds, "that in many territories in this area the atmosphere for collective negotiation was far from propitious. Social distinctions were great and unions were in many instances small and weak, and employers were not prepared to regard them as representative. Mr. Chairman, this is the considered view of a responsible international organisation and should merit our serious consideration and that of the Administering Authority, the United Kingdom in this case.

The Delegation of India has had occasion in the Committee on Information to express its view at some length on the question of racial discrimination, or race relations, as we are used to call it. The Committee has not gone into the origins of the policies and practices of discrimination based on considerations of race and colour. It is our view that it is not a purely social question. origins go back to the days of the conquests indigenous communities by alien invaders or colonizers, who believed that divine powers were themselves at work in assisting their mission of conquest and civilization of inferior races. This feeling of superiority was perpetuated by the exercise of uncontrolled political power by these foreign communities to the exclusion of, and many times at the expense of all indigenous interests. It was aggravated through the acquisition by means sometimes questionable, by these alien minorities of the wealth of these lands. The question is, therefore, as essentially political and economic as it is social. My delegation not only fully endorses

the Committee's view that the continuance of the policies and practices of discrimination in any form can only perpetuate disunity but that such discrimination is a gross violation of the spirit in which the Sacred Trust should be administered. To quote from the Committee's Report :

"The Committee considers that the problem of race relations should be attacked in all fields of activity in the Territories; measures to solve it should include the extension to all inhabitants of the full basic political rights such as the right to vote. It considers that the establishment of political equality among all members of multi-racial communities will prove the quickest way to destroy discrimination and the minority privileges which often give rise to it and to create nations united by a common loyalty transcending race".

That in our view should be the basic approach the immediate grant of basic political rights to all without any distinction. The denial of human rights to indigenous populations, which still exists in a number of territories, must cease at once. Discrimination in the matter of opportunity and of wages for skilled and unskilled African labour and for skilled and unskilled European labour must go. Weightage of opportunity, if any, should be in favour of the indigenous people, and not in favor of the alien settlers. There is no justification that while a European store assistant in Swampland should receive £ 500 a year, an equally competent and qualified African store assistant must remain content with £ 90 a year.

Racial discrimination in the field of education is, perhaps, even more objectionable and repugnant than in any other. The United Kingdom policies at home and abroad deprecate such discrimination and yet in Northern Rhodesia, in

288

Nyasaland and elsewhere today segregation in education continues and attempts are sometimes made even to justify it. In Northern Rhodesia, the unequal distribution of expenditure is but only one example of discriminatory policies in the matter, of allotment of funds for education. In 1953 the expenditure on education on an African

population of two million amounted to \approx 642,400 whereas expenditure on the education of some 70,000 Europeans amounted to over \approx 500,000. These inequities and disparities can no longer be justified on any ground. So far as we are concerned they are utterly intolerable, and we should like to see the Assembly to call upon the Admonishing Members to put an end to them without further loss of time.

In the field of education, as in other fields, there has been some tangible progress, and that progress is welcome. From paragraph 250 of the Report it will be clear that the introduction of universal free and compulsory primary education has been extremely slow in particular in British territories with an occasional exception here and there. In this as in many other fields, the territories under administration of the United States are well in the lead. Papua under Australian Administration is, perhaps, the only territory where education at primary level, imparted both by the state and by private agencies, is free; and we hope it will soon be made compulsory.

The lacunae in secondary and higher education in African and Asian territories remain formidable. The distinguished representative of the United Kingdom, in one of his interventions the other day stated that secondary education had registered an increase of 100 per cent in Kenya, of over 200 per cent in British Guiana and well over 200 per cent in Nyasaland between 1953 and 1958. One of the officers of the Committee, I recall, warned the other day against measuring progress in terms of percentages, and he stated that percentages will often be found misleading. I do not grudge Sir Andre Cohen the pride of achievement, but it would only be fair to this Committee to reduce these percentages to numbers in order to assess their true impact. Kenya, Mr. Chairman, had an African population of about six million in 1957. In 1953 there were a total of 1700 secondary African pupils in that Territory, and the number in 1957 was no more than 3000. It will be appropriate to recall also that the number of European secondary pupils in 1957 was also about 3000; and the total European population in Kenya in 1957 was no more than 63,000. The story in Uganda, in Northern Rhodesia, British Guiana and Nyasaland is no different, if it is not worse, and I shall not weary the Committee with figures from the

summaries on Information from these territories. These form part of the Progress Report, and will, no doubt, be consulted by those of my colleagues who wish to go into the details of these matters. It is our considered view that in the field of education special attention needs at this stage to be concentrated on the provision of adequate facilities of secondary education to indigenous communities. It is from this sector of education that the Territories will have to draw for their needs of teachers for primary schools, of pupils for the universities and technical institutes, as well as of administrators and technical personnel of various kinds.

University Education, in arts as well as in sciences, has made some much needed advance as will be clear from paragraphs 285 and 286 of Part II of the Report. Older institutions have undergone some expansion, and new ones are being established. The representative of the United Kingdom, in his first intervention, gave the numbers of indigenous pupils studying abroad. These figures are impressive, but even if they could be multiplied three times over, they would not meet the requirements of these territories in terms of administrators, teachers, mechanics, agricultural specialists, engineers and so on and so forth. Our view in this matter coincides with that of the Committee, namely that the "territories should not depend on higher education primarily on the facilities available in metropolitan universities." It is also the Committee's view, with which we agree, "that recourse to overseas education should be had only where specialisation, interchange and final practical experiences are required, undergraduate courses which cannot reasonably be provided locally and in post-graduate studies."

On this subject of facilities for studies abroad we also have a report from the Secretary-General (Document A/4473). The figures given in this report with regard to the numbers of applicants for study facilities made available by members under the Assembly's Resolution 845 (IX) point to the passionate desire of young men and women of these territories to seek opportunities of education. The rather large number of candidates whose applications were rejected for want of suitable qualifications highlights the fact that the educational facilities available in the territories are not of a standard which will qualify large

numbers of these people to go abroad for further studies. The contents of this report indicate the necessity of a further expansion of the United Nations programme in this field, and we should like to hope that members who have in the past

289

offered facilities of education to students from these territories will find it possible to expand their offers and that other members will join in this international endeavour to provide suitable opportunities of education and training to these territories.

As my colleagues here are aware, despite our many problems, and the insatiable demand of our own people for opportunities of education, the Government of India, under their own Cultural scholarships scheme, have made a number of places available to students from Non-Self-Governing Territories in Indian Universities and technical institutions. In 1960-61 we have offered 54 scholarships, and 51 of these have already been utilised. Mr. Chairman, it is a matter of satisfaction to us that our national programme of scholarships is popular and that we in India have the opportunity of being hosts to students from Kenya, Rhodesia, Aden, Zanzibar, Nyasaland, West Indies, Fiji, Mauritius and many other territories. It is a matter of regret that there are members of the United Nations, who have generously offered similar facilities and whose offers, for one reason or another, are not availed of. We should like to urge once again that the Administering Members should do their utmost to make it possible for students from their Territories to avail of the opportunities provided by member states.

Before concluding my remarks on this section of the Committee's observation I should like to stress one particular point, and that is the need for the establishment of human networks of efficient administrative and civil technical cadres in these territories as an immediate imperative necessity to accelerate the pace of independence. The circumstances in which the Congo became independent should serve as a lesson to us all. The Committee on Information had, in previous years emphasized the need to create the facilities for higher and technical education for training the Congolese in the arts of Government. Unfortunately little heed was paid

to the recommendations of the Committee on Information. The results of the apathy of the Administering Power are too tragic and too well known to all of us here to need further comment. It will be desirable in our view for the Assembly this year to make a special request to the Administering Members to transmit full information on the present state of civil and technical cadres in Non-Self-Governing Territories and on the measures they envisage to expand and improve these cadres in the immediate future. As regards progress in the economic field it is well to recall that in 1946 and preceding decades these territories comprised vast rural populations and the only economic activity to be found in these territories was subsistence agriculture. Though as the Report points out in paragraph 46, some progress was made in the shift to money economy with a concomitant decline in the share of subsistence production. This shift, from the fragmentary information available, is rather unsubstantial in the aggregate of all the territories together. The Committee observes that "the basic structure of the economy of the territories is at a low stage of development based mainly on subsistence agriculture and, also on the producing of a few primary products for export". The necessity therefore, remains for radical and far-reaching improvements in agriculture and this is well brought out in the triennial report on economic conditions in Part III of document A/4371. In the Committee on Information and here it has often been stressed by the United Kingdom and other Administering Members that primarily attention should be concentrated on the development of agriculture. That indeed has to be the case, as unless agriculture becomes productive to the extent of developing exportable surpluses, the primary conditions for industrial development will not be fulfilled. But the role of agriculture cannot and must not be emphasized to the exclusion of industrial growth altogether. Progress in both fields must go hand in hand.

The Committee points out that during the period under review the Territories "found themselves involved in the global phenomenon of the widening gap between the standards of living of the under-developed countries and those of the developed countries". If emphasis with regard to the development of these Territories remains on agriculture, the already wide gap will continue to widen further. As we are all aware, the prices

of agricultural products in the international market are comparatively low and they are subject to severe fluctuations. On the other hand, owing to the high standards of living, the high costs of labour, and several other factors prevailing in developed countries the prices of consumer and other goods manufactured in them continue to rise. In any barter of their agricultural produce with European manufactured goods these territories will, therefore, remain in an adverse position in the foreseeable future. The consequent unfavourable balances of payments and the terms of trade will continue to constitute a drain on the wealth and resources of these Territories.

We do not support the establishment of industry merely for the sake of industrialisation, but the establishment of manufacturing industry would appear to be the only means of rectifying

290

the present imbalance in the economic relationship of Non-Self-Governing Territories with the advanced countries of Europe and America, which administer them. The net effect of this relationship over a century or so has been that while enormous wealth has been extracted from potentially rich countries like the former Belgian Congo, the inhabitants of these territories have remained poor and the rise in their standards of living has been insignificant. In paragraph 53 of Part I of the Report it is stated that in 1957 the average personal income of Africans in the former Belgian Congo was \$ 42.00, whereas the per capita personal income of Belgians and others residing there was \$ 2973. It may well be that the per capita personal income of the Congolese before the establishment of mining industry in that territory was somewhat lower, and that the territory's population derived some, perhaps tangible benefits from such activity, but the irrefutable fact is that the Belgians in the Congo, associated with such activity in one way or another, profited much more ; and, in fact, their gains' from such activity were three times those that might have accrued to them from similar economic activity in Belgium or in other parts of Europe. The point is borne out by the fact, Mr. Chairman, that the per capita income of Belgians in Belgium is \$ 900.00 (approximately) while in the Belgian Congo, in 1957 it was nearly \$ 3000.

Because of these rather obvious results of economic activity controlled by private capital, we favor the rapid expansion of state activity in the field of economic development in Non-Self-Governing Territories.

While joining the Committee in acknowledging the assistance these Territories have received from the metropolitan countries we must express the feeling that such assistance should have been much greater. It must be noted that during the first decade of comparatively intense economic activity and of industrialisation in these territories almost all of them seemed to have paid their own way. The former Belgian Congo for example undertook the financing of the 10-year Development Plan without any assistance from Metropolitan public funds. In Nigeria the development plans were financed mainly from local resources and loans, increases in exports of agricultural produce and raw material. The United Kingdom share in the development of Uganda over a five year period during the decade amounted to about 2 per cent of the total outlay. A document prepared for the Economic and Social Council (E/CN.14/23) shows that the total United Kingdom public capital allocated, between 1945 and 1958, to Territory, with a population of about 120 million amount to about \approx 113 million. Thus the United Kingdom Government's financial investment in the welfare of the inhabitants of these territories amounted to less than 2 shillings per head per annum. Considering all this the least that the Administering Members can do is to supply to these territories more tangible financial assistance not in the form of private capital seeking high profits, but in the form of publicly allotted funds, for development and welfare and for projects which may offer poor financial prospects in initial years.

The nature of the profits that private capital seeks from investments in at least some of these Territories is revealed in paragraph 24 of the third part of the Committee's Report according to which the returns to Belgian private capital on investments in the Congo amounted to some 90 billion Francs over an 8 year period in the shape of goods and services, invisible transactions, transfers of income from investment and interests etc. while the total investment in the Congo in these years amounted only to about 15 billion Belgian francs. The state of the economy of that

Territory might have been quite different today if atleast 50 per cent of these returns were to remain in the Congo for reinvestment there.

The distinguished representative of the United Kingdom said in his opening statement the other day that private capital by employing labour, by helping to develop resources and by paying taxes helps to bring prosperity to the territory in which it operates. My country's experience of past decades and the recent experiences of Rhodesia, Nyasaland and the former Belgian Congo tend to show that private enterprises of the kind found in these countries are mere enclaves employing only unskilled local labour paid at extremely low rates with little tendency to spread higher techniques throughout the economy. The contribution by way of taxes of such economic activity in numerous territories has proved small. Its contribution to the establishment of an overall socioeconomic infrastructure is even of less significance.

I do not deprecate private enterprise, nor do I argue against the stimulation of industrial activity in these territories through private investment. We do feel that an augmentation of the share of metropolitan governments in economic activities in these territories will be justified. The needs of these territories are great, and they are diverse in scope. There will always be a place for foreign enterprise in the economic development of these territories. Expansion in the area

291

of state activity is needed, and in our view such expansion is only likely to open up new prospects for private enterprise. But the manner in which foreign investors should participate in economic and industrial enterprises should not be for the purpose of exploiting the resources of the Territories concerned, but in order to diversify their economy, to open up new avenues of employment, and to utilize available local resources for meeting the indigenous needs of the people. The Report, Mr. Chairman, furnishes evidence of the existence of powerful alien monopolies in some of the territories. For example in Swampland the Swamis are excluded from any claim to the minerals lying under the land belonging to them. In Northern Rhodesia the mining rights are owned by the British South Africa Company, a private organization, to the exclusion of all others. Similar

monopolies were to be found in the former Belgian Congo and several other Territories. In a number of Non-Self-Governing Territories prospecting and mining rights are still denied to indigenous inhabitants. In fact mining is one sphere where indigenous enterprise, whether private or governmental, should have priority. In this sphere there is as much need for generous aid and helpful participation as for the greatest vigilance.

While on the subject of industrial development let me emphasize the great need for the development of extensive transport systems in African and other territories. Transport is vital to any kind of economic development. It has been badly neglected. At the end of the period under review, Nigeria, comparatively, better developed than many other territories, had a network of metalled roads amounting to about 3000 miles in length together with an additional 27,000 miles of earth roads. This mileage of roads can hardly be regarded as being adequate infrastructure for Nigerians economic development.

In the 3rd part of its report, the Committee has especially mentioned the importance of the terms of trade of Non-Self-Governing Territories with the Administering Members who control their affairs. The pattern of relationship between these territories on the one hand and Administering Members concerned on the other has left some of them in a state of helpless dependence on metropolitan countries. Apart from the diversification of agriculture and of the economy of these territories, urgent steps need to be taken, as the Committee points out in paragraph 21 of Part III of the Report, for diversification in the directions of the trade of the territories to bring about some reduction in their dependence on metropolitan markets. The Committee considers, and we agree with this view, that this may lead to improvements in their terms of trade also.

The productivity of labour in these territories is, as a rule, lower than elsewhere in the world. Section VII of Part III of the Report suggests some measures for productivity-generation in these territories. We should like members to take special note of what is stated in Part IV of this part of the Report. The I. L. O. has not had sufficient opportunity of extending its knowledge and experience to the Administering Members for

the benefit of the inhabitants of these territories, and we should hope that their cooperation will be invited by all administering members in their efforts to remove the cause of low productivity.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, let me say once again that we feel more and more convinced, that the time has come when the independence of the remaining non self-governing territories should not be delayed. An item on this subject is under consideration by the Assembly and we hope appropriate directions in this respect will be given by the Assembly. The earliest independence of all these countries is of course a matter of vital concern to us and is very dear to our hearts. In view of the fact however that the subject of colonialism will very soon come up for full discussion and deliberation before the plenary session of the Assembly we have DO Wish to pre-empt in any way the Assembly's deliberations and decisions on this most vital subject. We also hold the view, Mr. Chairman, that racial discrimination in the social, political, and economic fields in all these countries wherever it exists, and in whatever form, should be put an end to.

Immediate steps further require to be taken to build up cadres of administrators in these countries while at the same time, steps have to be taken to accelerate the rate of progress in the economic, educational and social fields. These steps should be planned and determined by the people of the territories and their chosen representatives.

Lastly, Mr. Chairman, we would like equal opportunities to be opened in these countries for men and women. If there has to be any weighting of opportunities it should be in favor of the indigenous people, and all weighting in favor of advanced alien communities or settlers should be removed wherever it exists and in whatever form. Mr. Chairman, it has been suggested that the work of this committee has shrunk during the years with the enlargement of areas of freedom in dependent and non-self-governing countries. Let us hope that very soon we will find it possible to liquidate

292

completely the job of this committee so that we can share with the representatives of these countries and nations, the privilege of jointly shaping the future of our world.

INDIA USA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC PERU GHANA THE NETHERLANDS CONGO PORTUGAL
GUINEA KENYA UGANDA FIJI MAURITIUS RUSSIA BELGIUM NIGER NIGERIA SOUTH AFRICA

Date : Oct 01, 1960

Volume No

1995

POLAND

Trade Arrangement Extended

Letters were exchanged in October 14, 1960, in Warsaw between Mr. J. Burakiewicz, Vice-Minister of Foreign Trade, Poland, and Sri K. R. F. Chilean, Joint Secretary, Government of India, renewing the Indo-Polish Trade Arrangement for 1961.

Indian exports to Poland would be textile machinery and accessories, choir goods, tanned and semi-tanned goat skins and leather, iron ore and manganese. ore, tea, spices, shellac, mica, castor oil, groundnut oil, edible cakes,%, black pepper, handicrafts, sports goods, coffee, cinematographic films, books and periodicals, castings and forgings, semi-products for pharmaceutical production etc.

The imports from Poland would be capital goods, various machinery items, chemicals and drugs, textile machinery and accessories including automatic looms, garage tools and service equipment machinery and equipment for foundries, rolls for rolling mills, zinc, medical equipment and instruments and other types of machinery for small and large-scale industries.

POLAND CHILE INDIA USA

Date : Oct 01, 1960

Volume No

1995

SWITZERLAND

Instruments of Ratification Exchanged

Instruments of Ratification of the Indo-Swiss agreement on transfer credits were exchanged in New Deli on October 21, 1960 between the Swiss Ambassador to India, Dr. Jaycees Albert Scuttle, and Sri L. K. Ghana, Secretary, Ministry of Finance, Department of Economic Affairs.

The Agreement which was signed on July 30, 1960 provides for the purchase of Swiss capital goods by India for India's development programmes. The credit is for a period of 10 years covering transactions of the value of 100 million Swiss francs (Rh. 10.9 chores). Of this amount, a sum of 60 million Swiss francs will be made available immediately and the balance later. The credit will be provided by a consortium of Swiss Banks on mutual credit terms. The credit will be guaranteed by the Swiss Government within the framework of their Federal Law on export risk guarantees.

293

SWITZERLAND INDIA GHANA

Date : Oct 01, 1960

November

Volume No

1995

Content

Foreign Affairs Record 1960
Volume VI NOVEMBER No. 11

| CONTENTS | PAGE |
|---|------|
| BURMA | |
| Burmese Prime Minister's Visit | 295 |
| Reply by Burmese Prime Minister | 295 |
| CZECHOSLOVAKIA | |
| Indo-Czechoslovak Trade Agreement Signed | 296 |
| INDIA IN THE UNITED NATIONS | |
| Sri Krishna Melons Statement in Political Committee on Draft Resolution on Disarmament | 297 |
| Sri Hajarnavis' Statement in Legal Committee | 315 |
| Sri J. N. Zanies Statement in Administrative and Budgetary Committee | 317 |
| Sri B. K. Negro's Statement in Economic Committee on Capital Development Fund | 322 |
| Sri C. D. Bandies Statement in Special Political Committee on Palestine Refugees | 327 |
| INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS | |
| Prime Minister's Statement in Look Sabah Initiating Debate on Foreign Affairs | 329 |
| Prime Minister's Reply to Look Sabah Debate on Foreign Affairs | 337 |
| Prime Minister's Statement in Look Sabah on Incidents in Congo | 345 |
| Prime Minister's Statement in Raja Sabah on Incidents in Congo | 347 |
| Sri Krishna Melons Statement in Look Sabah Debate on Foreign Affairs | 349 |
| JAPAN | |
| Visit of Crown Prince and Princess | 357 |
| Reply by Crown Prince | 358 |
| PAKISTAN | |
| Joint Communique on Indo-Pakistan Press Code | 358 |
| U. N. E. S. C. O. | |
| Dr. Radhakrishnan's Address to General Conference | 360 |

MINISTRY OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS: EXTERNAL PUBLICITY DIVISION
GOVERNMENT OF INDIA

Date : Nov 01, 1960

Volume No

1995

BURMA

Burmese Prime Minister's Visit

The Burmese Prime Minister, Mr. U Noun paid a visit to India from November 10 to 21, 1960. On November 13, a Banquet was held in honor of the Burmese Prime Minister at Rashtrapati Phalanx.

Speaking on the occasion, Prime Minister Near said :

Mr. Prime Minister, Excellencies, Ladies and Gentlemen, we have met, as you know, to accord a warm welcome to the Prime Minister of Burma and yet, it seems a little curious to me that we should be a little formal about this welcome because he is not a formal person to us nor are we, I hope, formal to him. It has been our privilege to welcome him often in this country and in this city of Delhi. He comes as a friend, a dear friend. He comes casually and he goes also casually, without fuss or ceremony. That is as it should be, not only because of our abiding friendship and old relations between the two countries of Burma and India, our Iona contacts in the past, but also because you, Sir, Mr. Prime Minister, are particularly welcome here for a variety of reasons peculiar, if I may say so, to you. You would have been welcome anyhow. Any Prime Minister of Burma would have been warmly welcomed by the Government and the people of India but when you come here, you not only bring the perfume of your country but also an air of serenity, of calm, of friendliness, not particularly to us but I believe, to everybody wherever you might go and in this world of fierce animosities, conflicts and an expression of those animosities, it is good to come into an

atmosphere of peace and calm and serenity. How you have developed these qualities, I do not know. It may be of course possibly because of your deep devotion to the message of the Buddha, which message we have the high privilege of sharing with you and many others. Whatever it may be, in this world today we live certainly with hope for the future, also certainly often with forebodings of disaster. So this world, Janus-like, is two-faced-the good face and the evil face. When you come, the evil face- recedes, the evil face of the world, and only the good face is evident and so our spirits rise within us and our hopes also rise and we feel the better for it. If most of us had that capacity to spread serenity and calm which you possess, Mr. Prime Minister, it would be good for the world and our problems would be easier of solution. Yet, in 'Spite of this evil face of the world which sometimes shows itself, I believe that essentially we are passing through those very difficult phases to something much better for the world and we see this awakening for a better life or better thinking, for better cooperation and more friendliness peeping out in many places. We see and we have seen the whole of Asia astir. We are now seeing Africa in a state of ferment, full of hope and expectation, full of vitality and also full of difficulties but those difficulties, I suppose, anywhere, are the price we pay for moving forward. Difficulties cease to exist only when we are static, unmoving and necessarily decadent. I do not think Asia or Africa or for the matter of that, countries in other Continents, in spite of all these difficulties that we are passing through, are looking backwards. They are looking forward and in this forward march of the human race, it seems to me inevitable that Asia and Africa should play a great part. I do not mean that other countries or continents are not going to play that part but they have been in evidence for a long time, prominent, for good, sometimes for things that are not good. Anyhow, in this moving, dynamic and exciting world, it is good to have the friendship of countries and the friendship of individuals like yourself who are helping so much in various ways and almost, if I may say so, particularly by the mere fact of what you are in developing and encouraging these friendly relations among the nations of the world. So you are welcome, Sir, as the representative of a country which is dear to us and near to us. You are welcome in yourself as you are representing

certain nobler qualities of human beings which we cherish and I wish you and your country all success in the future and ever-abiding friendship with us.

May I ask Your Excellencies, Ladies and Gentlemen, to drink to the good health of U Nu, the Prime Minister of Burma and for the progress of the people of Burma ?

BURMA INDIA USA

Date : Nov 01, 1960

Volume No

1995

BURMA

Reply by Burmese Prime Minister

In reply to Prime Minister Nehru, the Burmese Prime Minister, Mr. U Nu said:

Mr. Prime Minister, His Excellencies, Ladies and Gentlemen,

295

I need hardly say how delighted I am to have this opportunity not only to meet many old friends but also to make friends with many others whom I have not had the privilege of meeting before. I am therefore most grateful to Prime Minister Shri Jawaharlal Nehru for arranging this sumptuous dinner in our honour this evening. As you all know, I am no stranger to New Delhi. I have paid many visits and I am looking forward to paying many more visits to this great city. There is special affinity between India and Burma. Burma at one time formed part of British India and even after her separation from India there was a close association not only between the two countries but also between the leaders in the two countries. Indeed the association between the national leaders of the two countries became stronger as their common struggle for independence advanced and it has paved the way for the

development of a strong sense of solidarity between the two countries on the attainment of independence. Happily on the foundation of tradition of friendship and of a strong sense of solidarity our two countries have developed in recent years a fundamentally similar approach to the various problems with which the world is faced today. In this age of super States and power blocs India, Burma and other like-minded countries have an indispensable role to play to help preserve world peace and promote friendly relations and co-operation among nations, We therefore welcome the gradual increase in the number of States which subscribe to the same basic policy in international affairs. We also welcome the fact that these countries have been drawn closer together not by any pact or alliance but by the solidarity and by the similarity of their basic approach to the international situation with which we are confronted today and that they have together made many a useful intervention in the interest of international peace and security. The Union of Burma has been privileged to work together with India and to maintain a close contact with her not only in matters of common interest to the two countries but also in matters of much wider significance, In this connection I should like to pay my humble tribute to the Prime Minister, Shri Jawaharlal Nehru, who has made the greatest contribution to this happy relationship between our two countries, We look forward to the continuation and strengthening of this relationship in the future.

Excellencies, Ladies and Gentlemen, may I now request you to join me in drinking to the eternal youth of the Prime Minister, Shri Jawaharlal Nehru, and to the further development of friendly and mutually fruitful relations between the Republic of India and the Union of Burma ?

BURMA USA INDIA

Date : Nov 01, 1960

Volume No

1995

Indo-Czechoslovak Trade Agreement Signed

A new Trade and Payments Agreement between India and Czechoslovakia was concluded in Prague on November 3, 1960. The agreement which comes into effect from January 1, 1961 will remain valid for a three-year period.

Shri K. R. F. Khilnani, Joint Secretary, Government of India, and Mr. F. Hamouz, First Deputy Minister of Foreign Trade, Government of Czechoslovakia, signed the agreement on behalf of their respective Governments.

In the course of the discussions which proceeded in a cordial and friendly atmosphere, opportunity was taken by the two delegations to review the course of trade between the two countries in the past year and explore ways and means of expanding the same. As a result of the agreement, it is expected that trade between the two countries will show a considerable increase.

The new agreement provides a framework for expanding trade between the two countries on the basis of equality and mutual benefit. Both countries have agreed to grant each other Most Favoured-Nation treatment and other trade facilities to enable closer commercial and economic relations. Payments relating to commercial and non-commercial transactions between Czechoslovakia and India would be effected in Indian rupees.

Schedules listing the goods available for export from either country to the other have been included in the Agreement. Among the articles listed for export from India to Czechoslovakia are cotton textiles and fabrics, jute manufactures, coir yarn and manufactures, woolen textiles, vegetable oils and hydrogenated oils, spices tobacco, tea and coffee, processed and semi-processed hides and skins, shellac and shellac products, mica, manganese and ferro-manga-

296
nese, chemicals and pharmaceuticals, handi-

crafts and handlooms, tinned fruits, plastic goods, sports goods, engineering goods, cashewnuts, deoiled cakes, cinematograph films, books magazines and pictures, etc. The items of import from Czechoslovakia would be iron and steel products, special steel, alloy steel, writing and printing paper and newsprint, various types of machinery and machine tools, capital goods, dyes, intermediates and chemicals, diesel generating sets, tractor and tractor ball and roller bearings, tyres and tubes, steel products, etc.

NORWAY SLOVAKIA INDIA CZECH REPUBLIC USA RUSSIA

Date : Nov 01, 1960

Volume No

1995

INDIA IN THE UNITED NATIONS

Shri Krishna Menon's Statement in Political Committee on Draft Resolution on Disarmament

Shri V. K. Krishna Menon, Leader of the Indian delegation to the United Nations, made the following statement in the Political Committee on November 15, 1960, while introducing a draft resolution on disarmament sponsored by India and ten other Member Nations of the U.N.

Mr. Chairman, my delegation is very grateful to you for the accommodation you have made in allowing me to speak at this time. My understanding is that we have now reached the position, in regard to the disarmament discussions, where the general debate is over and we would normally have come to what is called the resolution stage. On account of the peculiar circumstances that prevail and the decision of the Committee in regard to the alteration of items, this is the last day immediately available for this purpose ; and, while it is not really a matter of concern to the Committee, I myself have to leave this country after this meeting. Therefore, I am very grateful to you for allowing me to take the floor now.

My delegation wishes to address itself to three main items, as we said when presenting our views in the general debate, and I will take them not exactly in the order that appears in the agenda but according to what suits the convenience of the representations as far as we are concerned. First of all, I should like to deal with the item concerning the dissemination of nuclear and thermonuclear weapons, with regard to which the delegation of Ireland has proposed a draft resolution. I will try to deal with that as briefly as possible, because we want to give as much time as we can to the main item.

We ourselves would have drafted this resolution differently, but, as in all other matters, there are numbers of Governments concerned, and we have to meet every point of view. Therefore, we shall be very glad to support this draft resolution if ever it should come to a vote.

But the main point is that all these items are tied up, one with the other. One might call them disarmament ; one might call them arms control ; one might call them related problems. But, although the Irish draft resolution would not go as far as we would like to go, it certainly draws attention to this problem which has become, as I shall point out later, far more important because of the increasing capacity of large numbers of countries to make nuclear and thermonuclear weapons, the availability of nuclear fuel on account of atomic industrial development, and also two other circumstances which I mentioned some time ago : that is the capacity for the manufacture of smaller types of weapons, including tactical weapons, and the news that the Federal Republic of Germany was developing methods which will make this production cheaper-so much so that these deadly nuclear arms would become as prevalent and placed in the same category as conventional weapons. Therefore, this item, which was merely of a rather preventive kind-to prevent greater harm in the future-has now become a very urgent problem of disarmament itself.

Then we proceed to the question of the suspension of nuclear tests. My delegation has been connected with this item for a long time. We first brought it up here after a decision of our own parliament. It has passed through various stages, from total scepticism to defensive arguments about its impracticability. From there we

proceeded to the examination of ways and means by which these test explosions could be brought to an end. Finally, we are in the stage at Geneva when we have been informed by all persons concerned that, while no agreement has been reached in spite of protracted negotiations, considerable advances have been made and the area of disagreement has now become limited to a small sector, however important it may be.

We must also point out that there are reasons for apprehension, which I do not propose to take up at the present moment, but will when I come to the disarmament item. So far as the

297

nuclear weapons tests are concerned, I am not going to go into a great deal of detail about the consequences of ionized radiation, the fall-out, and what it does to the human body. I think the harmful effects of the aforementioned are very well known, and since neither the Committee nor I have the time, I do not propose to go into all of that except to say that, based upon all current information that we have concerning these tests, whether they be in the sky, or on the ground, or underground they are all harmful to the populations in varying degrees.

Of course, I am aware of the fact that some scientists are in favour of continuing tests, not for scientific reasons, not for political reasons—and no doubt well-conceived nations of national security—have sometimes said that some of these tests are not harmful at all or as harmful as others.

I have before me an analysis of the positions reached between the Western Powers, between the United States and the United Kingdom, on the one hand, the two Western Members of what is called the "nuclear club", and the Soviet Union on the other. When One refers to these three it is well for us to reflect upon the fact that at present we can deal with three major Powers who certainly, from the very fact of their "majorness", would exercise a responsibility, but when nuclear weapons are spread around the problem becomes more difficult; so looking through it, we find that the differences in this matter are between what is called the scope of the proposed threshold in regard to the underground explosions. Having accepted the purpose.

there shall be a treaty under effective control, and that they undertake the obligations, and if there is a comparative agreement in general terms with regard to the duration and also with regard to the organs to be created, the points of difference lie between what is called the threshold, the Control Commission, the apparatus of administration and direction identification systems.

Then, of course, there is also serious disagreement about the duration of moratorium in regard to the underground tests themselves. I do not propose to trouble the Committee with a great deal of these details, but it appears to us that the advances that have been made are of another character ; they do not justify any return to the practice of exploding these weapons for those purposes of research. We are told on the one hand that they have no armament value. That is to say, the suspension of these tests is not disarmament. We agreed with this completely, but it is a form of arms control, and what is more, so far as the world public opinion concerned, it is the creation of confidence. A reversal of this tendency in this way will be great value.

Now, the disagreement between the Western, countries and the Soviet Union in this matter is set out in the notes of the discussions at Geneva, and while there may be disagreements, even in the categories or the measurements given they are still a small margin which shall be worked out.

Then we come to the Control Commission. In the Control Commission the Western side wants an arrangement, namely the Big-Three, one ally of the West, one ally of the Soviet Union, and two neutrals. The Soviet Union, on the other hand, would like to have more equal voice on a pattern of three of them, the members of the nuclear club, three from Eastern Europe and one neutral. No doubt, there is some difference between the two, but it is for the Committee to consider whether it is impossible to arrive at the composition of this Control Commission, and it is our submission that, considering problems of this character which the United Nations itself or the Powers concerned have overcome, that it is not impossible.

At the present moment there is a difference

between these two sides in this way : the Soviet Union is asking for three from the West, three from Eastern Europe and one neutral. The Western side suggests three of them, one committed country from each side and one neutral country. We ourselves make no proposals about that, for more than one reason. The more the proposals, the more confusion there will be in regard to this. What is more, we all agree that this should be a matter of direct negotiation between the Powers concerned, and perhaps in the next few months we shall get agreements in that way.

Then we come to this problem of detection. There was a time when it was said in this Assembly that it was not at all possible to detect these explosions, and therefore there would be cheating by one side or the other. It was expected that explosions would take place and the side that would honour the agreement would be at a disadvantage. The position in Geneva is largely in regard to the number of control posts which number, so far as the west demand is concerned, is larger than the Soviet Union is willing to admit. Now again, we have come, so far as we can understand this-may be we are amateurs and therefore do not understand it-

298

so far as we can understand it, the apparatus and the ideas concerning this, the difference is in the quantity, not in the category itself. That is to say, the Western side wants twenty-one control posts in the Soviet Union, twenty-three in the united States and one control post on the high-seas. The Soviet Union has said that they objected to having twenty-one posts in their own country, that fifteen would be sufficient. Surely this agreement is not going to break down on this difference. One could go on and on in that way.

There is also a disagreement in regard to the seismographic reading which also is a matter which may yield itself to agreement.

We have deliberately refrained from going into a great deal of detail about this because it is still, in a sense, subjudice, and we hope that the resolution that we have put forth, which is A/C.1/L 258, is submitted by a number of delegations. It is very much the same as last year,

and I would like to submit, that after all these years of labour, the work done at Geneva, the increasing concern in the matter of nuclear weapons, when it is said that even so far as the United States itself is concerned its terrific consequences would be to increase the number of deformities in birth from 4 per cent to 5 per cent ; those are large numbers when you take the whole population into consideration. We hope there will be no delegation that will decline to support this. We recognize the fact that the kind of agreement we would like to have can not, perhaps, be attained now, but at any rate the revival of these explosions will be a great setback to the cause of peace, to the whole cause of negotiations in the field. It has been repeatedly said in this Committee room that any advance in the matter of test explosions will present a distinct advance in the whole field of disarmament. Therefore, while we waited patiently- and I have no doubt these negotiations have been very patiently carried out-we hope there will be no break in them as in the others, and while these negotiations are continuing and there appears to be this hope of reaching a settlement both sides have agreed that an agreement on this matter would make some contribution to the relief of tension. The world does not expect a renewal of this character which reverses the casing of tension. We submit this resolution A/C.1/L.258 with full confidence that it will have the unanimous support of the Assembly.

There is, however, one point we would like to make so far as our Government is concerned. The negotiations at Geneva have gone on the basis that by compromise and agreement, what are called underground explosions should be Permitted and should be arranged as between the members of the "nuclear club". I would like to submit that, in spite of it meeting other complications, my Governments does not subscribe to this view. There should be a total suspension, a total abandonment of these explosions. There is no evidence-that is, evidence so far as the Government scientists are concerned-that the purpose of these explosions is not to develop weapons. They are not merely for scientific purposes, and even if they were, their consequences are to be taken into account in this matter. There is no secrecy in this matter-after all, it comes over the radio and on television, and everywhere-and as late as 6 March 1960,

Professor Edward Teller said, on the CBS Television Network

"...we must be prepared with powerful, mobile, selected weapons, weapons which can be used for defense and weapons which are so constituted--and they can be so constituted--that they will do minimal damage to our friends while we are trying to defend their freedom ...

"... it is extremely important to continue not nuclear tests--it is not tests but the increase of knowledge, which I call nuclear experimentation and which can be used for the safety of our country and for the safety of the free World..."

Now, no one can take any exception to this no one can have any difference with the view that people must be concerned about the safety of their countries. But we are dealing here with a problem that affects the population of the world as a whole and becomes an international problem, not merely one of national defence.

Professor Teller went on to say, only three days ago over the NBC Television Network:

"I think that by developing smaller nuclear explosives, which can be reliably hidden"--it is surprising it should come out when the concealment is in difficulty --"so that we have a second strike force that the Russians cannot wipe out, and by pledging ourselves never to strike an all-out nuclear blow first, we can indeed increase stability."

It is not the business of my delegation to quarrel with these arguments or to put them out

in such a way that the responsibility is on one side. The fact is that this is the published information, and it is published to millions of people over the radio, the television screen and so on. Therefore, there is no gainsaying the fact that the purpose of these tests, whether conducted by the Russians, by the British or by the United States, is the perfecting--as it is called; a very bad

word to use-of these nuclear weapons. It is not an academic, scientific experiment. It is not for the purpose of advancing the cause of humanity in peaceful ways. It is necessarily, essentially, basically and fully a war project.

Senator Clinton Anderson, Chairman of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, in the Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists of March 1960, said :

"During these continued negotiations and while a ban would continue to be in effect, we should continue, however, to develop and improve our nuclear weapons.

"Testing is not in my opinion essential to advance our technology. It is, however, the easiest, the fastest, and the most certain method of developing new and improved weapons.

"I would support the resumption, as directed by the President, of our underground test program for final development of certain of our weapons before they go into production."

So far as my Government is concerned, while we welcome any agreement between the United States and the Soviet Union, we regret that they should have come to an agreement with regard to underground tests only, but I suppose it would be a very wrong thing to sacrifice what is good in trying for the best.

It must also be pointed out that the work done at Geneva has been of a character not only involving the discovery of formulae for bridging some small difficulty, but rather the working-out in detail of the whole problem of control in regard to this matter. I think it is for the world to consider whether at any time at all, in Geneva or anywhere else, it would be possible to elaborate, a system of inspection and control that is 100 per cent proof against mistakes, against overcalculation or undercalculation. Therefore we can go only by some sort of optimal measurement whereby the control is of such character not merely in regard to a particular explosion, but as to what goes before and after, that there would be the fear of apprehension or discovery.

It also touches on another problem-the general feeling that one of the main purposes of disarmament is to release enough money or resources for purposes of reconstruction. In my submission in an earlier statement, I pointed out that this is a mistake and I think that we should tell people that disarmament cannot be done cheaply, and economy is not its main purpose ; that it is done in order to save humanity from the disastrous consequences of atomic conflict. It is interesting, therefore, to find out that in hearings before the United States Congress in April 1960, evidence was given that :

"The estimated cost of the complete Geneva control system was reported by the Advanced Research Projects Agency of the Department of Defence to be \$1 billion; in round numbers, with an annual operating cost of about one-quarter of a billion dollars".

That is to say, for this one purpose of controlling tests under this vast system of inspection, the nations of the world-I suppose we would all participate in our small ways-would have to expend a minimum of \$1 billion in capital costs, and a quarter of a billion dollars annually thereafter as the price of our distrust of each other.

Continuing to quote from the above source, we note that

"A contractor study presented an estimate of \$1 billion to \$5 billion for installation of 22 stations of the Geneva system ",

These are rough estimates, I suppose ; there are others matters.

Concerning these underground explosions, we are told-in congressional and parliamentary systems of government, such evidence is readily available-that there was evidence before the United States Congress that these explosions underground-without this information one might get the idea that these are something like the little blasts we hear when buildings are put up here in New York-we are told that each of these "little holes" is going to cost about \$30 million-

small holes only, but as high as \$30 million each. I have the figures on the dimensions, and it is a

300

very large operation, whether underground or above ground. Unlike doctors' mistakes, they do not lie buried underground. That is the trouble with them. Therefore, our objections to underground explosions are as serious as to anything else, but our country will not stand in the way, and if it has to vote without reservations, it will do so. We still think, however, that the carrying on of this sort of business-which is more or less the licensing of evil-is not going to get us anywhere. We should now proceed to be satisfied with the fact that there are enough weapons in the world now to destroy the world five times over. It is said-I don't know where the information comes from ; the United States Government does not tell me, but it is the published information, and I think it must be true of the Soviet Union in the same measure-it is said that the quantum of atomic weapons available to them, at any rate, at the present time, would work out to fifteen tons of the explosive power of TNT per capita of population. Some people say twelve, others something else, but it does not make much difference which it is.

I go on now to the consideration of the main subject of disarmament, and here I would like to make some supplementary observations. My delegation, along with others, has for the past several weeks been engaged practically on this one point alone, without being able to discharge our duties in other committees and things of that kind, because my Government, in common with a number of Governments including the Powers concerned, regards the question of disarmament, peace and war as the over-all problem without the solution of which all our discussions are of not much value.

On 27 October, on behalf of the Government of India, we pointed out what were the main factors connected in this matter, what should be our objectives and what are the fallacies of the present position regarding, in thinking, that this large-scale quantum of armaments, affording no security to anybody-the failure or, rather, the no longer validity, if you would like to put it that way, of the deterrent theory, and the unfortunate position of non-committed areas such as Cambo-

dia, Laos, the African continent, and so on, who pleaded in this Committee that their parts of the world at least should be kept free from these matters, and therefore we suggested that this year in the Assembly we have reached the situation where it is necessary to have an entirely new look at the whole of the disarmament problem and get away from the idea of the balanced reduction of arms as solving anything at all, because, if the arms level of the world—for example, the Soviet Union and the United States—were reduced in their arms, shall we say, to the 1870 level, or even to the level of the second Hundred Years War—the first Hundred Years War—even then, in six or nine months, they would still be in possession of all modern weapons, because the people who make them, the technology that can produce them, the material that is necessary, the hatred and the fear and the apprehension and the desire to win a war, as they would think, is all there, and therefore the mere taking away of arms in that way, or coming to a balanced reduction, so-called, and arranging a kind of tournament or preparing for it—that is not going to solve the problems of the world, in view of modern technology. And in this it is not as though countries like ourselves, which are charged with not having great responsibilities, were alone in thinking so. Whatever continent you take in this country, from representatives of the Government itself—here, a few days ago, Mr. Wadsworth was telling us :

"We want a world in which nations no longer will have the power to settle differences by force of arms, a world in which international order will prevail, a secure world in which all people will be free from the fear of war. In short, we would like to see the total disarmament of all nations under law.

"In my personal opinion, if we were to start now and work at good speed, the step-by-step process to this goal should be completed in the neighbourhood of, say, five to six years, and with good faith and a real sense of urgency on both sides, it could take even less." (A/C.1/PV.1093, p. 51)

This view is contained in many statements, and I would like to recommend to this Committee—we cannot ask the United Nations to do

this-I would like all of us to be seized of some of what is being said. It would be very interesting to get hold of a transcript of the recent broadcasts and the recent television interviews in regard to the consequences, the policies and the various views held. I think it would be a libel on the scientists to say that all scientists are alike. Usually, Government scientists are hybrid creatures : they are half scientists and half politicians. They harness scientific knowledge for the purposes of political policy, and they correspond to the bishops of the eighteenth century, who always produced theology in support of divine right. So, if you do not have one scientist, you can get another scientist. If you are practising in a court of law, you always find one psychiatrist or

301

one doctor to put up against another doctor. Fortunately for us, in the United States the overwhelming body of scientists are on our side, that is to say, on the side of throwing away these weapons.

From the scientists, we go to a soldier and a writer on military affairs-not at an American this time, but an Englishman. I suppose he is; he may be a Scotsman, for all I know-Captain Liddell Hart. He is not a leftist; he is highly conservative. He said:

"Old concepts, and old definitions of strategy, have become not only obsolete but nonsensical with the development of nuclear weapons.

"The development of long-range rockets, to replace the manned bomber aircraft, makes the absurdity even clearer.

"To aim at winning a war, to take victory as your object, is no more than a state of lunacy."

I think that is strong language.

"For a total war, without nuclear weapons, would be fatal to both sides.

"There is no sense even in planning for such a war-for a World War III, as it is often called. In the present state of scientific development, the destruction

and chaos would be so great within a few hours that the war could not continue in any organized sense.

"In the H-bomb era in which we live now, miscarriage or disregard of signals to bombers in the air would have immensely worse consequences.

"To live under the shadow of a foreign dictator's power to threaten us with H-bomb attack is perilous enough. But it is far more perilous to live under the shadow of a multiplicity of H-bombing airmen, on either side, who are keyed up to an extreme pitch of alertness, and some of whom may be feeling intensely bellicose" or even may lose control of themselves.

I quote next from the Chairman of the Federation of American Scientists, which I am told is an extremely responsible and respectable body. He said:

"On this fifteenth anniversary of the nuclear arms race, let us recognize that while time is short, time still remains. We must no longer fail to do our utmost toward seeking arms control. The tragedy of ultimate failure is so great that we must make survival the first order of business and devote generously to the study of disarmament whatever talent and resources may be usefully employed."

Then we come to what I hope will not be regarded as controversial literature, because the Presidential election in the United States, so far as we are officially informed, is over. But perhaps let us look at the poor English-what they think about this. In writing in England, it says

"They calculate that in this event a total of 2,000 megatons would, as a result of fall-out alone, kill 55 per cent of the population of the United States of America; 5,000 megatons would kill 80 per cent, 10,000, 99 per cent; and 20,000, about 100 per cent."

You cannot kill any more than that.

"Is an attack on Britain of this magnitude likely ? The American stockpile has recently been put as equivalent to 28,000 megatons, and Russia cannot be far behind"

I do not take responsibility for that statement. Nor far ahead, for all I know.

"If this is so, then this country's entire population would be killed by two per cent of the bombs in either stockpile, and 95 per cent of the population would be killed by one per cent of the bombs. The prospect of eliminating America's major partner in NATO and perhaps five or ten per cent of all NATO bases by the use of only 1.2 per cent of the bombs available, and without any necessity to deliver them accurately. would seem a tempting proposition" to the mad people "in a war".

This is the position so far as the United Kingdom is concerned-and I have read to you some of these other statements.

Now we come to what must necessarily be accepted as extremely responsible statements. One is the former Minister of Science in the

302

United Kingdom, a person who is well-known for his progressive views and who is a distinguished Conservative-Viscount Hailsham. Speaking in the House of Lords, I think, he said :

When I contemplate the hideous weapons on both sides which even in my partially informed state I know to have been invented, I regard either a world authority or total disarmament in the long run as the only rational objective."

I read that because that is the basis on which our proposals are going to be made.

Now, here are a number of statements which I hope it is proper to read, Mr. Chairman-and, if it is not, you will give me some guidance. This is from the President-elect of the United

States. In June of this year, Senator Kennedy said :

"No hope is more basic to our aspirations as a nation than our hope for the day when our bombs can be converted into reactors-our rockets can be devoted to exploring space-and the funds now in our defense budget can be used to build a better, happier, healthier nation and world."

"The engines of death are multiplying in number and destructiveness on every side-the institutions of peace are not."

"The galloping course of our weapons technology is rapidly taking the whole world to the brink."

I want to say that this is not from one speech; it is taken from various different places-and long before there was an election fever.

"No issue, in short, is of more vital concern to this nation than disarmament; no issue could demand more priority of top-level attention than disarmament."

"However, even with such system, there will be risks. Peace programmes involve risks, as do arms programmes, but the risks of arms are even more dangerous. Those who talk about the risks and dangers of any arms control proposal ought to weigh-in the scales of national security-the risks and dangers inherent in our present course."

... there is no greater defense against total nuclear destruction than total nuclear disarmament."

This was said in the Legislature of the United States in the introduction of proposed legislation for the establishment of an Arms Control Research Institute.

Now we turn to the other side, the Soviet Union. Since I do not read Russian and it is

not necessary to go into translations and arguments as to whether the translations are accurate or not, I have not the material to quote from. But we heard Mr. Khrushchev telling us the other day that rockets were being turned out like sausages, I think that sausages are bad enough, but rockets are worse. But the only difference is this, that in the case of the sausages the poor animal absorbs the rays of the sun through vegetables, and then, since we want sausages-not I, but human beings in general want them-they consume the animal, and the animal absorbs 90 per cent of the carbon content and passes on the 10 per cent. But in this case there will be no carbon left after an atomic explosion. Mr. Khrushchev said that Russia was producing rockets like sausages. This is no laughing matter; it is not a case where we could say, here is a country with vast powers of achievement. We all hope and think that the world, with all its vast knowledge, should use it in some other way; but it points to something, and that is that this vast power of destruction is no longer now confined to smaller methods of production but is of a character which, if put into operation, would mean that there would be nothing left for us to think of or to say. So whether you take it one side or the other, there is this problem that the power of destruction is so terrific-I do not say this in order to appeal to the apprehensions and fears of the people, because it is my view and the view of my Government that you cannot conquer fear by fear-and the reason for this great armament is the fear of the people. The stronger the nation, the more afraid it is. Therefore, by arguments which are directed towards creating a feeling of apprehension and fear, we are not likely to get anywhere. Ultimately, disarmament has to be achieved by self interest because no nation wants to be annihilated-it may want to annihilate others, but no nation wants to annihilate itself.

During the last few days there have been debates on this matter, and when I submitted our statement to the Committee I pointed out that it was not the intention of my delegation at that stage to put down draft resolutions, or to

303

support any, or even to formulate something that was of a very rigid character. There are several draft resolutions before the Committee and we

do not intend to express our opinions in regard to any of them, although it is pretty well known that, having regard to their content and their origins, they are not likely to receive unanimous support. Therefore, following the discussions in the Assembly, my delegation said that if, as a result of the outlines we have proposed, there was in the General Assembly a certain degree of receptivity, that would be the time to formulate proposals. A few days afterwards, some delegations which field more than others perhaps similar views gathered together, and when we look at their proposal, we find that there is considerable, not necessarily endorsement of what we said but considerable drift of thought in that direction-take Mr. Wadsworth in the first instance, because, with his support, anything can go through this Committee.

That is the situation in which we find ourselves today. We hope that this debate, in which all Members of the United Nations can express their views, will mean an early resumption of the disarmament negotiations among the Powers principally concerned and will help to give the necessary guidance for the negotiators. I think it is true that, year after year, the Assembly adopts resolutions which are, as St. Paul said, all things to all men-and I interpret it differently. We have come to a stage now where this attempt at finding words which mean different things to different people is not going to solve problems, and my Government, as stated by the Prime Minister, takes the view that time is not with us.

But from the United States we go to our friends from the United Kingdom. Mr. Ormsby-Gore, speaking in this Committee on 24 October, said :

"...if the General Assembly can agree on a resolution embodying the basic principles with which any disarmament agreement must comply, if it is to work, this alone will be a great stimulus to the negotiations which we hope will shortly be resumed...we...should...try to give our negotiators a touchstone to guide their future work." (A/C.1P/V1089 p.51).

My understanding of principles in this context is something that gives concrete, direct

guidance. something that does not completely bind people down, but at the same time is not so vague as to be differently interpreted. Mr. Ormsby-Gore went on to say:

"..I hope that we can agree on certain principles which are applicable to any disarmament plan and which will help us in later negotiations."
(Ibid., p.58)

Now, the difficulty in this matter was with regard to the nuclear Powers themselves. I have not quoted from any extract of the statements made by the Soviet Union in this matter because the Soviet Union has repeatedly stated the same position in regard to directives,

We come now to what may be called the Powers that are not committed to power blocs- or even if they are, they are not quite committed in their relations one way or the other, but they are not part of a nuclear pattern. The first is the country and the delegation represented by the Chairman of the Disarmament Commission. Mr. Padilla Nervo brings with him a reputation in this matter and carefully weighs his words; he has had experience in the Disarmament Commission and, perhaps, of the frustrations under which it functions. He most certainly feel that here was a body over which he was presiding, which, in the submission we made last year, was intended not merely to be a narcotic to public opinion so that they would think something was being done, but to guide the Ten-Nation Committee, to receive reports from it and, in a sense, as we said last time, be the umbrella under which it functions. Speaking in this Committee on 2 November, Mr. Padilla Nervo said :

"First we must make an effort in the direction indicated by the representative of India; that is, to prepare and formulate a series of directives that are acceptable to, both groups of Powers, which will serve as a point of departure for the immediate renewal of negotiations." (A/C.1/PV,1099, p. 57)

That is what we, seek to do and hope to gain unanimous support for in the General Assembly in due course.

Now we have--and I hope that the representative of Jordan will note mind my saying it--a committed country in the Western alliance, Jordan. If I am wrong, I shall be glad to be corrected.

The part of the Assembly on the question before us is to make recommendations-- with regard to the principles governing disarmament.

304

obviously, that cannot be a repetition of last year. If so, it could be argued that the principles are the plans laid down in last year's resolution; then it would not be necessary to make these statements. Therefore, all these statements refer to advances, or what I call a new look in regard to this matter.

From the same part of the world, the United Arab Republic, told us that principles and directives could be given by the Assembly for the resumption of negotiations.

Now we go to a great part of the world, Latin America, the countries of which continent have played such an important part in the fashioning of the policy and the development of the Organization. I should like first to quote a Brazilian because Brazil, in all matters, has been closely aligned with and has closely supported the western position. I do not say it in a tendentious sense, but I put it forward to show to what extent opinion has moved, not only in the question of principles, but in the part that all Members of the United Nations must take. We, the lesser Powers, are perhaps in a better position to lay down the main principles that should govern general and complete disarmament under effective international control. Speaking for our delegation, we do not subscribe to the first part of it; we are not in a better position because we neither have the weapons nor the adequate knowledge but we certainly share the concern and, what is more, we are equal in sharing the risks because all nuclear war is universal.

Then we come to another statement which I take the liberty of reading out in full. It comes from a distinguished statesman, the previous President of the General Assembly, Mr. Belaunde:

"...the General Assembly would be remiss"--I have never heard the old gentleman using such strong language although I have heard his strong voice--"in its mission, it would be violating the spirit and the letter of the Charter, if it were not to assume consideration on the problem of disarmament and if it were not to adopt recommendations as to the main lines for disarmament, outlining the means and producers for the solution of the problem of discrepancies, and announcing, on behalf of humanity, that, in view of the process of negotiations which must be undertaken, the Assembly must outline the means of bringing together diverse points of view and co-operating in the elimination of contradictory opinions and positions.

"...The General Assembly has the specific function of defining the principles referring to peace and, therefore, disarmament, and its power to recommend is so wide that it covers all Members in their powers to contract. It might direct such treaties. It might guide these negotiations and make such recommendations to the Security Council also. In a word, we might say that as regards disarmament our competence has but one limitation, the precise terms of negotiation, which must be agreed upon by the parties to the negotiations. However, the Assembly must make known its position"-

and this is our view, also-

"On the conditions for the maintenance of international peace and security. It must create an atmosphere conducive to negotiations. It must determine and lay down the principles that must guide such negotiations."

(A/C. 1/PV. 1091, pages 43-45 and 46)

One cannot attend every meeting of this body, partly for the reasons which I gave earlier in this statement. But I have been at pains to read the verbatim record of most of the speeches

which have been given on this subject. We are aware of the fact that the United States delegation has stated its position quite frankly. It has asked : Is it possible to obtain agreements, and so forth. which would actually be carried out ? On 27 October, Mr. Wadsworth said that, having heard Mr. Zorin's speech the previous day, he was perhaps justified in thinking-he did not say that he thought-that the United States delegation had reason to hold the view that the Soviet Union was asking for all or nothing; that is to say, the Soviet Union would not discuss disarmament until the last word of a treaty had been agreed to and signed and until all armaments had been laid down. I suppose that that is only a manner of speaking, because if all armaments were laid down there would be no need to discuss disarmament.

I do not want to be unfair and read more into Mr. Wadsworth's statement than was intended. But Mr. Wadsworth did refer to certain remarks made by Mr. Zorin.

305

On 27 October Mr. Wadsworth said that:

"No country in the world would welcome more wholeheartedly than the United States a change in the world situation that would permit us to lay down the grievously heavy burden which armaments impose upon us. We want a world in which nations no longer will have the power to settle differences by force of arms"-

those are practically the words we have submitted-

"a world in which international order will prevail, a secure world in which all people will be free from the fear of war. In short, we would like to see the total disarmament of all nations under law.

"In my personal opinion, if we were to start now and work at good speed, the step-by-step process to this goal should be completed in the neighbourhood of, say, five to six years, and with good faith and a real sense of urgency on both sides, it could take even

less. Mr. Zorin may tell us again, as he has in the past, that our statements are not to be believed. The fact is that in making these statements I speak from certain knowledge of my country's desires and my country's official position whereas the skeptical reaction of Mr. Zorin can spring, not from knowledge, but purely from suspicion, a totally unjustified suspicion." (A/C. 1/PV. 1093, page 51)

I have read out the last part of that quotation from Mr. Wadsworth because it reflects the precise trouble in this field.

Looking through the statements of the Soviet Union delegation, I find that the Soviet position appears to be-I may be wrong-that negotiations can take place, and the question of "all or nothing" does not seem to arise.

Mr. Zorin said :

"The Soviet Union fully shares and clearly understands the desire of many States to the effect that, even before a treaty on general and complete disarmament is concluded"-

and I stress those last words-

"some measures should be carried out which would contribute to enhancing confidence in relations between States and creating a more favourable atmosphere for the practical solution of the problem of general and complete disarmament (A/C. 1/PV. 1090, pages 23 and 24-25)

Mr. Zorin then went on to speak about the measures he had in mind ; I shall not go into detail in that respect. One of the measures he mentioned was the abandonment of nuclear weapons. He also mentioned atom-free zones of the world, such as have been proposed by President Nkrumah, on the one hand, and Poland, on the other ; the subject was also discussed in the General Assembly by the Cambodian and Laotian delegations. Mr. Zorin said :

"Lastly, the Soviet Government supports all the proposals on urgent

measures for stopping the arms race and creating a more favourable situation....". (Ibid., page 28)

Perhaps I have missed some of the points, but I think I have referred to enough of them to justify the view that, however large things may appear in the heat of controversy, there is much that is common in the approaches of the two great Powers which bear the primary responsibility in this field. My Government believes that both the United States and the Soviet Union are anxious to bring about disarmament and to establish peace in this world, and are more aware than anyone else of the consequences of the non-attainment of disarmament.

After the above-mentioned statements had been made in the Committee, the representative of Romania spoke. Romania is one of the countries on the Eastern side in the Ten-Nation Committee. I recall the fear expressed by the United States delegation-and it is a legitimate fear-that the Soviet view is that there must be all or nothing ; that the "all" will take a long time to obtain. As Bernard Shaw once said, all revolutions are gradual-in the sense that no revolution can take place in an instant of time. On 27 October Mr. Wadsworth said:
"...what I do wish to stress is that if Mr. Zorin's statement means, as it says, that certain measures can be taken now, or very soon, which will reduce tensions and help to create a better atmosphere for reaching agreement on general and complete disarmament under effective

306

international control, there is an urgent need to start negotiating on such measures". (A/C. 1/PV. 1093, page 48-50)

I think that that was identical with what Mr. Zorin said.

Now, as I have said, there was a statement on this from the Romanian delegation. From our experience in the Assembly we have no reason to think that the Romanian statement would be inconsistent with Soviet thinking on this matter. And this is what the Romanian representative said:

"We do not want `all or nothing'.
We want general and complete
disarmament...

"We rule out no initiative what-
soever that could improve the international
climate". (A/C. 1/PV. 1092, pag 22)

In other words, measures that will contribute to
general and complete disarmament and to relieving
tension are not only not ruled out, but are
welcomed and are described as necessary.

It is part of the agreement already reached
that disarmament would have to be undertaken in
phases, as a practical matter. The difficulty arises
when what is called a partial measure is pleaded
in bar of a general measure-that is, it is like a
man pleading a pardon beforehand, when he is
being impeached before the law. That is the real
difference.

I now turn to the question of suspicion, to
which Mr. Wadsworth rightly referred. Here I
think it would be best to quote again authorities
who cannot be regarded as irresponsible. I refer
to Mr. Teller and Mr. zilard, and their debate on
12 November. Incidentally, these are two people
with two different views ; they should not be
confused. Mr. Teller, in the debate to which I
have referred, pointed out that the whole trouble
in regard to an agreement was the question of
doubts and he discussed how far such doubts
were justified from the scientific point of view.

Then, because it was suggested that he is
also opposed to entering into negotiations with
Russia on test cessation, he was asked about the
way of dealing with this matter.

"We have been in negotiation with
Russia on test cessation. And the
question is now should we break off
these negotiations on the grounds that
the Russians cheat ?

These are not my words.

"I would say," says he, "this, that
I recognize and I agree with Teller that
there is such a thing as irresponsible
distrust" ;

that is to say, just be sentimental and it will be all right. But he goes on to say :

"There is also such a thing as irresponsible distrust, and I think that those who advocate-at least, what I see in the newspapers-I don't mean Dr. Teller ; but what I see in the newspapers-those who advocate that we should take up testing now because the Russians are undoubtedly cheating, since they would be capable of cheating, from very close to irresponsible distrust".

And then he goes on to say, what is the reason for thinking so? The reason for thinking so, apparently, if you read the whole of this text, is that the Russians have made these rockets like sausages, as they are called, and the great advance which they themselves now claim in the long-range missiles, and all this has been developed in secrecy at least, the Americans did not know about it, according to these people. I doubt it very much ; but anyway, they did not know about it-and therefore, if it was possible to develop rockets in secret, it must also be quite Possible to make explosions in secret.

There is a very strange logic to this. It is almost like saying a cat has got three tails, because no cat has one tail more than one cat, is it not, and therefore, every cat has got one tail, and therefore, every cat has got three tails-no, I am sorry, it is not that way. Now, I was going to say, no cat has two tails-that is common ground-every cat has got one tail more than no cat, and therefore, every cat has got three tails. That is the logic of this argument. But it is not a governmental pronouncement ; this is the pronouncement of one person who is in favour of not only the continuance of tests, but tests ought to be taken up immediately. But as I say again, I am not now talking about nuclear tests. it is related to the whole problem.

Then we come to what my delegation and, I am sure, the whole of this Committee, including our Secretary-General, think would be a matter of very grave concern. When these two gentlemen are asked what is the answer to all these

these weapons are not a grave danger, and so on, it is almost like some doctors trying to cure a poison by the same poison, Sometimes it works, sometimes it does not ; it depends upon the quantities. Doctor Teller goes on to say:

"Machine-guns in today's world are a minor weapon. If we try to base our security on machine-guns only, then soon, in case of a crisis, quickly or slowly, in secret, other bigger forces may arise which may neutralize, which may nullify the machine-guns of the United Nations police force. I don't know that it's a good idea. I don't know whether the United Nations will work. I hope it will, and I think we might try."

The only part of it is this, that Doctor Teller does not believe in the United Nations very much, from what he says; but he is not the only one, you know.

"If it works, let's give some thought of giving tactical nuclear weapons to the United Nations"-that is a gift for our Secretary-General--"If it works, let's give some thought of giving tactical nuclear weapons to the United Nations and, thereby, at one stroke make it completely possible for the United Nations police force to become a major force in most of the countries."

I have never seen such a megalomaniacal expression of power.

"This much can be said, I believe. Disarmament would not automatically guarantee peace."

This is from Doctor Teller.

"Let's try to visualize what kind of a world would a disarmed world be. Well, I should say that a disarmed world is a world where you have only machine-guns which cannot be eliminated.- in such a world, an army equipped with machine-guns could spring up, so to speak, over night. Now, what kind of a world is this? If America and Russia would be secure, no improvised army

equipped with machine-guns could conquer America or Russia.

America and Russia, even in such a disarmed world, would be strong enough militarily to dominate their neighbours. America could not protect Turkey against Russia, and Russia could not protect Cuba against America."

These people are very tactless, are they not ?

"This does not mean that Turkey, without American protection in a disarmed world, would be less secure than it is to-day, or that Cuba in a disarmed world, without Russian protection, would be less secure than it is to day. The danger to peace could, however, come easily from the disturbed areas of the world. America could not control any area remote from our territory, nor could Russia. And if two nations in a disturbed area of the world resorted to arms, there would be a war."

That is to say, if they went to the defence of other nations.

"And if America and Russia were to intervene on the opposite sides, there would be a great war which would start out with machine-guns, but not long thereafter, there would be heavy guns turning up. And it wouldn't take very long until the war would be fought with atomic bombs-for we can eliminate the stockpiles of bombs, but we cannot eliminate the knowledge of how to make bombs. I should say that for a disarmed world to be a world at peace, we would need police forces operating in the disturbed areas under the auspices of the United Nations. These police forces could not coerce America or Russia, but they could keep smaller nations from going to war with each other."

So now the proposal is-if you read the whole of this script, which I have not got the time-that not only should there be explosions, not only should there be these big bombs, which only a few people can have, but one of the

methods of security for the world is-no doubt the same thing is being said on the other side, and I do not want anything that I have said to be regarded as though this kind of opinion prevails only within-this is the language of power, and powerful nations very often speak in the same language-the proposal that countries of the world should be armed with these tactical weapons, that there be distribution, wider distribution of atomic destructive power. That is the safety of the world-so far from disarmament, far from

308

controlling armaments. As my Prime Minister said, we have now reached the position of how best to rearm the world if this is to be taken, and that is why, as was seen reflected in the talk of Mr. Wadsworth, it is necessary for us to proceed to a world without war, and whatever might have been justification in the past for finding ways and means of balanced reduction, these things no longer provide us any security. Not only are they so destructive in their capacity, but one must also fear the time when, in spite of the great wealth and resources of the United States on the one hand and the Soviet Union on the other, even the wealthiest might sometimes feel that the bill is too large and there may come a time when, either on account of misunderstanding or on account of smaller nations trying to canvass one another, or for various other reasons, these things would operate.

The English poet who wrote the other day, "Let us make these bombs and write on them, 'these are not for use'"--then what are they for ?

So we have submitted this resolution, sponsored by a number of countries, including ourselves, which is a result of patient talking to everyone concerned. I want to say here and now, the resolution is the responsibility alone of the sponsors, and nothing that my delegation submits here should be regarded as apportioning blame or praise. We postponed the request of the Chairman for the convening of this meeting for this purpose time after time in the hope that we might be able to come here and say, "Now, here is a resolution for which we ask priority." And we would hope that it would go through without a dissenting voice, if not totally and positively unanimously. I regret to say that is not the position today, and I think the nature of the

problem is history. The suspicion that exists on both sides, the context in which this Assembly has taken place, some certain circumstances that are probably not strictly germane to the working of the Assembly itself in literal terms, but really politically are—all these may have contributed to our not reaching that position. But we still, our collaborators and ourselves, have not brought this resolution before the Assembly without a great deal of searching of our minds and our hearts to discover whether it is the right course to follow.

The Assembly has before it a large number of resolutions. They will either be voted upon or something will be done with them. We are today, subject to whatever arrangements you make hereafter, on, temporarily, the last day of discussion, because tomorrow you will take up Mauritania, which I hope will be more peaceful. But therefore, when we examined this problem, we thought, first of all, that we have seen difficult situations of this kind in the past, and we have one basic thing to go upon : that the United States, on the one hand, and the Soviet Union, on the other, are anxious that the world should be rid of this incubus and the dread of this particular situation, and they are assisted by their allies and collaborators in the west and the east in the same way. Therefore, this desire for disarmament and the recognition as I have quoted in these various passages, that no longer could it be done in the old way of trying to balance reductions, but they must proceed all together for the total elimination of war and whatever phases have to come into it, are part of this general unfolding of this thing.

That is to say, we do a little and hope that it will be all right and trust the fate that moves mountains and opens the windows in the morning to see if there is a mound of earth outside. We should not proceed in that way but should take the whole ambit, a world in which we can live, where war would become impossible not for sentimental or pacifist reasons, as some people would say, but purely for practical reasons.

People like ourselves are often accused of not being realists. What realism can there be in a world where these terrible powers of destruction exist and can easily be operated without much organization, where the very basis of their existence and fear of their use might deter other persons ? If fear of their use might deter other

persons at some remote time, however minimal the calculations are, it should be used. If it is not going to be used, why should they be made at all? If you have mere possession of them and the other person is sure that you will not use it, then it is not a deterrent. So we come to the position that there is no defence against them. In fact, nations like ours, so far as preparing for defence, even civil defence-I have not gone into it because I have not the time-no civil defence arrangement is going to be effective. According to various calculations after a period of time it would perhaps affect 5 per cent of the population. That is, the total deaths from the quantity of weapons I have read out in which probably 95 per cent were dead in the first instance would then reach 100 per cent. But however that may be, countries like ours are in a fortunate position in the sense that in the event of a great conflict there is no question of preparation arising. I do not know whether the representative of the United Kingdom feels that he is in a different class from some smaller nations like ours, but I think I told this story to the Committee before:

309

It is like the scoutmaster who told the little boy scout, "What do I do in the jungle if I see a tiger?" He said, "You give the tiger a scout salute and the tiger will do the rest". That is the position with regard to atomic war.

We have therefore submitted this draft resolution. I want to preface my observations by saying that my collaborators and I are extremely grateful to the parties on both sides--and I would not like to mention them individually--who have given us a patient hearing, who have gone through various details and difficulties, made suggestions and tried to meet, as far as possible--and I think that if you look through the draft resolution carefully you will find that the vast areas of this are areas of agreement, far more than have ever been reached before. The draft resolution also tries to place the onus on the General Assembly, and I will say something about this later on, whereby the General Assembly will take the responsibility of telling the people concerned what they are to do--and that is what most people have been saying in their speeches: "Tell the Powers concerned, tell the Committees concerned, what they are to do". That is to be their directives. As I said the other day, in 1952

or 1953, when we read of similar circumstance, similar but not exact, there was a deadlock and no disengagement, and the Assembly took it upon itself to give directives in regard to the total prohibition of nuclear weapons and the balanced reduction of arms.

Now we have reached the situation at a different level where, as I said, there is no escape from the fact that the world has to abandon war and resolve its disputes, if they still continue, by other methods. Therefore, the whole of the preamble that you have before you deals with previous resolutions and it also deals with the situation hitherto reached or not reached. There are certain common areas of agreement between the two sides. We have not spoken about the common areas of agreement because again it might delude the world into thinking that these people have reached agreement. But there are certain principles on which they have agreed; that is to say, there have to be phases and these phases each have to lead to the next phase; but it is not a conditional thing. What we are trying to do here is to say: "While there must be phases, those phases cannot be pleaded as obstacle in bar of a general approach".

Then we come to the declaration of the directives in paragraph 1. We read in paragraph I:

"Declares that the following directives should form the basis for an agreement on general and complete disarmament". (A.C. 1.L. 259. p. 2)

Now, you might well turn around and say that that is good English and, "why don't you leave it in?" It could have been left in, but the representative of the United Kingdom raised the question in the general debate on disarmament of comprehensive disarmament and in the circumstances List year we found some way of getting out of it. We have now set down the components of this general and complete disarmament. The English language is highly flexible and has become more so since it has come over to this side of the Atlantic.

Thus we have tried to spell out what this means, and this is by no means trying to draft a disarmament treaty in this Committee. My Government would be the last to subscribe to the idea that twenty or thirty of us could sit down and do this. At one time it would have

been possible to have it done by the administrative machinery of the United Nations and brought before us and the Powers concerned could have modified and adjusted it later. However, in the present circumstances of the world that would not be possible, and therefore this declaration tells in paragraph I (d) what it should consist of. Paragraph (a) states :

"General and complete disarmament should result in a world in which the method of war for the solution of international problems and the continued existence of all the instruments and machinery of war should stand eliminated".

I should like to explain that the word "continued" covers the point that where inspection and control is established it is not to be abandoned. It is part of the world administration. That is why I pointed out the other day that disarmament cannot be achieved, certainly not for the first fifteen years because the whole machinery would continue. The resolution continues : "war should stand eliminated" That is to say, there should be no recurrence of it.

A very legitimate doubt has sometimes been raised in the West sometimes in the East as to the continuation of these things, that somebody may throw away or demobilize a number of people and bring them back the next day. That is sought to be removed by this particular declaration. Ever since I have come here I have heard this, whether it be in cease fire discussions or in disarmament discussions: "If you take this step, Party A is going to be better off than

310

Party B or the reverse will take place." As we read the situation and as our own views correspond with it, disarmament should not-it is set out in the American resolution-at any stage give any party an advantage over the other, meaning a relative advantage. Now certainly the United States has an advantage over Iceland in arms. There is no suggestion that disarmament, until it becomes a totality-that then they will all be equal. In the United Nations we all have one vote. The draft resolution goes on to say in paragraph (c) :

"In respect of each phase and step there shall be established by agreement effective machinery of inspection and control for its operation and maintenance".

That is to say, it is not true that disarmament can be brought about by this machinery and that then they will retire. This is kept going so that there will be no question of running away from the arrangements reached.

I should like to say here that if those who are interested would read the resolution through, they would find the reiteration of two matters: first, general and complete disarmament and the other, the maintenance of effective machinery under international control.

My Government believes and has repeatedly stated that there cannot be disarmament in this world as it is constituted at the present moment without effective machinery of control. But we cannot substitute control for disarmament. We have always said that, and I believe now that the controversy is getting like the quotation I cited the other day, that of the American author who talked about "gamesmanship". This has somewhat gone away and once what is to be controlled is to be agreed upon, they should operate simultaneously. I hope that what I say is not going to create any more difficulties. The draft resolution states in paragraph (d) what general and complete disarmament would consist of and there it talks about "elimination of armed forces and armaments and of armament production". Certainly if armament production is eliminated in certain parts of the world, then I think that war as a business would also disappear. It is fortunately the condition of the world today, probably due to the sophisticated nature of arms, far less than what it was in the First World War when people wrote books like the "Merchants of Death".

Then we come to paragraph (d) (ii)

"The total prohibition of the manufacture, maintenance and use of nuclear and thermonuclear weapons and of bacteriological and chemical weapons of war".

We have had that as a goal long ago, but now we are saying that there should be a directive about it. It has been our goal for ten years. It is time that we come close to achieving it. There is no radical change about this in that way.

Then we come to (iii),

"the elimination of all existing establishments and training institutions for military purposes".

Naturally, if you train athletes they will want to perform. If you train generals, I suppose, they will at least want to conduct manoeuvres. I have some knowledge of this. Therefore we say that that shall be taken away. It is also taken away in (iv), which is rather an important clause, by

"the elimination of all equipment and facilities for the delivery, the placement and the operation of all weapons of mass destruction within national territories and of all foreign military bases and launching sites of all categories".

This draft resolution, therefore, does not take one side or the other, and we say that where the facilities for this are inside a territory-whether it be in Florida or Siberia, or in India or Pakistan, or in Cyprus--makes no difference. If they are national territories they will go with national disarmament. We have not called them bases because you cannot have bases in your own country. They are foreign bases and launching sites of all categories-which includes the submarine in the estuary of the Clyde, and means that whether they are under water or on the surface they all should be treated equally.

We come then to the question of the maintenance of the establishment of peace. It may puzzle some people that, in connexion with disarmament, we have included a paragraph relating to the retention of forces-the retention of certain kinds of units-and the explanation is this. You cannot disarm unless at the same time you provide for the maintenance of international security and for operations on behalf of the United Nations. So, in (v), with great difficulty, we have overcome various obstacles in this matter and have stated this:

"the maintenance by each Member State of necessary security units and training establishments, arms and their production as are agreed to be necessary exclusively for the purposes of internal security and of placing at the disposal of the United Nations for the maintenance of international peace and security, in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations."

Thus both the placing and the maintenance will be in accordance with the Charter, and the Charter provides certain things which, of course, would have to undergo revision in all the circumstances.

Then we come to the question of the organization of the United Nations. This has very little to do with particular views held by one person or another. I said a while ago that when there is disarmament on the scale that we have suggested, and a world without war, it will require millions and millions of people-technicians, administrators, scientists, inspectors and so on- and in fact they will be the peace army of the world. In order to do that, in order to create confidence and in order to be able to feel that whatever machinery was at the disposal of the United Nations would not be used in an improper way, it would be necessary that the United Nations should undergo such agreed changes. That is the present position, namely, that

"the United Nations should undergo such agreed changes for the implementation of this resolution and for the maintenance of peace in a disarmed world which would exclude the possibility of the international police force being used for any purpose inconsistent with the Charter including such use in the interests of one State or group of States against another State or group of States".

This last would not be necessary if we were not living in a world of power blocs-that is to say, if we were not dominated by the notion of balance of power and holy alliances, and if the idea of negotiating from strength had not become part

of the cardinal policy. And no doubt it reflects a certain amount of our own subjective attitude of uncommitted nations in relation to this whole problem.

Sub-paragraph (vii) is about outer space, and then we come to the operative part on the treaty, which states:

"A treaty on general and complete disarmament embodying the terms and provisions set out in (a), (b), (c) and (d) above shall include the time-limits and schedules for the implementation of each successive step and phase of general and complete disarmament, the completion of each stage shall be followed by the implementation of the next stage".

That is to say, there is no suggestion here that there should be anarchy or any helter skelter way of doing this. The phasing and the stages are agreed to, and one follows upon the other.

Then the draft resolution urges that negotiations--to which I shall come back later--should be resumed for the purpose of accomplishing these objectives. And it must be common sense and a matter of agreement that when there is a resolution of this character which urges negotiation, then the negotiation must be for the purpose of attaining those ends. It may be that in attaining those ends something else would have to be done, but that is a different matter. The draft resolution urges that negotiations

"Should be resumed for the purpose of the earliest conclusion of an agreement on general and complete disarmament under effective international control and taking into account the provisions of this resolution".

Then comes this matter on which I spent some time in connexion with Mr. Wadsworth had said to the effect that he thought that Mr. Zorin also took that view at the present time, or was leaning that way. I am not speaking for Mr. Wadsworth. Paragraph 3

"Considers that, without prejudice to the directives on general and complete disarmament, set out in this resolution

as well as to paragraph 2 above,"-

that is, urging negotiations-

"the possibility of putting into effect either agreed or unilateral measures which would create more favourable conditions for general and complete disarmament and would help the fulfilment of these directives is not precluded".

I would like to submit both to the United States and to the Soviet Union that this meets all their legitimate suspicions. It would include any desire on the part of anybody to say, "This

312

is an expensive and wasteful business. We are giving up this, that or the other base". It would include the suspension of nuclear tests. It would include any agreement not to give arms to anybody. It would include any agreement on balanced reduction, so-called. But it does not say that that agreement should come in such a way as to be a handicap to the attainment of the directives.

I cannot speak for others, but, after all, one gains a certain amount of experience by talking to people with different views, and we have been persuaded in this matter, because I believe that it is not possible to persuade anybody else unless one is willing to be persuaded oneself. And I want to tell you, Mr. Chairman, in all seriousness that those who have had the opportunities and tire responsibility of negotiating in this matter, my co-sponsors and myself, have at no time taken rigid positions except in relation to the maintenance of these directives and the attainment of what may be called a warless world. This paragraph completely covers any fear that nothing can be done until the whole world is disarmed. At the same time it does not give any reason for fear on the other side that this is a method of saying, "Now we shall transfer 10,000 kilogrammes of atomic material", or anything of that character. I am not referring to particular conversations. This also not only does not exclude, but very legitimately includes, such measures as that proposed by Poland, on the one hand, of a free zone in Europe-which was suggested also by Mr. Anthony Eden some time ago in this Committee, and is, as far as we know, still the approved

policy of the United Kingdom Government, which we shall hear later-or by small countries in Asia such as Laos and Cambodia, which unfortunately have also come into the context of the cold War and its conflicts, and which pleaded with this Assembly to declare their territories atom-free zones, or by President Nkrumah, who appealed that the newly-liberated continent of Africa, with its vast populations and vast wealth, excluded perhaps by the sea but not from radiation, should be protected in the sense that these territories should not be made, as was done by France two years ago, the scene of atomic experiments or atomic adventures. The Assembly appealed to France at that time against the explosion in the Sahara, but it nevertheless took place. However, it is not my desire to drag in smaller matters when bigger matters are to be settled.

Therefore, all these proposals, whether it be the Laotian-Cambodian proposal or the Polish proposal-the idea formerly stated by Mr. Anthony Eden-of a corridor where either disarmament or freedom from the atomic business could be practised, or the position of Africa, or the abandonment of bases which are only a threat and an irritation, or their stripping down, whether unilaterally or by agreement, would be greatly welcomed if they could be put into effect. If this-could be done no one would welcome it more than the world-all the nations here, those doing it and those whose suspicions would be allayed.

Therefore, I speak here, through you Mr. Chairman, to both the delegations of the East and the West and their leaders and appeal to them to consider paragraph 3 as a genuine, honest and reasonable effort to meet both their suspicions.

Only a fool or a knave could say, even with the best of resolutions, that it would be possible to go into negotiation tomorrow and that everything would run smoothly. The purpose of this is to create a basis in the world where the principles, as Abraham Lincoln once said, would, if they were really worth while, be so wide as to accommodate different points of view, and there is nothing here which precludes any reasonable, any legitimate or any desirable attempt that can be made. It does preclude the idea that something small cannot be pleaded in bar for the

main objective.

Therefore, it is our hope that, with all the endeavours which have been made by both sides in this matter—at least mentally—and by the submissions which we have made, the Assembly will throw its weight behind the world attitude that one side or the other cannot expect its own viewpoint to prevail in such a decision and, equally, that it will be recognized that the Assembly is bending over backwards, so to say, in order that decisions may be agreed upon between them to accomplish this purpose.

We also have paragraph 4 which is merely an appeal to create confidence, so that countries should refrain from preparing for surprise attacks or from attacks themselves. We cannot make an appeal to refrain from attacks without appealing to refrain from preparation for attacks. This paragraph serves as another reminder about previous resolutions.

I have made this submission in all humility, on behalf of my Government and on behalf of my colleagues, since I am the first speaker since the resolution was tabled. I cannot speak for all of my co-sponsors, although, I believe, to a certain extent, I can.

313

It has been the firm policy of the Government of India to reiterate in this Committee, time after time, that an attempt to pass resolutions by the mobilization of votes, in one way or another, would not achieve disarmament. Therefore, that is the reason why we have entered into this matter. It is also because we are an uncommitted nation, that we are equal sufferers as a result of the arms race, and also the kind of reception which large numbers of representatives have given to the general outline which we have proposed encouraged us in the belief that if some form—not a mere form of words, but some meeting of minds—of ideas were proposed, that would be acceptable.

As I have said today, on 15 November, at this time I am not in a position to tell the Assembly, as we have sometimes done in the past, that the great giants have to behave themselves in order to restore friendly relations.

But we are not without hope. We submit this resolution in the full confidence that, with the submissions we have made and with the opinions that will come from the Assembly in due time and, what is more, with the inexorable pressures of public opinion, which must ultimately sway the Governments and nations of the world, humanity will be redeemed. With the statements I have read of the great statesmen of the world, who are either in power or are about to assume power, with their pledges to redeem humanity, and with the alternative-the dire alternative-which we must face if we do not abandon war, it would be possible for the Assembly, possessed with the quality of patience, to find in a comparatively short time a further improvement-not a change-but a further improvement in this situation, and it will be possible for the Assembly to adopt this resolution unanimously.

At the present moment, therefore, we are not putting this forward-because of the changes in the composition of the Assembly-with the hope that it will be carried either by a majority or a two-thirds majority.

My delegation, and perhaps all delegations, have had experiences with other resolutions which have been carried by considerable majorities but which have had no effect whatsoever. There was a time when, after the Korean war, we had sixty-one clauses in an armistice agreement signed, and yet the guns could not be silenced because there was no agreement on the sixty-second clause. The delegations tried very hard. Proposals were submitted in order to make the sixty-second clause operative and to bring the war to an end. In attempting this, fears and hostilities between the East and the West were occasioned.

The great mistake is, if I may so submit with humility, to think that one side is partisan when it supports the resolution and that the other side, which disapproves of it, may not change its mind.

At the present moment, we have not put this forward with a view to separating the sheep from the goats because any resolution or decision made by this Assembly must be made with the consent of those who must disarm in order to ultimately have any effect.

I hope that what I have said will not serve as an encouragement for delay. I make this request and appeal with all sincerity. I am sure that it reflects the over-all sentiments of the United Nations and of the world. I say this both to the representative of the United States and to the Soviet Union: many countries have just gained admission to the United Nations and they-even more, the peoples which they represent-are, perhaps, charged with a greater degree of idealism than some of the older Members of this Organization because they have passed through some cynical phases.

The world expects something from the United Nations and from the leaders of Governments.

It would be true that this submission would be a foolhardy proposition if no provisions were made for inspection and control and if it said "all or nothing". If it had said that it was possible to establish world demobilization by waving a magic wand of some kind, then you would be entitled to ridicule it or to laugh at it and you would certainly be entitled to reject it. But I submit that while these proposals are not made by atomic or military Powers, they are made and submitted in all sincerity. I believe that if these directives are endorsed unanimously by the Assembly, these Powers will be able to find a way out of their difficulties because, as loyal Members of the United Nations, they should be able to find a way to overcome their difficulties. There is no doubt about the fact that there are difficulties. But if we proceed on the basis that we must find a solution for them we are bound to find that solution.

I submit, therefore, this draft, resolution on behalf of my co-sponsors and myself. I trust that this statement has made very clear that it is almost a matter of principle with my Government

314

that particularly in matters of this character we do not simply seek majority decisions and thereby add greater confusion to the problem.

We hope that at some stage, if it is practical, to inform the Assembly that such a decision has been reached as a result of the Committee's negotiations, and to say, at least, that we have

made considerable progress in solving some of the problems, which now exist as a result of suspicions, to a certain extent, and misunderstandings of the expressions used. I know this is not an easy task. However, through the efforts of both sides it will be possible, in due course, to pass this resolution unanimously.

INDIA USA IRELAND RUSSIA GERMANY SWITZERLAND CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC LAOS
JORDAN BRAZIL POLAND CAMBODIA OMAN ROMANIA PERU TURKEY CUBA MAURITANIA
ICELAND PAKISTAN CYPRUS FRANCE KOREA

Date : Nov 01, 1960

Volume No

1995

INDIA IN THE UNITED NATIONS

Shri Hajarnavis' Statement in Legal Committee

Shri R. M. Hajarnavis, Union Deputy Minister of Law and Member of the Indian Delegation to the United Nations, made the following statement in the Legal Committee on November 7, 1960 :

Mr. Chairman,

Permit me, on the occasion of taking the floor for the first time, to offer on behalf of the Indian Delegation, our sincere congratulations to you, to Ambassador Rosenne and to Dr. Nedbajlo, on your election as Chairman, Vice Chairman, and Rapporteur of this Committee. During the time you have presided over our debates, your courtesy, your anxiety to allow widest freedom of discussion and your fairness have demonstrated to us, how fortunate we have been in our Chairman. My Delegation avails itself of this opportunity, also to acknowledge the debt of gratitude we owe to the International Law Commission for their work in the twelfth session, as also to Dr. Jarpslv Zourek, the special Rapporteur, for his report on law relating to consular intercourse and immunities based on

painstaking and scholarly research. We also place on record our appreciation of valuable contribution made by Dr. Padilla Nervo, as Chairman of the International Law Commission during the twelfth session and in addressing us in this Committee.

Mr. Chairman, when our Committee commenced our session, we had before us an order paper which was almost blank. This indeed is disconcerting. Time and effort which could have profitably been devoted to the discussion of subjects in the agenda is expended on lament about lack of agenda. Some of our statements here have given rise to the complaint that they have ranged outside the proper limits. Running our eye through the agenda adopted for this session of the General Assembly, there are probably a few items which could with advantage have been allocated to the Sixth Committee. Whether as the distinguished representative of the United States suggested we should chide ourselves for not working harder in our own Delegation to prevent the meagreness of our agenda, or whether our reluctance to make claims for additional agenda is the unconscious result of the professional discipline observed by lawyers of not canvassing for briefs, we may in the future as has been pointed out by the distinguished representatives of Thailand and Greece in respect of questions falling within two or more committees draw attention at the relevant time to the recommendation of the Special Committee on Methods or Procedures, approved by the General Assembly in resolution 362 (IV) of 22nd October, 1949, that they "should properly be referred to the committee with lightest agenda".

As I said earlier, the question of relevance of bringing in matters outside the agenda has been raised. While any debate, in order to be fruitful, must be confined within ascertained and defined limits, I do not think, scope of discussion in our Committee ought to be unduly restricted by narrow or mechanical interpretation. Writ large and permanently inscribed on our order paper is the item quoted by the distinguished representative of Indonesia "measures to encourage the progressive development in International Law and its codification". It behoves us then to take stock constantly of our achievement in this behalf, to consider whether the question which we are dealing with is likely to lead us towards

this goal and if it does, how much progress we shall make in that direction. Judged by these tests, while some good work has been done, we cannot but confess to a sense of grave disappointment at the ratio between what has been achieved and what remains to be done. It raises several questions in our mind. Has the glowing faith which inspired the United Nations Organization become dim? Why has the fifteen years of labour produced so little? What contribution is International Law making to bring about adjustment or settlement of international disputes by peaceful means, which the Charter requires it to do.

In the ultimate analysis, our performance

315

here has to be evaluated in terms of the purposes and principles of the Charter and it does not appear to be considerable. Next is the question posed by the distinguished representative of Colombia,--have any limitations been placed on national sovereignty? If the answer to the question is in the negative, what is the future of the International Law?

But, I ask myself, is it necessary to surrender to such a gloomy view? Are we not, in doing so, placing undue and unrealistic emphasis only on the work done in the Sixth Committee, and, secondly, on form rather than on substance. Let us look at what is happening outside this Committee. At this very time, other committees are engaged in considering questions, decisions on which are likely to widen the domain of International Law. First, the Third Committee has before it a draft international convention on human rights by which "Each State party undertakes to respect and to ensure to all individuals within its territory. rights recognised in the covenant without distinction of any kind, such as race, colour, sex, language, political or other opinion, national or social origin, property, birth or other status". Further, each state party undertakes to ensure that such a person shall have an effective remedy what is most significant is that a permanent body is proposed to be established for the implementation of these covenants. Second, the First Committee has before it proposals for general and complete disarmament which means not only renunciation of recourse to war as an instrument of policy, but discarding

of means of making war. Third, an important development is the emergence of many dependent countries into independence (a process which the Trusteeship Council is to complete) so that European state system is being transformed into a world state system. Fourth, there are many national and international agencies working for, with or under the United Nations Organisation.

In my respectful submission, these activities indicate unmistakably that we are progressing toward international order of a world in which all human beings exercise fundamental human rights, in states whose existence is based on the right of self-determination and which have renounced war as a method of settling disputes. If we do not contend for forms but concentrate our attention on practice, gains made on this front will be the legitimate territory of International Law. If I understand him correctly, the distinguished representative of Colombia, has indicated a theoretical basis, to those who would insist on it. This in my opinion, is a comforting thought and is an encouraging prospect, for while we appear to storm in vain the traditional walls of national exclusiveness, there is already a wide breach being made in an unexpected area. We may not say that struggle nought availeth. For

"Not by eastern windows only
When the daylight comes, comes in the light
In front the sun climbs, how slowly
But westward, look, the land is bright".

I am in respectful agreement, therefore, with the distinguished representative of Poland, who, with the vision of a seer and precision of the scientist, said "For whenever the United Nations go into fields not tilled hitherto, they may pave the way to new solutions of international conflicts and controversies, new methods of cooperation, which may sooner or later receive the sanction of law. In many areas this means paving the way to the International Law of tomorrow". I, therefore, suggest in all humility while it is important to ascertain the rules and forms- which now govern the relation of the States, we may direct our efforts to devise new apparatus and anew idiom for the new order which we intend to usher in. In saying this, I find myself repeating what the distinguished representative of Poland said, but the thought bears repetition. He said that the United Nations has acquired new responsibilities it had to face many

new problems. To be successful it must reflect all these changes in the field of law. Our work in this Committee has been so far and probably has to concern itself more with the procedure than with the substantive matters, but have we no contribution to make when the solution of problems relating to disarmament is being discussed. Having outlawed war, we can probably follow it up by International Penal Code dealing with the crimes of preparation or advocacy of war. In this Connection, I wholeheartedly support the proposal of the distinguished representative of Ceylon that we should request the International Law Commission to take up law of neutrality.

Coming to the report of the International Law Commission which we are considering, it is receiving at the hands of the Government of India the careful attention it is entitled to. I do not, therefore, deal with the articles of draft. My Delegation reserves its right to deal with them at the appropriate time. Any reference that I make may not be regarded as having committed my Government to any portion of it.

The International Conference of Plenipotentiaries on diplomatic intercourse and immunities is scheduled to meet in Vienna from 2nd March 1961 to 14th April 1961. The distinguished

316

representative of the United Kingdom has made a careful comparison between the functions of a diplomatic agent and those of a consul. "The border line", as has been pointed out by the distinguished representative of Poland "between consular and diplomatic functions is not always clear." Further, the distinguished representative of Bolivia has drawn our attention to, the significant fact that the modern tendency was to extend the range of diplomatic intercourse and immunities at the same time reducing the consular sphere of competence. All matters connected with commercial activities, good neighbourly relations and economic assistance and cooperation were entrusted to diplomatic officials". That, in my opinion is an inevitable process. As commerce takes place between Government and Government, as communications multiply and as human rights are secured, and safeguarded by states themselves, consular functions will merge into diplomatic functions. Whereas the immunity of diplomatic agent is personal, that of the consul

appears to be functional. I, therefore, find myself in respectful agreement with the distinguished representative of Ireland in the proposal made by him that the Governments will be assisted materially if they have before them the result of the Vienna Conference on Diplomatic intercourse and immunities, for the consideration of the articles relating to consular intercourse and immunities. In my opinion, clear demarcation of the diplomatic intercourse and immunities and decision as to the form in which the proposal is to be implemented will be of invaluable aid to the Governments in formulating their views, in an allied and closely connected field.

After having heard the accurate analysis of Article 101 by the distinguished representative of Poland, I have nothing which I can usefully add. In this respect, I recall that in Pakistan, Burma and India, there are many scholars who have studied British, American and Indian systems in their own universities and the universities of the U.K. and U.S.A., and who are trained to study, compare and assimilate the many features of the Western system in the process of their application. I confess to feeling that these geographical areas are inadequately represented in the legal counsel's office.

My Delegation supports the suggestion that the three articles on ad hoc diplomacy may be sent directly to the Vienna Conference as they can appropriately be discussed together with and in the setting of law applicable to permanent missions. We find reference to ad hoc diplomacy in the great epics of India and rules dealing with it are to be found in "Manusmirti and Koutilya's Arthashastra". My Delegation would be glad to make their contribution to this branch of the subject.

Mr. Chairman, the distinguished representative of the Union of South Africa referred to the necessity of impressing upon the members of the Committee the importance of legal approach. If, like charity, this obligation is to begin at home, the distinguished representative may pause to consider whether legal approach permits him to raise grievances about a question in this Committee after it has been dealt with and decided by the General Assembly not only once but several times over, objections of his Government notwithstanding. I also thought it was rather late

in the day, when we have progressed so far in defining and safeguarding human rights, to attempt to justify discrimination which is a violent subversion of the provisions-and principles of the Charter.

INDIA USA GREECE THAILAND INDONESIA COLOMBIA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC POLAND
AUSTRIA FRANCE BOLIVIA IRELAND BURMA PAKISTAN UNITED KINGDOM SOUTH AFRICA

Date : Nov 01, 1960

Volume No

1995

INDIA IN THE UNITED NATIONS

Shri J. N. Sahni's Statement in Administrative and Budgetary Committee

Shri J. N. Sahni, Member of the Indian Delegation to the United Nations, made a statement in the Administrative and Budgetary Committee of the General Assembly on November 3, 1960.

The following is the text of the statement:

Mr. Chairman:

At the outset my delegation would wish to extend a cordial welcome to the Under-secretary of Information, Mr. Tavaris de Sa. I also wish to associate myself personally with this welcome for the reason that Mr. Tavaris belongs to my profession and I have no doubt that his experience and background will render him eminently fitted for the responsibilities he has undertaken.

We have read through the report of the Secretary General on Public Information Activities with great care. My delegation has taken keen interest in these activities and my personal interest has been even keener during the last three years. It gives me, therefore, considerable satisfaction in sharing with several other delegations the view that the Secretary General has taken several valuable steps in the right direction in

implementing Resolution 1405 (XIV) and Resolution 1335 (XIII) of the 13th and 14th General

317

Assemblies.

Without repeating what has already been said by several distinguished delegates, I might state that the progress made towards the stabilization of the budget at five million dollars is impressive. Even though a two year program has been outlined, we hope it will be possible for the department during 1961 to review even further some of the avenues of expenditure and, bearing in mind the objective "maximum effectiveness at minimum cost", bring about further economies, while at the same time improving the standards and the effectiveness of OPI programs. Five million dollars is practically 10% of the net budget and is by itself a formidable amount. We have reason to believe that there is still considerable scope for economy in certain areas and very considerable need for improvement in others. We trust that the talents of Mr. Tavaris and his able colleagues will be fully applied towards these objectives, and that in 1962 we can look forward to a fuller implementation of these objectives.

Coming now to the steps that have been taken to implement some of the recommendations of the Expert Committee and the two resolutions of the Assembly, we are glad to note firstly that the OPI plans to open three new information centers in 1960 and three additional centers in 1961, and that the money required for these will be formed within the budget of five million dollars.

We are also glad to note that in consultation with the governments of member states, the Secretary General has appointed a consultative panel on United Nations information and policy programs, and that this panel has spent four meetings in considering what now form recommendations of the report of the Secretary General. It would be of interest to this committee to know, in brief, if not in detail, the nature of advice tendered by the panel on broad matters of policy, and the manner of its implementation by the OPI.

We notice that in accordance with the

suggestions made in this Committee, effective steps have been taken for the decentralization of headquarters staff, for the better utilization of available staff at headquarters. We feel that there is still scope for decentralization and change in staffing patterns.

We are also glad that as a result of consultations with Governments concerned it has been possible to combine the activities of certain offices, for example, in New Delhi, the director of the information center has also been appointed resident representative of TAB. At Athens, Djakarta and Kabul and the three centers to be opened in 1960, they have been administratively integrated with TAB's administrative representatives. Arrangements are being made to have similar integration between information officers and TAB. We also find that in Africa in addition to the new center at Tunis, an information office has been attached to the staff of the Economic Commission to Africa, at Addis Ababa. We also note that the External Relations Division has expanded its services to information centers, and that local and regional production in a number of areas is being developed by the transfer of staff from several divisions of OPI at headquarters to information centers.

This Mr. Chairman, by no means exhausts the list of various valuable steps taken by the Secretary General towards improving the effectiveness of OPI programs and creating valuable and very substantial economies. One can mention additionally, for example, the altered policy regarding fellowship programs which takes into account the need for increased time of training and the improved quality of candidates selected, or for that matter the proposed change in the format, size, and quality of paper in the United Nations Review, or again the substantially altered approach to the policy regarding unrelayed broadcasts, the increasing emphasis which is evident throughout the report on the need and the desire to enlist the cooperation of governments concerned, leading to fruitful results. We notice for example that the National Broadcasting systems of five countries, India, Pakistan, Malaya, Indonesia and Japan, participated in the radio and visual media projects undertaken by the United Nations. Similarly, the government film units of Malaya, India and Ceylon are producing documentary films on

community and agricultural developments in Asia.

We wish to take special note of the section of the report which relates to the planning of United Nations information services in Africa, since among the underdeveloped, this is the largest and the most underdeveloped in terms of media of information and its requirements of an understanding of the United Nations are most urgent.

At present a nucleus of information is provided by five information centers with offices at Accra, Cairo, Tunis, Monrovia and Addis Ababa. We appreciate the difficulties confronting the

318

Secretary General both in respect of the choice of appropriate media and the manner of providing service to this large underdeveloped continent, and we are glad to note that despite these difficulties substantial Steps have been taken or are being planned in the right direction. In this Connection there can be no two opinions about the fact that the radio and audio-visual media are the best suited for this region. To make an effective start it is both sensible and practicable that the United Nations facilities, to quote the secretary General : (para 45) "Be linked with Some of the 22 field offices maintained in Africa by the specialized agencies".

While this part of the Secretary General's report does reveal a sense of appropriate concern and anxiety for spreading information among the countries of Africa, we do hope that during the next two, years, it should be possible for the Secretary General to establish in cooperation with various governments and the specialized agencies, and as a result of appropriate economies in other spheres an effective net work of information centers and facilities, not only in the free countries of Africa, but also in the dependent and Trusteeship countries if any still remain.

Much has been said about the achievement of maximum effectiveness at minimum cost. While we have taken note with great satisfaction of several of the proposals of the Secretary General designed to implement some of the recommendations of the expert committee, it is not possible to judge the measure of success achieved

it! various directions unless the Office of Public Information places before this committee, what it considers to be a defined program of targets and priorities. As the distinguished delegates of the USSR and the United Kingdom have rightly pointed out, the field of information is so wide that unless targets and objectives are defined and programs planned accordingly, the entire budget of the United Nations would seem inadequate, especially with so many media available and so many people to be reached. Annexure III to which reference has been made by the under-Secretary is not helpful in this respect. Keeping in view available resources, it is time that this committee was informed more clearly and more specifically as to the type and level of information which the OPI has in mind in various parts of the world, keeping in view the state of development of those areas. It is only then possible to judge if the media chosen for the purpose are the Most economical and the most effective and as to whether the results achieved have been in line with the objectives and commensurate with the objectives in view. This problem was most appropriately summed up by the Secretary General in his memorandum of the 14th March 1958 in para 7 to the Expert Committee on Page 39 of document A/3928, wherein he said : "A consideration of priorities concerns the relative importance to be accorded to the various media? and to the demands of outside agencies for information material and services. it is also affected by other variables, such as area priorities, subject-priorities and timing-priorities. For priorities from these various angles are interrelated and the final priorities therefore constitute a flexible scale. It would, for example, be appropriate to give importance to television coverage of a suitable Subject in A Country with well developed television facilities, whereas in a country where such facilities are lacking it would be necessary to concentrate on some other methods of presentation. Equally, there are various activities of the United Nations which are of particular concern and interest to particular areas and at particular times. Further, some activities lend themselves more suitably to one medium of expression, some of another. Account has also to be taken of the relative weight and scope of demand for United Nations information services, especially from the media of mass communication."

In order that the OPI should establish priorities in terms of targets and objectives, it would require careful planning, as much in respect of appropriations for the various media to be employed, as for the employment of suitable media for the objectives to be pursued, keeping in view territorial requirements and disparities. Such planning should necessarily keep in view certain yardsticks or one may say, some kind of standard barometric measures to determine the progress achieved.

Mr. Chairman, in planning programs for the future on a two-year basis, we hope it would be possible for the under-Secretary to give us a clearer picture in this respect, because in the past such a picture has not been available, and in the absence of such a picture any realistic assessment of effectiveness or of economy in cost has not been possible. Knowing the under-Secretary to be a distinguished publicist himself, knowing also that the Secretary General has shown considerable keenness and concern for effectiveness in economy and is likely to consult more freely his panel of advisers, we have no doubt that even for his own guidance he cannot help but establish certain broad concepts of objectives and priorities, so that progress towards those objectives can be properly assessed and the expenditure incurred

319

can be flexibly employed and appropriately justified.

To take a specific case, there can be no two opinions as to the need and the value of information offices, information centers, and information facilities in underdeveloped countries. There can also be no two opinions about the employment of Audio-Visual media for reaching the largest number of people at the lowest, possible cost, as also the value of the human element in informing illiterate or less-educated people.

At the same time there might be areas where certain levels may have been reached and it should be part of planning to decide whether available funds should be employed in those areas to reach a still higher standard of intensification, to alter the media or to spend just enough to sustain the levels reached while diverting the funds to other areas of greater need.

In the light of what I have stated, one may very well ask whether the present pattern of information offices including their location, in some of the very advanced countries should be continued, whether the present expenditure for these offices is justified, and conversely whether the stage has not been reached of a level of information in these countries, when by changing the pattern, large economies could be effected to meet the urgent needs of other areas where the levels of information are very much lower.

Mr. Chairman, it does seem paradoxical that while in the underdeveloped areas, and in the regions of greatest need, information facilities are being made available by integrating offices, by utilizing the U.N. agencies, and by covering large areas from small centers, within less than three hundred miles from the U.N. itself, at the Headquarters of UNESCO, of FAO, of ILO and WHO, all with their own information set-ups, need should still be felt for separate information centers. In the one case it would seem like searching for a candle to light up an entire dark landscape ; in the other case it is like someone carrying a candle to have extra light to see his way through Broadway. It may be when these offices were opened, there could have been justification, but the fact of their continuance in the existing form is deserving of review in the light of an order of priorities.

Now that the Secretary General has virtually accepted the principle of not only seeking the cooperation in various spheres of information activities of governments concerned, but also of consulting them in respect of these facilities, it may be appropriate for him to consult these advanced countries, and find out if the information centers are performing an essential function, if some desirable economies can be made, if greater reliance can be placed on other media of information available in those countries, and, herefore, how far it would be possible with their help and consent to reduce the expenditures of these centers and increase the number of centers in countries where there is urgent need and an urgent demand.

We are very glad to know that in consultation with the panel of advisers a decision has been taken to curtail the time and the frequency of unrelayed broadcasts. In principle, we are at one

with the Secretary General in upholding his obligations to "make available" to all the peoples of the world information on the United Nations, but in actual practice availability cannot justify a very large outlay of expenditure, when the results are not only in doubt, but also are known to be positively nil. While we have no objection to a symbolic weekly broadcast we do feel that a greater part of this \$92,000 dollars could be more usefully utilized in more urgent, effective, purposeful and necessary directions. In fact the radio programs of the United Nations have become so important and so popular, and offer such a wide scope for effective and economical source in underdeveloped countries, that within the Audio-Visual field itself the savings effected by these unrelayed broadcasts, could be utilized for reaching more usefully and more frequently the less informed people of the world.

Speaking of the media available to the Secretary General, use is being made of radio, films, press, publications, televisions visual aids like photographs, maps, charts, exhibits, etc. and human sources. The time has come and we hope our new under-Secretary will undertake a thorough study to determine, by what priorities, in what manner and to what extent, these media should be most suitably employed to obtain maximum effectiveness at minimum cost. I am reminded of the story of a top public relations man who was once commissioned by his big business interests to secretly find out, whether in the budget of the year, new duties were being proposed, if so on what main commodities and to what extent. A code was established, whereby each major commodity was given a name like 'Brown', 'Smith', 'Jack', or 'Henry'. The rate of the proposed duty was to be indicated by selecting a town nearest to the 'duty' rate in mileage. For example if 'Smith' indicated Cement, and the duty was 2% the town selected would be 250 miles

320

from New York, and the cable was to read 'Smith Going Washington'. The Public Relations officer was very successful in his mission and discovered from a very secret source that the ministry of Finance contemplated levying duties on practically all the commodities in his list, but he could not find the rate of duty. He, however, cabled to his principals as follows : "Smith

Brown, Jack, Henry all Going-not known where. The availability of all these media is one thing, their appropriate and most effective and economical use is quite another. In the programs that are planned we would like to know where Smith, Brown, Jack and Henry are going. In this connection, Mr. Chairman, I cannot do better than to quote some of the observations of the Expert Committee in Document A/3928 on Page 5 where it says in Para 12 : "The Department of Public Information should keep under continuous review the extent to which an informed understanding of the organization's aims and activities is being created by existing information media and by its own services." A reference needs also to be made to another observation in Para 4 on the same page "in the use of media and methods due regards should be paid to the relative importance which may vary in different parts of the world and from time to time." The Expert Committee further suggests where appropriate it (OPI) should seek to finance production by means of revenue producing and self-liquidating projects."

Lastly, Mr. Chairman, the observation in para 11 "in the interest of efficiency and economy there should be coordination of information policy between and, wherever practical, common information services for the United Nations and the specialized agencies.

These, Mr. Chairman, are pertinent and well considered observations of experts and have a considerable bearing on the observations, I have made earlier.

The last observation has a bearing on some phases of our television projects. At a time when the United Nations expenditure is rising steeply and when funds are needed for providing even elementary and basic information facilities in under-developed areas, any substantial expenditure outlay on T.V. projects is like offering cakes in one area while there is shortage of bread in many others. Without going into details, since the Expert Committee discussed some aspects of this question in sufficient details with the department, we feel confident that the T.V. projects of OPI should be so planned that television becomes in due course not only a self-liquidating but even a revenue producing project.

We have noted with satisfaction that it is intended to produce the U.N. Review on a paper and in a size which may lend to cheaper and prompter dispatch to various parts of the world. We may, however, observe in passing that the under-Secretary and his colleagues will need to reorientate its contents if it has to serve the purpose for which it is ostensibly intended. As it is, and without being over-critical, it creates the impression of a cross between Harpers Bazaar, the Readers Digest, and a quarterly report of the Council of Pacific Relations. It is also one of those projects which should be self-liquidating, if not revenue producing, to justify their continued existence.

Mr. Chairman, I have taken the time of the committee to recapitulate some of the views, observations and suggestions made in this committee from time to time, since the Expert Committee's report was published, because we have the advantage this year of addressing the new under-Secretary and of creating between him and ourselves a basis of common understanding.

I have also been encouraged in making some remarks which might seem critical because we are pleased to find the Secretary General considerably responsive to the views expressed in this committee in relation to the OPI as is evidenced by this year's report of the Secretary General. We have made these observations because we fervently desire that the initiative and the courage the Secretary General and I believe, Mr. Tavaris de Sa have displayed should be continued in full measure in the planning of program and priorities. May be, as they suggest, on a two year basis.

I can assure Mr. Tavaris that he inherits an excellent machinery for operations, although in certain spheres there are still some very heavy cobwebs which require to be removed to gear it to its great objective "bringing to the people of the world an understanding of the U.N. with greatest effectiveness at minimum cost." To sum up we feel that while the OPI should stabilize for the immediate two year period its budget at five million, it is large enough if appropriately and judiciously and economically spent to offer basic information facilities to all the developed and under-developed countries of the world. Additionally through the cooperation of the different agencies of the U.N. governments concerned and existing media of mass information

it should be also possible to sustain the higher level of understanding reached in the advanced countries.

321

It is our view that the facilities available for direct coverage by representatives of the press at headquarters, at Geneva, and the various centers should not only be maintained but should be considerably increased to meet the requirements of the increased membership in the U.N.

Planning should be an essential part of OPI activities, and in this, and in the laying down of priorities in terms of the need for regional service the panel of advisers should be freely consulted.

We feel that so far as basic approach is concerned greatest reliance should be placed on available media of mass contact in the advanced countries and on Audio-Visual media in general.

There is urgent need for more centers whether operating independently or as integral parts of other U.N. agencies in addition to the six centers that are already contemplated, and funds should be found by applying a process of priorities even to existing programs and projects to meet the pressing and essential need.

We support the view expressed by several other delegations that one such source should be available if unrelayed broadcast are suspended.

My delegation has no serious objection, in fact we welcome, any fresh project of extension of existing operations which may be planned between the OPI for the purpose of Public Information whether in cooperation with governments concerned, with commercial media, or any other means not involving extra expenditure or of a self-liquidating character, to add to the effectiveness of the work of the department. There is great deal of evidence in the expert committee's report, in some of the statements made by the Secretary General in his report Docu. A/4429 to afford us the hope that these additional sources of creating wider understanding of the U. N. including the human element represented by non-governmental organizations can progressively lead to fruitful results.

INDIA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC USA GREECE AFGHANISTAN INDONESIA TUNISIA JAPAN

Date : Nov 01, 1960

Volume No

1995

INDIA IN THE UNITED NATIONS

Shri B. K. Nehru's Statement in Economic Committee on Capital Development Fund

Shri B.K. Nehru, India's Commissioner General for Economic Affairs in Washington, and Member, Indian Delegation to the United Nations, made a statement in the Economic Committee of the General Assembly on the accelerated flow of capital and technical assistance to the developing countries, on November 28, 1960.

The following is the text of the statement:

Mr. Chairman :

It gives me great pleasure in introducing, on behalf of the co-sponsors, the resolution dealing with the accelerated flow of capital and technical assistance to developing countries contained in document A/C. 2/L. 474. I understand, Mr. Chairman, that the first effect of the circulation of this draft resolution was to cause the treasuries in many capitals of the world to have fits. I trust that having had time to study the terms and implications of this draft resolution treasuries are slightly less alarmed than they were when they first read it ; that, after the explanation I propose to submit in the course of my statement today, such doubts as may have remained in their minds will be completely removed and telegrams will start pouring into this building instructing all delegations enthusiastically to support it. This resolution is neither dangerous nor radical, nor visionary, nor impractical ; having been for the most part of my life a treasury official myself-and being consequently imbued with the moderation and conservatism which is the hallmark of all treasuries-I could hardly have been entrusted by my fellow co-sponsors with the

task of piloting this resolution if it did have any of the qualities I have referred to.

But before I go on to explain what the aims and objectives of this resolution are and how they are sought to be achieved, I should like to make clear what this resolution does not deal with. It does not deal with, firstly, the duties and obligations of the developing countries themselves. It is clear to all of us that the primary responsibility for economic development lies, and must always continue to lie, on the countries which seek economic development and that, unless they are prepared themselves to put forth for the cause the maximum possible sacrifice which their people are capable of undertaking, they lose the right, to that extent to claim the assistance of peoples and institutions beyond their own borders. I said so in my intervention in the general debate and the truth of this statement is so universally accepted that it is hardly necessary to go on repeating it. This resolution does not deal, secondly, with the many other factors which prevent the under-developed countries from helping themselves. It does not deal with the obstacles that are placed in the way of the exports of the underdeveloped countries, whether these exports are primary products or manufactured

322

goods, by the highly industrialised nations which have no justification at all in the modern world for continuing their policies of protection. It does not deal with fluctuations in the prices of primary commodities, nor with the worsening terms of trade with which many developing countries are faced. These are matters dealt with in other resolutions and need not take up our time in the discussion of the document before us. Thirdly, this draft resolution does not deal with the distribution to individual under-developed countries of the increased quantum of financial and technical assistance that may be made available to the under-developed countries if the recommendations contained in it are acted upon by the economically advanced States. There is no mention in it of the principles that should be followed in the distribution of economic and technical assistance, nor is there any suggestion that individual countries should increase their aid to some particular group or type of country and not to others. It is well known that the present pattern of the distribution of economic aid

makes no economic sense whatever; but this is a problem that this resolution does not deal with.

The premises on which this resolution is founded are two-fold. Granted that the under-developed countries are doing all in their power to develop themselves, granted also that the obstacles in the way of their helping themselves may be removed altogether or reduced as far as possible, there remains the admitted fact that these countries cannot develop at a rate which is either acceptable to themselves or which can ensure the peace and tranquillity of the world without a large inflow into them of external capital and external technical assistance. The first premise on which this resolution is founded is that this inflow of capital and technical assistance, while it has undoubtedly been increasing in the past, is wholly inadequate for the purpose sought to be achieved and that, therefore, it should be increased to a level more commensurate with the needs of the situation. What that level is difficult to determine in absolute terms without detailed economic surveys of every country in the world. But from the best estimates available, it would appear, as I said in my intervention in the general debate, that capital inflows from the developed countries of about \$ 7 billion per annum would be required and could be absorbed. The present rate of net capital inflow is slightly more than half of this rate. It is, therefore, the objective of this resolution that external assistance should be increased to somewhere around double the present figures.

The second premise on which this resolution is founded is that the burden should be shared as equitably as possible by all the people of the world. It is clear that every dollar raised by the people of the under-developed countries themselves represents a sacrifice in human terms infinitely greater than a dollar raised in the richer countries. If we were to carry the argument of equity to its logical conclusion, the entire burden of developing those parts of the earth which are not yet developed would fall on the people who live in those parts which are. The sponsors of this resolution do not, however, subscribe to this abstract idea of equity. All that they are endeavouring to do in this resolution is to suggest a method of sharing inter se that very small part of the total burden which we think should legitimately fall on the developed countries. We believe

that the fairest method of sharing the burden is for it to be distributed in proportion to the capacity of those who are to share it. This means obviously that the rich must bear a longer burden than the poor and we believe that the best statistical method of determining who is rich and who is poor is the national income corrected for the per capita income.

Coming now to the actual terms of the resolution themselves, the preambular portion of it hardly needs any explanation. The kernel of the resolution is contained in the first operative paragraph which calls upon "all economically advanced States to ensure as a matter of continuing national policy that the total annual net outflow of funds from their own countries for promoting the economic development of the under-developed States is increased to and maintained at a level not below approximately one per cent of their national income". This is a call not for study, not for consultation or consideration or deferment through the appointment of a committee, but for action. On this point, let me make it clear, the sponsors of this resolution can accept no compromise.

We have had for many years the acceptance of the idea that the flow of funds to the developed countries should be increased. We have never, at least in the General Assembly, attempted to indicate the order of magnitude of the funds that we believe should be made available for the purposes of economic development. The result has been that very often thinking on this subject has deteriorated to orders of magnitude which, in the light of the urgent tasks to be performed, can only be described as ludicrous. Partly for this reason and partly because the attention of the United Nations has been largely focussed on the activities related to economic development of the United Nations Organization

323

itself-and these activities are a very small portion of the totality of activities carried on in this field even at present-enormously rich, very well-meaning, honest and generous nations have come to believe that they are really playing their proper part in this great task whereas, when a comparison is made between the resources they make available for this purpose to the total resources available to them, the proportion is so miserably low that

their own people might be somewhat hesitant to mention it. What we are attempting to do in the first operative paragraph is to set a norm against which the performance of all developed countries can be judged. For the fixation of that norm, we feel that a minimum of one per cent is wholly defensible as not casting, on the one hand, an undue burden on the developed countries while, on the other, making sufficient funds available to the developing countries for their immediate needs. However, it will be observed that the word "approximately" has been used in this resolution and the reason for not being rigid about the figure is to allow those countries whose gross national income may be large, but whose per capita income may relatively not be very great, to reduce their contributions below those of the countries whose per capita incomes are high. The idea of one-per-cent contribution for this purpose is a new idea for the General Assembly but it is, by no means, new to those who have taken an interest in this problem over the years. The one-per-cent figure has been discussed in various forums in the United States; it is, I believe, the official policy of one political party in the United Kingdom; it has been endorsed by a large number of political parties on the Continent of Europe and very influential persons throughout the world-and in the developed countries in particular-have given their support to this idea. Furthermore, when the developed countries state what they have been doing in this field, they invariably relate it, quite naturally, to their national income. The distinguished representative of France in this Committee stated that France had been devoting 1.39 per cent of her national income for this purpose. The United Kingdom has published a white paper which purports to show that the comparable figure for that country is 1.5 per cent. I understand that the Government of the United States claims that its performance is over one per cent. If these figures are right, I have not the slightest doubt that at least these three countries who are, according to themselves, already acting up to the exhortation contained in this resolution will vote for it enthusiastically if only in order to urge other countries who are in a position to share the burden to help them in sharing it. I would only say at this point that the claims made by various countries cannot always be taken as wholly correct because analysis shows that a large number of deductions must be made from figures put out by national organizations before a

reliable figure for the net outflow of funds for promoting the economic development of the under-developed countries can be determined,

This brings me to the loopholes which have been deliberately included in the resolution itself in order that my colleagues in the treasuries of the world might be able to instruct their delegations here to vote for it with hearts less heavy than they might otherwise have been. I propose to point them all out so that the task of those seeking avenues of escape will become easier. We are not against people escaping from their obligations if they are not willing to shoulder them but are only desirous of it being recognised that an escape is being effected. First of all let us be quite clear that this resolution does not propose any kind of compulsory levy on any body. We propose only to urge, to make a recommendation. If sovereign States disagree with it, they will be quite as free as they are now to disregard it. However, the wording of the resolution itself offers certain avenues of escape even if the principle is accepted. The first is the phrase "national income". It is open to the developed countries to interpret it as the gross national product, as we would like it to be interpreted, or as the net national income. If they wish to relate their contributions to their net national incomes, it will also be open to them to argue about what deductions should or should not be made from the gross national product to arrive at the somewhat less clear notion of the net national income. The second-and very major.-avenue of escape is in defining what a net outflow of funds is. Should interest payments, dividends and profits be deducted or not be deducted from the gross outflow of funds? Should retained profits be regarded as an additional outflow? Should commercial export credits be included in capital outflows? Thirdly, what constitutes funds for economic development? What proportion, if any, of the value of surplus disposal programmes are to be regarded as funds for economic development? Are funds spent for defence support, which by definition are meant to counteract the increased economic burden arising out of non-developmental defence expenditures, to be regarded or not to be regarded as funds for economic development? On all these subjects, there can be, and I am sure will be, great argument and in the presentation of their figures developed States will undoubtedly wish to interpret all of the

doubtful points in their own favour. These matters the formulation of this resolution leaves deliberately in the air in the hope that when the first reports

324

come in under the last operative paragraph of this resolution, the General Assembly, or a body of experts, will give some guidance in regard to them to the Secretary-General and to member States.

The second operative paragraph of this resolution make it clear that while we desire that as much as possible of the funds to be made available should be channelled through the United Nations and its specialised agencies, we are not exclusively wedded to this particular channel for the flow of funds. What this resolution is basically interested in is in increasing the quantum of that flow through all the channels that are capable of being used. The channels through which each country makes available the funds that it wishes to make available are, again, left to the choice of the country providing the funds. This resolution, apart from indicating a preference, does not prescribe that only public or only private channels should be used or that only bilateral or only multilateral or only international arrangements should be employed. What it does say, however, is that the funds should be made available in a manner so as not to bear heavily on the future balance of payments of the less developed countries; and this phraseology when converted into more direct language means that this capital should be made available either as grants or loans repayable in local currencies or long-term low-interest bearing loans. It does not favour short-term and medium-term credits nor export credits which generally are short-term in nature.

The third operative paragraph has reference to the lack in most countries of organizations, whether public or private, to ensure the flow of funds envisaged in the first paragraph. Many countries have export credit organizations which they are now endeavouring to use for the transference of funds to underdeveloped countries. But these organizations, having been created not for the transference of capital but for the promotion of exports, find it very difficult to modify their thinking and their practice and are sometimes prevented by law from doing so-to

meet the requirements of the situation with which they are now being called upon to deal. Some countries do have specific organizations created for this very purpose and the object of this paragraph is to point out to all States that the achievement of the objectives of the resolution may very well be nullified by the absence of proper laws and proper organizations within their own countries. This is not a theoretical point at all for those of us who have endeavoured to effect such transfers of capital from countries which are honestly prepared to effect them have found, to our dismay, that while the will is there the lack of an organization through which the will can be executed has prevented our common objective from being achieved.

As this resolution deals also with the outflow of private capital, I should like to make mention of some of the obstacles which exist, not on the side of the receiving countries-for they have over the years been well-publicized and well-discussed-but on the side of the supplying countries themselves. It is now generally recognised that the profit differential, if any, between the underdeveloped countries and the developed countries is not large enough to compensate the private capitalist from undertaking the risk and the trouble, and subjecting himself to the uncertainties and other trials, of investment in an underdeveloped country. Consequently, though there are large outflows of capital from developed countries, they all tend to go to countries where the social need for them is the Least but where the conditions for private investment are the best because those countries are already developed, and being developed are stable and secure. Australia, Canada, the United Kingdom and the European Common Market all draw large amounts of American capital. The United Kingdom and Europe invest in the United States. But there is little investment in the countries which need the capital most because, apart from the normal business risks of a venture, which in the underdeveloped countries are often greater than in the developed ones, the capitalist is always afraid of the dual risk of the expropriation of his investment through a change of government and of his inability to remit back to his home country his profits, his dividends and his capital. If those countries which would like to rely as much as they possibly can on exports of private capital are desirous of increasing these exports and of thus reducing the burden on

their tax-payers, they have to take certain legal steps which, in effect, consist of a guarantee by their own government against the risks of expropriation and non-convertibility.

Similarly, many under-developed countries can be helped enormously to raise at least part of their requirements from the capital markets of those countries which have such markets, if the additional disadvantages which they have in these highly competitive environments are removed through governmental action. It is obvious that the newer countries have in the capital markets of the world not enough credit standing to be able to float public issues, for markets, like bankers, like to lend to the rich and not to the poor. The risk which the market takes in lending to a foreign

325

government is basically the possibility of the inconvertibility of the monies that are due to it in the way of interest and amortization. This is a genuine risk which is too great for the individual investor to take and if market funds are to be used for this purpose, the developed countries must evolve a system of guaranteeing the convertibility of market issues by foreign governments. This would undoubtedly mean a contingent liability on the tax-payer of the developed countries but from that point of view a contingent liability is always better than an actual one.

The final paragraph is simple enough and requests the Secretary-General to report annually to the General Assembly on the progress made towards the objectives of this resolution. What the sponsors of this resolution have in mind is a short report ending up in a very simple table. The columns of this final table would indicate the gross national product, the net national income, wherever available, the gross outflow of funds during the year divided into public and private outflows itemising each kind of flow (indicating, for example, how much went in by way of surplus disposals or of defence support), the gross inflow of funds whether in cash or in kind from the under-developed countries, the net outflow of funds, a deduction from this net outflow for that portion of the funds which do not provide funds for economic development, a net figure for the net inflow of funds provided for this purpose and the percentage which this last figure bears to the gross national product or the net

national income. We would trust and hope that in compiling this report the Secretary-General will have the full cooperation of the developed countries as well as the under-developed ones. Some of the information required for this purpose is already contained in the two reports of the Secretary-General dealing with the international flow of public and private capital. What we suggest is that for the purpose of this resolution those reports be shortened, simplified, amalgamated into one to be presented annually and contain as the end result of all this effort a simple statement of the kind that I have indicated.

I shall now deal with two specific questions which have arisen during the course of informal discussions on this draft resolution. We have been asked why we treat the whole developed world on the same basis and apply a flat one per cent rate both to the colonial powers, who have benefited from the exploitation of their colonies and have left them all economically underdeveloped, as well as to those powers which have not possessed any colonies and, therefore, have not gained any economic advantage from them. Is it not right and proper, it is argued, that those who have for long periods of time derived economic benefit from the possession of colonies now be required to bear a greater share for their rehabilitation and development than the others? The argument has validity; but the reasons why we have not attempted to distinguish one economically advanced State from another has, in the view of co-sponsors of the resolution, greater validity. It is true and undeniable that the possession of colonies has been of immense material benefit to the colonial powers. Many historians have held that the Industrial Revolution in the United Kingdom and subsequently on the Continent of Europe could not have been financed had it not been for the Rape of Bengal. The part that was played by the inflow of gold from South America into Europe earlier is even better known. But on the other hand, it must be remembered that the colonialists were not the only people who benefited from this exploitation. The wealth that was directly transferred to the colonial power was used indirectly for the economic development of many parts of the world including those which have never been and are not now colonial powers. If we were fully to investigate the many labyrinths of history, we would come up with very strange discoveries. Further, we the ex-colonics are on the whole not

revanchists and would prefer to let the dead past bury itself. Furthermore, as I have explained earlier, this resolution leaves it entirely open to each individual advanced country to apply its funds to the country or countries of its choice. We hope and believe that the ex-colonial powers will themselves, recognising their responsibilities, direct at least a substantial part of the funds made available by them under this resolution to their own ex-colonies. Similarly, non-colonial countries would be wholly free to devote their funds exclusively to areas-and there are many such-which have never been colonies.

Another point that has been raised is the situation of the so-called capital importing countries. It is argued that a country which is importing capital for its own development can hardly be expected to export capital for the development of others. This argument forgets that the state of development reached by these capital importing countries is already in many cases such as to place them among the richest countries in the world. The argument is tantamount to a man who has an income of a million dollars a year, and who is borrowing \$20 million in order to increase his income to two million dollars a year, suggesting to the income-tax authorities that he is too poor to pay his taxes because of the state of his indebtedness. This argument is so weak that I trust it will not be made before this highly.

326
sophisticated assembly.

I regret, Mr. Chairman, that I have spoken at such length in introducing this resolution but the sponsors of it regard it as of great importance. Several distinguished representatives have complained that the resolutions before this Committee have contained no new idea and the discussion and debate has generally been on the form of words in which the old ideas have once again been expressed. The sponsors of this resolution feel that the idea in this resolution, although by no means a new idea in many influential quarters in the world, is new to the General Assembly. They believe that the establishment of a norm against which performance can be judged will be of immense benefit not only to the underdeveloped countries by increasing the totality of funds made available to them but also to those developed countries who have hitherto borne a

larger share of the burden of this task than others who are today in a position to do so. I would, therefore, commend this resolution to this Committee for unanimous adoption.

INDIA USA RUSSIA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC FRANCE AUSTRALIA CANADA

Date : Nov 01, 1960

Volume No

1995

INDIA IN THE UNITED NATIONS

Shri C. D. Pande's Statemet in Special Political Committee on Palestine Refugees

Shri C. D. Pande, Member, Indian Delegation to the United Nations-, made the following statement in the Special Political Committee on the problem of the Palestine Refugees on November 28, 1960 :

Mr. Chairman

It is indeed tragic that, for the twelfth successive year. we are considering the problem of the Palestine refugees. The problem remains unresolved till this day and the total number of refugees is now 1,120,889. According to the report of the Director of the United Nations Relief and Works Agency, the refugee population is growing at the rate of over 30,000 a year.

"The lot of the refugees during this long period of dependence on relief says the Director, "has been one of hardship and disappointment. The relief afforded by UNRWA, though indispensable, has been a strict minimum dictated by budgetary limitations beyond the Agency's control, Opportunities for living normal independent lives have been non-existent for the majority of the refugees, and their life of enforced idleness, now in its thirteenth year, his inevitably affected their outlook and morale".

The outlook for the future seems to hold no

brighter prospects. Here is another description by the Director which is worth quoting. He says :

"There are now almost one half million refugees whose age is sixteen years or under. In addition, another 35,000 are now being born per year.....It is these young people whose plight is the most distressing of any. Intellectually they are as receptive to learning as are young people elsewhere in the world. The danger for the future inherent in the build up of an increasingly large body of unskilled and therefore unemployed, restless and frustrated youth needs no emphasis".

The problem, therefore, is of first magnitude and my delegation is painfully aware of the fact that, although it is the result of a decision taken by the United Nations, this Organization has so far failed to solve it. It was a decision taken with eyes wide open and the United Nations cannot, therefore, at any time be absolved from primary responsibility for it. In the circumstances, the Palestine refugees must with justification look to this Organization for support and an adequate and just solution.

By its resolution No. 302 (IV) of December 8, 1949, the General Assembly established the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees (a) to carry out, in collaboration with local Governments, the direct relief and works programmes as recommended by the economic survey mission for the Middle East; and (b) to consult with the interested Near Eastern Governments concerning measures to be taken by them, preparatory to the time when international assistance for relief and works is no longer available.

It is in accordance with paragraph 21 of this resolution that the Director presents an annual report and we have now before us his report for the period 1 July 1959 to 30 June 1960. My delegation has studied the report with the care it deserves and would like to associate itself with the other delegations which have paid tribute to the work carried out by the Agency under the leadership of its able Director. The report is not only a factual document written in an objective

manner, but one which reveals both great insight into the real nature of the problem and value for the human considerations which must weigh in

327

seeking an adequate and early solution of it.

The programme outlined to improve elementary and secondary education, vocational training facilities, doubling the number of university scholarships and placing the loans and grants programme, is commendable. But the Director reports :

"Presently, UNRWA is offering full vocational training to 300 refugee youths per Near. The inadequacy of this rate of training is apparent when one considers that more than 15,000 refugee boys and 15,000 refugee girls now attain maturity each year and that during the past twelve years over 300,000 such persons have grown to adulthood."

With the limited resources at the disposal of the Director, the programme naturally cannot be as effective as it should be. Even if it had larger funds, however, UNRWA could not be and is not expected to solve the problem which is essentially political. The idea, wherever it may exist, that it can be settled through larger funds or by compensation alone, however generous, appears to be unreal or based upon wishful thinking or an attempt to avoid the real issue.

The right to return to one's home is an elementary right. That the desire and hope also exist is natural. Let us see what the Director says about this :

"In their minds", he says, "the promise made in paragraph I I of General Assembly resolution 194 (111), passed in December 1948 and reaffirmed annually thereafter, continues to be the one acceptable long-term solution to their problem and they are embittered because it still stands unfulfilled".

This paragraph reads

"The General Assembly

Resolves that the refugees wishing to return to their homes and live at peace with their neighbours should be permitted to do so at the earliest practicable date and that compensation should be paid for the property of those choosing not to return and for loss of or damage to property which, under principles of international law or in equity, should be made good by the Governments or authorities responsible".

As long ago as December 1948, the General Assembly, debating this problem which was new then, recognized the right of repatriation and made it clear that compensation went hand in hand with the offer of choice to return home and only if the offer was not accepted. While compensation was occasionally offered, although with many qualifications and ungenerously and it is now being tied up with other countervailing conditions, the choice on which it was essentially based was never offered and has so far, in fact, been denied. My delegation believes that if the General Assembly's resolution had been implemented during the early stages of the problem, Israel herself would have found it easier, and, as a consequence much of the bitterness and animosity that has been created by its prolongation would not have been there. To-day it is an open sore and threatens the peace and stability of the area as a whole.

The General Assembly's resolution to which I have referred above also created a Conciliation Committee charged with the task of facilitating the repatriation, resettlement and economic and social rehabilitation of the refugees and the payment of compensation. There have been years during this period when the Conciliation Committee has hardly worked, owing to no fault of its own, and its reports show that it has not made much progress during the last twelve years. Its latest report for the period 1 September 1959 to 11 November 1960, however, shows that it was able to direct

its efforts principally to the programme of identification and valuation of Arab refugee immovable property holdings in Israel and the release of Arab refugee bank accounts and safe deposits blocked in Israel.

In its paragraph 3, the report says

"As the identification of Arab individual holdings in Israel is now practically complete, the work of valuation has commenced both in urban areas and in rural districts".

This is welcome information and my delegation is happy that the Conciliation Committee has met with the co-operation of the Government of Israel with regard to this necessary process of identification and valuation.

It seems inevitable that the United Nations Relief and Works Agency should continue its work in the meantime. In this regard, my

328

delegation is in full agreement with the Director when he says :

"It appears certain that some responsibility for international assistance will continue for a decade or longer. Not to recognize this fact and act accordingly would without doubt prove far more expensive than to provide such assistance in an appropriate and timely manner. The Palestine refugee problem has a bearing on the stability and peace of the Middle East and hence on the stability and peace of the world. It is in this broad context that the Director requests the General Assembly to make its decision".

I would be failing in my duty if I did not acknowledge the measure of appreciation which is due to the countries which have made generous contributions to UNRWA. To its fund we have also been making a modest contribution and, this year, we have pledged to make a contribution. We would have liked to participate in it far more fully, but, as the Committee is aware, we ourselves are faced with a refugee problem which is nearly ten times as large as the Palestine refugee problem. We are still engaged in efforts to provide the vast masses of people uprooted from their homes with a fresh start, adequate occupations and new homes.

Mr. Chairman, the problem of Palestine refugees needs to be dealt with now, while time is still on our side, in a more earnest manner than hitherto. The United Nations has to give a lead, and it should not be beyond Arab and Israeli statesmanship to endeavour to resolve it reasonably and justly in order to arrive at a solution which would be in the best interests of over a million people uprooted from their homes. It is true that the problem forms part of a wider question but the lives of so many people can hardly await final solutions. Meanwhile, the question of offer of choice of repatriation needs to be settled urgently. All the refugees may or may not accept to go back. It is clear that the circumstances in Israel are not the same as when they left and, in any case, these going back will be expected, in terms of the United Nations Resolutions, to live at peace with their neighbours. But these are matters which will arise for consideration only when the offer of the choice is made.

It is important in this context that a more active role should be played by the Conciliation Committee. There have been suggestions made for the expansion of the Committee. Whether it is expanded or re-constituted or left as it is, there is no doubt that, apart from what different Member States may do jointly or separately for helping to expedite a reasonable and just solution of the problem, the Conciliation Committee should take the matter up at the earliest possible moment of the offer of choice and ascertainment of the wishes of the refugees.

:: O : : --

INDIA USA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC ISRAEL

Date : Nov 01, 1960

Volume No

1995

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

Prime Minister's Statement in Lok Sabha Initiating Debate on Foreign Affairs

Initiating the debate on foreign affairs in the Lok Sabha on November 22, 1960, the Prime Minister, Shri Jawaharlal Nehru said

Mr. Speaker, Sir, I beg to move:

"That the International situation, with particular reference to the matters that are before the United Nations General Assembly in its current session, be taken into consideration."

At the beginning of the session of Parliament, a very large number of questions were sent to me relating to my visit to New York for the purpose of attending this current session of the U.N. General Assembly. I thought that it would be more convenient to the House and more profitable to me if we could have rather a debate on this subject instead of my making just a statement of my visit there, on what I saw and did there. Therefore, in this particular debate, although there is no limit to any subject which might be mentioned --that is in your discretion--it is particularly intended, I take it, and it is so mentioned in this motion, that we should deal with the important matters that have come up in the current session of the General Assembly of the United Nations.

When the question of my going to New York for this purpose arose, I was at first rather reluctant to do so, partly because it was not very easy for me to leave India because of the stress of work here and I was not quite convinced at

329

the time that my going would serve any useful purpose. But in the balance, I decided to go and I am glad that I did so. Indeed, soon after I got there, I realised that it was very much worthwhile, my visit to this session. Now looking back, I feel still more convinced that it was a right step to take for a variety of reasons.

Among those reasons are, it was helpful to have a more intimate knowledge for me of the inner working of the United Nations, something which it is difficult to get from reading reports, however full they might be, to see the various pressures and pulls at work there and the way people's minds work. Secondly, there were

a large number of eminent personalities from the newly independent States of Africa and it was a privilege to meet them, to get to know them and to discuss matters with them. Thirdly, this session of the General Assembly was rather unique, because it attracted a very considerable number of heads of Governments, heads of Nations and heads of States. Naturally, when so many of these eminent persons were present there, in a sense it gave a special look to the Assembly and a special authority to the Assembly and it was a chance for meeting them and discussing matters with them.

Now, much has appeared in the public press about the proceedings and Hon. Members must have noticed how often the tempers and temperatures rose rather high and from that, perhaps, to some extent, they may have even overlooked the basic issues at stake, because the public mind looks at incidents more, because they stand out, than the exact issues at stake. I am sure, lion. Members of this House are well acquainted with these major issues ; I am referring to the general public. There were the unfortunate incidents and there was the language used which, I am glad to say, we are not used to in this House. But the fact is that this General Assembly session was considering and is considering some matters of the most vital importance to the future of the world.

We have a number of our own problems, some serious, which trouble us and yet I would venture to say that the basic problems to which I am going to refer, world problems, are far more important than any particular State's individual problems. In fact, in a larger sense, they are governed by what happens to the basic world problems.

Among the more important issues that have come up before the General Assembly of the United Nations, there have been, first of all, disarmament; secondly, the position in Africa and more specially in the Congo ; thirdly, the structure of the United Nations and, fourthly, the broad question of colonialism. All these problems in a greater or lesser degree have been before us, there is nothing new in them, but at this particular juncture they came with a certain element of, well, push in them and importance and vitality which shook people's minds

Disarmament, of course, is a matter to which

we have always attached the greatest importance and on many an occasion our delegation in the United Nations, or sometimes even in this House speaking in this House during the past few years, put forward certain proposals. Always our attempt has been, whenever we put forward such proposals, not to propose something which may be idealistically right in our opinion. but rather something which fits in with the situation of the day ; that is, our approach has been partly idealistic-we shall never forget that aspect, but, nevertheless, realistic, not merely to express our views in strong language and criticise others but rather to put forward something which we think is feasible. and we have tried, therefore, to win over or to produce something which is likely to be acceptable, if not hundred per cent, very largely so.

This question of disarmament was considered in its particular aspect of nuclear weapons, weapons of mass slaughter and its broader aspect too, and we have made various proposals from time to time. Now, a situation has arisen, or is arising, when perhaps an even greater urgency comes into the picture for a variety of reasons. One is, if nothing effective is done in the course of the next five years, let us say, the next three or four years, I cannot fix time limit-if nothing effective is done in regard to effective disarmament, it may be that it may become too late to deal with it, that it may become almost impossible to control the situation. So far as nuclear weapons are concerned, some kind of advance is being made almost from day to day, or from month to month, some little thing, making these weapons more powerful, more dangerous and, what is more important, easier to make, relatively easier to make. Once this spreads to many countries, it is obvious that it will become exceedingly difficult to make all of them agree or to have any effective disarmament or any effective machinery of control. Therefore, something has got to be done before we pass this point of no return in disarmament, because there might well be a point of no return when we have gone too far and atomic and nuclear booms and the rest spread out, either by the fact that

330

they are manufactured by all the countries or, as is often suggested, by a lavish disposal of them to other countries.

Only this morning-I think it was this morning-I read in the newspapers a suggestion of the Commander of the NATO forces that nuclear weapons should be distributed to all the NATO countries, which means quite a number. Now, I do not wish to challenge the good motives of any country, but it is obvious that if, in addition to the four countries that have some kind of nuclear weapons today, a dozen more are added to it, the difficulty of dealing with the situation becomes infinitely greater and if, as is expected by eminent scientists, the process of manufacturing them becomes simpler and cheaper, relatively simpler and cheaper, then obviously the matter is quite out of hand. Therefore, we have to take action before we pass the point of no return, and therein lies the tremendous urgency of this matter.

Also, when we talk of disarmament we have to consider two or three aspects of it. It is curious that almost all the major countries concerned, and presumably the minor countries too, have agreed broadly, and it is often forgotten what a large measure of agreement there is. Everyone agrees that we want disarmament. I believe everyone agrees ; may be there is some exception on disarmament ; but I would remind this House of the resolution passed by the General Assembly last year, and again another resolution this year, a little earlier, on the necessity of general and complete disarmament, passed unanimously by the General Assembly. That is agreed to. It is also agreed that disarmament must be accompanied by effective controls. Anyhow, that would be desirable and in the state of fear and apprehension and distrust that is all the more desirable. Therefore, disarmament and control have to go together.

There is a curious argument often as to which comes first and which comes second. Obviously, they have to be simultaneous. Countries are not going to agree to disarm without proper controls, and controls coming in without disarmament seems to me rather remarkable, because what does one control? It almost means that armaments may continue under some control. Surely, all that we want is full and complete disarmament and, inevitably, it can only be reached by phases; we cannot change the world overnight. While it can be reached by phases, the objective of full and complete disarmament must be kept.

In any phasing, or in any steps that we might take in regard to this matter, care has to be taken that a certain balance is preserved between the rival groups of nations who fear each other, because if at any time they fear that a step to be taken increases the striking force or the military force of the other group then they will hesitate. Therefore this balancing has to take place.

These are the broad major approaches to these problems and I will submit that there is a very large measure of agreement on this as there is in regard to nuclear weapons also. In spite of that, it is well known that nations argue about this subject. They go on arguing and suspecting each other of some trickery and do not come to an agreement. At present there are various resolutions before the General Assembly in regard to disarmament. Among them is a rather long resolution proposed on behalf of India. I do not propose to go into that here. But by that resolution itself India does not represent, if I may say so, an idealistic approach of what we would like to be done, but a conscious, deliberate attempt to put forward something which approaches as nearly as possible the various viewpoints and brings them together. Even that resolution is not a sacred writ to us. If by some change here and there we can achieve greater success, we shall adopt it.

I shall not say much more about disarmament at this stage. But if the House so wishes, I would suggest that my colleague, the Hon. Defence Minister, who has been leading our delegation in the General Assembly, might speak on this subject latter in this debate and give more precise information as to how matters stand.

The second important subject I mentioned was the question of Africa. Now something has happened in Africa which is of very great importance, of course, but which might be said to be almost one of the turning points in historic processes—this emergence of a large number of countries of Africa becoming independent countries either hundred per cent or maybe somewhat less here and there. But I have no doubt that they will be hundred per cent later even though there might be some limitations at the present moment. In fact, excepting some areas of Africa, the first that comes to my mind is Algeria where

a bitter tragic war has been going on for a long number of years. It is a tragedy of the deepest kind. Vast numbers of people have perished and yet such is the urge for freedom that they continue ; and I have no doubt that they will succeed in achieving it.

Then we come to those parts of Africa which are controlled by Portugal. In this present day

331

world whenever the question of Portugal comes up, we somehow have to move from this century to some past century in the Middle Ages. It is very difficult to discuss these matters unless one is himself capable of going back to that period two or three hundred years ago because although it is not my purpose to interfere in any way or criticise even the ways of any Government, even the Portuguese Government in its homeland, we cannot remain Silent or look on when something happens in their colonial domain.

It is a curious thing to remember now that with these changes that have taken place in regard to colonial territories in Africa and elsewhere-I am not quite sure, but probably today Portugal is the greatest colonial power in the world. It is a remarkable fact. Its colonies which are called provinces of Portugal live in a state of darkness where light does not come at all. We know little about them except some news that escapes. They refuse to submit reports to the United Nations as they ought to as the United Nations has demanded. There is, of course, our own little territory of Goa, a part of India. There are a few other cases in the world where colonies function in a hundred per cent way, some may be in a somewhat lesser degree. On colonialism, I was dealing with Africa first ; I will come to the general question of colonialism later.

In Africa remarkable changes have taken place. Broadly speaking one may look at these changes. There are the changes which have taken place or are likely to take place in a year or two of the territories which are British colonies. Some kind of time-table has been laid down and we hope that it will be adhered to. Then there are the areas which were under French dominion--quite a number of small and big

countries-and some of them belong after independence to what is called the French Community. That is entirely for them to decide.

Then there is this vast area, the Congo, It has occupied so much of our attention. It presents extraordinarily difficult problems. And yet, in spite of the complexity of these problems, one can disentangle them and look at the basic features of the Congo. The first thing that strikes one is the extraordinary state of the Congo when the colonising country, namely, Belgium, left it or apparently left it. Here was a country which just has a total absence-total perhaps is not scientifically an accurate word-of any trained personnel in the country apart from Belgians for every kind of work and everything. Normally this should have created a difficult situation. It did. Even supplying those trained persons to them would have meant tremendous strain on the resources of any country or many countries taken together. No other problem, of course, is there. The United Nations was asked to help. They undertook to help. Quite rightly.

I want to make it quite clear that I think it was a right step for the United Nations to take. Having taken it, they have to go through it because the only alternative to that would be that vacuum being filled by others in an undesirable way. One could not have left that. The only alternative was, may be, internal civil wars and tribal wars egged on by outside agencies : chiefly outside agencies and countries interfering. There was no way out except for the United Nations to go there and take charge of the situation-take charge not in the sense of becoming a ruling authority and converting it into a kind of trust territory, but to give it a proper foundation and base on which to function.

So the U. N. went there. Other difficulties arose then and have been arising all the time. I cannot go into that story. But, I would commend to the House to read the latest report of the U.N. Representative there, Shri Rajeshwar Dayal, I might mention that Shri Rajeshwar Dayal was not sent by us there and was not our choice even. We were not asked to choose. Mr. Hammarskjold, the Secretary General asked us-because he had come into touch with him in Lebanon and New York in the U.N. itself-for the loan of his services. We hesitated because he was doing

important work as our High Commissioner in Karachi.

Nevertheless, we agreed and he went rather at short notice and fell into the middle of this rather steaming cauldron of a situation there. Although he happens to be one of our valued officers whose judgment we trust and we have experience of him, I am not judging him by our past experience. Nor, indeed, is it for me to judge his work there except in so far as we can see it. I may say that during all the time he has been there, we have been practically out of touch with him. He does not report to us. We do not send him instructions though some people imagine that we do. He is an international civil servant, now functioning in a difficult position, reporting to the U.N. He has been sending reports. One of the reports, the second full Report, has been published by the U.N. I have placed a number of copies in the Library here. We did not have copies for every Member. But we have distributed some copies

332

to leaders of parties and groups in this House. I would commend the reading of this report which is an objective survey from a man not only on the spot, but a man responsible for dealing with the situation. That itself will give you some picture of the situation there.

Many facts come out of this. One basic fact is, I regret to say, that the Belgians there have not functioned as, I think, they ought to have functioned. Not only that; after the first few weeks, Belgians who had left in the earlier stages of Independence, returned in considerable numbers to the Congo. This became a heavy flow, not only in those provinces like Katanga, etc., which, of course, are practically completely controlled by Belgians of all types, military, civil, technical and all that, but even in Leopoldville itself, the stream of Belgians returning continues. This House will remember that the Security Council repeatedly said that the Belgians should be made to withdraw. Naturally, the Security Council referred to the military element or the paramilitary element, it could not and it was not referring to the civilians. The military element or at any rate the military people are there still and have gone back there in some numbers. The Government of Belgium apparently says that they

have nothing to do with this business, that these are individual Belgians functioning of their own free will and how can they interfere. Perhaps not, though I should imagine that the Belgian Government, if it disapproves this kind of thing, could and would interfere very rapidly.

I would like to read out one or two brief passages from Mr. Rajeshwar Dayal's report on this subject.

"There is clear evidence of the steady return, in recent weeks, of Belgians to the Congo, and within this framework, of increasing Belgian participation in political and administrative activities whether as advisers, counsellors or executive officials. Belgian military and paramilitary personnel as well as civilian personnel continue to be available to authorities in the Congo, notably in Katanga and South Kasai.

"This steady return, following the precipitate mass departure of last July, may be attributed in part to spontaneous, individual reactions to an improvement in the security factor following the arrival of the United Nations Forces in the Congo, but the magnitude and nature of subsequent developments is difficult to explain in such terms."

Even in the capital city of Leopoldville where the United Nations is having its force,

"Symptomatic of the changing picture is the rise of the Belgian populations in Leopoldville from a low of 4,500 in July to at least 6,000. While a proportion has come back from Brazzaville, the regular Sabena service brings back full loads of passengers."

Here is an interesting fact.

"Soon after a measure of security had been re-established in the Congo, a recruiting agency for the Congo was set up in Brussels and supported Leopoldville."

The House will notice the organised way

this was done and yet, the Belgian Government says, it is individual action.

"One striking illustration has been the recent joint application of 122 candidates from Belgium for posts in the Congolese Judiciary. In this and other cases, there is an implication of considerably more than that individuals are seeking employment solely and directly with the Congolese authorities."

I won't read much more.

"Belgian influence is also seen in the military field. A Belgian colonel, who recently arrived from Brazzaville, acts as an adviser to the Leopoldville Ministry of National Defence, while a former Belgian warrant officer serves as aide de camp to Colonel Mobutu, with the rank of Captain. Thirty-six Congolese have been sent by Colonel Mobutu to Brussels for military training..." and so on,

In Katanga which wants to leave the Congo State,

"In Katanga, Belgian influence is omnipresent. Virtually all key civilian and security posts are either held directly by officials of Belgian nationality or controlled by advisers to recently appointed and often inexperienced Congolese officials." Going to South Kasai, the other trouble some area,

333

"In the so-called "Autonomous State of South Kasai there is also a considerable Belgian presence, The current emphasis there is on warlike preparations directed by a Colonel Crevecoeur, serving in Belgian uniform, and assisted by another Belgian, Colonel Levoux."

In conclusion, Shri Rajeshwar Dayal Says

"From the above data and the general consensus of well informed UNCC officers and from other sources, it may be concluded that a gradual but

purposeful return is being staged by Belgian nationals, which has assumed serious significance in view of the key areas which they have penetrated in the public life of the country..."

Apart from the enormous difficulties that the people of the Congo had to face after the sudden change, you see this deliberate, purposeful continuous coming back, if you like-of the Belgians, mostly previously connected with the Congo, coming back and occupying these offices, a few in the military, maybe, more I do not know, certainly large numbers in every other department of life; and you will find that wherever Belgians are in the greatest numbers, that area is asking for separate Statehood, for separation from the Congo, has a separatist movement. In fact, Belgians are often leading those movements. Now, it is not an unjustifiable assumption for me to make that a part of these troubles at least is due to this Belgian presence, over-increasing presence, and that one of the first things that should be done in the Congo is to carry out firmly and clearly what the Security Council said previously about the Belgians. As I said, they do not talk about the civilians and the rest but only about military and paramilitary formations, but in the circumstances, one can see it is very difficult to draw a line between these. And I feel that in all this argument which is going on there between various groups, a basic fact is this; and a further basic fact is that the Belgian authorities there are supporting the disruptive elements. Apart from the provinces that wish to part company from the State, even in Leopoldville, the so-called Government of Congo that exists today is being pushed hither and thither by Belgians.

Here is this difficulty. We hear about President Kasavubu we hear about Prime Minister Lumumba, we hear about what is called a College of Commissioners, drawn from some young students from the university there, each pulling in a different direction. How can we get hold of this situation ?

One thing is perfectly clear-that there was a Parliament which was elected ; under the basic, fundamental law framed by Belgium, and more or less fashioned after the Belgian Constitution, Parliament was elected; that Parliament appointed President Kasavubu and Prime Minister Lumumba.

Then trouble arose, and a new gentleman appeared on the scene. Col. Mobutu, who had been appointed by Prime Minister Lumumba as Chief of Staff. These are big titles, but actually, most of these gentlemen holding these high titles occupied rather humble positions in their previous career. Col. Mobutu, as far as I know, has no previous experience of military matters or anything. He was probably some kind of a clerk somewhere. Anyhow, he may be a very desirable person for what I know : I have nothing against him. But this Chief of Staff decided to do away with Parliament and the Prime Minister and the rest. He said he was taking charge of the situation and he would not permit Parliament to meet. He tried on various occasions to arrest Mr. Lumumba.

All this is very extraordinary. After all, the one solid thing there is Parliament, and the one fact which is obvious is that Col. Mobutu has no legal, constitutional or any other basis, and yet a still more extraordinary fact is that some countries have supported and encouraged Col. Mobutu in his activities, and very strange activities they have been. His army has been behaving in a totally, not only undisciplined, but wholly irregular way, tooting etc. It was with some difficulty that the UN troops could establish some order in Leopoldville.

At the present moment President Kasavubu is in New York, in the UN Assembly. As President of the State, of course, he is acknowledged, but the question has arisen as to who should represent the Congo State in the United Nations.

Some little time back, maybe a week or ten days back, the Congo question came up before the United Nations in a somewhat different context, in the context of sending a mission of good offices, or a conciliation mission, to the Congo from the UN, on behalf of the UN, consisting of members of countries. which are at present functioning on behalf of the UN in the Congo, about 15 such countries I believe. So far as India is concerned, we have not sent any military forces as such; nevertheless, we have seven or eight hundred personnel there in hospital and other connected works. After much debate it was decided by the UN, a resolution was passed,

should be postponed till this commission returned and reported. Probably it was a good decision, but a few days immediately after, this question was taken up in another way, as to who should represent the Congo in the U.N. for there are different people pulling in different directions, and there are two or three groups of individuals, each wanting to represent it, backed by some party. It is not for me to say which is the stronger party, and which is not, but I do submit that the one thing we must accept is Parliament, and parliament there is an elected Parliament. The first thing that should happen is for that elected Parliament to meet.

In the opinion of some, the standard of parliamentary behaviour may not be good there: that does not matter. Let them meet, because the extra-parliamentary behaviour that we have seen there has been pretty bad. Col. Mobutu, of course, forcibly does not permit this meeting of Parliament, but this kind of thing is tolerated by others, and Col. Mobutu is encouraged certainly by the Belgians there who are often in his staff and all that. Then the blame is cast on the poor Congolese. I have every sympathy for the Congolese, and I am convinced that the Congolese, left to themselves, may break some heads, but they would come to some conclusion and carry on, while now, all these external influences coming in, pulling in different directions, and an element of the cold war coming into this unhappy country, make it difficult for even Parliament to meet.

It is said that Parliament cannot meet because some Members of Parliament may not be able to come. This is extraordinary. Why should they not be able to come? If the U.N. is there in sufficient force, it should guarantee security to Parliament and all its members, whether they come from Katanga or any other place. I am afraid one gets the impression that there is no desire in the minds of some people and some countries for Parliament there to meet, because they do not quite know what Parliament might decide; it might not decide according to their liking. So, they come in the way and encourage these disruptive forces there.

So, I submit that in this matter, the first basic thing is that Parliament should meet. Let them have a new Prime Minister, a new President

if they like, do what they like, and try to come to terms, the U.N. helping them, advising them, others too. And the second basic thing is the less of interference from outside, from any country, the better—primarily it is Belgium, but the other countries also who have occasionally interfered, not so obviously as Belgium, but certainly interfered. These are the two basic things I should like to say.

In about two or three days' time I think day after tomorrow, the Good Offices Commission is going to the Congo on behalf of the United Nations. I wish them success, and I hope they will achieve some success in their work of conciliation; and on their return, the United Nations might be in a better position to deal with this question. We are asked to nominate a member on this commission, and we have selected a Member of this house, Shri Rameshwar Rao, because he has a wide acquaintance with African countries, and we thought that this commission would profit by that experience.

Replying to a question whether the Government of India can do anything to bring order in the Congo out of the chaos that has been created, the Prime Minister said :

I am venturing to do something by expressing the opinion of this Government and this House, I hope, as to what should be done by the United Nations. because this is a matter in which the United Nations is deeply concerned; it is tied up, and we, as members of the United Nations are, therefore, concerned to express our views, to advise, to help and to co-operate with the United Nations.

Then, the third question I mentioned was about the structure of the United Nations. This structure was evolved at San Francisco when the United Nations first came into existence. It was not a very logical structure, but it was something that represented the objective, if I may use the word, conditions of the world then, the play of forces etc.

It is clear that it was not very fair to Asia or Africa; it is clear that the situation has changed since then; it has been progressively changing, and there has been some talk of the structure being also changed. We have felt that this was necess-

ary, but we have not brought it forward or pressed for it, because of this involving, possibly an amendment of the Charter; and that would become a highly controversial issue, and we wanted to avoid that.

But, as things have been developing, now with a large number of African nations coming in, it is obvious that the United Nations structure is out of tune with conditions in the world today in a variety of ways, and something has to be

335

done about it. I should frankly confess to this House that I have no precise proposals as to what should be done, and even if I do, I would rather not put them forward in this way because this kind of thing can be dealt with satisfactorily only by a large measure of agreement. It cannot be done by the cold war technique of voting and out-voting this; of course, voting has to take place, but there has to be a considerable measure of agreement. That is why we do not wish to put forward any precise proposal. But the point is that the United Nations structure is not in tune with the present, the world situation, Africa, Asia and the rest. And this fact is recognised by all countries. It is not that only people from Asia or Africa say that. All the countries, to whatever group they may belong, recognise this fact. All I can say is that I hope this matter will be considered, not in the context of the cold war but rather in the context of reality, and some measures will be evolved.

It is very clear that the United Nations cannot be a merely debating body; it has undertaken a very heavy task, and solved some of the difficult problems. I have no doubt that because of the United Nations, war has been avoided on several occasions, in the past few years. I have no doubt that if the United Nations was not there, this world would be in a perilous state, and we would have had to search for it and build up some such thing. I have often criticised the United Nations for some step or the other with which I did not agree, but I should like to pay my tribute to the United Nations broadly speaking, for the work that it has done, and its able Secretary-General.

So, I shall not say anything about the structure of the United Nations.

Now I come to the fourth problem, that is colonialism in general. As I said, it is true that this is retreating. Nevertheless, what remains of it is troublesome enough, and the sooner this too is made to undergo a sea-change to free countries the better. It is no good postponing the question the way it is being done.

I do not suggest that some overnight change anywhere might take place, but the question has to be taken up and definite decisions should be taken.

These are the four great questions before the United Nations and the world. And many of the conflicts that have arisen in the world, or other conflicts too, are dependent and are connected in some way with these major questions.

Another fact that I should like to bring to the notice of this House is this. Sometimes, people talk about India being a neutral country. I have always said that I do not like the word 'neutral' in this connection. I do not even like, if I may say so with all respect, what is sometimes referred to as 'positive neutrality' in some countries. We are unaligned; we are uncommitted to military blocs; but we are committed to various policies, various urges, various objectives, various principles, very much so. Anyhow, when proposals are being made that we should form some kind of a bloc of so-called neutral countries, I have not taken very kindly to them. I do not like the system of blocs, but of course, we meet, we discuss, we have common thinking, sometimes we have common action, and we co-operate.

In the old days,--by the old days, I mean, three or four or five years ago --the great countries, great and powerful countries, leaders of these big armed blocs used to speak rather slightly of these neutrals who had no moral basis, and who, therefore, sat on a hedge, perched up somewhere, not daring to come down this way or that way. That attitude has changed a great deal. It has changed into one of considerable respect for these countries which are unaligned, and a realisation that whatever may be good for them, this position and this policy, are certainly good for the countries that call themselves unaligned; and now, with a large group from Africa

coming, and more or less also joining this unaligned group, not a formal group, I mean, it has made a big difference; and whether it is in the United Nations or elsewhere, this major fact counts that the world cannot wholly be disposed of, although they play a great part, by this mighty armed group or that mighty armed group; the others have a say also, and sometimes, an important say; that is, this development is taking place because, in spite of the terrible importance of nuclear bombs and the like, human beings and their ideas and their urges still count in this world, in every country. It is because of that that there is hope for the world. One of the major things we might see in this world is a growing conviction that the problems of this changing, exciting and turbulent world cannot be solved by threats or by military means. The misfortune is that while that is realised completely, yet energies, resources money and everything is directed far more to the development and advancement of the military apparatus of a country than to other things. Once we get over this major hurdle, then conditions will change in people's minds, in the reaction in people's minds to events.

336

At present, there is, I would say, a definite indication, a desire, that peoples and countries want to get out of the ruts they were in, ruts of thinking and ruts of action. It is always a difficult thing difficult even for us in India who are perhaps less in the ruts than other countries, to get out of our ruts of thinking and action; but it is even more difficult for those who have been conditioned in the last many years to believe faithfully in the virtue of ballistic weapons, inter-continental missiles and atomic and hydrogen bombs, thinking these to be a deterrent which would save them, each ultimately beginning to think that the best deterrent is something which should destroy the other, and putting the fear of destruction in the other's mind. I do not venture to criticise others who think that way; their position may be different, their geographical position and other position may be different from others. Nevertheless, one does feel, and what is more important, they have begun to feel that this is an out-of date way of approaching these problems, and they are searching for some other way out of this.

I was rather depressed when I was in New York and saw this cold war functioning in all its

bitterness and angry rhetoric, and yet looking back-and even to some extent there-I felt that there was a hopeful sign to all this, because the UN-when I say UN, it means the other countries represented there, their leaders, Presidents and Prime Ministers who were there-felt that they were coming to grips with these major subjects. They no longer were there just to have a debate and argue about or deliver fine speeches, but they were coming to grips with these subjects. They often got angry and cursed each other. Nevertheless, the approach was becoming relatively more realistic. That was a good sign, and I have no doubt that that is what is happening the world over.

There are great dangers all over the world; at the same time, there is this growing opinion because ultimately wars, as I think the Preamble of the UNESCO Charter says, start in the minds of men, and if the minds of men change, DO doubt that will affect the starting or the continuation of wars. If I may say so in all modesty, we in India have played some little tiny part; by our patient endeavours, by our attempt not to be pushed into warlike situations, by our refusal to curse countries even though we disagree with them by trying to cultivate the friendship of all countries and talking with them quietly, modestly and patiently, we have contributed to a small extent-may be to a very small extent, but still to some extent -in creating this new atmosphere in the world.

USA INDIA CONGO RUSSIA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC ALGERIA PORTUGAL BELGIUM
LEBANON PAKISTAN

Date : Nov 01, 1960

Volume No

1995

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

Prime Minister's Reply to Lek Sabha Debate on Foreign Affairs

Replying to the debate on foreign affairs in

the Lok Sabha on November 23, 1960, the Prime Minister, Shri Jawaharlal Nehru, said :

Mr. Speaker, Sir, I am grateful to Hon. Members who have spoken in this debate and who have thrown a good deal of light on various aspects of this question. May I however, right at the beginning, refer to what the Hon. Raja Mahendra Pratap said ? He accused me of having imbibed some ideas. I plead guilty to that charge. I think it is better to have ideas than to have an empty head. I am always trying to imbibe more ideas, to refresh ideas, to change them where necessary; whether I succeed or not, it is for others to judge, but that is my attempt— Sometimes it happens that people keep all the avenues to their minds closed or they never open them and so repeat the same phrase or word endlessly without any relevance to the occasion or to a developing world.

The fact of the matter is we are living in a world which is changing, changing in every way; the minds of men are changing, the minds of nations are changing, social habits of nations are changing, revolutions are coming in the way they live, all these things are happening, apart from the political plane which we often discuss. The political plane is important, of course, because it governs other things. But there are other planes, more important, social changes, economic changes for which we try in our country and other countries are trying also. So we live in this world and it makes a great deal of difference in the ultimate analysis what is in the minds of men.

As I said, I think the other day, the Preamble of the Constitution of the UNESCO says : "Wars begin in the minds of men", which is, I think, completely true. Therefore, it has some relevance and some importance to what we have in our minds, how we admit ideas in our minds. how we understand what is happening or else we shall go on talking of a world which has ceased to exist and which is changing so much that it has no relevance to what we say or what we think.

Now I do submit in all modesty and in all humility that the attitude that India has taken during these past dozen years or more, the

way we have dealt with them, has been both an idealistic way and a realistic way, idealistic in the sense of aiming at certain ideals and realistic in the sense of applying them to the existing circumstances because, unfortunately, we cannot always achieve the ideals; it is difficult—we have tried to adjust ourselves to the circumstances.

Now, because of all this, I do venture to say that we have affected the thinking of the United Nations and of the world, and it is no small matter. It is no small matter even if it is in a small degree. I do not claim big things. Big things come from changing events, not from what I say or anybody else says. Events force people to think ultimately. Even those who refuse to think are forced to think when the bludgeon of the hammer of events hits them on the head. But I do submit that the policy we have pursued, the way we have put in forward, not in an aggressive way not opposed to anybody, but in a moderate and in a humble way, trying to win over people, has affected the thinking of the United Nations, and thereby indirectly, to some extent—may be not much but to some extent—the thinking of the world. And that is a big thing. Because, in spite of what some Hon. Members might think, we cannot live apart from this world. Whatever might have happened in the days gone by, in the modern world you cannot live apart; you are a part of the world, an intimate part of the world, and you are affected by what happens in any part of the world.

Two kinds of general criticisms have been advanced in regard to our policy. One is: why do we throw our weight about and get interested in what happens in other countries or even in disarmament? Let the two big powers or other powers concern themselves with it. Why should we get entangled in this difficult question? We have got enough problems here. The other is the exact opposite of this. Some Hon. Members have said that we should throw our weight about; we should go and do this in Kenya and we should do this elsewhere. Leave out the question of Goa because that may be considered an internal problem, that we should go all over the place; that we do not accept the challenge of the world. I think Shri Khadilkar used words to that effect. So you will see that the criticism is from both ends and pulling in different directions.

The fact of the matter is that whatever we may do in the outside world, in the first and final analysis both-it is what we do in our own country that counts. That is obvious. For the moment we are discussing foreign affairs, We are not discussing our own country's affairs. But I do say that with assurance that the most important thing for us is what we do in our country, how our country progresses and how our country, solves its own problems. If we have any weight in the councils of the world, it is not because of our beautiful language or the beautiful resolutions that we put forward. It is in the final analysis due to some faith in the minds of other people in the world that India counts, and India will count more and more in the future. It is because the policies that we are pursuing in this country, political, economic or whatever they may be, have induced that faith in them, that however big our problems, we are facing them with courage and solving them step by step. Therefore India counts.

All the wisdom in the world of any representative of India would not go any distance at all if there was not this impression in the minds of many people of the world that India counts and what India is doing counts. Therefore let us be clear about it. It is firstly and finally the condition of India that makes every difference and that enables us even to play any part in the outside world; otherwise nobody would listen to us. So there can be no doubt about that.

The criticism is : Why should we get entangled in disarmament and other matters that are affecting world opinion ? I am surprised and a little pained, I must say, that any Hon. Member here lives in this narrow groove of thought and does not realise what lies behind all this business of disarmament. It is often being said that disarmament or no disarmament is a question of the survival of the human race. Are we interested in the survival of the human race or not? We happen to be a part of the human race. We are not apart from it. Therefore it is a question of our survival. It is a question of our achieving any objectives that we aim at or not.

Perhaps in the matter of phrases people may agree with that, but I want this matter to be thought of, if I may say so, in a somewhat

emotional way, to understand the real significance of all that is happening. The fact of the matter is that in India by and large we talk about peace a great deal and, I believe, we believe in peace. But there is no emotional acceptance of the horror of war because we have not had war. The greater part of the world has had it and there is not a single family in all these vast countries, many of Asia, nearly all of Europe and some elsewhere, that has not experienced the horror of war in imately either through death of the members of that

338

family or otherwise. Not one family you will find that has not experienced it. Therefore it is an intimate, emotional thing for them. An intimate emotional thing which has to be multiplied a hundred or thousand-fold in the present conditions is not merely losing a son or a brother or a husband. It is something infinitely more.

If you thought in that way, it becomes important. It is not merely a question of some great power play. It so happens that some great powers and notably two have tremendous power. Either of them, and both certainly, can make a vast difference to the world, whether they act rightly or whether they act wrongly. There it is. All the wisdom in the world that we may have cannot prevent them, if they decide to do so. Therefore to think of disarmament as something remote from us, which does not apply to us because we have not got the atom bomb, we have not got such vast armies, we have got a relatively small army and a relatively smaller air force etc., is very wrong thinking.

As Hon. Member seemed to hint that we should look after our own defence, why should we bother about that, and if disarmament comes it may affect our defence. That again is a very extraordinary argument which indicates a total absence of, shall I say, full consideration being given to these aspects of the problem. If world disarmament comes, the world is changed and we are far more secure than we would otherwise be. Obviously, there can be no world disarmament with any major country remaining armed. It is out of the question that even if the Soviet Union, the United States of America, England, France and may be some other countries agree to disarmament and China does not, that is not disarmament. In fact, they will never agree to it. You

cannot imagine the great or small powers leaving out of any pact on disarmament a mighty power and allowing it to keep all these armaments. It cannot happen. It is not disarmament. When we talk about disarmament, it must apply to all countries in appropriate measure.

I mentioned this idea of disarmament because that is the most important question today though it does not appear to be realised. It is theoretically approved of by us. We like the idea, but it does not hit us on the head, it does not hit us on the heart, it does not bit us on the mind as it should because the whole future, the survival of India and each Indian depends upon that. If we once go beyond this, and reach as I said the "point of no return in regard to disarmament, if we go too far, there is no coming back and it has spread too much, namely, the nuclear bombs and other things, then we can write fiction stories, but what will happen, is even if we write them, there will not be any readers of those stories.

If my analysis is correct then I say the question of disarmament is more important than any problem, internal or external, national or international, because it is a national problem, apart from being international. Our survival depends upon it. Yes. In carrying it out it affects the great countries. If we can help in any way in that, obviously we should do so because it is our concern and it is our problem. There is a certain measure of static thinking about these matters, not realising what is happening.

We talk about our border defence and we use brave language, sometimes a little too brave language, without thinking of the consequences of that language. But it is good to have brave language occasionally. I have no objection to it. But let us think of it in this changing world as we are today and not merely give expression to our wrath on every incident that happens.

This motion I had ventured to place before the House, as I explained when I did so, was specially meant to discuss the recent occurrences in the United Nations and what is happening there. Therefore in my opening remarks I dealt with those events and not with many other problems, important as they are. There are many important problems, vitally important problems for us, but I thought and I think normally in

debates in this House even in international affairs it may be more advisable to concentrate on one or two subjects, deal with them rather thoroughly than deal with a vast variety and roam about all over the field. Thereby, you get more concentrated attention paid to the question. This is the normal practice, if I may say so, in other Parliaments. That is for you and the House to decide. I have no objection to either course. I thought it more desirable to concentrate on the particular issue that is mentioned in this Resolution. I say so because some Hon. Members took exception to my not discussing in some detail other important problems. There are, of course, the most important problems in regard to this matter, for instance, our relations with China, the aggression on our territory and the consequences thereof. That is strictly true. How can anybody deny the vast importance of this question to us? All our future and everything depends upon it. In fact, it is because it is so vastly important that I speak with great thought and when I refer to it, I do not allow myself to run away with words merely exhibiting my strong feeling on it. But one has to refer. If I had anything new, I would

339

have said it. I broadly concentrated my attention on these matters which came up before the United Nations or Goa or some other subject like that.

I just mentioned disarmament in its wider context as it appears to me and its primary importance in this world of ours today. When I say primary, every other question is second to it, whether national or international, in that context. That does not mean, of course, that disarmament should occupy the whole, place, the whole mind and all our activities. We carry on our activities which we do except when occasion arises, we express ourselves about disarmament. We must feel the importance of it.

I am glad that my colleague the Defence Minister gave a fairly full account of the steps taken or being taken in regard to disarmament there. It may be that some Hon. Members were not interested in these details. But I am sure many would have been. They must have a full picture. The reports that appear in the papers, long as they may be, never give a full picture, naturally.

I referred a good deal to the Congo situation. Even as I spoke and since I spoke, other developments have taken place in the Congo, as the House knows partly. You will probably read about them tomorrow morning or this evening. There has actually been fighting there between the so-called Congolese army and the U. N. troops, to protect a Ghana diplomat. Casualties were not very many-I forget-7, 8 or 10 or 12. But that is a new development and a very serious development.

Another development to which I referred to yesterday was the question of the U. N. General Assembly deciding upon the Delegation from the Congo which was to be seated there. There had been much difference of opinion about that and very strong arguments. It had been suggested that this matter should be postponed till the Good Offices Commission comes back. I am sorry I used the words Good Offices Commission; I am told that that is not the correct word to use. It is called the U. N. Delegation to the Congo. As a consequence of the General Assembly voting by a majority that certain person or persons nominated by President Kasavubu should take their place to represent Congo, two members of the Asio-African Delegation to the Congo, the representatives of Guinea and Mali, have resigned. They have decided for the present at least, to postpone their visit. For how long, I do, not know. They were going in a day or so. They have decided to postpone it, and may be, they may go after two or three days. I do not know or a longer period.

Anyhow, it has rather introduced a new element of confusion and conflict certainly in the Congo, and in Leopoldville. This has happened in the capital of Congo, not in some distant province or far-off area. It has brought this very extraordinary and difficult issue of how the United Nations and its forces in the Congo should function. If it cannot give protection to its own men or to others to whom it wants to give protection, to diplomats and others, and the so-called Congolese army-I use the word 'So-called' because it is not much of a trained army; it has semi-trained people-can run riot as they have done in the past. In the past it was not against the U. N. They ran riot all over Leopoldville, arresting, beating, looting and all that. It is all in the report. You will see that in Shri

Rajeshwar Dayal's report. Now, they come and attack the U. N. people themselves.

It is not for me to say what is going to happen there or what should be done. It is obvious that the United Nations can either function or not function there. It cannot remain there without authority to function, all the time being battered, hit and itself being attacked. This matter has to be decided. It has been put in a difficult position, because the instructions sent to the U. N. people there have been to be cautious, never to attack, never to do this, and all that. So, they are put in a very difficult position. That question arises. I shall not pursue that. I only wanted to point this out. A very difficult development has taken place in the Congo.

This is reflected in the U. N. itself. You see some African members have resigned from that Delegation. I do not quite know what the next few days might bring about. The situation in the Congo, therefore, is important for the Congo, for Africa as a whole and for the United Nations. In a sense, the future effectiveness of the U. N. has to be settled, whether it can function in such circumstances either in the Congo or elsewhere in the future or not. If it fails in the Congo, then, naturally, its prestige goes or lessens greatly and it can hardly undertake such a piece of work elsewhere in future. That is a danger.

In the Congo, right from the beginning, we have been laying stress, the U.N., and the Security Council have laid stress on one thing.

There is one danger, a bad thing if it takes shape. That is, the break up of the Congo.

340

Right from the beginning in this Congo affair stress has been laid by the Security Council, by the United Nations in their Resolutions, on the maintenance of the integrity of the Congo. Because, the moment it splits up this means a Continuing conflict for the future,--we have too many continuing conflicts for the future, the sowing of the seeds of conflict which does not end till some mighty thing happens which decides all the conflicts of the world. I think it will be a very sad thin- if this kind of a thing happens.

Discussing these general matters, reference

was made to what I said-on two or three occasions I spoke in the United Nations-and to the Five Power Resolution. One Hon. Member opposite spoke in terms of subdued enthusiasm about Mr. Menzies amendment to our Resolution. Unfortunately, so far as the U. N. General Assembly is concerned, in that large crowd of distinguished people, there were four, or may be live, I am not quite sure, who voted for it. Even the closest colleagues and allies of Mr. Menzies did not vote for it. It is worth considering for that Hon. Member that something is surely wrong either in the amendment or on the occasion for it or the context of it that it got so little support. it was said-I am not quite sure-it was said that this was quite a record in the United Nations only five persons voting in the matter. Why was that ? There was surely some reason for that. I cannot go into the whole context of these things.

Then the Hon. Member repeatedly said that I should not have gone into a temper. Unfortunately, having got a reputation of going into a temper, I am accused of that whether I go into it or not. Hon. Members, because I speak with some emotion or some force sometimes here, may say: 'oh, he went into a temper.' Never have I been cooler and without a temper than when I spoke in the United Nations. And I am not referring to my original speech, the statement I made there, but to the subsequent speech when I moved this resolution. It was a forceful speech, certainly, because I thought the occasion demanded some forceful speaking. That amendment of Mr. Menzies struck me as not being a proposal which was positively meant. It might have come separately, I would have had no objection. It came in the shape of an amendment to obstruct, to put an end to this. One has to see this context.

What was this five-nation proposal ? The Defence Minister said this morning that nobody asked Mr. Eisenhower to meet Mr. Khrushchev. We had said that they should renew contacts. Now, what does all that mean ? I shall try to spell it out a little.

It was an extraordinary thing, sitting there in New York, to see not only this intense cold war at work, but the bitterness, the avoidance of each other, not only dislike, but even the common courtesies that count being avoided. We all knew, every one there knew, that no major step

could be taken in this matter, apart from everything else, because of the American elections or the presidential elections. It was obvious. The whole point was that at this particular General Assembly meeting of the United Nations the position may not get so frightfully rigid that even after the election was over, and whatever the result of the election, you could not make it flexible afterwards. That was the point. Whatever was to be done had to be done afterwards, but the object was somehow to make it a little more flexible so that whoever was elected, whether Mr. Nixon or Mr. Kennedy, should have some room to play and manoeuvre and not be tied hand and foot by all the previous unfortunate happenings and be unable to take any step. That was the difficulty. Therefore, this resolution was meant to draw people's attention there in the Assembly and outside, to this position. It was not spelled out this way there. but this was the basic thing. About the question of meeting etc., if it could take place well and good, obviously, even a formal meeting. Nobody thought that a discussion of the problem should take place at that stage. Nobody thought that Mr. Eisenhower and Mr. Khrushchev could sit down then or later and solve the world's problems.

In fact, Mr. Menzies spoke particularly about this on his amendment. He asked : `Why should these two countries solve the problem, why not four solve the problem T quite naturally the reply was : Why should four solve them, why not all solve them T I said everybody was going to take part in the solution, but it so happened that two of them happened to occupy such positions that their decisions could make a difference to the world.

But our idea was not that they should discuss the problems or solve them, but somehow to bring an element of flexibility in the situation which could be taken advantage of at a later stage and not to petrify it, make it like dead stone and you cannot move it; and when national passions are concerned, they tend to become that way. The American people being naturally very angry at many things that had happened at the summit meeting etc., the Russian people also were very angry at some things that had happened; then sometimes it goes beyond the power of even great leaders when they find public opinion so strongly entrenched in a passionate attitude

that they cannot get out of it. That is why I do not want public opinion in regard to any matter becoming petrified in India. We hold strongly, we should hold strongly, to any position we hold but intelligently, not just in a gust of anger.

So, that was the purpose of that resolution, and if I may say so with all respect, it did not very much matter if the resolution was passed or not. It had that effect. It drew attention to this subject everywhere, and therefore it achieved at least partly the objective aimed at. If not, the situation would have gone on without any shaking being given to it. And that was the purpose. When some of us, those who signed this resolution, sponsored it, discussed it, we said : All of us are going away in a few days, some two days earlier, some two days later; if we all go away and leave the situation as it is, it will become more and more rigid, more and more petrified, and then it will be difficult to move in the future, therefore we must do something.' And after consultation, we put forward this idea which, and I say so quite honestly, I thought, was not a controversial resolution. I mean to say, it may not be liked, may not be approved wholly, but I did not consider it a controversial resolution, and many people did not.

And may I interpolate that even this resolution got a majority in the Assembly ? It should be remembered. It did not get a two-third majority which was necessary. It came up in a rather curious way, but I will not go into these matters as to how the voting came up in an indirect way. Even this resolution got a majority there, but it required, according to the Chairman, a two-third majority and so in that sense it did not succeed.

After all this had happened, the general opinion there, not only among the delegates and others, but in the noted influential newspapers of the United States, was that those who opposed this resolution had not been wise, that it did not serve their purpose and so on. So that, I think that these aspects should be considered. And the resolution achieved its purpose quite well enough I think.

Acharya Kripalni talked about the defeatist

manner in which we were following our policy, and I think he was more especially referring to our frontier with China and our frontier troubles. Some other Members also referred to this frontier trouble.

First of all, this impression that we can only deal with any question, and more especially an important question like this, in a language of violence or anger is not the impression I think which should be encouraged. I do not think and Acharya Kripalani, I hope, will agree with me, that strength consists in the epithets and the strong language that may be thrown about, because he has been bred up himself in a tradition of language being moderate even when dealing with strong matters. Of course, some strong language is used, but when it comes to great consequences having to be faced, one has to be wise and to think about it.

Now, the question of India and China is not just a question of a border affray, and I would repeat I do not attach any importance or much to two horsemen coming across the border, or half a dozen men coming across. Let us keep some true perspective in our minds. You think the orders came from Peking for two horsemen to cross the border? Obviously, it is some mischief of some local men there, may be some local commander, or just the two men themselves. Whatever it is, it is a bad thing, so we protested and all that. But let us not get excited because two men on horseback come there, or ten men come over and rapidly disappear when they see two or three Indians.

Replying to a question about the fifty-two violations of air space, the Prime Minister said :

The air space violations were a very serious matter. But the only thing is that I cannot honestly say that there were 52 aircraft, because the same aircraft is seen many times; but I cannot say with assurance, that is, with proof in my hand, except the fact that they are near that area, and the Chinese frontier is not far, that they necessarily were all Chinese. I cannot say that. That is the difficulty. As I said the other day, we are not only at liberty to shoot them down, but we intend to shoot them down where we can do it.

But the real question in regard to India and

China is much more serious than these matters. It is a matter of the greatest and the most vital importance to the safety of India, to the future of India. And I regret that by concentrating on petty things, one loses sight of the extraordinary seriousness of this thing, with which we are, of course, so much concerned.

What we can do, in the circumstances, in the major sense, we should try to do, namely, to increase our defensive strength, both in regard to positions and otherwise; we should increase it by building up communications etc. In order

342

to be able to defend adequately and to take such action as we may consider necessary from time to time. These things are not done very quickly. They take time. We are building a thousand miles—I cannot say exactly what the figure is—of communications in all these border areas. It is not a light task; it is a heavy burden on us and on our budget financially, and we are doing it with extreme speed. We are doing it roughly in one quarter of the time or one-third of the time—one third is perhaps more correct—that the Central PWD thought possible. When we asked them, they said it would take so much time. We decided to do it in one-third of the time and, more or less, we are keeping to that schedule.

If I may say so in all humility, I do not wish really to argue about these small matters. When I referred to these matters as relatively small, it was from the point of view of the bigness of the real matter connected with India and China and this conflict between India and China, bigness in the present and in the future. We are not going to deal with that unless we realise the problem and prepare to meet it. It is not the path of wisdom to take steps or to talk about taking steps before you are prepared for them, before you can take them effectively and before you have exhausted every other means. All these things are normal things for every country, not merely for a country like India which is supposed to be addicted to peace. Every country does that. No country that I know of, big or small, be it the greatest Power in the world would, I say with all respect, function as sometimes some Hon. Members have suggested that we should function, that is, rush an army, start a war or

start a local fight or big fight. That is not the way countries function. Even bitter enemies do not function that way.

In this matter, it is obvious that if by some great misfortune there is war between India and China, it is going to be a terrible affair. China is not going to overwhelm India; nor is India going to overwhelm China. We are too big for that and neither is weak in that sense; one may be stronger and one may be weaker. It is a tremendous thing. And even if that is going to happen, one prepares for it; one does not go about waving banners and all that to deal with the situation. It is something as a result of which world developments may take place—they are bound to. It may last a whole generation. It is not a question of a police action or something. It may put an end to all kinds of what we are doing in our country or it may affect them.

All these factors have to be considered and the real fact of the matter, as I said, the basic problem is the attitude of China, what the Chinese Government may have in mind and may be thinking of in the present and in the future. I do think it is of the highest importance for us to have friendly relations with China. That does not mean and I do not think there can ever be friendly relations by adopting a weak attitude to a strong country. That is not the way to have friendly relations. If you do not respect yourself, if you cannot protect yourself, others will not respect you. Our self-respect and all that demands that we should not take up a weak attitude in the matter. Nevertheless, the fact should be remembered that it is a matter of the utmost importance and in the present and more historically speaking that these two mighty colossuses, China and India, should not be in perpetual conflict with each other. It makes a vast difference to the whole of Asia and to the world. We will live on the verge of a world war if that happens.

Unfortunately, some Hon. Members here think rather lightly of these matters of war and peace, not having had any experience of them. Therefore, they do not see this picture in this context.

Let us go a little further afield. It is said

in newspapers and elsewhere-I hope the Hon. Member, Shri H.N. Mukerjee, will not mind my saying so-that there is an ideological conflict even in the communist world, a fairly big one. Whatever it is, they think in different ways and pull in different ways. I do not mean to imply that they are practically breaking with each other. But there it is.

I am interested in that not from the point of view of which ideology is correct or not. But I am interested because of its effect on world problems. And I cannot ignore that, not because of the communist party in India. That is a very little, minor issue. The major issue is its effect. If it is true that the Chinese Government's policy basically does not accept the concept of co-existence-even though it is said that it is accepted-if they think war is more or less inevitable in the world which is part capitalist and part socialist or communist, that presents a type of picture which is rather alarming; that war is inevitable on that issue. That means our living in a state of semi-war all the time, intense cold war, sometime or other breaking out into full war. As I understand it, that is not the attitude of the Soviet Government. So, it is a very vital difference.

343

There is one thing more. Reference was made in this House, yesterday and may be, today also, about the Burmese Prime Minister's visit here. I am sorry that Prime Minister U Nu's name has been brought in here and I am sorry that many of our newspapers gave currency to the story that he was coming here to mediate between India and China or to bring a message to me. There was not an iota of truth, shadow or substance, in this story and it has absolutely nothing to do with it. At no time did U Nu write to me previously about the India-China problem not at all in this connection. I am not talking about a year or so ago; sometimes he has asked for my views about the situation ; we have been corresponding and I explained to him. He decided to come here fairly a long time back. He came here particularly, as he does almost every year, on a pilgrimage to certain Buddhist places here.

All he said to me when he came here was that he wanted to explain to me his own treaty

with the Chinese Government because I had been connected with this matter for the last two, three, four years, corresponding with them, even writing to Premier Chou-En-lai, three-four years ago, about the Burmese matter. So that he came to explain to me-I knew the problem-that this was the problem and the boundary has been decided here and there and so on. That is all. He did not give me a single hint or advice about the India-China problem or any message.

He was criticised by some Hon. Members because when newspapermen were asking him here he said that he believed that Premier Chou-En-Lai was sincere and criticisms were made that inferentially, that means that we were not sincere.

How does any Member in this House accept that inference-they said so, some of them-or expect U Nu to say anything except what he said? Is it conceivable? Is that the way people function in responsible places? May I respectfully suggest to this House that the troubles of the world are not due to the fact that sincere men are up against insincere people. The troubles of the world are due to the fact that sincere men are up against equally sincere men on the other side. They may be misguided-that is a different matter-they may be wrong or right, but they are sincere in what they believe. That is the trouble in the world. That is the difficulty.

You can move insincere people, but when two sincere persons come with rigid attitudes, rigid beliefs, then comes trouble and conflict. That is the trouble in the world today, and always this has been the major trouble. It is very easy to consider a person with whom you do not agree as insincere; as bad or as a knave. You can deal with knaves, but people who are equally firm in their own belief it is very difficult to deal with. Certainly, so far as U Nu is concerned, who is a very dear friend of ours, with whom I have had the privilege of friendship for many years, to conclude that because he said that Mr. Chou En-Lai was sincere he thought that I was not sincere, I submit, is an absurd inference.

I am sorry I have exceeded the time that I wanted. I have not mentioned other matters. But one thing I think I should mention, because whether it is Congo or whether it is any other

place, the real trouble is, there are these major conflicts which prevent people from dealing with a situation as it is and inject a cold war element into them.

Take the case of the Indo-China States-Laos for the time being. When the Geneva Conference agreement took place five or six years ago it was patent that these States could only exist, could only function if they did not fall into this cold war-that is, if the major military blocs did not throw their weight about them-because if one did it the other will surely come in and there is that conflict. That was laid down quite clearly for Laos, for Viet Nam, and also, in a slightly different way, for Cambodia. Now there have been many internal troubles. At the present moment the Prime Minister of Laos, Mr. Souvanna Phouma, has been trying his best to constitute a government which might be called, for want of a better word, a neutral government. He is more or less succeeding. But so many difficulties are put in his way, with the result that if one party pulls him in one direction and exercises pressure, immediately the other party comes and exercises pressure in the other way and the whole country is split into bits. The only way to save Laos and all those countries in South-East Asia is for the cold war to be kept far away from them. In fact, that is the only sensible way, because, if you want to exercise your influence on them in a particular direction, the inevitable consequences are the other party pulls in another direction. In order to keep out the other party it is best not to exercise those pressures.

344

USA INDIA KENYA FRANCE CHINA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC CONGO GHANA GUINEA MALI
RUSSIA UNITED KINGDOM LAOS SWITZERLAND CAMBODIA

Date : Nov 01, 1960

Volume No

1995

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

The Prime Minister, Shri Jawaharlal Nehru, made the following statement in the Lok Sabha on November 30, 1960, on the recent incidents in the Congo :

Sir, three or four days ago the attention of the House was attracted to certain events that happened in Leopoldville in the Congo because of which some Indian officers were beaten and suffered injury. I promised then to place before the House such other facts or information as I could collect. I am not naturally at this stage dealing with the entire very complicated question of the Congo but rather with these incidents.

Certain authorities in the Congo-it is rather difficult always to refer to these authorities as to which are formal or informal, or legal or ultra-legal-decided to take steps to have one of the Ghana diplomats to leave the Congo. This gentleman, that is, the Ghana diplomat, did not agree with this order that he had received, or it may be that he was in communication with his Government. Anyhow, he did not carry out that order and asked for protection from the UN Force there. The UN Force apparently agreed to give him some protection. He was staying in his house with some UN Guard round about it when the Congolese armed forces came there and either attacked or tried to rush to positions, whatever it was. There was firing between the UN Guard and these Congolese forces. The firing resulted in casualties on both-a few casualties, three, four, five, six or something like that. Among those who were killed by that firing was a certain officer of the Congolese armed forces by name Col. Nkokulu. This Col. Nkokulu was the Second-in-Command after Col. Mobutu and no doubt the killing of Col. Nkokulu gave rise to considerable excitement in the Congolese armed forces.

I should like to make it clear, as I said previously, that India has not got any combat units there at all. India was not involved in this incident of firing either. The Indian personnel that have been sent there, although they are Army or Air Force personnel, are engaged in supply operations, in signalling and in medical work. We have opened a big hospital there and our

people there are 700 or thereabouts.

After this incident there were very considerable number of sporadic attacks by the Congolese armed forces on odd people and on diplomats of many countries from the 21st November. On the 21st, 22nd, and 23rd November many of these attacks took place. Just to indicate the nature and number of these attacks, I shall mention a few but there were a large number. I think a report has been presented to the Secretary-General and by the Secretary-General it has been placed before the UN.' These instances are taken from his report.

I might add that the instances where there was not much threat of violence have not been mentioned in this. The instances are where there was actual violence or a threat of violence where, for instance, many people were pushed at gun point and at bayonet point though actually bayonet was not used but there was threat of violence. So, people were threatened and by their threats a large number of automobiles were forcibly seized by these Congolese forces. I do not know their number but some reports said they were 40 or 50 and some said they were 70. It was said that later they would be returned, but as far as I know, most of them have not been returned.

There are the instances about the Indian Officers which the House already knows in which two officers were beaten rather badly and three others were not beaten but were pushed about and were made to deliver up their car and some other belongings.

Apart from these, here are some other instances that happened : A car containing four civilian UN staff, one Swiss, two Swedish and one French, was stopped by the Congolese forces on the night of 21st November. The occupants were ordered at gun-point to leave the car, beaten by rifle butts and confined in a small room with a further 24 UN personnel including two women staff. They were released after eight hours. The four UN civilian staff were beaten again after release and their cars were stolen.

A car containing three UN civilian personnel, one Canadian, one Spanish and one American, was stopped the same night. The occupants were

forcibly detained and beaten. They were released in the morning.

On the same night a car with two Italian UN civilian personnel was stopped and both were beaten with rifle butts. They were released an hour later.

On the 22nd morning a Canadian Air Force Officer was forced out of his car at gun-point and struck several times. His briefcase was stolen.

345

On the same morning a Ghana Officer of the United Kingdom nationality had his car stolen. He was beaten by rifle butts. His watch was stolen and he was confined for five hours.

All this happened after Col. Mobutu had ordered his release.

A Swede-the House will notice the variety of nationalities involved-U. N. civilian was arrested and confined for five hours during which his life was threatened many times with guns and knives.

On the 22nd November, a senior Nigerian Officer, British nationality, and two N.C.Os. both Indian, were forced out of their jeep by armed Congolese forces. The two non-commissioned officers were threatened with death, but were released shortly afterwards.

A Dutch U.N. Civilian was threatened with death if he returned to the Congolese radio station.

On November 23, a senior Canadian Air Force officer was forced at gun point out of his car which was stolen.

All these attacks were against unarmed personnel. May be some officers carried revolvers. They were not armed people.

Lately, three other incidents happened. On the 22nd morning, an Indian I.O.R. proceeding to the airport was deprived of his personal belongings. Two Indian military police escorting a Nigerian Brigadier to the airport, took a wrong turn and they were held up by the Congolese forces who deprived them of one pistol and two

sten guns. On the 27th evening, one Indian ambulance was stopped and driven off by the Congolese forces. These are the actual incidents that have happened.

Since the 23rd, broadly speaking, these incidents have stopped except the one which I just mentioned about the ambulance car being forcibly seized and taken away. It is stated that relative calm has prevailed in Leopoldville from the 24th November onwards. The two Indian officers who have been injured have been released from the hospital.

The reasons for the cessation of attacks and improvement of the situation are given out as (i) increase in patrolling by the U. N. forces in Leopoldville, (ii) some restraint on the movements of U. N. staff, particularly at night, (iii) pressure on Col. Mobutu by the U. N. Commission in Leopoldville, and (iv) pressure on President Kasavubu and Mr. Bomboke in New York, who were present in New York then. The Secretary-General made written protests to President Kasavubu and followed it up with two oral representations. The Advisory Committee which has been meeting consists of representatives of those countries which have sent armed forces, or, as in the case of India, other forces not armed. This Advisory Committee was formed by the Secretary-General of the U. N. and they also considered this matter and made strong appeals to both President Kasavubu and the Secretary-General.

These are the facts. Recently, some other developments have taken place. As appears from the newspapers, Mr. Lumumba appears to have escaped from the kind of confinement he was in at Leopoldville and no one quite knows where he is. Presumably, he is going to his home town, Stanleyville. Obviously, there is considerable danger in the situation. There have been, and still they are there, dangers of a civil war on a big scale between the various elements in the Congo, that itself attracting outside elements to support one party or the other. But, that is a larger question into which I do not propose to go now.

Replying to questions put by Hon'ble Members, the Prime Minister said:

"May I be permitted ? But I confess that I do not myself see in this rather shifting situation there, what profit it can give the House in the near future, unless something happens, to discuss this matter. If we discuss it, well, we either, if I may use the word, condemn the U. N. action, criticize it or commend it-one of the three. And so we sit here and do what we think is the right thing, no doubt, but unfortunately rather interfere with what is happening in the UN. I do not myself see how that could be helpful at this stage. If at a subsequent stage something happens the House may discuss it, but at the present moment it is not likely to be helpful. It is a difficult, complicated situation. One does not know how it would develop. Our views are fairly well-known, and I repeat that apart from the fact that law and order should be maintained, that is obvious, the second thing is that a firm central authority should function.

Now, the U. N. has accepted President Kasavubu. Naturally, a certain prestige attaches to that. President Kasavubu himself was accepted by us, and by every country, nobody has

346

challenged him. The point that had arisen previously was not the fact of this presidency, but the question as to what functions the president should exercise, that is the point, whether the President could go out of the way or exercise only his functions. That was the matter in doubt. There it is. But nobody can say that things in the Congo are firmly established. There is an element of flexibility and all that, and in the U.N. our representatives and others are perfectly cognizant of this fact, and are trying to deal with it to the best of their ability.

There is the question of this Commission, a delegation going from the U. N. I understand it is likely to go in the course of a week or so. That delegation will presumably report. So, all these things are happening, and I confess I do not see the advantage of our discussing this in the near future till something further develops.

CONGO USA INDIA GHANA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC NIGER NIGERIA LATVIA FALKLAND ISLANDS

Date : Nov 01, 1960

Volume No

1995

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

Prime Minister's Statement in Rajya Sabha on Incidents in Congo

The Prime Minister, Shri Jawaharlal Nehru, made the following statement in the Rajya Sabha on November 30, 1960, on the recent incidents in the Congo:

I am sorry to intervene in this way but I wanted to place before the House certain further information about the recent incidents in the Congo. The House will remember that some 4 or 5 days ago we learnt with a sense of shock that some of our officers there in the Congo had been badly beaten and injured in a more or less mob-like fashion and I promised to get as much information as I could and place it before the House. Part of it of course has been appearing in the newspapers.

Now what happened was that the Congolese authorities functioning there ordered a Ghana diplomat to leave Leopoldville within a very short time, within a question of hours. He did not agree to leave, at least then, and he appealed to the U. N. authorities to give him protection in case of any attack. The U. N. did give some, placed some kind of armed guard in the Ghana Embassy. Thereafter some of the Congolese armed forces attacked that armed guard, there was firing and as a result of the firing, there was some casualty on both sides. I do not know exactly but about possibly 4, 5 or 6 were shot down both sides included. Among those who were shot down was Col. Nkokulu, who was second in command of the Congolese Armed Forces under Col. Mobutu. I mention his name because it would appear that his death created a great deal of excitement among the Congolese Armed Forces, and apart from other reasons, apart from their general inclination not to be very disciplined and do what

they liked, this also may have been a reason for the extraordinary behaviour during the next 3 or 4 days. From November 21st to 23rd, for three days, there was a state of utter insecurity, more especially so far as the U. N. personnel were concerned, and these Congolese, groups of Congolese soldiery, entered the houses of U. N. personnel sometimes beat them, sometimes threatened them, usually stoned their cars or took some weapons that they could find. This was done not only to the Indian officers who were mentioned last time but to quite a large variety of people belonging to about a dozen nationalities. I might make it clear here, as I have said previously, that India has no combat forces in the Congo. Although we have about 770 or 780 personnel there --they are military, air force and others--all have gone for non-combat duties like communications, supply, signalling and chiefly hospital work. Of course we have a big hospital functioning there. They are not armed as combat troops are armed but possibly the officers have some kind of pistol or revolver or something like that which they normally carry. Otherwise, they are not armed. Also, when this conflict took place in the Ghana Embassy, no Indians were there involved in that fighting at all. So it was apparently a resentment against the whole of the U. N. apparatus that made the Congolese Armed Forces function in the way they did.

I shall mention a number of cases, type of cases from a report that was presented by the Secretary General to the U.N. This is not a complete report. I mean to say that there are many other cases and many other cases just of threats are not mentioned. Those involving some measure of violence or threat of violence were mentioned. I shall not mention again the cases where Indian officers were concerned--Col. Gore and others --because the House presumably knows about them. I dare however to mention that of the Indian officers concerned, there were five of them--two were more or less seriously, injured, serious in the sense that they had to be looked after and the other three were just pushed about and were not injured, of these, Col. Gore and others, Col. Gore, after a few days in hospital, has come out and is no longer a hospital case and he is recovering, so that none of those Indian officers involved are now in hospital or hurt in a bad way.

Now these are some incidents on the 21st and 22nd November: 1. "A car containing 4 civilian U.N. staff-I Swiss, 2 Swedish and I French-stopped by A.N.C. (A.N.C. means Army Nationale Congolese, the Congolese Armed Forces) on the night of 21st November occupants ordered at gun point to leave car, beaten by rifle butts, confined in a small room with further 24 U. N. personnel, including 2 women staff. Released after 8 hours. The four U. N. civilian staff were beaten again after release and their cars stolen.

2. "A car containing three U. N civilian personnel--one Canadian, one Spanish and one American- was stopped. The same night occupants forcibly detained and beaten. They were released in the morning".

The House will notice the different nationalities that creep in into this.

3. "On same night, a car with two Italian U. N. personnel was stopped and both beaten with rifle butts. They were released an hour later.

4. "On the same morning a Ghana officer of U. K. nationality had his car stolen, beaten by rifle butts, his watch stolen and he was confined for 5 hours. All this happened after Col. Mobutu had ordered his release.

5. "A Swede U.N. civilian was arrested and confined for 5 hours during which time his life was threatened many times with guns and knives. Then the same morning 3 Indian officers were attacked and beaten-what I have already said-two of them being injured. On the 22nd November, a senior Nigerian officer of British nationality and 2 N. C. Os, both Indian, were forced out of their jeep by armed A. N. C. The two N. C. Os. were threatened but were released shortly afterwards. A Dutch U. N. civilian was threatened with death if be returned to the Congolese Radio Station. On November 23rd a senior Canadian Air Force Officer was forced at gun point out of his car which was stolen".

There were many other arrests of U. N. personnel, civil and military, by the A. N. C. soldiers from the 21st to 23rd November. The threat of armed force was made virtually in all cases but

generally there was no imminent danger to life or physical assault. It should be remembered that all these attacks were against unarmed personnel.

Now, recently, on the 22nd morning, one Indian I.O.R. proceeding to airport was deprived of his personal belongings, beddings, etc. Two Indian military police, escorting a Nigerian, Brigadier to the air-port took a wrong turn, were halted by A. N. C. and deprived of one pistol and two sten guns.

On the 27th evening-that is the only incident that has happened subsequently-one Indian ambulance was stopped and driven off by A.N.C.

Broadly speaking, apart from these incidents which I have just mentioned, these incidents stopped from the 23rd onwards, so far as we know, and there was a greater measure of the prevalence of some kind of law and order. And it is thought that this took place because there has been increased patrolling by U. N. forces in Leopoldville, some restraint on the movements of the U. N. staff, particularly at night, pressure on Col. Mobutu by the U. N. Commission in Leopoldville and pressure on President Kasavubu and Mr. Bomboko in New York. We had, of course, protested strongly to the Secretary-General of the U. N. and the President of the General Assembly- Apart from that, the matter was considered by the Advisory Committee there on the Congo in which all the countries which have given any forces for the Congo operation are included. They took up a fairly strong line with the Secretary-General and the Secretary-General himself felt this was a serious matter in which all possible steps should be taken. So for a moment, these incidents have stopped. But the position remains rather fluid and it is rather difficult to prophesy what might happen. I do not wish now at this stage to discuss the future of the Congo. It is a big question and there are many uncertain factors in it about which we can discuss, we can express our opinion, but we cannot do much. That is the position, Sir, which I wish to place before the House.

An Hon. Member: The Prime Minister used two expressions in his statement that he has just made. One was the 'Leopoldville authorities' and the other was (he 'National Army of Congolese'. Now, do we recognise them ? They are bandits.

They are not acts of any authorised government. Do we recognise this so-called A. N. C. Army Nationale Congolese, or do we recognise Col. Mobutu ?

The Prime Minister: We have not recognised any such, but we have to deal with them. It is a fact that, by and large, the old A. N. C , the Congolese armed forces, are broadly under the control of Col. Mobutu, not very well under control, because they do what they like, sometimes, but, no doubt, they are supposed to be under his influence. We do not recognise Col. Mobutu or

348

his army as such. But we have to deal with him. I am sorry, I mean the U. N. people there have to deal with them. President Kasavubu as President, we have all along recognised. But the question has arisen, not about recognising him or not, but about his functions, and some of the things he had done, we felt, had exceeded his functions. To some extent, directly sometimes, indirectly sometimes, he encouraged or accepted what Col. Mobutu had done, and his College of Commissioners. It is a very confusing situation, Practically speaking, therefore, the position is that we and the U. N. or course the U.N.--has just seated him or his group in the General Assembly--recognise President Kasavubu as the legal Authority. But tire question of his exact powers is another matter. We have always been anxious to have a meeting of the Congolese Parliament to define these things and to choose such people as Prime Minister whom they like or change. whom they have now. At the present moment, the House may know from the newspapers that Mr. Lumumba who was kept under some kind of detention and who was partly protected by the U.N. forces there from any action that might be taken by Col. Mobutu's forces, has escaped and it is said that he is probably going towards Stanleyville which is his hometown. All this, of course, has elements of considerable danger.

An Hon. Member: May I ask whether President Kasavubu has brought Col. Mobutu into prominence in opposition to General Victor Lundulla who has also fled to Stanleyville? Or does President Kasavubu at least recognise the authority of Col. Mobutu?

The Prime Minister I thought I had men-

tioned this fact. It is obvious that at the present moment at any rate President Kasavubu and Mr. Lumumba are not on good terms. They have not been. President Kasavubu has occasionally recognised Col. Mobutu's authority and sometimes it appears he has not fully recognised it. But broadly speaking, I think it may be said that Col. Mobutu has the backing of President Kasavubu, not in everything that he does but broadly.

Asked whether anything can be done through President Kasavubu by the U.N. by putting pressure on President Kasavubu, to stop such actions of the Congolese army; Prime Minister Nehru said : That has been done, even previously, and after President Kasavubu has been seated in the General Assembly his responsibility becomes greater and the U.N. can deal with him more in a formal way. That has been done. What the Hon'ble Member has suggested has already been done by the U.N.

CONGO USA GHANA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC INDIA NIGER NIGERIA FALKLAND ISLANDS

Date : Nov 01, 1960

Volume No

1995

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

Shri Krishna Menon's Statement in Lok Sabha Debate of Foreign Affairs

Speaking in the debate on foreign affairs in the Lok Sabha on November 23, 1960, Shri V. K. Krishna Menon, Minister of Defence, said :

The Prime Minister desired me to intervene in this debate largely to give an account of the present position in regard to the disarmament problem in the United Nations. As a result of the decision of Government, I have the privilege of being chairman of the delegation of India in the United Nations. Certain observations have been made in regard to matters of fact which are in error. Perhaps I should refer to them. But be-

fore I do so, I think it is appropriate for me to refer to the co-operation and the team spirit that prevailed among the members of the delegation, some of whom are- Members of this House and the other, which has largely contributed to our position and such efforts as we are able to make.

Reference was made, first of all, to the resolution moved on behalf of five countries by the Prime Minister in early October, and how disastrous it was, how untimely it was, and how ill-managed it was. Naturally, so far as the management and the general preparation for the resolution are concerned, the delegation must assume responsibility, even apart from the Prime Minister's own responsibility as the Head of the Government. I would like to say if all resolutions must be passed, if all motions must find acceptance in an assembly, it is very difficult to understand the role of the Opposition.

This resolution that was moved must be considered in the context of events in New York at the time. It was necessary for some one to take the initiative to set in motion currents in a direction reversed to antagonism and acrimony, and the House will bear with me, and perhaps accept, if I say that irrespective of the voting results, the feeling in the Assembly-I would not say universally, but overwhelmingly-was one of relief and thankfulness that it was moved, and it was touch and go whether it was voted or not. Its main purpose was not merely the recording of a vote, and those who are familiar with the Assembly procedure will realise that the mere passing of a resolution or its being lost is not of the total significance that might be the case in other Assemblies, because the decisions of the United Nations are not like the decisions of this

349

House, binding upon anybody. They are only recommendations-recommendations to whom, nobody knows. They are expressions of public opinion, and while a number of countries either abstained or in some cases voted against, it was known that their sympathies were with the resolution; even more, it paved the way for the progress that was made afterwards. In all resistance one has to keep on taking step after step, chipping away the resistance before oneself, and naturally the first attempt is likely to encounter greater part of the resistance, and perhaps result

in apparent failure. So, the Assembly as a whole, that is those who took the same view as in the resolution, were glad that this pioneer effort was made at that time.

Then there are certain mistakes of fact which would embarrass us in our future work. It was said that the purpose of this resolution was, so to say, lock President Eisenhower and Premier Khrushchev in a room or something of that kind. Very deliberately it had been drafted in a form where it only referred to contacts. It might well be asked, if it is contacts, why should it not be between the two countries rather than between these two heads of Governments or States. The reason is that the United States and the Soviet Union are still in diplomatic and friendly relations. There has been no breach of them, there has been no caveats no demarches or anything entered in regard to the general relations. The deadlock that had arisen was a result of the failure of the summit in which these two principal participants were the parties concerned, and that is why a reference was made to them- and also because of the nature and character of the Government, on the one hand, of the United States. and, on the other, of the Soviet Union. These gentlemen represent their Governments, though one is head of the State, and the other the Chairman of the Council of Ministers, and therefore, the format of the resolution was not only appropriate, it was necessary, it was proper in the circumstances. It is equally right that when by the tortuous procedure which is probably legitimate in debate, the purpose of a resolution is totally defeated, and when you get something totally contrary to what is intended, the mover of the resolution should withdraw it. In fact, in the Security Council of the United Nations there is a rule that when amendments are moved in such a way, and accepted, as to change the purpose of the resolution, the sponsors are entitled to withdraw it without the permission of the Council. Probably some day, it would be extended to this Assembly also.

Then, I would like to refer to one or two other matters. Reference was made yesterday to the Indian delegation opposing proposals made by others for the expansion of the Councils of the United Nations. I do not know what kinds of reports appeared in our newspapers, but it is quite true that the Indian delegation did say they

would not support the resolution that was before the Committee. That does not mean that they do not support the proposal. What is not realised is that there was a resolution last year calling upon us to do certain things; that could not be changed unless that resolution was rescinded by a two-third majority. The proposal made before the Committee was that the Committee should merely pass a resolution saying the Council should be expanded. When it is known that the initiative came from that group of countries who are already over-represented, and probably are afraid of losing their over-representation, it should be realised that those who want expansion should adopt such tactics as would make expansion possible.

The facts are these. No change in any organ of the United Nations can take place except under the provisions of the Charter which require its amendment, and the amendment of the Charter requires unanimity among the great Powers that are permanent members of the United Nations. Whether we like it or not, whether it is right or not, I am not going into that question now, that is the Charter, and that is the only way it can be managed. There is unanimity of opinion, as the Prime Minister pointed out yesterday, from all sides that there must be reorganisation, there must be expansion of these bodies, especially because today the United Nations has 99 members, while at San Francisco it had only 45. Therefore, we had to think, being seriously interested in this matter of the best way of obtaining some results next year. Last year it had been laid down that if at this session there was agreement in the matter, a committee should be appointed. Therefore we suggested we did not propose a resolution-that there should be a committee consisting of these four great Powers and others in order to work out some ways of enabling larger representation in the councils concerned. These are the facts, and we cannot get away from them. And these facts have been sufficiently effective in their impact that some of the sponsors of the previous resolution will be withdrawing from it and joining this proposal, which, I think, will go through before the end of the year.

Then we come to the colonial question. One of the main advances made this year has been these last two years, and particularly this year-

the change, the progress in the thinking of the United Nations in regard to the whole of the colonial empire. Acharya Kripalani a little while ago said that we had opposed some resolution on the ending of the empire. Maybe, if you indulge in flights of fancy, you can fly as far as you like. There was no resolution before the Assembly so far as I am aware, and I am aware of most things that happened there, on the ending of the empire. What has happened is that there is an item on the agenda called colonialism which has not been reached, and preparations are being made to obtain some good results out of that.

But in the meanwhile, on all those small, single matters that go on, we have made advance. And that stands side by side with the facts that while some ten years ago there were four African countries-Egypt, Libya, Sudan and Liberia-as members, today there are 25 or 26 countries from Africa, former colonial territories. While in the old days, a few millions were represented, today out of an estimated population of some 222 million in Africa, 178 million belong to States that are members of the United Nations. Similarly, last year probably there were areas just under 9 million square miles belonging to the empires of France and Britain, while today the area of the colonial territory in the African continent is 1.35 million. Out of it, 800,000 square miles are the empire of Portugal. And, therefore, the Prime Minister rightly characterised yesterday that she is the greatest imperial Power today.

But in regard to Portugal, having regard to the constitution of the United Nations, its methods of work and its strength, there is no way of wresting her colonies from her. But the greatest progress that is possible in regard to this matter was made this year, when the United Nations committee concerned, not by unanimous vote, but by vote without opposition except that of Portugal, decided that she should submit information to the United Nations. That is a matter of importance because of the recognition that she is a colonial Power. Until now, Portugal had said that she had no colonies, her territories were overseas territories, metropolitan Portugal, being her provinces. The only difference on which she had not made a notice was about Goa which is

now called the State of India. Therefore, this year, when this matter came up, even those who had opposed this in the past agreed to the situation. It also led to the only other colonial country which was in the same position, namely Spain, giving way; and Portugal today stands isolated. This is a great advance in the colonial position.

Equally, the territories of South Africa, which are not colonial in the legal sense-but there is a case of a serious violation of the Charter in regard to South West Africa, in which two countries, Liberia being one of them, have taken South Africa to the court in regard to certain legal matters-and others have received in the Assembly the kind of severe attention that no country has received before, so much so that the ordinary latitude that is allowed to a Foreign Minister in regard to certain procedures were not forthcoming from the committee. This is an advance in the colonial side.

Equally, in other ways also, there have been some advances of a notable character in the last two years. I have mentioned this not as an apologist of the United Nations, but because always, the quarrels, the acrimony and the scenes received publicity. In the last two years, the economic issues, particularly, the issues arising from the probable disarmament of the world, the economic consequences of disarmament on the one hand, and the position of the undeveloped countries on the other, have received considerable attention.

Coming to disarmament itself, before I deal with the advance, I think it is appropriate, Mr. Speaker, to draw the attention of the House to the part that this country has played in the whole of the disarmament problem from the year 1948 onwards. From 1948 to 1951, disarmament was largely concerned with the control of atomic energy and the position in relation to what is called the Baruch Plan. From 1952 onwards, the controversy on disarmament assumed its present state.

With your permission, I would like to draw the attention of the House to a little publication by the Ministry of External Affairs, on which I see no other number but M.E.A. 26; I believe it is one of their internal documents for their own

I use, but it is not marked secret. It will be one of those things which it would be proper for Members of the House to refer to. And you would find that year after year proposals are made by India in regard to disarmament which either are accepted for consideration, or which, where they are moved in the shape of amendments, become part of the thinking of the United Nations. It is interesting to note that the suggestions made seven or eight years ago and rejected at that time come back afterwards and a great many of them are today the crucial issues on which discussions are taking place.

Disarmament is no longer merely one of the

351

items or even one of the more important items. It is probably of total concern with regard to the world itself, the reason being that the quantity of armaments, and its characters change, so as to change the quality of war and the quality of its consequences ; that is the main reason.

And for the first time in the history of the United Nations, though countries like ours, perhaps for ethical reasons, perhaps for moral reasons, have pressed the position that the mere balanced reduction of arms, which has been the popularly accepted connotation of disarmament is no longer sufficient, on behalf of the Government of India, it was put forward at the Tenth Anniversary meeting at San Francisco, that disarmament was only a step towards a warless world, and what was required was the outlawry of war, where nations would be able to live in a society where war would no longer be an instrument of settling disputes. That was not accepted by the United Nations till last year.

Last year-and I do not say this because, as some gentlemen said, of my bias towards the one side or the other-after Mr. Khrushchev's speech, followed by that of President Eisenhower and others, the United Nations, after a great deal of controversy, accepted a warless world as the goal of disarmament. But this word 'goal' has created difficulties, because, sometimes, a goal is something that you do not achieve, but you fear you might achieve. But there it is. But, anyway, in 1959, it moved away from the construction of balanced reduction of armaments, whereby each country will have sufficient arms,

either for its own security or for collective defence as such, which would be stepped up, and which would be stepped up in case of international conflict. Now, we have moved away from the conception to what is now spoken of as a warless world, and following from that, the reduction of arms, not in the sense of cutting the size down, but the total abandonment of all equipment, of all forces and defence administrations of military training and things of that character, which was dismissed as being Utopian in the old days.

Nothing will advance this movement for the achievement of this more than the mobilisation of public opinion in the world, because, in spite of all that we say, there is a general fear, particularly in the circles economically and militarily affected by these things, of what is called the 'outbreak of peace', that is to say, that people may be out of work, business may go down and so on and so forth. But people have accepted the idea of a warless world in this way. I said a while ago that this is because of the changes that have taken place and I propose to refer to those changes in a short time.

But, in the history of the last ten years, irrespective of whatever we have said, there has been progress made between the two sides, and the role of India in this matter was played on behalf of the Government of India some years ago, and I say this because, yesterday it was mentioned that our position was either interfering where we should not or weighing on one side or the other. Speaking on this subject, we said that the essence of success in disarmament work is agreement. Therefore the power of the Assembly to rally behind one view, whether it be the view of the majority or of the minority, makes no difference ; at the next stage, the negotiations become more difficult. India is always opposed to putting her weight in the Assembly behind disagreements. And, therefore, whenever there is an attempt merely to carry something by a vote in what we call the cold war issue, we have abstained ; it is not because there are no views, but because we know very well that majority votes do not mean anything. I think the most outstanding instance is the voting on the issue of South Africa, where every year we mobilise enough votes, and nowadays all but the vote of South Africa, but the one vote we want for any settlement is the vote of

South Africa, and some day, we will get it.

Therefore, that has been the position that we have taken up. But, here there are arguments between the two sides, to one of which the Prime Minister referred yesterday as the controversy over whether control comes first or inspection comes first, that is, whether disarmament comes first or last. Anyway, during the last ten years, after the attempt of the United Nations to force the two Powers, more or less by persuasion and negotiations, there have been agreements on a number of particulars. But whenever there is nearness to an agreement, one side or the other brings forward something which the other side cannot accept. That is why I say that there is a general fear of disarmament, and I could not express it any better than what has been stated by an American source. The Carnegie Foundation this year in an examination of present proposals published a report in which the following is said-I have not got the whole of it, but this is an extract :-

"Every plan offered by either sides has contained a set of proposals calculated to have wide popular appeal. Every such step has included at least one feature that the other side could not

352

possibly accept and thus forcing a rejection. Then the proposing side has been able to claim that the rejector is opposed to the idea of disarmament in toto. The objectionable feature may be thought of as the 'joker' in every series of proposals."

They refer to this as what is called 'game-manship'. It is not a new thing today. It was there in the old disarmament discussions in the League of Nations. It is our experience that this year there are proposals in which the Russians object to some Particular feature; the next year they accept it, but the Americans object to it. In that way, it has gone on backwards and forwards. Then a position was reached in 1952 when there was a complete deadlock, when largely on our initiative the General Assembly gave directive as to what should be done.

Today we have reached the further position

where the nature of armament is such that unless we end war, war will end us, that is to say, the nature of atomic and hydrogen weapons is of such a character that not only the destruction is so vast but the emergence of war itself is not a remote possibility. This, again, is another factor which even statesmen sometimes do not give serious consideration to. It is not as though the possibility of war is remote. We are, in the present circumstance of an atomically armed world, not only on the brink of war, but war can be easily triggered. It can happen either by accident or by what is called the process of rational irrationality where they miscalculate the powers of these weapons; it can happen also by a catalytic process where small countries think that they can draw the big ones into the war which will be to their advantage. If one of these 'under-water bases' was used by one country, if from that a weapon was operated by accident and it fell on its own country, on the country of its origin, even that would lead to war because it makes the other people think that war has begun or the possessing country would say. Now, our weapons are known; we must start fighting'. The consequences are such that in the first few hours, the casualties in the war on the attacked country may be 50-60 million. It is said that 263 atomic bombs making a total of 1470 megatons would destroy 90 per cent of the population of the United States in a few hours; and the same applies to the other side, But this vast quantity of death and the appeal that it may make of fear will not conquer anything because armament itself is the result of fear and we could not meet fear by fear.

Therefore, we have to argue the position which is gradually being understood that the purpose of armaments is four fold; firstly, security of the country; secondly, expansion, for the acquisition of colonies; thirdly, the question of markets through economic penetration; and fourthly, to assert themselves in an ideological conflict. I will not, in the time that I have, go into the details of these. But I believe we may rule out the last three for the purpose of this debate, because on the colonial side, as I have said, the colonies are getting more or less--shall I say ?--disbanded, the economic issues are of a different character and co-operation between nations is forced, and the ideological controversy,

in spite of Communism and anti-Communism is in its intensity not as acute as it was at the time of the Crusades, because, after all, co-existence is, more or less, accepted.

Then there remains the question of security. But in the last two years certainly even this question of security, of what is called the fortress of nation has disappeared, because the quantity of arms, the striking power, is so much that, they no longer frighten anybody else; the weapons could not be used, because if used, it would mean total annihilation, so much so that their possession becomes more a danger than otherwise. If the deterrent power of these weapons, that is, if you have got atomic weapons of this type, the other fellow may not wage war, is to justify them, it means that you have confidence in your opponent that he will not use his weapons to destroy the world. And the whole difficulty has arisen from the fact that there is no such confidence. The two things are contradictory. Therefore, the whole thing has become absurd, developing from the old idea of one having weapons superior to the other.

The second question is the competition in what is called the armaments race. The arms race was had enough, when one nation competed against another in having more and more deadly arms; but today that is not the only position. A nation is competing against itself, in the sense that even before a particular weapon is completed, it has become obsolete and the next one has to be made. So it is competing with its own economy, its own technical powers and so on, and has come to a stage now when technologists say that there is nothing that cannot be made, with the result that whatever is made is out of date.

Thirdly has come the position emerging from space research in which some people think that neither the United States nor the Soviet Union want any control. They come to the position,

353

that on account of technological advances in space, unless war is outlawed, there is no method of control.

Fourthly, again while there is always argument about insistence upon inspection and control --and our Government has from the very beginning said that there could be no proper disarmament--

ment without a proper machinery of inspection and control-it is recognised at least in private conversation that no method of inspection and control is really going to be fool-proof, that is to say, there could be no method of inspection and control which would operate in all cases before the weapon has reached its target, That is, the Russians would deliver the missiles into the United States; then the missiles would be there long before the machinery of control can operate. Therefore, the machinery of control has to operate beforehand, and if it is to operate beforehand, then we must have agreement. That is now the basis of all our disarmament discussions.

Therefore, we have proceeded from the conception of a balanced reduction of arms to a size as envisaged in the Charter for the purpose of keeping the security of people, because it is feared that if nations have arms, they will grow from small to big ones. Equally, if we were to prohibit atomic weapons--destroy them, dismantle them-and even the larger high-explosive weapons, then it is realised--let me put it this way-that if the great countries were reduced in their arms to the level of 1870 or even 200 years before and if still there was an international conflict, all these weapons would come back, because the men who made them or the successors of the men who made them are there, the technology is there, the industry is there and the fear and the passion that make for war are also there. Therefore, any kind of disarmament in the sense of taking away weapons is no longer of any value. There is no instance in history where Generals who were in positions in war when it began concluded the war of the weapons with which the war began were the weapons which were used at the end. Today we have now reached the position that as a result of space research and nuclear and thermonuclear weapons whereby the disarmament problem has become one which is meaningless in the whole context, and a revolutionary outlook has become necessary,

Then the next factor that has emerged in the last two or three years was when first Great Britain made a little bomb and exploded it off Christmas Islands. Afterwards, when the French insisted on exploding theirs in the Sahara, it used to be called the fourth-power problem. Now it is not the fifth-power problem; it is the nth power problem. An American investigation

into the subject was made last year by a group of scientists under the chairmanship of a great scientist, Davisson. He submitted a report which pointed out that at that time there were 10 countries including India which had sufficiently advanced in nuclear research and the possession of nuclear fuel to be able to make bombs. This number has advanced to 20, Now, to get away from this academic statement, it is possible for countries like Germany, China, Japan, Italy and Israel-all these countries-to produce these weapons, with the result that the control or atomic weapons has become impossible.

Therefore, unless at the present stage the larger countries-the Soviet Union, the United States and the United Kingdom-who may be regarded as more responsible in this matter and will, therefore, contribute to disarmament, unless at this stage we bring about elimination of these weapons: there is no hope of eliminating them. That, I understand, is the significance of the Prime Minister's observation yesterday that unless we disarm in the next three or four or five years, there can be no disarmament at all.

Added to that is the change in the character of these weapons. I do not want to read extracts and take too long a time. There are methods and methods. The older method is revived in Germany whereby these weapons will be produced much cheaper and in much smaller size. The bomb that was dropped on Nagasaki and Hiroshima is what is spoken of as the 20 kiloton bomb. They now use these 20 kiloton bombs in order to trigger bigger bombs. That is only like a match stick that ignites. That is one of the main difficulties that these big megaton bombs which have such explosive power in one of them as all the explosives used in the world in history; and that and that alone is such a menace. But today they have learnt to make very much smaller weapons. It is known that the 50-ton bomb has been made; and the same scientists say that next year it can be reduced to 10 tons and in the following year to 5 tons. So, the position put forward by our delegation 2 or 3 years ago, which was laughed off at that time as scientific fiction, that atomic weapons may very well become conventional weapons and become portable and be loaded even in smaller arms, that has become true. Now, all this means that unless war is ended, war must end us. That is to say, there is

no way of controlling these things today except by abandonment. And this has been gradually and increasingly realised. That is what has taken us to the position in the United Nations this year.

354

In the United Nations this year, before the General Assembly first of all, there was the deadlock with which we started. Last year's resolution spoke about the abandonment of war and asked the ten powers to negotiate. The ten-power negotiation was outside the United Nations because there was no possibility of getting an agreement for a negotiating committee which appealed to both parties. So, largely on our initiative, it was settled that the two countries talk to each other. They then called for this ten-power committee which, although it was unconstitutional or not literally under the United Nations, was a part of the understanding. Anyway, they came to grief in the sense there was no advance made in these negotiations and they got into a deadlock; and the final phase of this unfortunate situation was when the summit meeting broke down in Geneva.

And the Assembly met under these circumstances where the device of direct negotiations through a ten-power committee had met with grief. There was no proposal; there was no advance of any kind and what is more, the resolution to which I made a reference a little while ago, trying to remedy the situation, namely the bringing together of these two people, that had become necessary because they won't talk to each other. There was complete deadlock and some disengagement had to be thought of. Various other methods were tried even before we came to the decision of trying to get negotiating groups and what not and that still is in the process of development.

But, in the meanwhile, it was suggested by us in general debate, afterwards taken up elsewhere, that we should now come to the position, the same as in 1952, when on the balance of reduction of arms there was a total deadlock and no movement would take place. We had then simply come away and said this negotiating committee must do these things, A. B. C. D. and E, and a directive was given. That was why, unsuccessful as it may appear at the shortest context, for the last 5 or 6 years, they have gone on. It was

wrong for us to think that while no results have been reached, no single gun has been thrown away but still great progress has been made in the whole process of disarmament.

We have reached the same situation now when there was a complete deadlock. And so it was mooted that we should give directives to the Assembly, to the negotiating people who were there. We are still far away from the position where we can find an acceptable negotiating group. The Soviet Union wants a negotiating group in which there are 5 other people. 5 of the West and 5 of the non-committed nations. Now, even if this were possible, it is unlikely that neither the non-committed countries nor the Western countries would accept this division of the world being in 3 camps, the two power blocs and the non-committed ones. That ideology they may not accept. But, in practice, some such arrangements would probably emerge and from that, incidentally, an indirect inference may be drawn by those who criticise our policy.

At long last the policy of non-alignment of certain people, people not being committed to those countries taking an objective view-though always we do not vote as logically as we should-but trying to express our objective view has resulted in the position of both the West and the East today looking to the non-committed nations perhaps, sometimes directly, sometimes in a shy way and sometimes in an indirect way to bring about the reconciliation that is required. And, so, before the Assembly are various resolutions. There are the usual East and West resolutions coming from the United States, the United Kingdom, Italy and those western powers, from the Soviet Union, Poland and the others and there are one or two other people. And, at the present moment while all these have the same status, when I left New York the position was that the proposals made by a number of countries, including ourselves, which have taken a considerable part, which have been the result of a long period of negotiations of 5 or 6 weeks, still holds the field in the sense that while one may not say so in any formal sense, the general feeling is that if agreement can be reached on this basis it will be possible to get unanimity. The basis of the resolution is to recall what has been said in the past, lay down these directives. I do not propose to read them because they have been published.

These directives include the elimination of arms, the elimination of bases, the elimination of training facilities and carrier weapons and so on. It also makes a provision for the maintenance of international and internal security in future by the existence of a police force in the municipal territory which would be placed at the disposal of the United Nations. And this also requires an amendment of the Charter and it is being realised on both sides because the Charter actually provides for military contingents, Air Force and Navy to be placed at the disposal of the United Nations. That also is taken account of.

But, as I said to the Committee, we are not in a position to say that there is unanimity of opinion on this. We hope that it would be so.

355

At the same time, it is interesting for this House to notice that both the representatives of the United States and of the Soviet Union informed the Committee that there are some parts of it with which they were in agreement, one more than the other, but there were certain parts, from their own point of view, which did not represent the balance. Each one says it does not represent the balance. That is a hopeful feature., They thought that if after a few days-perhaps referring to our Delegation-someone may be able to assist towards an agreement; and it was for that reason that the discussion of this question has been adjourned.

Normally, when an item comes, that is finished before anything is taken up. As, was found more convenient for all these reasons, just to take no notice of that practice, the position is that there will be further consideration given to this problem. There is a realisation everywhere that the nature of armament and the size is such that unless there is agreement in this way arms will spread.

There is also the knowledge that a country like China with vast potentialities-where the economists estimate that in 1970 she will reach the position, economically and industrially of Russia in 1960-with the vast potentialities in that way, and with advanced Japanese technology; and what is more of the production of conventional arms in the small countries, particularly the achievement

of Germany in this field, there is fear all round that we are reaching a stage which would be beyond control. We also welcome that. It is recognised by each side though not in public that there should be space control that the use of outer space for this purpose should be prohibited.

The main trouble in this matter is that the Americans, the Western side thinks that while there is no objection to accepting all this,--and it is interesting to note that none of these great countries shrink at least in public from the elimination of fighting forces, military colleges and the Defence Ministries and what not--when it comes to the practicability of it, the Westerners--though it is not accurate, broadly speaking--think let us do something big; let us agree on that and let Russia agree to that big thing; and then we go on to the next. The Russian view and the view of the uncommitted nations will be that the trouble is not going to end in 10 or 12 years; let there be a commitment; there must be a committed commitment by the great Powers, the Assembly as a whole, to accept this, and that will lead to total disarmament in the world.

Now, in the negotiations we have gone so far as to the position where if some method can be found, the two points of view can be reconciled and to the extent what may be called partial measures can still be discussed and implemented. If the Soviets would accept them as not a bar to the other one, then perhaps progress can be made. But the fear in the Russian side is that if you put emphasis on partial measures, the West will go about talking partial measures and nothing else. Similarly, the Americans would say: if you agree to this objective, then the Russians would come and say: 'let us have one treaty and write everything down'. We cannot make progress. That is I would not say deadlock--difficulty may arise; that is the risk. So, it is largely dependent upon the wisdom of these two sides and the capacity of the other people to find agreements. Then we may make some progress. And the progress, is assisted by the fact that there have been some small agreements. Whether these small agreements will become complete or not is one of the factors. In these small agreements are the steps in regard to the suspension of nuclear explosions.

You remember, Sir, the Prime Minister made a statement in the House some six or seven years ago, calling for the suspension of nuclear tests and explosions. For many years this was not accepted as part of the disarmament and even now it is not called disarmament; it is called arms control. The official scientists in the West, the 18th Century bishops always have the opinion that suits with the Government. They did not lay the same stress on the effects of these things as the others and have spoken about these explosions as if they were merely scientific. Fortunately, there are several publications brought to the attention of the UN where those who wanted to have these explosions themselves had stated that their purposes were not scientific but that they were intended to perfect the atomic weapons. So long as the explosions are permitted, then the engines of war and destruction are not reversed. Why do you want to perfect a weapon unless you are going to use it? That is the idea.

Anyway, these discussions have gone on in Geneva for nearly a year and about two-thirds of the treaty had been agreed. But the one-third which is not agreed to is rather a difficult matter where first of all there is no agreement on the measures of seismographic tests or on the committee of inspection. On the committee of inspection, it would appear, that there may be some agreement provided there is a move towards total disarmament but at the same time

356

our country would be rather sad to think that both the Russians and the Americans have agreed to maintain underground explosions. Underground explosions were insisted upon by the West and now it has been accepted. Following our general policy that when there is agreement between the Russians and the Americans, we do not try to improve upon it thinking you cannot sacrifice what is good for the best. These underground explosions have been put up before the Assembly as though they were small matters of digging a little hole. Now it is known that these are very serious and large undertakings in the field of armament. Let us take an example. Each one of these holes would cost about 30 million dollars. The huge salt mines are used for this purpose. The whole process of maintaining them is going to cost about a

billion dollars.

I say all this to show the dimensions of this problem. Anyway there is every hope that some progress may take place. If there is no progress it is feared that there would be the renewal of explosions. If explosions are renewed, not only would they increase ionisation and radiation in the world-the birth of deformed children had gone up from 4 to 5 per cent in the US alone-but also they would lead to more and more countries adopting them because if tests were banned, it partly stops the nth power problem.

Apart from this, there is the problem of smaller weapons. De Gaulle of France has come forward with what is called the doctrine of atomic isolation. That is to say, he wants to develop his own weapons in his own way and does not want to come into any of these compacts at the present time. If that happens, then particularly the undeveloped countries and the ex-colonial countries fear that atomic weapons may be used in colonial wars because neither Russia nor the United States is going to involve themselves in a world war in order to punish somebody for some depredation somewhere. So, it is feared that if these weapons get to smaller size and become more distributed in the development of what is called the nth power problem, you would have a situation beyond control. That is why disarmament is today, rightly, the one problem that should concern all of us because our economic development, in fact the survival of the world, is at stake and it is necessary for us to realise that all this talk about world destruction and so on is not academic. A US scientist has given the chance of atomic war in the close proximity of 4 to 1. That is to say, it is not as though it is a very distant possibility; it is a great danger. I think we should be happy to feel that. in spite of our limited resources, limited knowledge and our limited influence in the world, we have over the years been able to make some contribution.

INDIA USA EGYPT LIBERIA LIBYA SUDAN FRANCE PORTUGAL SPAIN SOUTH AFRICA CENTRAL
AFRICAN REPUBLIC TOTO RUSSIA CHINA GERMANY ITALY JAPAN ISRAEL SWITZERLAND
POLAND

Date : Nov 01, 1960

Volume No

1995

JAPAN

Visit of Crown Prince and Princess

Their Imperial Highnesses the Crown Prince and Princess of Japan paid a visit to India from November 29 to December 6, 1960. On November 29, a State Banquet was held in honour, of Their Imperial Highnesses at Rashtrapati Bhawan.

Extending a most hearty welcome to Their Imperial Highnesses, the President, Dr. Rajendra Prasad said:

Your Imperial Highnesses, Excellencies and Distinguished Guests :

May I on behalf of the people and the Government of India extend to Your Imperial Highnesses once again a most hearty welcome to our country. We welcome you as the personal representative of His Imperial Majesty and also as the shining symbol of the new era in Japan. We have been looking forward to your visit for some time, and as I said earlier in the day, it signifies an important stage in the history of Indo-Japanese relations.

For me who had the privilege of visiting your country some two years ago, this occasion brings back cherished memories of a great and beautiful country and a charming and dynamic people. I returned to India with the lasting impression that the bonds that link us will grow stronger as time passes, for our ideals are the same and spring from the same ancient traditions. The visit of Your Imperial Highnesses will reinforce these ties of understanding and mutual regard and strengthen our efforts for the establishment of lasting peace in the world.

To us in India, Japan is a striking example of a rapidly changing society in which traditional

patterns are gracefully adapting themselves to modern requirements. Your country's attempt to preserve and maintain a balance between the old and the new, the rising tempo of your economic development that affects all levels of society and your rapid recovery from the tragedy of war are surely sources of inspiration for other Asian countries.

There is undoubtedly a great deal that we can learn and benefit from the experience and example of your country. We in India are engaged in a vast and stupendous effort to raise the standards of living of our people against great odds. In the context of this prodigious task we greatly value the co-operation and assistance we have received from the people and Government of Japan.

May I request Your Imperial Highnesses to take back with you a message of affection, friendship and goodwill from the people of India to His Imperial Majesty and the people of Japan.

Your Excellencies, Ladies and Gentlemen, may I ask you now to join me in drinking a toast to the health of His Imperial Majesty the Emperor of Japan and Their Imperial Highnesses the Crown Prince and Princess of Japan, and to the happiness and prosperity of the people of Japan.

JAPAN INDIA USA

Date : Nov 01, 1960

Volume No

1995

JAPAN

Reply by Crown Prince

In his reply to President Prasad's Speech, the Crown Prince said :

Mr. President, Mr. Vice-President, Mr. Prime Minister, Your Excellencies, and Distinguished Guests :

The Princess and I are very grateful to you for the warmth of your welcome. We have been deeply touched by the kind words of the President, which I believe have been addressed, not only to us personally, but to my father the Emperor, and to the Japanese people whose unity the Emperor symbolizes.

Mr. President, it is my great privilege to return on behalf of my father the Emperor, the courtesy of your memorable visit to Japan, which has left upon our people's mind a very deep impression of your great and benevolent statesmanship. And I recall also with great pleasure the visits of the prominent leaders of India, including the Vice-President and the Prime Minister. The sincere welcome they received from the Japanese people was more than an expression of the hospitality and friendliness of our people. It was a manifestation of the high respect of our people for these leaders of India, whose devotion to the cause of world peace is widely known and appreciated in my country. It was also a reflection of the deep sense of indebtedness of our people to India for her great civilization, which had such a far-reaching influence upon Japanese culture.

In recent years, our people seem to have come to be interested, more keenly than ever, in the industrial growth of the new India and the important role she is playing in international affairs, because, I believe, our people are increasingly concerned about the welfare of our fellow Asians and the preservation of peace. In this respect, our two countries certainly have a goal in common and are determined to attain it. I hope its attainment will be expedited by the joint efforts of our two countries.

The Princess and I have been in this great country only for a few days and just a little more than half a day in its capital city, but things we have seen and the people we have met and, above all, the welcome generously accorded to us have made us feel sure that our present visit in this great country, although not long enough, will be one of the happiest experiences we have ever had and will remain unforgettable throughout our life.

Excellencies, Ladies and Gentlemen, may I now ask you to raise your glasses and drink with me to the health of His Excellency the President and the prosperity of the Republic of India.

JAPAN USA INDIA

Date : Nov 01, 1960

Volume No

1995

PAKISTAN

Joint Communique on Indo-Pakistan Press Code

The Indo-Pakistan Information Consultative Committee met in Rawalpindi (Pakistan) on 358 November 26 and 27, 1960. After the conclusion of the meeting a joint communique was issued simultaneously in New Delhi and Rawalpindi on November 28, 1960.

The following is the text of the communique:

The Indo-Pakistan Information Consultative Committee which reviewed trends in the Press, radio, films and publications in India and Pakistan, appreciated the work being done in the two countries to implement the Indo-Pakistan agreements.

In the inaugural session on November 26, the leader of the Pakistan delegation, while welcoming the leader and members of the Indian delegation, acknowledged the significant improvement that had taken place in the relationship between the two countries. He said the climate of friendship could be further improved if, in addition to observing voluntarily the Joint Press Code, some thought was given to the positive aspects of the problems, and the information

media in both India and Pakistan stressed on the work being done in both countries in the field of economic and social development.

The leader of Pakistan delegation emphasised the need for broad agreement on principals and a better approach to the problems. He pointed out that while there might be infringements here and there of an all-embracing Code in both the countries, the committee should concern itself more with flagrant violations that cause a sense of anger and animosity between the two peoples. He said that in order to create a more harmonious understanding personal attacks on national leaders should be avoided.

The leader of the Indian delegation reciprocated the sentiments of friendship and goodwill expressed by the leader of the Pakistan delegation and said that the initiative taken by the President of Pakistan and the recent visit of the Indian Prime Minister to Pakistan as also instances of greater cooperation in economic and trade relations had done a lot to lessen the tension between the two countries. There was now greater understanding of each other's viewpoint. He agreed with the leader of Pakistan delegation that in addition to the observance of the Joint Press Code the Press in both the countries should strive to see the positive side of the work that is being done in India and Pakistan. As regards other media of information, the two Governments could take steps and evolve a procedure much more easily because they were under their control. He emphasised that these media could give the lead by avoiding attacks on the personalities of the leaders of both the countries.

In his view there was an all-round improvement, but there was room for further improvement.

Both delegations agreed that the violation of the Joint Press Code should be looked at from the viewpoint of getting the broad picture in order to assess the progress made towards more friendly atmosphere and understanding.

In the field of the Press, the Committee reviewed the working of the Joint Press Code since its adoption last April and noted the steps taken to implement it. While the Committee was satisfied that the Press as a whole had tried

its best to contribute towards friendly feelings between the two countries, it noted with regret that some newspapers in both the countries had not acted in consonance with the Joint Press Code.

It felt that the time had come when positive steps should be taken to promote a more cordial atmosphere by reporting on and reviewing constructive and developmental activities in both countries.

The Committee felt that efforts of the two Governments to promote friendly relations should be supplemented by the Press in both the countries collaborating to ensure implementation of the Joint Press Code.

The Committee held that better understanding between the two countries would be promoted by broadening the basis of facilities given to journalists for reporting on activities in each country. It held the present procedure to be unduly restrictive.

The Committee recommended for increased facilities for circulation of newspapers published in each country to promote better appreciation of the achievements of the two people.

The Committee was informed by the Pakistan representatives that the question of the removal of ban on the entry of three Indian newspapers into East Pakistan was under active consideration.

On broadcasting, films and publications, the Committee noted the distinct improvement in the tone and complexion of broadcasts of the two

359

organisations and agreed that efforts to maintain this trend and to make further improvements should be continued.

In this connection the Committee discussed some specific broadcasts where selection of material and its editing and treatment called for further improvement. They exchanged views with regard to the ways and means of effecting this improvement.

The Committee also discussed and favoured

the exchange of visits by personnel of the two broadcasting organisations and wherever possible the joint production of programmes.

The Committee further recommended that there should be exchange of radio programmes, documentary films and publications reflecting economic, social and cultural progress of the two countries.

PAKISTAN USA INDIA PERU

Date : Nov 01, 1960

Volume No

1995

U. N. E. S. C. O.

Dr. Radhakrishnan's Address to General Conference

The Vice-President Dr. S. Radhakrishnan made the following speech at the plenary meeting of the General Conference of UNESCO in Paris on November 15, 1960:

I shall now invite your attention to the valuable work which the UNESCO can do in this troubled and distracted world, when tensions are mounting, nuclear weapons are increasing and arms race expanding. Whether in education, technical assistance or scientific research, UNESCO is demonstrating how the nations of the world are caught in a web of international influences and commitments. The nations are today a part of the world-wide human society but that society has not the structure and safeguards of a civilised community. Within a nation we live under the rule of law. We share common purposes and promote general welfare. All these are lacking in the international world. We do not aim at the general welfare but pursue our national interests. - We do not seek a world under law but are interested in our national security. It is for us in this organisation to do a little to articulate a common purpose for a

frightened humanity and strive to build on its basis fundamental international institutions.

The present state of armed peace is untenable and is gradually becoming impossible. Each nation is spending on armaments much more than what it does on education, science and culture. We immobilize a large part of the nation's manhood and create more evils than we are able to cure.

The abolition of war is the most important thing for the growth of education, science and culture. If we do not bring about a new climate of opinion, total annihilation may overtake us. If we go on experimenting with nuclear weapons, manufacturing them, stockpiling them, keeping them in, readiness, sooner or later a time will come when some of them will go off. It might be a deliberate attempt by one of the great powers or an accidental blunder by some subordinate officer or inefficient novice.

It is the duty of man to pass life on to the next generation unimpaired if not enhanced. Life is a gift from past generations and we have no right to maim it or destroy it. The radio-active fall-out will have dangerous effects on the future generations, but in our blindness we are continuing to pollute earth, water and air.

The mere banning of nuclear tests or even the destruction of nuclear weapons is not enough. We can destroy the weapons but we cannot destroy the knowledge, the know-how. If hostilities break out it is virtually certain that nuclear weapons will be used sooner or later. We will be misleading the peoples of the world if we suggest that in a global conflict nuclear weapons can be avoided. Even small nations can learn it. No system of inspection and control can prevent the danger. There is no security, therefore, for any nation, small or big, in a divided and suspicious world. War has to be given up and disputes among nations should be settled by peaceful methods, by negotiation, adjustment or arbitration. If we are opposed to international agreements, if we continue to rely on military strength and the threat of destruction, catastrophe is inevitable. Intemperate words, cynical threats, unrestrained wranglings in the General Assembly of the United Nations a few weeks ago show that the world is passing through a crisis of

stupidity and violence which is all too obvious. That is why nothing concrete has happened in spite of the declared intentions of the Great Powers.

360

What is necessary is the dissipation of the clouds of fear, suspicion and mistrust. The Great Powers are suffering from persecution complex. Soviet Union feels that the socialist countries are being encircled. America does not forget Pearl Harbour and is afraid of a surprise attack even during the process of disarmament. Both groups suffer from a deep feeling of insecurity. Governments do not rely on the good faith of others. This is why they employ spies, speak untruths and half-truths, bribe employees of other governments, break confidence, send intelligence planes and meddle in other people's affairs. We all condemn these practices but we do not hesitate to adopt them. Unless we replace fear by trust, there does not seem to be much hope.

In November 1959, the Executive Board of the UNESCO requested the Director General to continue to take all appropriate measures to bring about the formation in all Member States of a climate of opinion favourable to general and complete disarmament. By enabling the nations of the world to work on international cultural projects, scientific research, educational and technical development of under-developed countries we are attempting to liberate thought, increase hope, foster understanding and pacify the minds of men.

Bernard Shaw gave an address a few years before his death in Cambridge and described his vision of the future. An old cleric got up and asked about the forces which could implement his ideals. Bernard Shaw answered with a bland smile, "Human selfishness, human selfishness". Man's instinct to survive is there and it is bound up with a sense of human solidarity. The knowledge that human survival depends on the practice of tolerance may make us practice this virtue. Here Bernard Shaw assumes the basic rationality of human nature. We have rational science and along with it irrational minds. Human life works at three planes ; the unconscious instinct and impulse rule at the lowest ; conscious reason at the next ; spiritual insight,

artistic vision at the highest.

Here in UNESCO we deal with the fundamentals of living, with the mobilisation of intellectual resources, with the direction of science to creative ends, with the expansion of facilities for education and with the increase of beauty in human lives. These are in keeping with the full dimensions of human spirit. Nations should compete with one another in excellence and not in missiles and rockets. The international campaign to safeguard the monuments of Nubia threatened with submersion as a result of the construction of the Aswan Dam recognises world's interest in great works of art. Man should see and live by a higher standard of loyalty to the world community.

Differences which divide the great nations become slight when we look at the threat with which humanity is faced. Our pretensions to ultimate truth and our conviction of the universal applicability of our version of the truth are found in politics as in religion. Gandhiji said : "I shall have no pleasure from living in this world if it is not united". It will be united only if we learn to reconcile different civilisations and religious traditions, with their different pre-suppositions and values, with their different economic systems and political responsibilities. We should be loyal to each other across creedal, cultural or political frontiers. The East-West project is one significant attempt towards the development of this great ideal of cultural solidarity. Now that the United States has a new President we very much hope that the great leaders will soon meet, understand each other's fears, suspicions and difficulties and strive to remove them, and save the world from the threat of annihilation.

We should try to diminish the tensions that give rise to military conflicts. One of them is the political subjection of peoples. The United Nations General Assembly recently passed a resolution demanding immediate political independence for colonies which are still under foreign rule. Nationalism in Africa is on the ascendant. A young nationalist author Albert Tevoedjre writes: "In the name of African women wandering for miles to find a bare sustenance for their children, in the name of African urchins whom hunger has forced to become habitual liars, in the name of African soldiers drafted to fight in

north Africa as shock troops in the attack on the life and liberty of other weak peoples", subject peoples demand equality and end of colonial rule.

The whole structure of subjection and tyranny depends on the foundation of ignorance. Today ideas of freedom and progress are spreading all over the world, and the mind of man is not so impoverished and crippled as it used to be.

We welcome the new States which have attained political freedom, but this freedom cannot be effective unless these nations are enabled to raise the living standards of their people. Political freedom should be accompanied by a simultaneous liberation of the peoples from social and economic ills. The new political leaders are charged with the responsi-

361

bility which is at once formidable and inspiring. Problems cannot await slow solutions. Human urgencies are acute. Education, health, housing, industrial development, require to be speeded up. Advanced nations are in a position to help the new free nations with doctors, engineers, chemists and agriculturists. They should not work up the highly excitable peoples of the African States into civil strife so that they might themselves maintain their influence, if not power, indefinitely. Strong currents of passion are sweeping across the awakened States threatening to submerge the liberties won with difficulty and cherished with respect. Advanced powers who have retreated from control should assist and not retard the growth of social and educational facilities.

We live in a world of sharpened social consciousness. New States should have at their service not only modern science but also modern social conscience. Countries outside Europe and North America which are underdeveloped, un-modernised, almost wholly lacking in the capital they need for growth require the assistance, which our organisation and other agencies of the United Nations can give them. The gap between the world's rich and the poor should be bridged. Economic development is as important for security as military strength. I hope that when the Conference considers the programme and budget proposals these needs of the under developed will be taken into account.

So long as race discrimination is on the statute Books of certain States, peace will be precarious. The emotions of large parts of the world are directly and deeply involved in this problem of racial discrimination. Wounded souls are the greatest danger to peace and we have such souls in large numbers in Africa and Asia. If constitutional processes prove to be of no avail, violent upheavals will result. History is made up of classical tragedies of great nations which are doomed by their insensitivity to the changes of social consciousness and political climate.

We are living in one of the great liberating periods of history. Many factors are blended in this movement, resistance to tyranny, to colonial domination, to racial intolerance and the great struggle for the improvement of human conditions.

Culture is progressive subjugation of the animal in man. Man should function as an animal tamer. The great prophets teach us the courage of suffering without inflicting pain, of dying without killing. We need loving kindness, universal charity.

I have no doubt that this earth will outlast our self-destructive impulses and will create new men and women whose loyalty will be to the human community and not merely to smaller groups.

362

FRANCE USA PERU RUSSIA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC

Date : Nov 01, 1960

December

Volume No

1995

Foreign Affairs Record 1960
Volume VI DECEMBER No. 12

CONTENTS PAGE

CEYLON

Prime Minister Nehru's Welcome Speech 363
Reply by Ceylonese Prime Minister 364

CONGO

Prime Minister's Statement in Lok Sabha on
situation in Congo 365
Prime Minister's Statement in Rajya Sabha on
situation in Congo 370

INDIA IN THE UNITED NATIONS

Shri Krishna Menon's Statement in Security Council
on Congo 372
Shri Krishna Menon's Statement in General Assembly
on Congo 394
Shri Krishna Menon's Statement in General Assembly
on Colonialism 409
Shri Krishna Menon's Statement in Political
Committee on Algeria 418
Shri M.H. Samuel's Statement on U.N. Special Fund 424
Shri M.H. Samuel's Statement on Dissemination of
Scientific Knowledge 426

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

Prime Minister's Statement initiating Rajya Sabha
Debate on Foreign Affairs 428
Prime Minister's Reply to Rajya Sabha Debate on
Foreign Affairs 436

JAPAN

Speech by Crown Prince at Farewell Banquet 447
Reply by President Rajendra Prasad 448

PAKISTAN

Prime Minister's Statement in Lok Sabha on Berubari 448

UNITED KINGDOM

Indo-U.K. Credit Agreement Signed 457

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Indo-U.S. Loan Agreements Signed 457

MINISTRY OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS: EXTERNAL PUBLICITY DIVISION

GOVERNMENT OF INDIA

CONGO INDIA ALGERIA JAPAN PAKISTAN UNITED KINGDOM USA

Date : Dec 01, 1960

Volume No

1995

CEYLON

Prime Minister Nehru's Welcome Speech

Speaking at a banquet held in honour of the Hon'ble Sirimavo R. D. Bandaranaike, Prime Minister of Ceylon, at Rashtrapati Bhavan on December 30, 1960 the Prime Minister, Shri Jawaharlal Nehru said:

Madam Prime Minister, Excellencies, Ladies and Gentlemen, We have had the privilege of welcoming many distinguished guests here but I can say with perfect honesty and truth that you, Madam, are particularly welcome and your visit here has given us very special pleasure for a variety of reasons. Any person in your distinguished position coming from Sri Lanka would have been very welcome. You particularly are welcome because of yourself, Madam, and also because of your distinguished husband whom we knew so well here. You are also welcome because you have not come here for any complicated political discussions. We have so many problems facing us in the world that sometimes some little relief from them is very welcome. You have come here, as you yourself said, on a pilgrimage to the land where the great Buddha was born. and lived and gave his message and that, apart from numerous other bonds, still unites us.

When we talk of Sri Lanka immediately our minds go back to our own mythology, to our old stories. Indeed, if I speak about your country anywhere in India in my own language, the only way they can understand me is to say I am referring to Lanka. Ceylon probably will not be under-

stood except by a relative few. The word 'Ceylon' here is adopted recently as the official designation of Ceylon. So our bonds go back to remote ages past and they have their foundations so deep that even when we argue about matters, even when we have some small problems of our own, nothing really takes away from that close association based on past history, a great similarity of culture, tradition, the message of the Buddha and geography.

We have had some problems of our own which we have discussed and which we will no doubt discuss and solve but the nature of the problems is something quite different from the other and more difficult controversies that rage in the world, and behind it all, is something which is very precious; that is, an amount of goodwill between the two countries which is really very great so that whatever petty controversies we may have from time to time they can never lead us astray. So you are welcome here as a pilgrim, as also as a Prime Minister. In a sense all of us, at any rate I do, feel more and more like pilgrims in this world having to cross occasionally very difficult terrain which test our endurance and such capacities as we may have to the utmost. In doing so it is heartening to think of friends who in some ways broadly think alike, broadly act alike, and anyhow who are friends. With so much controversy and language of bitterness and hatred and violence thrown about in the world the fact that there are friends in the world, and many friends, rather lightens the burden one has to carry. You have come here at a time when both your country and ours, as indeed most other countries, are facing these very difficult problems, apart from our own local national problems, world problems. Now all of us, your country and mine, are tremendously occupied in trying to build up our countries, in various ways their economies, raising their standards of living. We are planning and we have no desire to get entangled in other countries problems. We have enough of our own and yet we cannot escape them. They surround us and try to overwhelm us because the world becomes so restricted, in spite of these controversies, grows so much as one world that whether we have the virtues of one world or not, we have to suffer the disadvantages of it all the time because all the ills of other countries also pursue us apart from our own. So we face these world problems because we cannot escape them. Even so, it is

something even when we differ-not that we differ Madam, with your country very much or at all in these world problems-it is an advantage that we do so without rancour or illwill, and to be able to discuss matters with an effort to understand them, understand the others viewpoint, even though we may not agree with it. I suppose that that has been a virtue of the Commonwealth. There are very considerable differences in our approach sometimes but the basic fact of our discussing them in a friendly spirit and trying to understand each other's viewpoint carries us far and I have often wished that that particular type of approach might be duplicated elsewhere in the world also. I do not know when that will happen but if we duplicate that approach we will not solve all the problems, perhaps not, but anyhow we should live in a more gracious world, not in a world so full of the spirit of bitterness and always on the verge of violence, always suspecting each other and always preparing for something that we all say must not happen. It is an extraordinary state of affairs. Anyhow, whatever may happen to the world-I hope nothing very bad

363

will happen-I am sure that your country and ours, Madam, will live in friendship and co-operation and when any relatively petty problems arise between us or have arisen, we shall solve them in friendship and co-operation and in the larger world also we shall co-operate for, I hope, not only our particular advantage but for the good of the big causes that we have at heart, the cause of peace, freedom of other countries and the world developing through a spirit of co-operation into a really one world as it must be unless it destroys itself. Men's minds lag behind scientific and technological growth of humanity and till we catch up to them probably we shall have to face all these difficulties.

You have come here, Madam, on a pilgrimage to the places which have been sanctified in the past by Buddha's presence and his teaching. Perhaps if people paid a little more heed to that teaching, we might find the true path more easily the path of peace, tolerance and friendly co-operation. I hope that when you go back from this country your visit to these sacred places in India, sacred to you, sacred to us and sacred to many, will give you strength and courage to bear the heavy burden you are carrying and I am

sure your visit here in this particular way for this purpose will give us a little more courage too.

May I wish you, Madam, give you all our good wishes to you and to your people and hope that your people will advance and help not only in solving the problems that they have but in other problems too ?

Your Excellencies, Ladies and Gentlemen, I ask you to drink to the goSd health of the Prime Minister of Sri Lanka.

USA SRI LANKA INDIA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC

Date : Dec 01, 1960

Volume No

1995

CEYLON

Reply by Ceylonese Prime Minister

Replying to Shri Nehru's welcome Speech, Mrs. Bandaranaike said :

The Hon'ble Prime Minister, Your Excellencies, Ladies and Gentlemen, You, Sir, in proposing my toast made some very kind references to me and I thank you very much for your very kind words.

I have been greatly touched by the cordiality and warmth of welcome that my children and I have received during my visit to your great country and I must take this opportunity to express my sincere and heartfelt thanks to you, for making it possible for me to come here on a pilgrimage and a much-needed holiday.

I am conscious of the enormous responsibilities that I have to shoulder as the Prime Minister of my country. I shall endeavour to discharge them fully, conscious of the fact that my election

was due to the affection, regard and trust the people of Ceylon had in my late husband. It will be my endeavour to follow in his footsteps. It is encouraging for me to know that I always can rely on the sympathy, goodwill and friendly interest of a world statesman of your calibre.

Our two countries regained independence only recently. Since independence India has been very fortunate in your leadership-one of the greatest statesmen of the world today. Your policies and principles greatly influenced and had the support of my late husband. You, Sir, have given to us and the world Panchsheel which, as my late husband once pointed out, was only second in importance to mankind, to the Charter of the United Nations. You, Sir, have been one of the greatest advocates of resolving of international disputes by discussion rather than by force, influenced greatly no doubt by Mahatma Gandhi, that great apostle of non-violence.

Mr. Prime Minister, I need scarcely speak of the close ethnical and age-long cultural ties which exist between our two countries despite the problems which an unfortunate past has bequeathed us. I have every hope that we shall ere long solve these problems with mutual understanding and goodwill which happily exist in an abundant measure between our two countries.

May I, Your Excellencies, Ladies and Gentlemen, call upon you to join me in wishing a long life, health and happiness to the Hon'ble Shri Nehru so that he may not only guide the destinies of his country but those of a much stricken world ?

364

USA INDIA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC

Date : Dec 01, 1960

Volume No

1995

CONGO

The Prime Minister, Shri Jawaharlal Nehru, made a statement in the Lok Sabha, on the situation in the Congo on December 12, 1960. The following is the text of the statement:

I have referred to the situation in the Congo on several occasions during the last few weeks or months, and Hon. Members must be following what has been happening in the long debates in the Security Council which are even now proceeding, from day to day. It is an extraordinary situation causing us a great deal of concern. May I, right at the beginning, just for the sake of giving the background, mention that the Congo is a country which might be said to be fabulously rich in the sense that it has mineral resources, diamond mines, etc. It should not be imagined that it is a kind of backward tract with no resources. Actually in a sense and potentially it is a very rich country, the richest in fact in the whole of the continent of Africa. No doubt these great riches have been drawn from the Congo to a large extent by the colonial power which controlled it. In the cities of the Congo, there are great boulevards, tremendous offices, luxury hotels and all that.

Then again, on the one side it has been said quite rightly that when the Belgians left the Congo, there were hardly any graduates--I think probably less than a dozen graduates -- in the whole of this tremendous country, which is half the size of India. The Belgians apparently followed a policy of widespread primary education. The level of primary education is pretty high and the number may be higher--not, of course, now; our level has gone up much higher--but till a few years ago. it was possibly as high or higher than the Indian level before independence. But it seems to be a deliberate policy of giving elementary education, primary education and some secondary education and of stopping education at that level. Deliberately there was no provision for teaching of anything else. I believe, from accounts one has heard, that it is not merely lack of provision. but. an affirmative policy of not getting them above a certain educational stage. So, we find in this country a Very high level of primary education, but somehow stopping there.

I forgot the exact number, but the medical services were fairly good-hospitals and doctors. There were hundreds and hundreds of doctors. I think there were 800 or so of Belgian doctors. No Congolese was trained up to that stage; he was trained up may be at some lower stage. So was the case in regard to the telegraph, telephone system and everything. As I said, there are plenty of primary schools, there. I think I am correct in saying that there was not a single Congolese teacher in those thousands of schools ; they were Belgian teachers. It is an extraordinary thing that the development took place in that great country of great distances, but in a way which did not benefit the Congolese markedly at all. It may be said, of course, that the fact that there has been such widespread primary education does lay the foundation for future growth ; that is true.

May I also say to remove any impression to the effect that the Congolese are very primitive people-in a big country, there may be all kinds of people-but by and large they have shown considerable capacity to learn and do things, given the chance? In fact, some students who wanted to learn physics-I saw somewhere reading about it-were described as brilliant in comparison with any people in any country. So, we must get rid of the idea that we are dealing with a primitive population. We are dealing with a population, virile, active and capable of learning given the chance, but deliberately whose training and intellectual growth was limited to a certain level--school level-and not allowed to go beyond that.

The second point I should like the House to remember is the way the Belgians left the Congo. Even before they left, a few weeks or months before that, all the money reserves of the Congo-the gold reserve and other things- were gradually transferred to Belgium. There were very large sums of money, very considerable sums of money, because it was a rich country, rich not in the sense of individual Congolese, but the resources of the country were tremendous. There were big mining companies there, enormous, powerful, rich companies, international, but largely run by the Belgian authorities. So, all these resources were taken away.

I cannot go into details. The Belgians left and to begin with there was some trouble among the Congolese soldiery. They were not paid, or whatever it was, and there was a great deal of publicity given to it that the Congolese soldiery had risen in revolt, killed their officers, committed rape, this and that. They had revolted against their officers, but the publicity given was very

365

greatly exaggerated. There was practically no damage done in any of these cities--Leopoldville, Stanleyville, etc. Whatever the reasons might have been for their rising in revolt, the damage done by them to individuals at that time certainly was deplorable, but was not very great. In fact, Hon. Members will remember the behaviour of the Congolese army subsequently even to our nationals and nationals of many countries.

What did the Belgian withdrawal mean? It meant leaving the country with a bankrupt treasury, because they had withdrawn the moneys. It meant leaving the administrative system with nobody to run it except some junior clerks. It meant the vast health services of the Congo suddenly being left without any direction. In a country like the Congo, or in any country in Central Africa, health services are of the utmost importance. If you do not fight them all the time, they simply overwhelm you. All kinds of diseases overwhelm you, including plague, this and that. It was a fairly good system run with constant vigilance. That went to pieces. The communication system went to pieces, because there was nobody to deal with it. It was an extraordinary state of affairs as soon as the Belgians left.

According to the Constitution which had been framed really by the Belgians and broadly on the lines of the Belgian Constitution, elections had been held. The elected Parliament appointed or elected Mr. Kasavubu as President and Mr. Lumumba as Prime Minister and a Government was formed. But a little later they did not pull on together. There were difficulties. I am leaving out the intervening stages. At one stage, the President dismissed the Prime Minister and the Prime Minister dismissed the President. As far as we have been able to understand their Constitution—we have had legal opinion—neither of these dismissals could take effect, unless Parliament gave its sanction to that.

The Parliament did meet and refused to accept either dismissal. So they confirmed again President Kasavubu in his place and Prime Minister Lumumba in his place. But meanwhile other difficulties arose. There was a state of tension and in spite of efforts to pull on together, they did not. Meanwhile Col. Mobutu came on the scene. He was on the scene; he had been appointed as Chief of Staff by Prime Minister Lumumba earlier. But he decided to take the administration, in fact everything there, in his own hands, i.e., in the army's hands. And he had announced that he is not going to allow Parliament to meet and he will deal with the situation through the army.

Now, again, just about that time, President Kasavubu, who had rather ignored the second decision of Parliament about himself and Mr. Lumumba, had appointed a new Prime Minister of the name Mr. Ileo. So, here we were with a Parliament which was not meeting, rather not allowed to meet because Col. Mobutu will not allow them to meet and, in fact, he had put soldiers round about the Parliament building, there was President Kasavubu, who was, legally speaking, a legal authority, that is to say, he was the recognised President elected by Parliament, there was Mr. Lumumba who, some people say, continued to be legally the Prime Minister though not actually as he was in some kind of semi-detention because of Col. Mobutu, there was Mr. Ileo, the new Prime Minister appointed by President Kasavubu, though apparently he did not function at all at any time and there was Col. Mobutu also, who had come into the picture by what may be called a coup d'etat, not the legal way but simply because the Congolese army was behind him, or a part of it, in Leopoldville. Meanwhile, this army was very badly disciplined or not disciplined at all and it was running about Leopoldville and doing what it chose, beating up, looting, shooting etc., chiefly in the African quarters. Much more noise was raised when they attacked some Europeans, Indians and others but the poor Africans, when they were attacked, less notice was taken though this happened chiefly in the African quarters. This is a curious and very difficult position.

Now, it seemed to us at that time, two or

three months ago, that the only two really what may be called hundred per cent legal organs there were the Parliament and President Kasavubu. There was Premier Lumumba but after all this has happened they were the two legally acknowledged organs, one supplementing the other. That did not mean, of course, that President Kasavubu by himself could function as a complete Government. We acknowledged him but in regard to functions they were limited as of other individuals. Whether it is a President or the Prime Minister there are certain limitations to their functions and they cannot suddenly become dictators and do what they like. Therefore, we have suggested from the very beginning, and others have done so too, that the only way to settle this constant internecine conflict is for Parliament to meet and decide it. Let them quarrel, let them shout at each other, but let them decide something which will have constitutional and legal validity and which will at the same time, be probably acceptable to all, by and large. The odd thing is, and it passes one's understanding, that the very first step and

366

the obvious step that Parliament should meet, has not been carried out, of course because of Col. Mobutu, who has said definitely that he does not approve of Parliament meeting, and he is just not going to allow anybody to meet in the Parliament chamber. But the odd thing is that Col. Mobutu has been encouraged in this attitude in various ways by various authorities and countries, because, I think, if some pressure had been brought to him, even friendly pressure, he would have agreed to it. Obviously, the idea of Parliament meeting did not appeal at all to many countries, many great countries and, of course, it did not appeal at all to the Belgian authorities,

Now I would like to remind the House of the second report of the United Nations representative in Congo, Shri Rajeshwar Dayal, which was circulated, I think, to Members because, apart from the long speeches delivered in the United Nations, Security Council and elsewhere, this is a report, an objective and detailed report of conditions there at that time by a person who was in a position to find it out. That report pointed out that the Congolese army, the so-called National Army of Congolese, has been misbehaving a great deal, nobody properly controlled it, not even Col. Mobutu and, in fact,

there was no central authority at all functioning there and any person with a little force behind him did what he liked, and he pointed out that the Belgians were returning in large numbers, and returning in an organised way. There were actually organisations in Belgium recruiting them and sending them. The Belgian Government have said in reply that it is not their function because private people are doing it. But this kind of excuse is not very easy to appreciate or accept when there is a large-scale return of Belgians, who were going in the name of being experts and others.

Another fact that comes out from this official report is that the Belgians there are definitely often obstructing the work of the United Nations, even relief work and other work and, certainly, the police work. Another fact that has to be remembered and which I have not yet mentioned is that Col. Mobutu had appointed certain students as commissioners to carry on the Government and, in fact, some government is carried on by these student commissioners. All these student commissioners and Col. Mobutu have Belgian advisers. In fact, the student commissioners really paved the way for the Belgians to function and their advisers are also their own teachers, the students' teachers, Belgian teachers, who taught them elsewhere. We learn that in Katanga Province the Prime Minister Mr. Tshombe etc., are surrounded by Belgian officials, experts and advisers, even military advisers. So that we see in effect Belgians functioning there in various ways and in increasing numbers. We see that Col. Mobutu's College of Commissioners largely depend on Belgians, who are advising them. Shri Rajeshwar Dayal in his second report to the United Nations drew particular attention to all this and recommended that something may be done about stopping these Belgians. I think he recommended or pointed out that this was coming in the way of any settlement of the problem there.

This has been the background. Since then another thing happened. May I say that the United Nations' Mission there did not recognise formally any of these authorities. They recognised President Kasavubu as President, but this college of commissioners or Prime Minister Ileo or others they did not recognise, although they dealt with them. They dealt with the college of com-

missioners, because they were there. And in regard to most of the things, relief work, administrative work and so on, they dealt with them but there was no formal recognition of any of these. Mr. Lumumba meanwhile was more or less in detention with two sets of guards, the United Nations guards and the Congolese guard trying to get over the United Nations guards and capture him.

At this stage, Mr. Kasavubu, went to New York to press for his claim, to have his delegation seated in the General Assembly and by a majority, the decision was given in his favour. He did go there. As a result of this decision, Mr. Kasavubu and those whom he supported--and he began later to support Col. Mobutu--became much stronger in the Congo. After that, many things happened which the House knows. The representatives of a number of countries were expelled by Col. Mobutu or his College of Commissioners, which means Belgians behind them. They were expelled and a number of countries had withdrawn their representatives from the Congo because the conditions they had to face were insulting or derogatory. A good deal of beating and insult has been thrown at our Indian officers there.

We have no combat troops there. We have nearly 800 personnel a little less than half of them medical, connected with the hospital and the rest with transport, signalling, supplies, etc.

Meanwhile, the position has grown worse and worse in every way. In spite of the U. N. recognition of Mr. Kasavubu, which was meant

367

to bolster up his authority so that he and his colleagues could deal with the situation, the fact is that the situation is even worse than even before. Legally, it is difficult to understand what it is. Practically it is true that in Leopoldville and some other places, Col. Mobutu's forces were there in control, But, the province of Orientale where Stanleyville is situated is broadly out of their control. Katanga claims independence. Kasai, again, wants to separate. In all these separatist tendencies, it appears that the Belgians there and the Belgian advisers, etc. encourage these separatist tendencies. It has also been said that they have flown in large quantities of arms in Katanga and elsewhere and generally, they are at the

back of some kind of almost what one might call resistance to the U. N. functioning there.

The Security Council has considered this matter again and again. It is now considering it. It laid great stress on the Republic of the Congo not losing its integrity, not being split up and on the Belgians leaving the Congo. That means, no doubt, Belgian military personnel not civil. The Belgians did go out and it was said at one time that all the military personnel had gone out leaving about 600 at a military base round about there. But, since then, the return of the Belgians has taken place, not directly military, so far as I know, but chiefly civilian, technical and all that, by the thousand, 20,000 or 25,000, some, it is said, military people functioning as technicians or others. This question has arisen.

The House knows about the escape of Mr. Lumumba, his subsequent capture and gross mishandling and injury caused to him. At first the U. N. people were not even allowed-nobody was allowed-to see Mr. Lumumba in detention, because it had been said-ghastly reports came to us about the treatment given to him by the Congolese soldiery-no one was allowed to see him. It is an extraordinary thing and it indicates the status of the U. N. Mission there. At present they could not even send a doctor to visit Mr. Lumumba who is either the Prime Minister or an ex-Prime Minister whichever way you may like to call him, even to see how he is faring in a prison, after all these serious charges. It shows how their authority, either because of their own decision or whatever it was, was strictly limited. Later Mr. Kasavubu has kindly agreed to allow a doctor to go to see him. But, he has made it clear that the doctor must be of a nationality he approves of, so that the U.N. cannot choose any doctor. I believe they have indicated that they would not object to a Swiss doctor going there. I do not know if he has gone or not.

The present position might be said to be that really no effective Government is functioning there in the Congo. It functions in a small sphere under a person who has some soldiers round him. These are more or less admitted facts. The Army is very much a political wing and it has got into politics. It is just beating up anybody whom it does not like or belonging to any other party, The Belgians

are everywhere in the shape of advisers, technicians. Broadly speaking, the Belgians do not encourage, even oppose the United Nations functioning there and U. N. aid coming in. The Student College of Commissioners are advised by Belgian teachers. Thus really, they become a Belgian arm there. Some countries have withdrawn their contingents and a number of countries have had their representatives sent away by the College of Commissioners. There has been danger to numbers of foreign nationals. Mr. Kasavubu, the President after some trouble with Col. Mobutu, has, in effect, recognised him, with the result that some kind of a legal cover has been given to Col. Mobutu and his forces. But, it must be remembered that Col. Mobutu came in by an illegal act. Whether this could be covered up later is a matter for consideration. In all this picture, still, two legal organs remain, the President and Parliament. The Parliament not meeting and not being allowed to meet, in fact, the President is all in all except that he has not got the power to function except through Col. Mobutu. There has been a great deal of talk of law and order that has progressively gone and the situation is worsening. Law and order, normally speaking, can only be enforced by an authority which is itself based on law and which employs legal methods. That is the position.

I confess it is quite extraordinarily difficult. The position is difficult enough. It is easy enough to express oneself that this must be done or that must be done without realising what is capable of being done, because our writ does not run there that we should order it. Nor, indeed, can any country easily do it. It is a difficult position for the United Nations in the sense that either they have to decide on carrying on a war there with much larger forces than they have got or some other method of dealing with the situation.

May I say that so far as the other aspects of work in the Congo are concerned, the non-law and order, that is the health aspect, the administrative, how to carry on the country etc., that has been done, in spite of all manner of difficulties, with some efficiency by a vast number of people; the WHO and various other organs of the UN have been doing a good piece of work. But the basic thing is that the whole country is going to

pieces, that there is really no law there and no order there, and the United Nations Mission is sitting there almost passively, and sometimes things happen before its eyes which are highly objectionable. They have adopted a policy, as they call it, of non-intervention, which is carried to an extreme. Even when a crime is committed before their eyes, they do not intervene. But they have intervened in some cases, as for instance, when there was a threat recently, a very unwise and wrong threat, in Stanleyville that the heads of Belgians would be cut off if Mr. Lumumba was not released. That is highly improper of course, this kind of vicarious punishment. They did intervene there, and rightly intervened, they should intervene, but in other matters which require their intervention for protection etc., they have not intervened. Take Mr. Lumumba's matter. They have not intervened at all. They stand by the law. The legal authority is the President, and through the President other authorities, Col. Mobutu, and through Col. Mobutu his soldiery. So, it is a very odd position, and a very weak and ineffective position for the United Nations.

There is another aspect of it. There is a very great deal of resentment at these developments in the Congo, at the various activities of these commissioners of Col. Mobutu, a very great deal of resentment in Africa and Asia more especially, as is shown by the withdrawal of some countries from their association with the UN Mission there. And that has made the UN there weaker than it was to deal with the situation.

What can we advise them ? I would not venture to advise them in detail, it is a very difficult matter. Even when I spoke in the United Nations, I put forward two or three things, basic things. Firstly, of course, I said that I did not want any power to intervene. The big powers come and they practically function as a ruling authority, they become that. I do not want the United Nations itself to become a ruling authority. Therefore, I suggested that the only step to be taken was for Parliament to meet. It is no good telling me: oh, every member may not be able to come, they may be stopped. It was the duty of the United Nations to facilitate this meeting. If they cannot help in the meeting of Parliament, what else can they do there ? That is one thing.

The second point was that the Belgians should go. Some of the Belgians may be doing good work for aught I know, but the whole colonial background is such that the Belgians remaining there is a danger and is a constant irritant, and in fact they come in the way of even the United Nations working.

Thirdly, of course, both for Parliament to meet and otherwise, political prisoners, Mr. Lumumba etc., should also be released, so they may attend Parliament, and they should be given the protection of the, UN or other authorities.

A curious fact is that Shri Rajeshwar Dayal's report, the second report to which I made reference, a detailed report bringing out what has been done by the Belgians and others has never been considered there yet. It is an extraordinary thing. Here is the United Nations' representative's report supposed to be objective made public and apart from the Secretariat, the UN General Assembly and, for what I know, the Security Council, do not even consider it, just put it by, because, presumably, they did not like the conclusions that had been reached in that report, that is an extraordinary situation. And the major conclusion was that the Belgians had come back in large numbers and were coming in the way of any settlement of any problem there. In fact, it is an extraordinary situation where an attempt is being made to create a new kind of empire, not in the old sense, not in the old way, they cannot go back, but nevertheless the controlling authority being in Belgian hands. It is true that that cannot succeed, that attempt—that is a different matter—but it may well lead, as it is indeed partly leading now, to very big conflicts, civil wars and disasters.

As I said, the matter is being considered in the UN Security Council even now, and I do not wish, and I do not think even the House can wish, to make detailed suggestions in a very complicated situation. But of one thing I am absolutely clear, that the Parliament of the Congo must meet, and every member of it, to whatever party he belongs, should be allowed to come there. Let them have it out. Let them be advised by the UN people, let them be advised by others. Let them make mistakes, but you cannot leave the position as it is. The UN should continue to function there, because I think it will be very dangerous for the UN to withdraw. It is an easy thing to withdraw,

it is an easy thing for me to say we will withdraw our men, that is, we will not suffer indignity there- by, but if the UN withdraws, it means the Congo going up in the flames of civil war and interven- tion. There is no doubt that great powers will intervene ; and if a great power intervenes, the other opposing great power will intervene too, and all these dangers will come. It will affect not only the Congo but the whole of Africa will be in flames.

There is no hope of settling this issue except

369

through the United Nations, but the United Nations itself can only function with dignity and authority and not merely without the authority or the power to do anything and merely looking on. So far as we are concerned, we have given much thought to the question whether we should continue there or not, but feeling strongly that we should not take any step which weakens, in the whole context, the UN working there, we have, for the present, decided to remain there. We thought it would be not, in this larger context, a right thing to with- draw, but it is obvious that the attitude we may adopt in future will depend very much on a developing situation and how Indian nationals are treated there. If they are not treated properly, then we will have to reconsider our decisions.

CONGO USA INDIA FRANCE BELGIUM FALKLAND ISLANDS CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC

Date : Dec 01, 1960

Volume No

1995

CONGO

Prime Minister's Statement in Rajya Sabha on Situation in Congo

Prime Minister Nehru made the following statement in the Rajya Sabha on December 12,

1960, on the situation in the Congo :

I am grateful to you, Sir, for giving me this opportunity of intervening. There was a Motion for Papers-I believe it is so called-from one of the Hon. Members of the House opposite about the situation in the Congo. Just at the present moment the Security Council is discussing this very matter at great length. Nevertheless I should like to draw your attention to certain aspects of the situation. It is a very dangerous situation, and not only dangerous for the Congo but for the whole of Africa, and not only for the whole of Africa but for the future of the United Nations itself, because if the United Nations cannot deal with the situation and fails, then naturally its capacity to deal with any other situation or similar situation will also go.

Another fact should be remembered that recent developments there have been a matter of not only deep concern and anxiety but in a measure even of anger to many people in many countries in Asia and Africa. A number of countries have had their representatives thrown out, a number have withdrawn their contingents in the UN Force, and no one quite knows what other developments of this kind may take place later. There is a danger not only of the civil war which is practically taking place in a small way now, of the civil war spreading, but of foreign intervention on a bigger scale, because, as things are in the world, if one major Power intervenes, its opposite number on the other side wants to intervene also and comes in to create some kind of balancing intervention.

So, Sir, the situation is a dangerous one. We have to consider it from this larger point of view. We have also to consider our own attitude and whether we should keep our personnel there or not. Now we did not send any combat troops to the Congo. We have sent our Armed Forces there for specialised work like hospital work-we have sent a fullfledged field hospital with 400 beds-and for signalling, transport, communication work and the like. These people are not armed in the normal way. They may have some small arms, our officers, but, as I said, they are not fighting troops. Their number is nearly 800 or maybe 770 or thereabout, nearly half of these being connected with hospital. Now the question does arise whether we should

continue this or not. We have been gravely perturbed at the treatment given to our officers there by the so-called Congolese Army. We have not been selected for their treatment. They have been fairly impartial in beating and insulting citizens of other countries, European as well as others. Nevertheless if we cannot function there with dignity, we do not want to push ourselves in. We have not gone there for any advantage for ourselves. We went because we wanted to serve the cause of the people of the Congo, help them in their difficulties and serve the cause of peace. And we shall keep this in view. But looking at this matter apart from the question of our nationals being there and even apart from the fact that much has been done by the United Nations which has not seemed to us to be right, I think it would be a disaster if the United Nations Mission were to be withdrawn. It would really be a defeat, a confession of a defeat, and an act of despair and it would leave the Congo to go up in flames affecting the whole of Africa and certainly affecting international affairs very greatly and intimately. So, I do not want this thing to happen. Nevertheless, it is obvious that the United Nations can only remain there if they can function properly; they cannot remain there just for some little humanitarian work which they are doing well, and just to bolster up some odd regime there or some odd party there and to carry out their orders.

Now, that is the position, and if I may say straightaway, it is very difficult for us to advise, in any complicated system, what they should do in the Congo; it is very complicated. But two or three things stand out. One is that if this welter there is not much law and order left in the Congo.

370

There is no real governmental authority functioning except in some local areas where a bit of the army is present. The army itself is completely undisciplined and ill-disciplined, and does more or less what it chooses. Also, the army itself is very much now functioning, interfering in politics, and politics not of a high grade. Constitutionally speaking, the only legal authorities in the Congo are President Kasavubu and the Parliament which is not functioning, which cannot meet; all the others cannot be placed in this category. We may accept them as functioning authorities. Until recently, the United Nations Mission there did not recognise there any authority in a formal sense but

dealt with them because they had to deal with somebody who was functioning. The other authorities are there is Col. Mobutu who came into the picture by a coup d'etat, that is, illegally, but who subsequently has been broadly accepted or recognised by the President. Now, whether the President can legally do so or not is another question to consider but he did. It is said that a person coming in by illegal means cannot assume a legal garb unless something else happens. Now, Col. Mobutu appointed a number of students from the college as a Commission to carry on the government of the country and there they are. They may be good people or not, I do not know, but they are young people without experience, and they have got with them advisers-Belgian advisers, in effect, it is the Belgian Army that is functioning there through the Student Commissioners and possibly through Col. Mobutu. In fact one of the basic facts of the situation there is how the Belgians have come back in large numbers everywhere. They do not call themselves an army; they are not there as military people except that they come as advisers, technicians and experts. Certainly, Col. Mobutu and Mr. Tshombe in the Katanga Province do everything through their Belgian advisers even militarily and otherwise, and Mr. Kasavubu also, I believe, has some such advisers, so that we see these Belgians functioning there in various capacities and not only influencing but practically controlling the activities of these gentlemen who have some control there of the army as well as of civil affairs.

Now, the House may remember that at the end of October, I think-or some time in October --Mr. Rajeshwar Dayal, who represents the Secretary General of the United Nations, sent a report, a second report, on the Congo which was circulated. It was a revealing report, an objective report by a person who had the full opportunity of judging the situation and who was neutral, who took no sides. That report brought out the state of lack of order there, how these various authorities functioned and quarrelled, and it more particularly brought out how the Belgians had come back and were continuing to come back in very large numbers. The Security Council's Resolution passed, maybe, three or four months ago had expressly stated two things, that the integrity of the Congo Republic should be maintained and that the Belgians should go out, that is, military Belgians. A little later, it was reported that they

had gone out but about six hundred of them, military people, remained at one of their bases there. But now I suppose there are about twenty-five thousand Belgians, mostly civil, some military, spread out there and in all the responsible and important places. In effect, indirectly but fairly effectively, it is the Belgian influence and direction that is counting there. In fact, therefore, it is an attempt to build up, after the ruins of the ending of the first Belgian Empire, a second one. Of course, it may not be an empire in the old sense of the word, it cannot be; conditions have changed in the world and in Africa. But it is extraordinary how after their rather precipitated departure from the Congo, they have come back in a different garb and have the cover, some kind of a legal cover, under President Kasavubu and Col. Mobutu and Mr. Tshombe. Now, what do the United Nations do in these circumstances? Sometimes they take up a very strict and narrow legal view that they cannot intervene in anything. Sometimes they have done something which is the clearest intervention. I do not understand it. The other day in the Katanga Province where another tribe was fighting, the ruling authorities there, United Nations authorities, captured several hundreds of the tribe and handed over their leaders to the Katanga officers whom they did not recognise. That is very extraordinary, but I am saying that there they do this. Here it is another case of a Prime Minister--or, if you like an ex-Prime Minister, Mr. Lumumba--being captured, beaten and his face being disfigured and all that, and they have not got the authority even to send a doctor to see him. It just seems to me to be a very extraordinary state of affairs for the United Nations Mission. If they cannot function properly, well, they are doing more harm than good. Now, as I said, I do not want them to go away. I think that would be fatal but I do think that they should be made to function properly; they should be given authority by the Security Council, and there should be no vagueness or shilly-shallying about this question as there has been. I cannot precisely state in detail what should be done especially when the Security Council is considering this. But I do think this problem will not be solved except by the Congolese. The Congolese can only solve it through their Parliament: It would be difficult of solution, of course, but anyhow that is the way and they

have to come together. If the Belgians are there and further continue and rather interfere and if others encourage them to continue, it will not be solved, and it would lead to a major conflagration. I have no doubt about it. And therefore Parliament has to function and the Belgians have to go. And it is no good anyone telling us that there is not the Belgian Government functioning but that individual Belgians go there. Surely that is not an adequate or a convincing argument to put forward. Yet, not only has it been put forward but great Powers are prepared to accept it, not realising that thereby they are preparing for one of the biggest disasters that the world may witness. I use these words deliberately because there is deep anger at the things happening in the Congo in the countries and the people of Asia and Africa-and I do not say every country; I cannot say that, but masses of people-because to them it is not a question of this party or that party. They do not know; we do not know the parties there; we do not know the individuals there, but we do see this cold war coming in there; we do see an old colonial power coming back there and creating all these difficulties. preventing the people from functioning, preventing their Parliament from functioning, preventing them from even meeting and talking to each other, and all kinds of suspicions rise in the minds of the people in Asia and Africa and no doubt in many in Europe and the Americas about this policy that is being pursued. I hope the Security Council that is meeting will find some effective way to lay down, first of all, the broad policy that should be pursued, the authority that should be given to the UN Mission there, and the resources, to see that that authority is obeyed and also, I hope, to make it clear that the Parliament should meet there. It is very extraordinary that people who call themselves democrats and their countries democratic countries make excuses for Parliament there not meeting and encourage this kind of semi-military dictatorships all over in the name of law and order. Many worse things have happened recently but the arguments that have been put forward in regard to the Congo have been quite extraordinary, because they have used the stick of the law to defend every illegal act that has been happening there. That is the position, Sir, now, and may be in the course of a day or two we may have further information; we shall see what the Security Council has decided and we shall always have to keep this in view, because this is a developing

situation and from time to time we shall have to consider what part we should continue to take in it.

CONGO USA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC

Date : Dec 01, 1960

Volume No

1995

INDIA IN THE UNITED NATIONS

Shri Krishna Menon's Statement in Security Council on Congo

Shri V.K. Krishna Menon, Leader of the Indian Delegation to the United Nations, made the following statement in the Security Council about the situation in the Congo on December 10, 1960:

At the outset I should like to express the appreciation of my Government for the consent that the Security Council has given to our participation in this meeting, under the relevant clauses of the Charter and the relevant rules of the Security Council.

We are privileged to be here, but at the same time we are weighed down by a sense of responsibility, inasmuch as in an organizational sense it lies on the members of the Council, and we have therefore to warn ourselves that we should not be in the position of armchair critics. That would be so in a normal case, but here my first duty, under the instructions of my Government, is to convey to this Council the sense of great concern and, in a certain respect, the sense of anger of our people in regard to what is happening in the Congo-concern inasmuch as we realize, in the words of the Prime Minister of India spoken to Parliament only a few days ago, that the situation is "extraordinarily complex not only for us but for everybody and more especially for the Congo itself". He went on to say:

"If the United Nations withdrew, it would lead to absolute chaos there and

civil war of the worst type and possible intervention by foreign Powers. On the other hand, the United Nations could hardly function if it could not function effectively ; that was the dilemma".

I assume that the task of the United Nations in difficult situations of this kind is to allow to come out from its Member States the best that they can contribute so that solutions may be found for difficult situations. This is not the

372

first time that the United Nations has met with challenges of a difficult character where great Powers have been involved, where those associated in alliances have had to take different positions, where those that have usually been apart, in opposite alliances, have come together. I particularly think of the situation in regard to the invasion of Egypt by France, the United Kingdom and Israel three or four years ago. At that time the United Nations was at its best, and the unity displayed in the cause of peace, in the cause of the withdrawal of aggression, and the responses made, certainly by the two great Powers, also were a great contribution to the strength of the United Nations.

My country is not carrying as much of a burden in the Congo as those with combat troops there. Our personnel in the Congo are, under Indian law, combatants. They are-all either officers or other ranks of the Indian armed forces, men or women, but they are in the Congo specifically on non-combatant duty. That does not take away from their character of combatants, and in their daily duties they incur as much risk as anyone else, and they know that when they go there.

We are also concerned about the fact-and here I speak with great restraint, and I am sure the Secretary-General will not misunderstand me-that we have Indian nationals placed in positions of great responsibility. When the Secretary-General asked for their services, we readily spared them, though it is not possible for us to find personnel easily. But we made it clear that they were international servants and no longer under the direction of the Government of India. However that may be, a national is a national and he cannot isolate himself from that. They were asked because they were nationals coming from a nation

uncommitted to other controversies, and perhaps because of their own records of having discharged their duties with objectivity in the past. Therefore we are very much concerned, and with regard to any reflections on these gentlemen which have nothing to do with particular acts--criticisms of policy and attacks on policy, we will accept-I would say that it is the position of my Government that any officer who holds the President's commission, or any member of the armed forces of India would have the protection of this Government so far as honour and things of that kind are concerned. In the Congo they have to take pot luck ; that is to say, they have to function according to the vicissitudes of events.

Therefore, we are participating in this debate for three reasons. First, like all those present here, we are part of the world and a Member State of the United Nations- Second, we are involved through the dispatch of personnel which, the Secretary-General well knows, in view of our difficulties on our own land, could be ill spared at the present time. Thirdly, we are concerned-and this is a matter which I shall develop later-that we regard this Congo situation not as something that should be shutlecocked between domestic jurisdiction and foreign jurisdiction. It is a question of peace and security, and I do not say this in a dogmatic manner. I have very high authority on this matter, largely in the Secretary-General's own statements to us from the beginning of this incident. What is involved here ultimately-I believe, from the beginning--is, on the one hand, aggression by a foreign Power on an independent territory, when it was supposedly withdrawn. One part of the Secretary-General's report says it was withdrawn, and another part says it is there, but anyway let us assume for the purpose of argument that it is. So it begins with aggression, or a threat which is a violation of the Charter, and, secondly, a situation where peace and security is threatened.

We could conduct these meetings-as unfortunately has become too often the me-by taking up debating positions and scoring points and at the end finding out who has been more abusive than the other. I do not think that is going to take us anywhere, because the situation, so far as my country's estimation of it is concerned, is, in all conscience, very serious. Therefore, I want to start off with the position that there are

four main factors which first strike one's mind: what ought to be done in the circumstances, and how much of it should be done, to decide, on the balance of things, whether one course of action or another course of action is likely to yield results which will further the purposes of the Charter and of peace and security in the interests of the people of the Congo. The two other factors are in opposition : the legal problems of how much can be legally done and how much can be done from the remote possibilities. So, going back to these four points, I would say that what ought to be done is to a certain extent, in the minds of the people, quite rightly, affected by what is legal and by what is possible. But, having said that, I would also say that the subjective view that is taken of this matter of what ought to be done and what ought not to be done depends upon political orientations, depends upon the sense of right and wrong, depends upon the importance of peace in Africa, apart- from the statements we make, depends upon the role that liberated colonial peoples should play, and so on.

So what ought to be done is very likely

373

conditioned by these circumstances but tends--I do not say mischievously, but tends unconsciously--to be covered up by legal arguments. Law is the best aid to justice. It is also the best smoke-screen for the reverse. It always has been so in human history.

Therefore, I propose to take these things one by one at a later stage. But the main position that I want to submit on behalf of my Government is this, that the United Nations does not work on a set of instruments which are divine revelation. These are not like the laws of the Medes and the Persians. The Charter of this vast Organization of nearly a hundred nations is contained in a small compass which is probably half the schedule in the constitution of our national countries because it enunciates principles; it lays down certain guidelines. But the main feature of our Organization is that it is a dynamic Organization and, therefore, I want to examine the statements made at various time on behalf of the Secretary-General or of the delegations from this point of view, and, since time is short and one is likely to spend too much time in the beginning of these matters, I should like first of all to submit the position of international law in regard to

this.

I believe that a doctrine which I submitted before on another occasion in this Council-what is usually called *rebus sic stantibus*, that is to say, changing conditions-is applicable here. We cannot today be bound by the course of action which was valid three months ago. This does not mean that we are like a weather cock, changing from one day to another, or that we are being opportunists. Certain actions, certain interpretations, were valid at certain points. If we read the Secretary-General's report, for example, we find that the way the thing was handled has depended on what was necessary at the time. Therefore, we should not be too much bound by the fact that someone has said : no interference in internal affairs-I shall deal later with how much we have interfered and where-or in domestic jurisdiction, or the use of force or non-use of force, or standards, and double standards, and so on. So we have looked at the conditions as they change and then we take these changed conditions.

If we look at the Secretary-General's statement, we find that he says that "even though normal economic activities were far from satisfactory, life has continued on a minimum basis of normalcy due to the various forms of assistance rendered by the United Nations." (S/PV 913, page 18). That is to say that, up to the beginning of September there was more or less, by the action of the United Nations, a return to normal conditions.

Then there was deterioration. The action taken at that time has varied from day today because law in this case has been a matter of interpretation.

Then comes the period from September onward, and it would not be polite to argue whether our meeting here at the emergency special session of the United Nations had anything to do with it; it might be the cause, it might be the result, but whatever it is, the controversy is here and is largely reflected in the Congo itself, and the changed conditions have come one by one. I should like to speak about these changed conditions.

First of all, the United Nations intervened, not at the request of a public meeting, not because

it thought that it was a good thing to do and, therefore, went in; the United Nations intervened at the request of a constituted Government which, so far as we know, was a Government sanctified by the laws of the territory. Since then, that situation has changed. It is not only common knowledge-again I do not want to quote too much-but it appears from the Secretary-General's report that there is no organized government. That is to say there is a state of chaos altogether. Therefore, this is one big changed condition. But we were asked to go there by a Government that was the authority at that time. And that condition has changed and, therefore, we must see what consequences follow from it.

Secondly, when the United Nations intervened, the Congolese army, while it was far from being a disciplined force, was one that was considered by the United Nations as a worthy subject of discipline. Again I do not want to quote at length, but the report shows that this discipline would have been possible because the army entered into politics; and Mr. Hammarskjöld says quite definitely refers to this feature of the army becoming a political organ. In other words, the constitutional Government, the Government that was democratic as far as it went, and certainly a constitutional and legal Government, has in fact been replaced by a defacto Government by a coup d'etat. This is a changed condition : the army entering into politics, which means that the operation of law had to take that into account

The third is that, while the United Nations went there, among other purposes, for the purpose of maintaining the integrity of the Congo, namely not encouraging the forces of separatism and, to

374

the extent possible, either by economic, technical and other aid. to bring them together. This cycle also has changed. Disintegration has begun, and this disintegration is referred to by the Secretary-General in his last report where he says :

"this disintegration of the Central Government was accompanied by, and perhaps even a result of, the emergence of units within the Armee nationale congolaise loyal to individual political leaders who began to feud with each

other. This situation was on the verge of developing into a major civil war, had it not been for the quick intervention by the United Nations which neutralized, to the greatest degree in its power, the warring factions..." (Ibid, page 19-20.)

This was the position when disintegration first reared its head. It was dealt with by the United Nations, and somewhere else Mr. Hammarskjöld refers to the position. If it was necessary for the United Nations to intervene in July-and all of you agreed that it was necessary ; it was one of the occasions when the Security Council voted unanimously, then, as the Secretary-General says, it is more necessary today. And we concur in this in the terms stated by the Prime Minister which I have just read out.

Then there are other facts that have changed; that is to say, the United Nations intervened-again apart from other things-to obtain the withdrawal of the Belgian forces. How far they have been withdrawn and how far they have not been withdrawn I will deal with later, but the fact of the matter is that while it was fundamental that, with the entry of the United Nations, outside forces should be withdrawn, now, whatever the shape or form, more outsiders are intervening than the United Nations, It is not necessary today to make a chart sheet of this because we have not the material, and it is a great pity that the United Nations has no military intelligence, although it has an army. I do not say that its officers have no intelligence, but it has no military intelligence. We have been asked to send doctors, pilots, a supply of officers, nurses, all kinds of things, but no military intelligence officers are asked for. Some of us, however, have our representatives there. So, to refer to the changed conditions from what was a situation in which a new State asked for assistance of the United Nations and the United Nations stepped in to settle things more or less, to help them to improve and, according to Mr. Hammarskjöld's statement, the situation was improving, certainly up to the beginning of September-I think that now there is no other way of describing the situation but as virtually a state of chaos and, anarchy in the Congo, not only in regard to today, but in regard to another circumstance which I shall refer to later. There has been the institution of what is called the "college of commissioners"

wherein over-grown school boys and students are recruited for the purpose of partisan and blood feuds. There are seeds of future anarchy in this country, where the liberty of this great part of Africa which, of course, belongs to Africa -and I do not want the representative of Cameroon to think that anyone else is laying any claims-is something that concerns us all. One of the worst features in the situation is that the younger generation should have been harnessed by politicians in order to create feuds not only as between themselves, but among those who grow. The situation is one which has got to be dealt with from this point of view and in consideration of the changes from time to time. Therefore, the interpretation of our powers, of our positions, has to be looked at.

Before I go further it is necessary for me to deal with the other aspects of things. You may say that this is so in regard to all other Member States.

We have no special position in this matter, but it is very difficult, as we have informed the Secretary-General to keep national Parliament quiet, to keep public opinion satisfied, when Members of the Armed Forces, who are there unarmed, who are unarmed individuals-as I said a while back they are combatants but on non-combat duty-it is one of the most difficult things to place on a soldier, to do this sort of thing; they are trained to fight, and if anybody attacks them, they attack them in return. But these men who have gone out, whether it be in the Congo or in the Gaza or anywhere else, have rendered such good account of themselves and self-restraint.

It is not my province to go into the case of other people, but so far as our people are concerned, our diplomatic officials and their womenfolk have not been treated in the way-I shall put it as mildly as I can-there have been intrusions on their liberty, their property, and their movement. We have the case of officers of the Indian Army-and I pay tribute to them for taking it in this way. It is easy for a soldier to criticize and kill; it is very difficult for a soldier to take blows and not return blows. It is, in a sense, a truly Gandhian Army that we have sent out. One of these officers was knocked down on the ground, sat upon and beaten. and we are told

that his spine is affected-we have no means of finding out-and taken to the hospital. just because he was in a car and somebody else wanted it. It is plain highway robbery. And we talk about law and order. It is an insult in a way that exercises the minds of our people. We are not whining about it. In fact, when certain sections of public opinions, as you would naturally expect, want action of a different character, our Government has taken the view that we must take the rough with the smooth; it is part of our duty. But still it should be known that this is not the kind of thing that a country-or I will not say a country, because we cannot call it the whole of a country-but those who are responsible, or irresponsible, for its management at the moment should have meted out to those who have gone to serve them.

Secondly, there was another officer who was beaten up, and his eardrums are gone and he was no longer able to function in the capacity he used to. I will not read out all these things.

On the 28th November, troops of Mobutu seized an ambulance van belonging to the Indian medical unit. Even in times of war there is a sanctity about an ambulance medical unit. I would particularly ask my colleagues here who can exercise influence over those who may be legally or illegally in power to see that some sort of decency is observed in these matters.

"Troops of Colonel Joseph Mobutu yesterday seized an ambulance van belonging to the Indian Medical Unit here ... earlier, the Congolese soldiers disarmed two Indian military policemen escorting Nigerian General to the airport...the Congolese officer forcibly took away all the goods of the house of the Commander of the Indian contingent and has now occupied the house." (The Times of India, 29 November 1960)

Even these Indian nationals who have been lent to the United Nations, like Brigadier Rikhye, for example bad armoured cars and things taken away. Mr. Dayal and Brigadier Rikhye often have been under threats of attack. We have also held the position of having considerable amounts

of indignities heaped upon our people, small as they are, in the Congo ; political propaganda of a character as if we were an occupying force in this place. Colonel Roy was stopped on the way to the airport on the morning of 22 October not by civilians, but by the Congolese troops.

Colonel Singh, Officer Commanding Indian Contingent, and Captain Jagjit Singh, his adjutant, were stopped on the way to their office and deprived of the use of their cars. This is plain highway robbery.

On 3 December, the situation became worse-an attack on civilians by civilians. Therefore, we are now coming to the state when there is total anarchy. It is in those circumstances, when there is a situation of that character, how much we can argue the fine points of law in older terms is a matter for consideration. Earlier this month, the correspondent of the Press Trust of India, our leading news agency, was twice set upon by Congolese civilians and beaten up. The local gendarmerie went to his hotel during his absence and-I will leave the rest to imagination. It is not as though a couple of ruffians did this, because immediately after-I cannot say the Government-the authorities, whoever they are, ordered his expulsion from the place; which means that these unlawful acts received some kind of sanctification from them. I am happy to say, although I have no official information, that I heard rumours yesterday that the Congolese authorities have withdrawn this order of his expulsion, and therefore, some news will come out of there. It was probably due to the kind intervention of friendly powers.

Official papers, which are covered by diplomatic immunity, they have been interfered with-not interfered with in the way of espionage, but just by way of plunder. These were some business papers held up by some people representing the Congolese authorities.

What is more, we have reason to think that the Congolese Government-the authorities at the present time-seemed to take the attitude that any country that expresses an opinion in the United Nations that does not suit them is a hostile country. In that case, we could not be here. We would have no Ambassador in any country if that was the criterion, that we would not

express our opinions here.

This is the position. Therefore, these atrocities are not said in the way of atrocity tales. I believe that we are probably the people somewhat less effected than some others.

Then we come to the position in regard to the reasons why the United Nations went there. It was said in the first resolution, on 14 July, and repeated several times afterwards:

"Calls upon the Government of Belgium to withdraw their troops from

376

the territory of the Republic of the Congo". (S/4387)

It authorized the Secretary-General to take all necessary steps to this effect.

Then, on 9 August the Security Council said:

"Calls upon the Government of Belgium to withdraw immediately its troops from the Province of Katanga under speedy modalities....." (S/4426)

In answer to the Secretary-General's requirement, the Belgian Government answered, on 30 August 1960:

"...the withdrawal of Belgian troops in the Congo has been completed with the sole exception of some members of the First Paratroop Battalion-who are in transit at Albertville..." (S/4475, Annex. 4)

It is one of those cases where the troops have withdrawn and they are still there, because it says that the withdrawal of the Belgian troops from the Congo has, in effect, been completed.

On the same day as this came, the Secretary-General wrote to the permanent representative of Belgium :

The Secretary-General has, however, just received a report from his representatives who arrived at Kamina today, 30 August, at 430 hours local times. At about time Belgian combat

troops consisting of one 400-man battalion of paratroopers,, one-120-man company of airfield guards and one school of aviation comprising fifty instructors and students had not yet been evacuated...

"The Secretary-General expresses his surprise at finding that there is a marked difference--a very mild statement--"between the information received from Brussels and the facts observed on the scene." (S/4475, Annex 5)

I am quite aware that there is a difference in time between Brussels and the Congo, but here is not only a question of time, but a question of difference in facts. The Belgian Government said this was due to the,

"...Overlapping period in which to transfer authority and hand over the provisions..." (S/4475 Add. 2)

Now, it has been an unfortunate experience of this Council and of the United Nations that troops take less time to go into somebody else's country than to come out. We had this before. All invading troops get there very quickly, but to come out--may be they land by parachute, and gravity therefore pulls them, and we cannot rise in the same way.

Then, the Belgians, after having talked about this overlapping, on 4 September received this reply from the Secretary-General:

"Furthermore, according to the report, there are still 650 Belgians at the base, including those at Banana. The Commander himself has said that all these men are combatants, that there are no technicians among them, and that he himself is a paratroop. In a flight over the Banana naval base two gunboats were observed." (Ibid., Add.2, p. 3)

Of course, this can all be called technology, the gunboat is certainly a result of technology. But there it is This is four days after Mr. Hammarskjöld said this is not correct. Facts differ. It is explained away, and then four days afterward the position is that there are 650 Belgian

troops in one place.

Again on the same day, the Secretary-General said,:

"According to information received by the Secretary-General, officers of Belgian nationality are at the present time attached to Katanga forces and other groups in armed conflict with the Central Government of the Republic of the Congo," (S/4482/Add. 3, p. 1)

Now, the question arises whether direct participation in the event is less or more grave than aiding and abetting. I believe any technical advice given, and direction of operations of a military character or of a semi-military character, is direct intervention.

"In view of the circumstances, however, the situation can be interpreted in the sense that the Belgian Government has at least permitted persons connected with its military services under a technical assistance programme to give help to forces fighting the Government of

377
the Congo." (Ibid.)

Therefore, we have a Member of the United Nations, a country whose history we look upon in many chapters with great respect and with great regard in other ways, not only rendering assistance- one can say yes, we render it-but rendering it under cover of technical assistance.

This is not the first time that the Security Council has been given information which is contrary to the facts. On a previous occasion, I spent two or three days where this idea of concealing facts from the Security Council was brought out. Mr. Hammarskjöld went on to state that "the situation is essentially different from that in which private individuals volunteer their services in a foreign army". The usual story that these are not troops, that they are soldiers on leave and so on, does not apply. The Secretary-General went on to say :

"In view of customary military regulations, it may be assumed that this

transfer could not have occurred without the assent in one form or another of the Belgian military authorities; at all events, it would be hard to believe that officers of the Belgian Army have severed their connexion with that Army in order to enrol in Provincial Forces without having obtained the approval of their military superiors and without having thereby made certain that they could rejoin the Belgian Army, if necessary with a loss in rank or seniority." (S/4482 Add. 3, page 2)

Here I should like to interpolate that if this deviation from the law is not looked into very closely, if at any time there should be disarmament-perhaps I should not put it that way-when the world becomes a disarmed world, then this way of getting round things is going to create a serious situation for maintaining peace in the world.

In their reply the Belgium Government stated :

"Under the circumstances, a small number of Belgian experts were supplied to the Corps de Gendarmerie of Katanga as technical assistance." (Ibid, page 3)

It is hard to see why the Gendannerie should want technical assistance unless they cannot handle their guns ? If that is the case, they should not have them. The Belgian reply went on:

"It is hard to see in this technical assistance a measure contrary to operative paragraph 2 of Security Council resolution of 22 July 1960." (Ibid.)

Now the Secretary-General is told that the facts are right, but his interpretation is wrong. On 8 September, the Secretary-General wrote to the permanent representative of Belgium :

"Confirmed reports have been received to the effect that a cargo of weapons, marked 'Belgian weapons', or something similar, the weight of which is estimated at nine tons, was unloaded at Elisabethville airport yesterday from a DC-7 civil aircraft of the Sabena Air-

lines." (S/4482/Add. 1, page 1)

Sabena is a Belgian airline. The Secretary-General went on:

"The Secretary-General wishes to draw this report to the immediate attention of Belgium Government in order to ascertain whether it is true that the Belgium Government has thus sent, or authorized the sending of, weapons from Belgium to the provincial authorities at Elisabethville." (Ibid).

The Belgians replied that:

"This was an order made on behalf of the Public Force and placed before 30 June 1960"-this is a customary excuse. If an order for medicine was placed when a patient was not so ill, it should not be delivered when he is likely to die by taking it--"The execution of the order was due to the incompetence of an ill-informed official." (S/4482/Add. 2.)

I must say that is tragic when a responsible government blames things on a poor official.

I would refer again to the second progress report of the Secretary-General, and I deal with all these reports as reports of the Secretary-General, because so far we know only the Secretary-General, and I am sure he takes responsibility for his representatives and the representatives who act under his instructions. There is a complete team spirit in this matter, and we do not want to make any division. In his second progress report he stated:

"In the last few weeks there has been increasing evidence of the return of

378

Belgian nationals into many phases of public life in the Congo. While the reactivation of economic enterprises and the participation in bona fide humanitarian pursuits is of benefit to the country, unfortunately there has been a substantial incursion of those elements which appear to seek a dominating influence in the councils of administration

and to exclude or obstruct the application of United Nations technical assistance and influence. Some Belgian nationals are believed to have been actively arming separatist Congolese forces, and, in some cases, Belgian Officers have directed and led such forces, which, in certain areas, have been responsible for brutal and oppressive acts of violence. Advisers of Belgian nationality have been returning to governmental ministries both in Leopoldville and the provinces, partially through what seems to be an organized recruiting campaign in Belgium." (S/4557, pages 4 and 5)

We are informed that there is a recruiting office now in Brussels. That does not tally with the idea that the Congo has been given or obtained independence. The report went on to say:

"The motives and activities of a significant portion of these returning officials appear to be clearly at variance with the principles of General Assembly resolution and with ONUC's basic objectives." (Ibid)

The reply of the Belgium Government was an attack on the Special Representative of the United Nations, and I hope that those who pay tribute to the work of the United Nations Secretary-General and his representatives will take notice of this. The reply stated :

"The Second Progress Report of the Secretary-General's Special Representative in the Congo has greatly displeased the Belgian Government and Belgian public opinion, which have been shocked by tendentious judgements based upon a series of purely subjective allegations and interpretations, ambiguous innuendoes, unfounded insinuations and arbitrary interpretations of the decisions and resolutions of the United Nations." (A/4629, page 2)

That is a polite way of saying that a man has told a lie. It is for you to consider whether Mr. Dayal's objection to the importations of these arms is an arbitrary interpretation of the decisions and resolutions of the United Nations. At the

meeting of the Security Council on 8 December, Mr. Harnmarskjoeld said:

"...in my report of yesterday, I did not raise the question referred to in that report"-that is, Mr. Dayal's report-"Regarding the return of Belgium, it was only because we have no confirmed factual information of relevance to the discussion in the Security Council to add to that report". (S/PV. 914, page 4)

That is to say nothing new had been reported. That is the position. In the second progress report it is also stated :

"On 25 October an armed clash took place between the Kanioka and the Baluba in the regions of Mwene-Ditu and Kabinda, resulting in a large but still undetermined number of casualties. The clash was temporarily halted by the United Nations force, but was later resumed with greater violence, despite United Nations efforts at pacification."-therefore, there had been efforts at pacification-"A force estimated at 5,000 men and led by one Captain Roberts"-I do not know whether or not that is a Belgian name-"an English-speaking European"-that should not mislead us, because Belgians speaking very good English-" and by non-Congolese residents of Mwene-Ditu began to advance towards Luiza on 28 October against the opposition of armed Kanioka. The Belgian-led Kalonji forces burnt the village of Malunda and killed its inhabitants... Captain Roberts and three of his assistants were taken into custody on 29 October while attempting to lead their units across United Nations lines in defiance of the cease-fire orders." (S/4557, page 24)

If that last is not a total defiance of the United Nations, I would like to know what would be. Mr. Dayal goes on to say:

"The presence in Central and North Katanga of heavily armed gendarmeric units under the command of Belgian officers had been for some time a

source of irritation to the Baluba tribes opposed to the present Katangese authorities." (Ibid, page 25)

379

So this is the position, and it is with this background that we received further information from the Secretary-General. Therefore, apart from the purposes for which the Soviet delegation called this meeting, which to a certain extent have been modified by the change in the agenda -it is not our business to go into these procedural matters-we are very definitely considering an urgent situation. While we were sitting here, the Secretary-General quite rightly informed us of a new situation in Stanleyville. I want to make the position of my Government entirely clear. We think that cruelty is cruelty, wherever it is perpetrated. We think that any exercise of violence which is not legally sanctioned and, even more, not morally sanctioned, is cruelty. Therefore, anything that happens in Leopoldville is no less important than anything that happens in Stanleyville, and what happens in Stanleyville is no less important than what happens in Leopoldville. We stand by the position that the taking of hostages, if the report is true, for political or military purposes is entirely contrary to the canons of civilization. I want to draw attention to the fact that if the former Belgian Congo is still a State, and there is a generally accepted canon of international law that States do not die, but States do not-then the Congo accepts the responsibilities the Belgian Government undertook in regard to the Geneva Convention.

The Geneva Convention, although it is labelled "Treatment of prisoners of war", deals with questions of civilians and conditions arising from civil commotion, and the taking of hostages, cruelties and the heaping of indignities, as has been done by the authorities in Leopoldville, are total violations of international law under the Geneva Convention. It is a very bad thing indeed for a State which comes here for the first time and in its first year to start its career in the United Nations with gross violations of the Geneva Convention, which is not only an international law accepted by people by means of ratification-it is not imposed upon anybody-but which is a monumental piece of humanitarian legislation. My country played a great part in shaping this in 1946, and the whole of this is

based on humanitarian considerations.

This takes me to another question. We were told there were reports of the Red Cross. We are happy about this. We are not saying that the International Red Cross is composed of men with sympathetic minds which are totally objective. That is impossible, since there is unconscious non-objectivity. But, by and large, as human nature goes the International Red Cross has a great reputation and we are prepared to accept it, but we think that if the International Red Cross is useful and valid in one place, it should be useful and valid in another.

We were told that there were reports about violations and cruelties which were perpetrated on some of Lumumba's former supporters. We cannot now take the position that we are not interested in these persons whose eyes have been gouged out. According to one statement I have read with regard to one of these persons, one eye is gone and the other will probably go shortly, of something of that kind. Anyway, there is a report from the International Red Cross, If a report from the International Red Cross can be called for in one case, why is there no report on the former Prime Minister ? Why is that report only from Belgian doctors ? Why should President Kasavubu object to the International Red Cross reporting on this gentleman ?

Now I am not here to reveal information that we have, because that may have consequences. But we do not accept at the present moment the statement made either by the representative of the United Kingdom or the representative of the United States, second-hand, or by the gentlemen from the Congo, who said that he was well cared for or is well, of course, one person being well, or otherwise, may be very important to his relatives, but in matters of this kind it is a different story. There was a great statesman who said: "When one man dies it is a calamity; when million men die it is just statistics." Therefore, we will take it in that fashion.

I think the same law should apply. My Government is prepared to condemn acts of atrocities whether they happen in Stanleyville, in one part of the country, or in another part of the country, because this is a law of nations, a custom and a convention, a moral injunction that must

be obeyed by everybody.

Although it may be out of order as to presentation, I would like to complete our position on Stanleyville; and I would request, with great respect, that the Secretary-General take note of what I am saying.

It was said that there are several thousands of Europeans who will likely be held as hostages, and that they have heard stories of previous atrocities and the atrocities that are likely to be perpetrated—such as the taking of their personal property, violations of persons, and all sorts of things that may be done.

This is a very, very harassing situation, a

380

situation that must cause us grave concern. But at the same time we would like to say that we congratulate the United Nations authorities for using the necessary amount of force—force does not always mean killing—to prevent these cruelties from happening.

Our country does not advocate war or military activities. However, if anybody attacks us, we shall do whatever is necessary.

Therefore, in regard to Stanleyville, we welcome this. But this is not a Council for waging war or reprisals, or anything of that character. The Secretary-General has just explained to us the action that is to be taken. I am also glad to have his explanation of what was done in Stanleyville.

But there are certain other circumstances to which I want to draw the attention of this Council, and I hope the Secretary-General will take note of this.

First of all, there is a report in the newspapers—and quite frankly I do not believe everything I see in the newspapers; life would be very difficult if one did—that Colonel Mobutu—I believe he is entitled to that title—is going to lead 300-odd paratroopers into this place.

Now two considerations arise—and this is a very serious matter. First of all, where do these paratroopers come from? If they are purely Congolese paratroopers, then what are the reasons for

the Belgian technicians being there ? Where do the parachutes come from ? Where do the aeroplanes come from ? They can only come from outside the Congo, because the Congolese Government is not in any position to manufacture these things. I know of Governments that are more technically advanced, and a paratroop battalion is not an easy business. Where do they come from ?

It is quite possible that the men who will be pushed out of the plane will be Congolese. I would not deny that. In colonial armies the so-called brave men were pushed out in the line of battle.

Where do these paratroopers come from ? If they had been supplied by the Belgians or by outside Powers, we are entitled to know about it.

But that is the least of it. The most important thing is this. Let us assume, for the moment, that those paratroopers going there are going in order to defend law and order, to protect those who are likely to be harassed. The position then arises that the Congolese paratroopers and the United Nations troops have the same objective. Now if the objective is the same, it will likely lead to an alliance. Will the United Nations find itself mixed up with Colonel Mobutu's troops, and will they be joined in a war against the opposition of Colonel Mobutu ? This is a very serious position.

If the United Nations is going there, then no other protective hand is necessary. If the United Nations feels that its protective hand is not sufficient, or if the Congolese paratroopers feel that it is their duty to go there, then they must join the United Nations forces and accept orders from the United Nations Command. There cannot be two independent lines of action in regard to the same problem. If this takes place it will lead to serious political complications and it will compromise the position of the United Nations.

I may be entirely beating the air in this matter because, after all, it is only a report. The Secretary-General has not given us this information. It has to be inquired into.

I now come to another circumstance, which is even more serious. In this connexion, I am not relying on press reports. I speak on behalf of my Government. We believe that the Belgians have concentrated troops in the Trust Territory of

Ruanda-Urundi. This is a gross violation of the Charter and of the agreements into which the Belgians have entered.

The amount of troops in Ruanda-Urundi is more than is required for a Trust Territory. In order for a Trust Territory to be used for these purposes, the Security Council must sanction it. I believe that comes under Article 139.

You all recall the legal argument going on about the use of a Trust Territory for experimental purposes. I am not going into this.

This Trust Territory is the sacred trust of the United Nations, and the Belgians are only in the position there of an Administering Authority. The General Assembly will shortly consider the transfer of power in Ruanda-Urundi. We are quite concerned about a Congo situation not developing or being repeated there. My country takes a most serious view of this position with regard to trying to convert Ruanda-Urundi into a base of operations, either by this method, or by giving them what is known as a "bogus independence".

The United Nations carries a serious responsibility if Trust Territories are to be justified as jumping-off grounds for the invasion of other

381

places, especially in regard to Stanleyville.

At the same time I hope that the members of this Council and the Heads of Governments will exert their influence on all parties to refrain from acts of cruelty, because the Secretary-General has said that he wishes to have the backing of world leaders. I have no doubt that the United States, the United Kingdom, the countries of the west, the Soviet Union, on the other hand, and people like us who have no allies in the world—thank God—will exert their influence upon these people to refrain from acts of cruelty and from violating the Charter, so as not to increase the difficulties in the Congo.

In spite of what was said by the representative of Cameroon yesterday, we have a great deal of kinship with the liberated countries of Africa. We were a colony only a few years ago. There are some people who ask, "What are colonies T

I can understand their asking that question; they were never colonial subjects. We know what a colony is.

We want to tell you that an empire does not change its spots. Empires have been dissolved in the past. There may be situations, as in the case of the British Empire, where it has broken with the concept of imperialism. Perhaps the journey is a little slower than we would wish, but there is no question of dressing it up in a different way. It will not be tolerated by their own people; it will not be tolerated by the people over whom they rule. I say this without any reservation whatsoever.

But past empires have governed by the policy of division. Having left Africa, they are trying to divide Africa not only physically, but they are setting up one lot of African people against another lot of African people. Even in the United Nations, where the Asian and African countries were very united on most questions, every attempt is now made to prevent their unity from developing and therefore the empire always takes this step. It is quite true that the empires live by the policy of divide and rule, but the latter version of the policy of divide and rule is divide and leave. That is what happened to our country and that is what happened to Korea. There are other places where partitions take place and that is what happened in China and so on and so on. Therefore, it is either divide and leave or divide and rule.

Secondly, they set up populations one against the other. I do not say that any person who supports an empire is necessarily an evil person or an immoral person-they-condition their minds to the belief that they are doing good. I think the worse evil is done by people who do evil and think they are doing good. This is the position in regard to some of these matters.

Now we come to the question of the legal aspects of this situation. We start from the premise, first of all, that the Secretary-General-I mean the institution ; I am making no personal references-will have to re-think this problem. It is in fact a problem of continual re-thinking, but, unfortunately, events go so fast that one cannot keep pace. We must re-think this problem and look at it in an unsophisticated way,

If the function of the United Nations is to maintain law and order, how can we maintain law and order through the agency of lawless people? Therefore, it is not a question of interpreting the fundamental law in the Congo-I do not know whether anybody can ; it is very badly drafted.- My Government would not come here and say that the function of the Security Council is to interpret legal questions; that is not permitted by the Charter. But if we are going to maintain law and order it is necessary that it be accepted on the other side.

Here we have a situation in which my Government wants especially to dissociate itself from any personal fights. The only legal authorities in the Congo are the President of the Republic, the Parliament, the officials of Parliament and those who are appointed according to the constitution. Here I would like the representative of the United Kingdom to take note of our position, and it has been communicated to him. We recognize Mr. Kasavubu as the head of the Republic of the Congo, but the recognition of his status does not mean that we accept his interpretations of his functions.

There is no country in the world, no group of political thinkers, which knows more about the difference between status and functions sanctioned by one of your statesmen some years ago. Equality of status does not mean equality of function, he said, in talking about the Dominions in those days. Similarly, just because we recognize Kasavubu as the Head of State and pay him all the courtesies that are due him, it does not mean that we recognize the usurpation of authority. It does not mean the conversion of himself in defiance of Parliament. We say that Parliament is the legal authority.

We went into the Congo. I am quite certain that the Security Council would not have voted

382

unanimously for entry into the Congo it at that time there was one-man rule, one-man's principles and one-man's interest at stake.

What is the position today ? Parliament does not exist. According to some people it is absorbed, according to some people it has sus-

pended and according to some people it does not exist. The constitution of the Republic of the Congo does not permit the suspension of Parliament for more than one month. Therefore, the suspension is illegal. Again, no doubt these lessons were learned from Belgium because the sleight-of-hand is the same, just the same as these troops that were withdrawn, which I talked about previously.

It is necessary, for example, to legalize certain documents, with the signatures of Ministers, and in order to legalize these documents, you get a Minister to sign who himself is not legal. A Prime Minister is appointed illegally because he has never been approved by Parliament. The removal of the Prime Minister has never been approved by Parliament. Therefore he is a de-facto Prime Minister because he is a Minister of Kasavubu. There is a palace government. I recognize it for what it is worth ; but authorization by an illegal personality would not make an instrument legal. That is a simple truth.

Then we are told by Mr. Kasavubu, in talking about the constitution-and I would like the United States delegation to give attention to this:

"The institutions given to the Congo by the fundamental laws are not in keeping with the sociological and political realities of the country. For that reason, the local authorities of Republic of the Congo wish these institutions to be modified, with due regard for the unity and territorial integrity of the Congo, and taking into account the defects of the fundamental law and the experience of the months which have passed since the promulgation of independence."

(A/4577; page 3)

But there is no reference here that these changes should take place in a legal manner. What he says is this : This constitution is "...not in keeping with the sociological and political realities...", "so I am going to change it."

The problem is a constitutional one which can only be solved by the Congolese authorities guided by the wishes of the people. That is entirely correct-if he knew who the Congolese authorities were and how the wishes of the people

were to be ascertained.

One of the allegations which must be refuted is that of the high-handed closure of Parliament. The chief physical difficulty preventing the assembly of Parliament is that a state of disorder, fomented by the supporters of Mr. Lumumba, deters members of the Provinces from returning to Leopoldville. Our view is that, whether Lumumba supporters created the disorder or Mobutu supporters created the disorder, whatever Government is in the country is responsible for it. If they are not responsible then the writ does not run.

One of the fundamental conditions of the Charter is that anyone who is a member should be able to carry out the obligations that they undertake as a Government. If the writ does not run, then it is a toy government ; it does not work. This difficulty will only be solved by so adapting the constitution as to give more effective guarantees to see that the rights of the Provinces are respected.

I am sure Sir Patrik Dean would not mind my saying this; it is often said in the country where I have lived for a long time : the difference between gentlemen and players in cricket is that the gentlemen play according to the rules except when the game goes against them, and then they change the rules. The players-poor devils-had to play according to the rules. They pay for it. So it is not a question of changing the rules when the game goes against them. That is what he says. The difficulty can only be solved by so adapting the constitution as to give more effective guarantees to the rights of the Provinces.

Parliament is certainly competent to control the executive power and, if need be, deny it confidence. It is not their power, however, to restore the Government on the demand of the Prime Minister, a prerogative of which it has been stripped; and even if it had the power it could only be subject to authorization by the majority required when a new Government appears before the Chambers, Senate, etc.

I will not read all of this; it is all here in the report. The long and the short of it is this : the contention of the President is that the former Prime Minister has not had a vote of confidence or, in any event, the vote in Parliament has been

against him, and he says the vote is 60 to 19; and in order to make the total, it must be 69. This is not any new mathematics. I will tell you what it is. It is 60 to 19; Mr. Lumumba gets 60 votes and against him are 19 votes in the lower house.

383

In the Senate I think it is 42 to 2, or whatever it is. The contention is that 60 does not make a two-thirds majority. But then you look at the constitution and it says two-thirds of those present; and the total number that was present was 79, and out of it 60 people voted, so it was not only two-thirds, but it was an overwhelming two-thirds majority in favour this way. Therefore, whatever has been done in this way is illegal and it is not a question of the Security Council sitting in judgement on this. But the facts of the matter are set out here. "This constitution does not suit me. It is not in keeping with sociological and political realities." That is a very fine term for a dictator to use. Therefore, while it is quite true that the origin of Mr. Kasavubu is the constitution, the ladder he has climbed, that has been kicked away.

Therefore, it is a moot question whether, when the constitution is altered in any way, the constitutionality remains. But my Government recognizes him as the Head of State and continues to give him all the respect that is due to the Head of a State because of the respect of the Congolese people and in the embodiment of their sovereignty. But to say from that all that is unconstitutional is illegal. is a different matter.

Then we have the situation today where the former Prime Minister, the former Speaker of Parliament, the former Chairman, the President of the Senate—all these people are in prison. Some of them have changed sides; and not alone in the Congo do people change sides in politics. That is one of the usual vicissitudes of fortune in this matter, and I think that when you come to a very highly sophisticated country like the United Kingdom, they say "crossing the floor". But this is a little more than that. In a thousand years everybody else will be like that. Or if you do not want quite to "cross the floor" -Mr. President, I do not think you do it in Russia—then you sit below the gangway.

All that is past history. If one goes to the House of Commons in the United Kingdom one

sees red carpets in front of the two sides. This is not to honour the Members, but because in the old days those gentlemen used to hit each other and so it was laid down that if anyone puts his foot on the red carpet he is out of order. It is like the mahout who puts a little stick on the elephant's foot so that it cannot move anywhere.

In any case, the point is that these rules cannot be changed in this way. The President or the Republic says that he is in favour or the reconvening of Parliament as soon as the necessary conditions of security and freedom of action for Members of Parliament have been re-established. Why do we not take this gentleman at his word? Why do we not request the countries which no doubt have great influence on him to advise him to try and create conditions in which Parliament can be convened?

That is all I shall say about the question of changed conditions; unfortunately time goes so quickly that it is not possible for me to deal with that question in any greater detail.

I come now to the point that law and order cannot be maintained unless, basically, law is respected. This cannot be done if the present position of those who are in charge of the administration, those with whom we have to treat, is based upon lawlessness and if, what is more, they make a gospel out of it. In such circumstances it is quite impossible for the Secretary-General or his officials to take the view of maintaining law and order in the sense of interpreting a criminal code under a parliamentary system of government. That was not what the United Nations went into the Congo to do.

But all that is vitiated by the presence of Mr. Mobutu. Now, I am a pacifist myself-even though I am Defence Minister of my country-and I would not wish anything that I say now to be interpreted as meaning that we desire the elimination of Mobutu. Such an interpretation would mean that we were inciting to violence.

Now, Mobutu is a colonel of the Congolese army-at least he has had the decency not to give himself titles and call himself a general. But his position is only that of chief of Staff. He has no political position. However, he carried out a

coup d'etat in which he captured power, and it is that illegal capture of power which the Head of State is now apparently honouring, or sanctifying, or ratifying, or whatever one wishes to call it. That means that this is really government by coup d'etat. The aim is to make it possible for the United States and the United Kingdom to maintain that the Head of State conforms to all the constitutional requirements.

I come now to my next point. My Government agrees that we cannot make bad laws just because of a bad and hard situation. We may not disregard the Charter. We are, however, entitled to submit to the Secretary-General that the Charter has to be read in its entirety; every word is important. This is especially necessary in the case of an instrument which allows of interpretation in the light of moving circumstances.

384

Now, in order to interpret the Charter we must find out what is the disease with which we are dealing. And here Mr. Hammarskjöld comes to my assistance. He says:

"The coup of the ANC Chief of Staff had introduced a new factor"-and, therefore, changed conditions rebus sic stantibus-

"adding to the complexity of the situation. ...the eruption of the army into the political scene"-

I think that "eruption" is a bit too mild ; "intrusion" might be more apt-

"constituted a new menace to peace and security, and actually inhibited peaceful political activity". (S/4557, paragraph 118)

I stress the words "a new menace to peace and security".

Now, the Secretary-General is not in the dock here, but in these matters he is the highest authority I can quote. We do not subscribe to any attacks made upon either the office or the individual ; policies can be right, policies can be wrong. Mr. Hammarskjöld has indeed been good enough to say that neither the Secretariat nor he is infallible.

Mr. Hammarskjöld has said that the resolution :

"did not specifically state that the United Nations Force was to maintain law and order, but it was clear from the context that this would be its essential function"-

and here I would say that it is a proposition of ordinary law, which also applies to international law, that something is made legal by practice; that is to say, two people conclude a contract and, even if the written instrument is not perfect, it is made an agreement by performance, by conduct, by the honouring of it.

The same applies in this case. Mr. Hammarskjöld continues:

"The legal justification for the Council decision was the threat to peace and security"-

this is not a new invention of Mr. Hammarskjöld he has always believed it-

"which arose as a result of the intervention of Belgian troops in the Congo; this intervention, in turn, occurred purportedly because of the widespread internal disorders in the country". (S/PV. 913, pages 13 and 14-15)

Therefore we are entirely justified in regarding this matter as based upon the conception of peace and security, which is necessary in order to interpret the Charter.

Now, according to Mr. Dayal, government in the Congo is being conducted by a College of Commissioners-I do not know whether these Commissioners are going to college or whether they have come from college. Mr. Dayal states:

"The College of Commissioners, drawn from inexperienced young students"-

and this is not disrespectful to the Commissioners; sometimes young students are very capable, and it is certainly no crime to be young-people who are not so young themselves are particularly of

that opinion-

"and whose declared purpose was to keep the elements of the administration running, created problems of its own in relation to the United Nations effort"--

and I would say that we are somewhat familiar with that problem.

"The young men were invariably accompanied"-

this is the sinister part of it-

"by numerous Belgian advisers, occasionally drawn from among their own teachers. The inevitable consequence was that the Commissioners were more inclined to listen to their own mentors than to act in co-operation with the United Nations consultants, who in many ministries found a wall of opposition building up against them. Indeed, instead of co-operating with the United Nations technical aid mission, as was their proclaimed purpose, the Commissioners actually set themselves up in opposition to it. Their inexperience, their lack of method and order, their susceptibility to outside influences, com-

385

bined with a propensity to issue conflicting statements, introduced new elements of delay, confusion and disorganization. As a result of these combined factors, the chaotic administrative and economic situation reached the verge of collapse." (S/4557, paragraph 121)

Here I should like to say that I read in a newspaper that some Canadian sources had been reported as stating that it was not possible to carry on United Nations technical aid because of the opposition of the Belgian authorities. In other words, whenever there was a proposition for technical aid-whether for oil, or for coal, or for anything else-there was tremendous opposition. There was nothing doing : it was the vested interests of the Empire trying to push out the United Nations. Thus, even in the field of

technical aid we are up against that situation. In this connexion Mr. Dayal has stated:

"In dealing with the College on a purely technical plane, for the purpose of continuing the existing technical aid programmes, there has been no question whatsoever of recognizing the College as a legitimate government"-

in other words, the United Nations has not recognized the College as a legitimate government-

"for its existence does not derive any sanction from the Loi fondamentale.

The College was nominated by the ANC Chief of Staff"-

That is, by Colonel Mobutu-

"and later formally installed by the Chief of State, an action which the Chief of Staff immediately criticized as unauthorized, since he had 'neutralized' the Chief of State." (Ibid, paragraph 123)

Now, the argument for this College of Commissioners is that politics has been neutralized; that is to say, the administration has been taken out of the field of political squabbles. That means objective and learned men, young men who are idealistic-probably they would be more idealistic without their advisers. But there is no evidence whatsoever that this band of people are anything but a political instrument. That is to say, there has been no neutralization of politics.

As I said a while ago, we are concerned, as citizens of the world, that young people in a country, particularly a liberated country, with the whole future before them and the making of not only the Congo but of Africa as a whole ; therefore, the contribution which they should make to the world is dependent upon this rising generation, particularly in the Congo where the Belgians have not thought it necessary to see the advantages of higher education when they were there. "In the confused political situation which prevails, the only two institutions whose foundations still stand, are the office of the Chief of State and the Parlia-

ment." (S/4557, pages 44 and 45)

That is our position, and with which, I am happy to say, we are able to agree with this report.

"If the minimum conditions of non-interference and security mentioned earlier could be established, it would open the way to the leaders of the country to seek peaceful political solutions through the medium of these two institutions." (Ibid., page 45)

That is to say, in spite of all that is happening, if it were possible for the Chief of State to function, as laid down by the constitution, through the instrumentality of its ministers and through the machinery of its Parliament and in conformity with law, then, the Chief of State, as the embodiment, the personality of the Congo and the sovereignty of the people, would perform not only a good service but would be amenable entitled to high respect. But if the Chief of State wants to appropriate to himself functions that are not placed upon him by the constitution and the Congo fundamental law, as I saw it, contains far more stringent measures, written down in terms, than is contained in the unwritten law of the United Kingdom or in our written constitution, where it is left to conventions. But here, the Chief of State has been tied down ; the limitations are explicitly put down-"You cannot do this unless Parliament does that ; and you cannot initiate this unless a Minister says something else." Being a written constitution of the Latin type, they have been more logical in that way and therefore there is no question that while the status can be respected, the functions cannot be.

Now, if it is true that peace and security is endangered-I would not say that I join issue, because I have not heard Mr. Hammarskjöld objecting to this-then the Government of India

386

takes the view, as it has been put out here, that it is necessary for the United Nations either to stay there and function or to think of other things.

We think the withdrawal of the United

Nations would be a calamity not only for the Congo but for ourselves. It is not a question of losing face or anything of that character. The position of the United Nations is that the capacity of the great African countries should be developed without being canvassed by one side or the other or without being a kind of object in economic bargaining-all that would disappear. The great schemes of technical and economic advancement, the resurgence of Africa, the development of its 200 million people and of its large territory-all this would become impossible.

Therefore, I address your attention to Article 14 of the Charter:

"Subject to the provisions of Article 12, the General Assembly may recommend measures for the peaceful adjustment of any situation, regardless of origin,".

There are two words here which are the key to this: "any situation". It does not say any dispute; it does not say any war. No one will doubt that there is a situation in the Congo-otherwise, we would not be here. It definitely says:

"adjustment of any situation, regardless of origin, which it deems likely to impair the general welfare...", as the sentence is constructed "general welfare or friendly relations among nations" that is an alternate. The "general welfare" is a welfare of the human family as put out in the preamble of the Charter "We the peoples of the United Nations"-that is "the general welfare". And the Congolese people are part of it.

My Government submits that Article 14 is applicable to the present situation, that there is "a situation" and we do not have to bother about the "origin" though I share, in certain circumstances, regardless of "origin", even if it is purely a situation of anarchy and chaos, they are to intervene "from a violation of the provisions of the present Charter setting forth the Purposes and Principles of the United Nations".

Therefore, from Article 14 we go back to Article 1, to the Purposes, that is to say, "measures for the prevention and removal of threats to the peace". It does not say peace in

the event of war between two countries-"removal of threats So the peace, and for the suppression of acts of aggression."

In the submission of my Government, in spite of what may have appeared in some parts of the Secretary-General's report, aggression continues. So long as Belgian troops are there, whether they are in cold storage, whether they are in technical assistance or whether they are in Ruanda-whatever it is-there is aggression-"suppression of acts of aggression or other breaches of the peace"-and if what is going to happen in Stanleyville, what has been happening in Leopoldville with the idea of the United Nations line being crossed-if they are not threats or breaches of the peace, what else is it? Then we have "disputes or situations"-it is not a situation-"situations which might lead to a breach of the peace".

As I said, the Charter has to be read as one piece. So Article 14, read for the purposes of the Charter, places this matter squarely within its conspectus. Therefore, we are not able to agree that there is any fear of going beyond the Charter. My Government would not subscribe to going beyond it. We have always held that the torturing of procedures, the torturing of rules in order to gain an immediate point, ultimately creates problems. Hard cases make bad law.

All we are saying is this: the Charter has to be interpreted first in its normal order--and I say "general welfare" does not apply merely to the welfare of two nations; secondly, "regardless of origin, a situation"-I have read out the Purposes etc. This also attracts; if unfortunately a situation should develop in that way, there are eleven sections of the Charter. which I shall not go into detail, in Chapter VI and Chapter VII. Long before we go to Chapter VI, Chapter VII becomes relevant.

I say all this because, unfortunately, in some parts of the statements made by the Secretary-General, some parts of the report, certainly in all parts of the statement made by those who regard the present situation as a legal. one, as Mr. Wadsworth said yesterday-and I am coming to that in a moment-seem to be interpreted that not only the intervention of the United Nations by force of arms but even the pacific settlement is

a matter of intervention.

I should like to ask you, Mr. President, you come from a country that has been involved in this quite a lot, in pre-present historic times, when does a domestic event become a domestic

387

event? It is only when it is possible to isolate the home from the country. I would like to ask whether the murder at Sarajevo, was that a domestic event? It provoked a war all the same. In all history the marriage of two people, of two dynasties-that created both complications and otherwise. I should have thought that it was a very domestic event. So it is a question of what are the repercussions of a domestic event ?

The history of the United Nations from September 1946 has been a history where every time an attempt is made by any side here, on the lines of progress, on the lines of redressing of evils-for racial discrimination or otherwise-always Article 27 has been pleaded. We yield to no one in the respect for the sovereignty of countries, particularly when those countries respect the sovereignty of others. But you cannot have it both ways. If this were a domestic matter, then why did the United Nations go there at all ? It could go there through the machinery of the Economic and Social Council and not through armed troops. What is more, the United Nations at the present moment having no international police forces-its military organization merely being an embryo, not functioning as it was expected under the Charter-has devised this machinery for this purpose. Therefore, it was not as though somebody slipped it in absent-mindedly.

The Security Council took a very deliberate decision; and here it will not be considered impertinence-my Government wishes to say something in regard to the Security Council decisions. We have heard here and elsewhere a great deal of criticism of the Secretary-General. We put in no special pleading for him. He can well look after himself. I do not doubt that he made mistakes; if he did not he would not be human; but the main responsibility lies on the Security Council. The Security Council, having passed resolutions, the Security Council had the responsibility, in our opinion, of continuous surveillance of this matter. The Charter provides for a meeting of the Security Council, not at a

shorter interval than a fortnight-it does not happen-and detailed instructions should have gone out. The Secretary-General is the Executive Officer, though he is an organ of the United Nations-he has to function from day to day. The Secretary-General-and I heard Mr. Hammarskjöld say the other day in the General Assembly or in the Advisory Committee, I forget which it is-"Let the General Assembly take the responsibility; let them say what is wanted" etc. So when their resolutions are passed and Member States are asked to make contributions, not of money but of people, when troops went in, it could not have been taken in a light-hearted way.

It was a very serious matter, and therefore my Government would regret the withdrawal of the United Nations from this operation-I am not saying that in a calamitous way-because that would lead to anarchy. It would lead to a loss of prestige-I do not mean in a false sense, but a loss of prestige for the United Nations. And no one knows better than Mr. Hammarskjöld how, in the under-developed countries, in the less sophisticated countries such as ours, the United Nations has such high prestige, not Only among the politicians but among the ordinary people.

Although time is short I will tell the Council of an incident. The Secretary-General visited our country. He occasionally does that, and two years ago he wanted to go to see some of the rural areas. Like all Governments, I suppose, we take visitors to special places-although not because they should not go anywhere else. But, because we are a very disorderly people, I believe his driver lost the way and he found himself in a village where he was not scheduled to go. So, there were no brass bands or anything of that kind. They produced a chair on which the Secretary-General was asked to sit, and then they asked him every possible question about the United Nations, the Trusteeship Council, and so on, and they finally asked him, "What are you paid for doing this job?" That is not a laughing matter. In the rural areas of our country there are 600,000 villages, nobody asked them to say these things: the Secretary General was not expected to go there. That is the general response of people, and, although I do not speak for Africa, I am quite certain that in the whole of the African territories there is an emotional, spiritual reaction to the whole conception of the United

Nations and, its purposes which is an asset that should not be wasted, and the reaction of any cynicism arising in connexion with this would be a terrible thing because it is one factor which might operate against conflicts of various kinds.

I do not think that I can deal with all these things now. Therefore, we come to the question of what is to be done. There has been a great deal of controversy here with regard to the disarming of the Congolese army. There has been a great deal of reaction to what is called the disarming of an army that is not an army-as though it were unfrocking a bishop. But we did not start this. The Secretary-General started this business of disarming the army. In his report of 7 September he said:

388

"... emphasis now should be put on the protection of the lives of the civilian population in the spirit of the Declaration of Human Rights and the Genocide Convention. This may necessitate a temporary disarming of military units, which, in view of present circumstances, are an obstacle to the re-establishment of law and order in the interest of the people and the stability of the nation." (S/4482, p.5)

And he says in another place that the disarming was effected with the co-operation of the Congolese people:

"... throughout the early months of the United Nations operation in the Congo, the Congolese security force"- which is rather an odd name for it- "re-styled as the Armee nationale congolaise, remained for the most part inactive and, in several instances, units of the Armee nationale congolaise had, by agreement with the United Nations, voluntarily disarmed themselves." (S/PV, 913, p 18)

When there are 20,000 professional troops in the place-quite a large number of people-in addition to lot of Belgian technicians, it is very difficult to see why, for security in the present state of disorder, another element should be contributed.

I have great sympathy with and I understand the position expressed by our young friend from the Congo that no country can be forcibly disarmed, but every country has to submit itself to the demands of order, to the demands of international organization. We do the same. It is important to stress that they are parts of our country where, under international arrangement, our armed forces stand away from certain places. That is not to say that there is a subjugation of our sovereignty, but there can be no international order without some agreement of this character. It is important to stress that with reference to the complete control of the country as a whole, even aside from Katanga, which is at least claiming to maintain a semblance of authority. I shall take up the question of disarming afterwards.

Much has been said about the ill-treatment and so on of the former Prime Minister. It is not my business to refer to it. because, first of all, my Government likes to place this on the basis of institutions, not of personalities, and Mr. Lumumba happens to be the person who had the largest following in Parliament and who has been displaced illegally. Perhaps if legality was restored either he would assert himself and help to maintain order, or he would be shown up. In either case it would be better to call Parliament.

The Secretary-General I believe-or was it the representative of the United States yesterday?-referred to the question of trials and magistracy and so on. I think our young friend, the representative of the Congo, also spoke about the law of the Congo and how it would be done, and so on. Now article 66 of the Congolese Constitution says :

"No member of either of the two Chambers may be prosecuted or arrested for penal offences, as long as the session goes unless the Chamber to which he belongs has given its authorization or he has been surprised in flagrante delicto."

That is to say, there is no sanction for this action at all, and the article continues :

"When the session is over, a member of either of the Chambers may be arrested only with the authorization of

the Bureau of the Chamber of which he was a member,..."

But how can it be authorized if both the Speaker and the Chairman are in prison ?

The Secretary-General's letter of 5 December continues:

"Of special importance in this context is the concept of due process of law as developed in general recognized law and the fundamental law of public liberties." (S/4571, Annex 2, p.

I take liberty of asking Mr. Hammarskjöld how he can write this sentence and at the same time say, "we are not concerned with the law of the Congo".

Mr. Hammarskjöld continues:

"I refer in particular to the questions of the necessity for and legality of the warrant of arrest, the requirements that the detainee be informed, with 24 hours at the latest, of the reasons for his arrest and of the formal charges in detail entered against him, that he shall not be prosecuted except in the cases provided for by legislation and in

389

accordance with the procedure in force at the time when the offence was perpetrated, that he may have counsel of his own choice, and further, that he shall be entitled in full equality to a fair and public hearing by an independent and impartial tribunal in the determination of any criminal charge against him." (Ibid, pp. 2 and 3)

Now President Kasavubu replies. In his letter to the Secretary-General of 7 December—that is, after he came here—he states :

"...if the entire judiciary had not been destroyed to a large extent as a result of action taken by Mr. Lumumba himself and by the special courts he set up, the judiciary would today have no difficulty in conducting the trial in accordance with the rules in force in all

civilized countries. This however will be our main concern for the future."
(S/4571/Add. 1, p. 3)

But, even presuming that his previous Prime Minister destroyed them-and I do not know the facts-two wrongs never make a right, and this is our concern in the future, not for the present.

Now Mr. Dayal says what follows from that :

"...the magistracy exists only in name ... In the absence of a magistracy, arrested persons are either let off or languish indefinitely in the jails and lock-ups,..Although his (Mobutu's) army has not itself formally assumed the prerogatives of the judiciary or the functions of the police, members of the ANC have frequently usurped those functions. They have set themselves up as judges of what type, of activity they will allow or disallow, regardless of the laws of the land. It is they who have taken upon themselves to decide who is to be imprisoned or detained for how long and under what conditions.
(S/4557, paras, 58 and 64).

That is to say that, when we talk about the due process of law, first of all we must be sure that the law will be respected, that the law is respected, that the institutions are under the law, and, what is more, that the ordinary judiciary machinery is functioning at all, even in a limited form.

The question now arises-and I want again to repeat that I would like the Secretary-General to take note of what my Government has to say-with regard to the possibilities that might come about in Stanleyville. On the one hand, there is rather horrific position with regard to the hostages, and on the other hand there is also the position that the United Nations forces might get themselves embroiled with the paratroopers of Colonel Mobutu. And if Colonel Mobutu has paratroopers to spare he should join the United Nations forces. Again, there is the use of Urundi as a base of operations, and thirdly there

is the supply of arms in large quantities. Therefore the question arises what is to be done in those circumstances, and my Government, although it is, I believe, entitled under the rules to suggest resolutions and things of that character, does not intend to do so. We are here by kind permission of the Security Council-although perhaps entitled to be so-and therefore we do not want to abuse the privileges that have been offered to us.

We would like to say that among the actions that must be taken immediately, we have a right as a friendly country, in regard to the United Kingdom, and as a member of the Commonwealth to ask them to use their best influence with their NATO allies-We tried to once before with them, in the case of Portugal. It did not work, but I hope in this case it will-to try to see, together with their NATO allies, that no arms made in Belgium or under Belgian control, whether pooled in NATO or otherwise, should hereafter reach the Congo; and what is more, that whatever arms there were when Belgium was an imperial Power should be withdrawn. And secondly, among the things to be done is the creation of a climate of a different character in the Congo itself-and that takes me back on a little detour again, into this question of interference in internal affairs.

In the changed circumstances-I should have said that there are certain changed circumstances-I submit that the General Assembly has intervened in the internal affairs of the Congo. My Government regrets this, because it will be misunderstood by others. We think that all the excesses that characterize the present situation in the Congo and that have occurred during the last month or so would not have taken place if, in its wisdom, the Assembly in letting these things slide had not upset the salt. The fact of placing here in the position of a Government the delegation of one side or the other, whatever it was-the General Assembly decided that since there

390

were difficulties about it they would leave it alone, and they then went on to pass a resolution adjourning the whole matter until certain Members of the Assembly could go and see for themselves. That was agreed to. I am not now raising the question of whether it was procedurally

correct or not; whether it was procedurally correct or not, there is no doubt that the spirit of the decision or the General Assembly was violated. And therefore these gentlemen who have no legal authority now handle the authority by their participation in the United Nations.

We would not like to see the place of the Congo left vacant for ever; but equally, we would not want to have arise a situation such as exists in the case of China. Therefore, this attitude of building a halo around them has not helped the forces of law and order.

We are continually told that we may not interfere in internal affairs. Is it not interference by the United Nations in the internal affairs of the Congo when there is a violation of the Constitution, when an unconstitutional authority has been set up and sanctity is conferred upon it? That, if anything, is interference in the internal affairs of the Congo. We have tried to take the view that an atrocity in Stanleyville is just as bad as an atrocity anywhere else, or even worse. There should not be this double sense of values.

The representative of the United States has set out his position with regard to this, and I quote him :

"As for the status of Mr. Lumumba in the political system of the Republic of the Congo, this is a matter which can only be dealt with by the Congolese Government and the people themselves. It is problem of internal Congolese jurisdiction and not one for the Security Council or the General Assembly to judge; it is not for the Security Council or the General Assembly to choose between sides in an internal conflict and interfere in the internal affairs of a sovereign Member State of the United Nations."(S/PV. 916, page 12)

Now, we agree with part of this; that is to say, what Prime Minister they should have is for them to decide, and whether the Prime Minister should be impeached or hung by the neck or expelled is for them to decide. But after all, the Congolese State was admitted to the United Nations on condition of respect for the Charter and on the condition that the Government was

able to deliver the goods. They must discharge their responsibilities.

Therefore, if it is a question of one or another being benefitted, then it becomes necessary not to put the matter before the Credentials Committee in the middle of a civil war, or what amounts to one, but rather to abide by the earlier wisdom of the General Assembly and let things go.

Now, this is not an attempt to review the decisions of the General Assembly, passed by a considerable majority and with support not only in numbers but in weight and supported by those who have great faith in democratic institutions- and I would be the last person to say that the countries that supported this and thought it was the right thing to do, since they thought it was the right thing to do are pioneers or great leaders of the democratic world-some part of it they call the "free world", but at any rate, part of the democratic world. I believe the soviet countries also call themselves "people's democracies", so democracies generally, all over, accept it.

So as to the question, we have no objection. We cannot object; it would be improper for us to do so. It is entirely for them. But to say that there is any legal sanction for this is what is difficult to follow. But in that respect I entirely agree with Mr. Wadsworth in saying that the political system of the Congo is entirely a matter to be left to the Congolese people. That is what we are saying : Leave it to the Congolese people, in the sense that Parliament be convened.

That is one of the things that could be done. And the desire expressed by Mr. Wadsworth that things should be done according to accepted practice is shown on the next page, where he says that they have used their good offices, through their Ambassador "...to inform President Kasavubu and Colonel Mobutu that the United States Government hoped that former Prime Minister Lumumba would be accorded humane treatment.....", although they have not been able to get a report from the Red Cross, and that they hoped "...that he would be given a fair trial." (S/PV. 916, page 13) But expressing the hope that he will be given a fair trial when conditions are such that there is no judiciary, that

the whole administrative system is produced by ordinance which is sanctified only by the signature of an illegal Prime Minister-how can legality come out of that ? I suppose the United Nations is accustomed to that, because they think peace will come out of war.

391

Then there is this part of Mr. Wadsworth's statement :

"In the view of the United States, this purpose could be significantly advanced if all Members of the United Nations-and I repeat: all Members-would give full support and recognition to what has been characterized as one of the two organs still functioning in the Congo: the office of the President, Mr. Kasavubu ; and if they, would give full support and recognition to President Kasavubu's efforts to restore law and order throughout the Congo." (S/PV. 916, pages 16-17)

Now, what I find in this paragraph that there is a reference to two organs in the first part of it, but as the paragraph goes on it gets fatigued and loses sight of one organ : there is only the President there. We entirely endorse what has been said by representatives at the United Nations, that there are only two legal organs that we can deal with at the moment, that is, the Parliament and the President. The President we recognize. Our Ambassadors are accredited to the Head of the State, I assume. But the implications of the statement may be carried out.

Then comes another paragraph-and I quote all this because I have great respect for the dedication of the representatives of the United States and their colleagues to the conception of government by law. They have given a great deal to the world in that way, and I am quite certain that for any small gains they will not let it go, But to quote him:

"I personally believe with the utmost sincerity that we must think not of our own prestige, not of any quarrel between ideologies-East or West-not necessarily even of which interested group or party within the Congo should or

should not have the ascendancy; but of the Congolese people. We should remember that the more difficult we make it for the Congolese people, the easier we make it for Congolese to kill other Congolese. That is obviously something which the United Nations was not established to do. We should remember our obligations under the Charter." (S/PV. 916, page 18-20)

May I respectfully say that we agree with every word of this.

Now may I read the words of another Supporter of the resolution-and with restraint I will try to comment on this, because the document is before you, Mr. Ortona, the representative of Italy, tells us there are four points to be considered, and we are quite willing to consider them. he says:

"In the first instance, in my delegation's opinion, we must make an effort to use all ways and means to stop violence." (S/PV. 916, page 28)

For what it is worth, my Government would like to say we are in accord with this-"all ways and means to stop violence".

Mr. Ortona continues:

"An unbiased and highly respected organization, such as the international Red Cross, would help very much in that direction". (Ibid)

The only qualification we would put on this is that the international Red Cross should function in all contexts, not only in certain contexts.

Then Mr. Ortona goes on to other matters, mentioning the "respect of human dignity and the preservation of human rights". If all this were also universally applicable, that would be a good idea.

Therefore, we submit that if we are to create, even before we go into the question of arming and disarming, a situation in the Congo which to some degree is respectful to these ideas of peaceful reconstruction; if we are to bring to an end all

the violence and the resort to such doctrines as the holding of hostages on the one hand and the beating of political opponents on the other- and my Government hopes this will be taken by the great Powers in the spirit in which it is offered-we submit that if those influential countries that have the greater contact with the authorities in the Congo and to whom the present Congolese authorities owe some debt of obligation for the assistance they have had-and I have no doubt at all that, as pointed out in Mr. Wadsworth's statement here, they used their good offices-if those countries, in that way, through their good offices, privately or publicly used, would warn them, whoever they are, against lawlessness and violence, by whomsoever committed ; and also, as the Secretary-General has pointed out, if they could get the Congolese army itself-that is Mr. Mobutu himself, whom, according to Mr. Wadsworth, they had recognized now,

392

for that is what he has said-to agree to disarm-- or I should not say "disarm"--to agree to the neutralization or the non-activity of the Congolese forces-I would suggest that they get three months' privileged leave, or something of that kind-and if it could be done in that way it would be far better than a direct appeal for disarmament, because disarming the army might quite likely evoke the kind of action, understandable though it is, that has been already referred to-if all this were done, we submit, some progress might be made toward our goals.

There is no reason at all why their friends should not persuade them that there are other troops there and that this may create difficulties when one army meets another army. Why is it called the Congolese National Army ? The Secretary-General's report speaks about two things. He speaks of private armies-those are the words he used-and the intervention of the army in politics. If this influence could be used in that way and the army could go back to barracks as it was before United Nations day, that would be of great assistance.

Secondly, we recall the words of the Italian Ambassador, that there should be on our side an adjuration to refrain from violence or incitement to violence. I think that the example set by the United Nations in this respect will probably go

some distance.

We also submit that if these things are to be operative, the good offices of whoever can be of use to the people concerned should result in a general gaol release, that is, the release of all political prisoners, whether on one side or the other. This is necessary in any country to restore order. There would not be any peace between warring factions so long as there were some leaders in prison. So those who have influence with the President-or, I suppose, really with Mobutu-we would request to use that influence, in the sense that these are former political colleagues. As the representative of the Congo pointed out, they were all fellow fighters together. but temporary difficulties have landed them in different places. Therefore a general release from prison, not of ordinary criminals but of the others, should be undertaken.

There should be on the part of the United Nations and the Secretary-General, in this case, an interpretation of the mandate given to him which fits in with the present purpose. This is not by any means a counsel of opportunism, as I have tried to point out. If I have not been successful, I am sure the Secretary-General himself will be able to pursue this, but there should be an interpretation of the Charter, according to its words, according to its purpose and according to the present conditions and, what is more, taking into account the consequences. You cannot be in the position of holding a tiger by the tail ; then you can neither leave it nor continue to hold it. So we are fully entitled to put forward this position that there should be an interpretation of the Charter with the idea of assisting in the restoration of good conditions and, what is more, warding off the evils that might arise in the form of a breach of peace and security.

Next, I would point out that the United Nations is there for the maintenance of law and order, because the breakdown of legal institutions has created a state of anarchy, and that has established rule by private armies. Having regard to the position in Stanleyville and so on, the best thing to do is to get Parliament convened. We recognize that the United Nations has no authority to convene Parliament but we also recognize that Mr. Kasavubu has the authority to call Parliament. Our appeal would be to those who have greater

access to Mr. Kasavubu to ask him to call Parliament, because Parliament has not been dissolved. It would be to his honour and glory if Parliament were called. Simply calling Parliament by sending out a letter would not be sufficient. It would be the business of the United Nations to neutralize some area, with the consent of everybody concerned, to neutralize some place where Parliament could meet and function in peace, because Mr. Kasavubu himself has said that one of the difficulties in calling Parliament is the fact that there are these physical troubles. This area would be large or small, as required, and not necessarily Leopoldville. I suppose that they followed our example of having the United Nations in New York; they like the most crowded place, and therefore the Parliament is in Leopoldville. It would not necessarily have to be in Leopoldville. That is not a matter for us. We think that the convoking of Parliament should be made part of policy until it is dissolved by due process. Even to be dissolved, it must meet. Therefore, the political prisoners have to be released and some sort of immunity provided by the protective arm of the United Nations. This is the submission that we would make.

In these circumstances, if, coupled with this, the resistance to technical assistance and to the functioning of the various organs of the Economic and Social Council and the competition that arises from other technicians could also be removed, in other words, if it is the desire of those who are powerful in this Organization to restore to the

393

Congo what belongs to it, namely, the right of the people to live their own lives, then, instead of being a problem, instead of being a matter of concern, the situation would be such that we would have a country in Africa that attained its independence and, though it unfortunately went through a little trouble, was able to get over, it and profit from its experience.

We have made these submissions in no spirit of being doctrinaire. We believe that this cannot be left as it is. We are very sorry to hear that friendly countries like the United Arab Republic and others have withdrawn their troops. It would be very difficult to see what they could do otherwise when their Ambassadors are turned out and called *presona non grata*, and not only individuals

but the Embassy is turned out. In fact, one of the cardinal principles of the importation of United Nations troops is the consent of the country. In the case of Gaza, the Egyptians and the other side agreed; otherwise the United Nations could not go there. But we hope that the Secretary-General's good offices and his arm will extend so far as to change conditions so that those who are there will not have to go and those who have left will be able to come back.

Once having begun the idea, once having had to start in this place the introduction of army personnel or service personnel-and it would be very difficult at the present moment to do anything else-it is difficult to change conditions. But we would like to see conditions change in this way and an appeal made to the Congo as a Member State of the United Nations not to take the view that those who do not agree with everything that goes on there are necessarily opponents of the regime or enemies of the country. We wish it well, and we do not say this in a patronizing manner, for we believe that it is a country with tremendous resources and a population of great ability, with men like our distinguished colleague that we have seen here, and these could be utilized for this great purpose. Again I may say this both to Congolese and to non-Congolese.

There is no break with an empire unless all its works go with it. There cannot be peace with an empire in the place. I have great respect for those who say that there are doctors, people in leper camps, and we are doing good work in the Congo-all honour to them-but it is very difficult to convince Members of Parliament, in India or anywhere else, that what the Belgian Government has not been able to do in the eighty years they have been there, the education they have not provided, the leadership they have not prepared, the economic redirection they did not undertake in 100 years, will be accomplished through the dropping in of paratroopers. No Belgian national in foreign territory can be protected by Belgian arms. In the world as it is today, that is to apply the law of piracy on land.

Therefore, we come back to the beginning of our enterprise and I hope the Secretary-General will succeed in the formal removal-I do not say of Belgians, but of all non-Congolese who are now in the Congo except those who are there for United Nations purposes or who are front United

Nations agencies. Whatever may be the law-and there are many things in regard to which we have the right to ask the question whether we should exercise the law-that would be in the interests of peace in the Congo. It should be possible for the Congolese authorities to assist in the matter by placing their customs and immigration machinery in co-operation with the United Nations, to prevent incursions into their territory. Even the so-called leaders of private armies and so on may find it to their temporary advantage, but once you get these people in, you do not get them out so easily. That is all I have to say, Mr. President.

INDIA CONGO USA EGYPT FRANCE ISRAEL CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC TUNISIA NIGER
NIGERIA LATVIA BELGIUM FALKLAND ISLANDS SWITZERLAND RUSSIA CAMEROON KOREA
CHINA PORTUGAL PERU ITALY

Date : Dec 01, 1960

Volume No

1995

INDIA IN THE UNITED NATIONS

Shri Krishna Menon's Statement in General Assembly on Congo

Shri V. K. Krishna Menon, Leader of the Indian Delegation to the United Nations, made the following statement in the General Assembly on the situation in the Congo on December 15, 1960 :

Once again the General Assembly, at the request in the initial instance of the delegations of Yugoslavia and India, is convened today to consider what we regard as a critical and emergency situation. It does not fall to me to speak about the responses in the Assembly in this matter. The fact that so many delegations are not able to be present here is perhaps not a reflection upon themselves as upon the fact that for months we have sat in the Assembly without coming to conclusions on matters of great importance, and the pressures of work in other Committees may contribute to it.

But the fact does remain that we are today discussing probably one of the most critical situations that emerged in our time, which may affect the question of order or anarchy, on the continent of Africa, the prestige of the United Nations, and what the Secretary-General has

394

described as the problem of peace and security, This afternoon we are here especially because the Security Council has failed the United Nations. For days and at all hours of the night the Council debated these problems and these eleven wise men were not able to produce the results that were required.

Therefore, whatever may be the niceties, the various nuances involved and the reasons that go into it, the world looks upon the fact that the Security Council, which is charged with the protection of peace and, security in the world and to act with great urgency-even though it was convened thanks to the initiative of the President, and I mince no words in that matter, at this critical situation-did not come to a conclusion. It does not matter very much whether it was due to the intransigence of one or the lack of courage of the other, or whether it was for this or that reason. The fact does stand out that while war threatens, and while civil war threatens to tear up Africa, and while other events in South East Asia, on account of the intervention of the great Powers of the world, thereatens to shake the peace of the world, the Security Council has been stultified, and that is why we are here.

We hope that those of us who are not committed to the great Power blocs-and I particularly address myself to our new colleagues of Africa, particularly those who have been liberated from the French empire-will throw their weight behind peace and order in Africa, because their vote here, because of one thing or another, the obligations that they may immediately have to other delegations who try to exert pressure, these are not the things that decide our issues in the word.

For once we must shako fear and vote fearlessly in order to compel action on the part of the United Nations Secretariat. Therefore, we come here first of all because the United Nations appears paralysed. My Prime Minister used these

words on a previous occasion and I believe I speak without any sense of national egoism on this matter. That particular debate had the effect of giving it a little, bit of oxygen, and a few days afterwards we adopted a resolution saying that at least people must refrain from doing this that and the other thing.

Now we come to another position, a position, as I said at first, which is due to the action of the Security Council. Secondly, we have before us a document from the Special Representative of the Security Council which says that the armed forces of the so-called Government of the Congo-that is what we propose to call it hereafter because it has no legitimate authority-led by a person who is IL product of a. coup d'etat, and not of a good type either, has challenged the authority of the United Nations and, in the words of Mr. Dayal, committed aggression against the United Nations. I am sorry that the Secretary-General is only listening, therefore I cannot judge his face. I think that it is the worst challenge, the worst humiliation, that the United Nations ever suffered, that there should be a person in charge of armed forces with no authority from his people or even of the head of his Government presumably, and no authority from Parliament, who dares to challenge the authority of the United Nations, sanctified by resolutions of the Security Council and this Assembly, which is not in the Congo for imperial occupation and, as one representative unfortunately once tried to say, for joint imperialism. It is not there for the purpose of aggrandizement, but rather called there by a legal government. And the Secretary-General pointed to the Security Council, whatever the resolution may appear to be literally, and said that the maintenance of law order was implied in that resolution.

What is more, as Mr. Fawzi pointed out a while ago, we have taken so many steps in the maintenance of that law and order.

Therefore, there is the second fact, that is to say, there is the beginnings of war waged upon the United Nations. Are we to sit back here idly, we the peoples or nations of the world, as it is stated in the Charter, and not accept this challenge ? My Government does not take the view that, as regards the Secretary-General or whoever is responsible, the mandate given by the Security Council is not enough to cover this event. We

agree that it is not necessary to exercise a mandate to the full in the beginning, but we believe that the resolutions adopted by the Security Council, read With the various documents that have come in to us, and the various statements made by the Secretary-General before us, are sufficient to cover the entire issues that are before us, because there is a threat to peace and security. Therefore, what is to be sought is not a new mandate, but working out and facing the realities of the situation. I hope those of you who are Members of the Security Council will bear with me if there is some repetition of what I have already said before the Security Council, After all, they have been said in the United Nations and I cannot simply say to you that I have said this somewhere else.

Therefore, I propose, with your permission and assuming your patience, to go into this very fully. After all, we have spent a lot of time discussing things that are less important than this. We are

395

here for three reasons. First, we are concerned with the fact that the prestige and position of the United Nations and its right have been challenged. Secondly, we are as nationals concerned with the humiliations inflicted upon our people. We did not go to the Congo to be humiliated; we are prepared to stake hardships; we are prepared to bear the burdens which are necessary, and we do not whine about them. But we say that 'these national humiliations are international humiliations. What one country suffers in the pursuance of a mandate, in the pursuance of a request by the United Nations, is the suffering of every other country. So we sent out people to the Congo. I will deal with that in a moment. But I think what I have said just now is not merely what has emerged in the halls of the United Nations.

The feeling in my country, in Parliament, in public opinion and in the Press is so strong about this that I have to convey it to you. I can do no better than quote a few words which my own Prime Minister uttered two or three days ago when the Security Council was sitting, and he, with the optimism that characterizes him, hoped that some solution would come out of the Security Council. He said:

"It is a very dangerous situation, not only dangerous for the Congo but for the whole of Africa; not only for the

whole of Africa but for the future of the United Nations itself, because if the United Nations cannot deal with this situation and fails then naturally its capacity to deal with any other situation or similar situation will go."

Another fact should also be remembered, that recent developments there had been a matter not only of deep concern and anxiety but, in a measure, even anger to many peoples and many countries of Asia and Africa. If I may stop there. I turn to my friends, to my colleagues and brothers in Africa and the Asian countries, and I should like to remind them that this is a great humiliation; it is the reverse of Bandung.

A number of countries have had their representatives thrown out. We do not stand for that from one country when we have an Ambassador accredited there-a number of countries have withdrawn their contingents from the United Nations Force and no one quite knows what other developments of this kind may take place hereafter. There is danger not only of civil war, which is practically taking place in a small way, but of civil war spreading, or foreign intervention on a bigger scale because as things are in the world if one major Power intervenes, as indeed it has done, of opposite number or some others would want to intervene also and come in to create some kind of balancing intervention. I think that that is a very mild statement, but it "presses a situation that calls for a very strong characterization.

The United Nations went into the Congo in order to give technical assistance, in order to assist in the maintenance of law and order but, more than all of this, to expel the intruder; that is to say, the Belgian Government, having ruled this country over a period of eighty years as an imperial ruler, having left it helpless without educated or capable administering strata in the society, with no development that could cope with this situation, gave it independence-the gauntlet with the gift in it.

We do not regret the independence of the Congo but we regret this act of political desertion. There can be no greater condemnation of an empire, not even its atrocities, that leaves a country paralysed, emasculated and incapable

of taking care of itself. Belgium today stands in the dock of the world, not only here but everywhere and it should be called to account by the United Nations for this purpose. We therefore went in there for this purpose of expulsion, for the withdrawal of Belgian nationals, and although it is somewhat out of order I propose to take this first.

The Security Council, in its resolution of 22 July, called :

"upon the Government of Belgium to implement speedily the Security Council resolution of 14 July 1960, on the withdrawal of their troops and authorizes the Secretary-General to take all necessary action to this effect". (S/4405).

I would have asked the Secretary-General, if he were here, about this because it says that the Secretary-General is authorized "to take all necessary action or legitimate action to this effect". It does not say "all legal action". or legitimate action or cautious action ; it says the "necessary action" the action limited by the achievement of a result. Therefore the mandate is sufficiently wide.

This was a repetition of the resolution passed on 13 July. The resolution of 9 August 1960 adopted by the Security Council called :

"upon the Government of Belgium

396

to withdraw immediately its troops from the Province of Katanga under speedy modalities determined by the Secretary-General and to assist in every possible way the implementation of the Council's resolution". (S/4426)

Credit is due to the Secretary-General because he permitted, and, I believe, even led the United Nations troops into Katanga. At least it was a good gesture, at least so far as I know; I do not know anything more about it.

On 20 August the permanent representative of Belgium replied to the Secretary-General, that is, one month and six days after the first resolution asking the Belgian Government to with-

draw. I have said from this rostrum in another connexion three or four years ago that it always appears for aggressive troops or invading armies or imperial forces, to take less time to go in than to come out. In other words, it takes more time to come out than to go in. Why it should take one month and six days for Belgians to pack up and go home I do not know. The Belgian Government replied as follows :

"The Belgian Government has instructed me to inform you that the Kitona and Kamina bases will be evacuated except for experts." (S/4475, ANNEX I)

Further on the reply stated

"The number of experts required for essential services is 1,000 at the maximum for Kamina and 500 for Kitona." (Ibid).

On 30 August the permanent' representative of Belgium said :

"that the withdrawal of Belgian troops in the Congo has been completed"-I want you to mark these words- " with the sole exception of some members of the First Paratroop Battalion who are in transit ... Instructions have been issued to the effect that, should it be necessary and in order to avoid any delay, they should be evacuated by air. Thus the withdrawal of Belgian troops from the Congo has in effect been completed." (S/4475, ANNEX 4).

This is a categorical assurance given by a founding Member of the United Nations and, what is more, a country that twice in this century has been ravaged by foreign invasion and to Whose aid the rest of the world has gone. We have that assurance from the Belgian Government.

But what happened? We do not have to take any partisan sources for the examination of this reply. This reply from the Belgian was dated 30 August. On the same day, the Secretary-General wrote to the permanent representative of Belgium as follows:

"The Secretary-General has, how-

ever, just received a report from his representatives who arrived at Kamina today. 30 August ... At that time Belgian combat troops consisting of one 400-man battalion of paratroopers, one 120-man company of airfield guards and one school of aviation comprising fifty instructors and students had not yet been evacuated...

"The Secretary-General expresses his surprise at finding that there is a marked difference between the information received from Brussels and the facts observed on the scene... As the evacuation has, nevertheless, not yet been completed the Secretary-General deems it necessary to submit a formal protest to the Belgian Government requesting that the evacuation of Belgian troops which are still in the Congo should be effected immediately". (Ibid. ANNEX 5)

Those of us who know Mr. Hammarskjöld know that he does not use offensive language, but Very courteous language; but we would all agree that this is strong enough as language, as a request, as a protest, but it was necessary action, as events alone have shown.

In their reply the Belgian Government said that the relief of Belgian units in Katanga :

"provided Inter alia for an overlapping period in which the transfer authority and hand over the provisions, bedding and other equipment...

"(2) The relief by United Nations troops was not carried out in accordance with the time-table laid (S/4575 Add. 2)

In other words, they said, "we could not go out because you did not come in".

397

The reply continues :

"General Geysen nevertheless confirmed that, despite this major delay on

the part of the United Nations, the Belgian troops would be withdrawn at midnight on 30 August." (Ibid)

Mind you, just before they had said that they had already withdrawn. Now they said that they would be withdrawn by midnight. The Belgian reply continues :

"(5) An essential number of men were left on the spot to carry out this task." (Ibid.) Then we could have rested with some feelings that things were being done. But then we turn over and we find that on 4 September, that is, four days afterward, the Secretary-General has again to write to the Foreign Minister of Belgium this time. So it is not as though there were any delay in communication. The Secretary-General said:

"My representatives, who went to the base today in order to see what the situation was, have sent me a report to the effect that the commander of the base has so far received no instructions except an indication that he must furnish logistic support for the United Nations effort in the Congo." (Ibid. page 3)

It has nothing to do with removal, it is solely "logistic support for the United Nations effort in the Congo". The Secretary-General continued his reply:

"Furthermore, according to the report, there are still 650 Belgians at the base, including those at Banana. The commander himself has said that all these men are combatants, that there are no technicians among them, and that he himself is a paratroop. On a flight over the Banana naval base two gunboats were observed." (Ibid.)

So it does not look as though they were there for any peaceful purpose. On the same day the Secretary-General pursued this with greater persistence and he said :

"According to information received by the Secretary-General, officers of Belgian nationality are at the present time attached to Katanga forces and other groups in armed conflict with the Central Government of the Republic of the Congo."

(S/4482/Add. 3, p. 1)

"In view of the circumstances, however, the situation can be interpreted in the sense that the Belgian Government has at least permitted persons connected with its military services under a technical assistance programme to give help to forces fighting the Government of the Congo." (S/4482/Add. 3, page 1)

In other words, here is a statement by the Secretary-General to the Belgian authorities where he definitely charges them with assistance in insurrection. Of course, there is no question at that time that the Government of the Congo had even suffered any difficulties of internal problems. Here was Belgium intriguing and using its military assistance to perform an operation which would upset the legitimate government and the Secretary-General draws their attention to that. If that is so, the situation is essentially different from that of private individuals who volunteer their services, because the Belgians presumably had said beforehand-I am interpolating this-that "we cannot do anything about them, they are private individuals". But the Secretary-General reminds them:

"In view of customary military regulations, it may be assumed that this transfer ... could not have occurred without the assent in one form or another of the Belgian military authorities ; at all events, it would be hard to believe that officers of the Belgian Army have severed their connexion with that Army in order to enrol in provincial forces fighting in the Congo without having obtained the approval of their military superiors and without having thereby made certain that they could rejoin the Belgian Army, if necessary with a loss in rank or seniority." (Ibid., page 2)

In other words, Mr. Hammarskjöld, if I am right, rejects this contention of Belgium and says That they are taking part in adding and abetting insurrection, they are present there, and he does not accept their word.

Three days later, the Belgians again replied-I will not read the whole of it:

"Under the circumstances, a small number of Belgian experts were supplied to the Corp de Gendarmerie of Katanga as technical assistance.

"It is hard to see in this technical assistance a measure contrary to operative paragraph ,2..." (Ibid. page 3)

398

That is to say, they admit a small amount of this presence, but not the volume mentioned by the Secretary-General-and then seek to justify it.

The Secretary-General again writes to the permanent representative :

"Confirmed reports have been received to the effect that a cargo of weapons, marked Belgian weapons, or something similar, the weight of which is estimated at 9 tons, was unloaded at Elisabethville airport yesterday from a DC civil aircraft of the Sabena airlines. The Secretary-General wishes to draw this report to the immediate attention of the Belgian Government in order to ascertain whether it is true that the Belgian Government had thus sent or authorized the sending of weapons from Belgium to the provincial authorities in Elisabethville. Should this be the case the Secretary-General considers it necessary to make a formal protest against the delivery which is contrary to the letter and spirit of the Security Council resolution of 22 July."

Again, the Secretary-General writes in his Second Progress Report, reporting to the United Nations that his special representative says :

"In the last few weeks there has been increasing evidence"--this is after this period, this is not what it was after they left-"of the return of Belgian nationals into many phases of public life in the Congo...there has been a substantial incursion of those elements which appear to seek, a dominating influence in the councils of administration and to exclude or obstruct the application of United Nations, technical assis-

tance and influence." (S/4557 page 4)

So that if I may interpolate here, the present action of Mobutu in offering armed resistance to the United Nations, which, had been reported by special representative, was preceded by the Belgians themselves in offering technical aggression in the technical field.

"Some Belgian nationals are believed to have been actively arming separatist Congolese forces and in some cases, Belgian officers have directed and led such forces, which, in certain areas, have been responsible for, brutal and oppressive acts of violence." (S/4557, page 4)

These are not my statements, these are the statements of the Secretary-General.

"Advisers of Belgian nationality have been returning to governmental ministries both in Leopoldville, and the provinces, partially through what seems to be an organized recruiting campaign in Belgium. The motives and activities of a significant portion of these returning officials appear to be clearly at variance with the principles of the General Assembly resolution and with ONUC's basic objectives." (S/4557, pages 4 and 5)

The answer to this rather strong protest by the Secretary-General, with facts and figures, chapter and verse quoted, is, if I may say so, a rather offensive one from the Belgian Government.

The Secretary-General receives a letter from the Permanent Mission of Belgium to the United Nations stating :

"The Second Progress Report of the Secretary-General's Special Representative in the Congo has greatly displeased the Belgian Government and Belgian public opinion..."-that is something, is it not ?-"which have been shocked by tendentious judgements based upon a series of purely subjective allegations and interpretations, ambiguous innuendoes, unfounded insinuations and arbitrary interpretations of the decisions and resolu-

tions of the United Nations." (A/4629, page 2)

I will not read very much more, but the point is-in spite of the large quantity of paper material that comes before us, we sometimes seem to take hold of these matters-and I am sure everyone, including the Secretary-General, feels the same, it is an insult to the United Nations. No doubt Mobutu does these things afterwards-he turns around and says "They are subjective Judgments". In other words, you are, a prejudiced individual, you are collecting gossip and information add this is not truthful. And if this is, not, a challenge from a Member State of the United Nations, which has more than once, I believe, occupied positions of responsibility in the Security Council, is responsible for the administration of Trust Territories, is a founding member of the United Nations, seeks election to the Economic and Social Council at this moment-I would like to know what is our responsibility in this matter ?

399

The Secretary-General then says in the Security Council on 8 December 1960-very recently-that this report from the Special Representative was not specially referred to-there was no contradiction as between Mr. Harnmarskjöld and Mr. Dayal as regards these matters. So that is the position.

We go back to what I was saying with regard to the mandate. It is the position of my Government that no extension of the mandate as such is necessary. What is required is an extension of activity in implementation because first of all, as I submitted to the Security Council, since the Secretary-General must by virtue of his office-and he does by temperament-stick to legal forms and maxims, he would not be moved, as he said in reference to my intervention, from principles, I think we should therefore cite the maxim that when conditions change, *rebus sic stantibus*, then the pertinent things have also to change. Mr. Harnmarskjöld has replied to this, which I shall take up in a moment. Now, what are those changed conditions ?

First of all, when the United Nations went into the Congo there was a legal government. We went at the invitation of the legal government. We are still there. There is no legal government, and today there is no government at all.

That is one changed condition.

The second changed condition is that there has been a coup d'etat by a person who at best is a Chief of Army Staff under the old Government, and therefore, a coup d'etat conducted by a commissioned officer in the regular post of an army amounts to an act of treason, that is to say, that a treasonable individual is in charge of the operative forces that are in the Congo.

The third circumstance that has changed, I state with great regret, is that nationals of various countries-and my country has only a small share-who have gone there, have indignities, cruelties, and terrorism heaped upon them-to which I shall refer later. Diplomatic officials are insulted, their luggage and their papers tampered with, their families and their women folk insulted. Then things have taken place in the Congo, not under the higher authorities-it is not as though they were helpless people who aided, abetted and promoted this; it is of a technique of opposition to the United Nations. And, I think it is time, we recognized that a continual war is being waged against the United Nations by methods that are of an extremely questionable character, and Colonel Mobutu, for whatever he is worth, in so far as the United Nations is concerned, is guilty of a great crime.

So then, I come to probably the worst of the changed conditions. The Assembly in its wisdom, or otherwise-and whenever the Assembly makes a decision, even when we are against it I suppose we ought to accept it as wise-the Assembly in its wisdom changed its original wise position, that is to say, to leave the Congo benches vacant until these matters are resolved, so that it will be possible for the Congolese themselves-not for us-to decide their affairs and to have a delegation sent over that would speak in their name. Unfortunately, on account of the war of words that goes on here, on account of these ideas of prestige and what not, we have a situation where a considered decision of the General Assembly was, in effect, upset by a procedural device that does not require a two-thirds majority. I think it will forever stand as a regrettable fact in the history of the United Nations that an extremely wise position which would probably have acted as a brake on the bad events in the Congo, was upset by a procedural

device in which a great many people participated.

So a delegation nominated by the Head of State, Mr. Kasavubu—who has no right to nominate them—is seated today in the Assembly. We have nothing against this individual, an estimable gentleman with whom we have, personally, friendly relations. But we are dealing with principles at the moment. These people do not represent authority; they cannot deliver the goods; it is very doubtful if they can even be adequately briefed by their own principles, and they certainly cannot implement their promises to the United Nations.

But we have a right to expect; whether we made a right decision or a wrong decision the Assembly, having, by a majority, agreed to regard a certain group as the representatives of the Government—we have a right to expect from them the discharge of the responsibilities of a Member State. Therefore, from that point of view, out of evil some good may come.

These are the changed conditions that have taken place, and therefore we would suggest that the repeated affirmation of confidence in the Secretary-General, the repeated—I would not call them directions, because that would not be the right thing to do—the repeated expressions of opinion by the Assembly that more and more vigorous action must be taken—all this, we would suggest, has to be implemented.

There is another aspect of the change that

400

strikes the man in the rural villages of India. He sees that when in Stanleyville large numbers of Europeans are going to be held as hostages the Secretary-General, with commendable—I say it very deliberately—with commendable promptitude and with great courage turns in the United Nations forces to prevent atrocities taking place—because atrocities in one place are like atrocities everywhere else, and we, for ourselves, whatever may be the law in the case, are glad that nothing of the kind took place, though we are not quite sure now whether all this terror had any reality in it—but in any case, all I want to say is this, that, it did come into operation, and we believe that similar action should be taken everywhere, and we think the time is past when we can indulge in legal quibbles on these matters.

I have instructions from my Government to communicate to you the following facts. not for purposes of special pleading, but because of the special national concern of my country in this matter of atrocities.

On 22 November some ANC soldiers-the ANC is supposed to be the National Army of the Congo-stopped a United Nations field officer, an Indian, while he was starting his car. Another field officer, and a captain, both Indians, came to his assistance but were overpowered by the ANC soldiers. It should not be thought that the Indian personnel could not have retaliated ; they are not there for that purpose. These two officers were threatened with cocked rifles, struck on the face with a rifle-butt and marched off at bayonet-point. We have had no apology, either from the Congolese Government or from the Permanent Representative, or whoever sits here, and, we have, had no explanations. The one field officer is suffering from a punctured ear-drum as a result of the blows received. The first field officer was taken away by the ANC, savagely beaten, thrown face down, and he received repeated kicks and rifle but blows from his assailants.

This is the treatment offered to officers of the Indian Army wearing the President's Commission. We would not tolerate this, we would not accept this, we would not sit down in the face of an enemy; but we have done this, and these officers have accepted it and not retaliated because., first of all, while they are combatants, they are on non-combat duty in the Congo. And we are still waiting for some explanation from Mr. Hammarskjöld on this question.

On 28 November, troops of Colonel Joseph Mobutu seized an ambulance van-a very glorious thing for soldiers to do, seized an ambulance van-belonging to the Indian Medical Unit. Even in the worst of wars when the enemy was of the character of Hitlerite Germany, these laws, which are sanctified by practice and by the Red Cross and the Geneva Convention, have been observed, but here is a gallant soldier trying to seize the ambulance of a medical unit. Earlier the Congolese soldiers disarmed two Indian military policemen escorting a Nigerian general to the airport. The Congolese officer forcibly

took away all the goods of the house of the Commander of the Indian Contingent and has now occupied the house. If this is not plain highway robbery, I would like to know what it is.

A bazooka gun was mounted in General Rikhye's garden and two armoured cars stood nearby.

The families of Mr. Dayal and Brigadier Rikhye had to spend the night often at the United Nations Headquarters, in view of Colonel Mobutu's troops threat to attack their homes.

These are Mr. Hammarskjöld's representatives. One is his adviser, the other his Special Representative. I do not know what would happen if the Secretary-General himself went there.

On 22 November, Colonel Roy was stopped on his way to the airport by ANC troops and deprived of his car. There must be a shortage of vehicles in this place.

Colonel Harmandar Singh, the officer commanding of the Indian Contingent, and Captain Jagjit Singh, his Adjutant, were stopped on their way to the office and deprived of their cars.

On 3 December, Mr. Lazarus, a correspondent of the PTI, the Press Trust of India, was twice set upon by Congolese civilians and received blows. Local gendarmerie went twice to his hotel during his absence-not for protective purposes. But I must here say with regard to this correspondent that the Congolese authorities thought better of it afterwards and have withdrawn all objections against him.

These are some of the atrocities that have been committed. But my Government has no desire to enlarge and circulate them as atrocity stories. However, if we who are not taking any combat part in this-out of the 780 or nearly 800 people who are there, 400 are in the field hospital; a 400-bed field hospital has gone there from India-if our people, I repeat, who are there on

401

practically what many call a mission of mercy, are to be treated in this way, what is the fate of the others who are combatants and who are there

in order to check lawlessness ?

This is the position so far as the changed situation on the other side is concerned. The second aspect to which I referred is that there is no effective central authority. The authority, in the Congo, according to the Constitution as we see it, is the Head of State, Mr. Kasavubu, whom this Assembly, in spite of all that has been happening, treated with highest respect. He addressed us as the embodiment of the sovereignty of the Congolese people. But sovereignty as an embodiment is not adequate in order that that sovereignty may function through the right and proper channels. So the Government of India, while it recognizes the authority of Mr. Kasavubu as the Head of State so long as he respects the Constitution, does not accept his definition of his functions; and therefore the dismissal of his Prime Minister is unconstitutional. It is not only unconstitutional in law, but it has no validity so far as we are concerned. His closing of Parliament is also out of authority. Under the Constitution of the Congo, which we have carefully pursued, the President has no authority to shut down Parliament for more than one month. He could not get rid of his Prime Minister unless there was the sanction of Parliament; and what is more in this case, Parliament gave its two-thirds vote in favour of the Prime Minister and against the decision of the President, and the President, in my opinion, quite untruthfully points out that there was not a two thirds majority-and I take the responsibility for these words.

Parliament has been sent away. It is impossible for them to meet, and numbers of them are in prison. There were cruelties inflicted by one faction against another-and we do not want to pass over it in any way-and members of Parliament who have parliamentary immunity, as we have in our own country, are under illegal detention.

The army, which is just a semblance of authority-I would like to ask the Secretary-General to enlighten us on this as to this Army, if the United Nations forces are there, what is the function of the Congolese Army ? The Congolese Army can keep to traffic regulation if they want to. As the Secretary-General has pointed out, they are partly for the maintenance of law and order. If that is so, they should

join the forces maintaining law and order, since there cannot be a situation in the country where there are two military forces, each acting in its own way. That is the best way to anarchy as indeed it has done.

So there is violence, anarchy, illegal rule, suspension of Parliament, imprisonment of political people, ill-treatment of foreign nationals with indignities heaped upon them ; there is total lack of observance of all diplomatic courtesies-the idea that there has been no response whatsoever, either from the Permanent Mission attached to the United Nations or from the Congolese Government, in regard to all these matters. And then, again, there is the opposition offered-by Belgium on the one hand, and now by Mobutu's troops on the other, to the forces of the United Nations. They have presently challenged the United Nations and are pressing the situation. This is not a challenge merely to our dignity, but really a challenge in fact, a challenge to the authority " and prestige of the United Nations which, if it is lost in Africa, would be one of the great calamities of our time, reflected in the rest of the world.

Then came the next thing: the Government of the Congo is now apparently in the hands of what is called a College of Commissioners. These Commissioners are, apparently, students or ex-students who are selected, I suppose, because they are young people who never had authority before; they would like to exercise that authority. It is not for us to decide whether the Congolese should have students running their Government ; that is up to- them. But it is our business to see that it is under constitutional authority, thus, in accordance with law and civilized practice.

These young people are usually guided- by their teachers, who are Belgians, so in fact it is the Belgians. who are the College of Commissioners, and Mr. Dayal reports that in many cases they give contradictory orders and opinions and create a great deal of trouble. I regret that the young' 'generation in the Congo, on whom rests the future of that country, has been dragged into the party politics and made to do, the bidding of party politicians who are self-seeking.

In a recent case, with- regard to the orders to occupy the base at Kitona, these orders were

given by the district commissioners. I would like to ask, Mr. Secretary-General, how, even if these commissioners were legally appointed, a national action of this kind be taken by local officials ? The occupation of the Kitona base, as far as I can see, was the subject of an agreement or understanding between the United Nations and the then Congolese authorities, and even if this College of Commissioners were legal

402

and competent officials, even then how does it happen that a municipal authority can deal with an international body like the United Nations, as is now happening? That is more evidence of the anarchy that is now going on.

We come now to the- more serious situation in this matter-apart from the Belgian occupation to which I have partly referred-and that is the position of Mobutu himself. The Secretary-General has been good enough to inform the Security Council that Colonel Mobutu would not be able to function in the way he has unless he had outside assistance. That is a fact that the Secretary-General has put before the Security Council and it is a matter of great significance.

On 2 November 1960, in the report of the Special Representative, it is stated, "The coup of the ANC Chief of Staff ..." -and is it right for us to deal with one who has usurped power in this manner?-" ... had introduced a new factor adding to the complexity of the situation... the eruption of the army into the political scene constituted a new menace to peace and security I want to lay stress on these words, "to peace and security", because the arguments that I am going to submit to you in the resolution are largely based upon that, "a new menace to peace and security", and that is the United Nations position, that there is a menace to peace and security in the Congo, this is Belgian aggression, and Mobutu is a menace to peace and security.

In Leopoldville, the principal centre of political activity in the Congo, a slate of terror has been introduced threatening a paralysis of life in the community. The young men, the College of Commissioners, were invariably accompanied by numerous Belgian advisers, occasionally drawn from among their own teachers. The inevitable consequence was that the commissioners were more inclined to listen to their own mentors than

to listen to the United Nations consultants, who in many ministries, found a wall of opposition building up against them. Indeed, instead of co-operating with the United Nations technical aid mission, the commissioners actually set themselves up in opposition to it. In the latest communication of Mr. Dayal you will find the same thing repeated.

Now we come to the position in regard to the Constitution. As the representative of the United States mentioned in the Security Council, there are only two constitutional authorities-I am not agreeing-in the Congo; One was the President and the other was Parliament. Presumably Parliament includes the Government. He went on to say that one of them is extinct; therefore, only the President remains. That surely is the way of all dictatorships. Destroy all opposition and say, "I am the State." That is the position. Therefore, the rule of Mr. Kasavubu-apart from Mr. Mobutu and the men lower down on the ladder-is an unvarnished and unashamed dictatorship, and here is the evidence if you want it: on the evening of 5 September 1960 the Chief of State in a declaration broadcast on the national radio proclaimed in effect that the Prime Minister had betrayed his office by provoking discord within the Government, depriving citizens of their fundamental liberties and plunging the-country into fratricidal civil war. He therefore revoked the Government with immediate effect and named the President of the Senate, Mr. Joseph Ileo, to form a new Government. He asked the United Nations to assure peace and order; that is to say, having usurped power he expected the United Nations to police his usurpation. That is in fact what is happening.

During the same evening the Prime Minister spoke three times to the population indicating the President was no longer Chief of State and calling upon the people and the workers and the army to rise. That is to say, they have already got a state of civil war.

In the face of an imminent breakdown of law and order with a civil war already under way in parts of the country and with a clear threat to the United Nations Force in their function of maintaining peace and security, the Prime Minister that night called for a closing of all major ports to traffic of the United Nations. That is to say,

they have taken action hostile to the United Nations. They have taken people under Security and they have threatened to use force. They have given ultimatums to certain people in other contexts.

What we are saying is this the situation having reached its present state, it is now necessary for the United Nations to govern or get out.

Also during the night of 5 September the Council of Ministers published a communique declaring the Chief of State deprived of all his functions; so we have a situation where one cancels the other out. I will not go into the background of this situation, but will come to the position of Mr. Kasavubu himself, and I think there are many here who are temperamentally and I think, in a sense constitutionally legitimate misthinking, that here is a Head of State universally recognized -and up to a point it is true--but the recognition of a constitutional Head of State requires the

403

observance of the Constitution-and here I comment particularly to my African colleagues, and I would like to know how they feel flattered about it.

Mr. Kasavubu, on 16 November 1960, stated:

"The institutions given to the Congo by the fundamental laws are not in keeping with the sociological and political realities of the country."

In other words, this is a polite way of saying that the African is not fit to have parliamentary government. For that reason the local authorities of the Republic of the Congo wish these institutions to be modified, with due regard to the unity and territorial integrity of the Congo and taking into account the defects of the fundamental law and experience of the months which have passed in the promulgation of independence.

The problem is an institutional one. It can only be solved by the Congolese authorities guided by the wishes of the people. The only snag in this is neither the people nor the Congolese authorities-apart from Mr. Kasavubu and his creatures do not exist, or it may be that Mr. Kasavubu himself is at time not so independent.

Therefore, the position is this : Mr. Kasavubu

says that the Constitution is not in keeping with sociological conditions. In other words, he wants to rewrite the Constitution. What happens to the sanctity of the Constitution if another President wants to do that ? This is another way of saying, "Well, I like power; I do not like any limitations on it, so I shall put it away."

One of the allegations which must be refuted is that of the high handed closure of Parliament That is to say, Mr. Kasavubu says that Parliament was not closed in a high-handed way. The chief physical difficulty preventing the assembly of Parliament is that a state of disorder, fomented by the supporters of Mr. Lumumba, deters members of the provinces from returning to Leopoldville. I am quite prepared to say, for argument's sake, that Mr. Lumumba may also behave in that way, but that does not mean that that Parliament should not meet.

"...The difficulty can only be solved by so adapting the constitution as to give more effective guarantees to the rights of the Provinces.

"Parliament is certainly competent to control the executive power and, if need be, deny it confidence. It is their power, however, to restore the Government on the demand of the Prime Minister, a prerogative of which it has been stripped;"-if you can understand the meaning of this sentence, well, you must be a genius--."and even if it had the power it could only be subject to authorization by the majority required when a new Government appears before the Chambers, Senate, etc."-in other words. a two-thirds majority. (S/PV. 917, pages 73 and 74)

Mr. Lumumba asserts that he is Prime Minister by virtue of a Parliamentary decision, which decision is attacked as illegal by Mr. Kasavubu on three counts ; that is, he is questioning the legality of Mr. Lumumba's position. Mr. Kasavubu contends that it constituted an abuse of power and that it was taken by the threat of armed force, the necessary majority of votes not having been obtained. He said that the vote was 60 to 19. This, of course, would total 79. In the Senate it totalled to 43.

I want to say here that it has been contended that these votes are 19 votes short of the required majority. This, in fact, is not true, because I looked at the Congolese Constitution, and it says "two-thirds of those present and voting". And this is more than two-thirds of those present and voting. Therefore, the boot is on another foot.

Therefore, this is the constitutional position, although I really doubt it, because there is nothing in this except the sheer wish on the part of Kasavubu to govern just as he likes. I am putting it euphemistically; I do not think he has the power to do so.

Therefore, we come to the problem of what should be done. We have set forth our position in this matter in the resolution which is before you.

Firstly, we think that it is necessary in the conditions of the Congo that there should be created a new atmosphere, by putting a brake on terrorism and by leaving it to the United Nations to assist in the maintenance of law and order and to prevent acts of aggression. It should prevent the threat to peace and security and, what is more, it should fulfil the mandate containing the implications to which the Secretary-General has referred. We must then enforce it by opening the doors of the houses of detention where these people are. After all, there are 20,000 troops in the Congo, and if disciplined troops cannot take

404

effective action against regulars, then there must be something wrong somewhere, and I would not like to say any more. If there are 20,000 disciplined troops under an effective command, they should not be hit in the face by this rabble called the Congolese Army. I do not apologize for saying this, because this lawless rabble, this murderous gang that is called the Congolese Army, has been committing atrocities and has been heaping indignation upon diplomatic officials. I am authorized by my Government to say that they have never seen anything of this kind before, even in times of war. If those things can happen, either the Belgians are running the show for the Congolese Army or the United Nations forces are not doing their job; and I would not like to say that, because I do not know. Therefore, the

doors of these houses of detention, wherever they are, should be opened, and these political personalities, of one persuasion or another—more particularly, members of Parliament and government officials and others who are highly respected members of the community—must be released. If they are released, there may be some trouble; but that is a part of the democratic system. However, unless these people are released, it is not possible to take any step forward.

Secondly, as my Prime Minister has repeatedly said, and which I am asked to repeat again, there is no halfway house in this matter, the Parliament of the Congo must be convened. If it is necessary that this must be done under the authority that exists, according to the representative of the United States, in the President, who is the only one that is left, then the United Nations and those who are responsible for giving him his halo must persuade him to reconvene Parliament. Somehow or other he must put his signature on the calling of Parliament; that is all there is to it.

If necessary, the United Nations must offer the protective custody required. This would not be the first time that the United Nations has called upon other countries to act in a custodial capacity. The Secretary-General well knows that even before his time we were called upon, in very difficult circumstances, to exercise custodial duties over people who far more effectively resisted and protested and who were more capable of making trouble—such as in the case of Korea—and those custodial duties were carried out, and in the whole course of our troubles only three men lost their lives. Therefore, if the United Nations has to assert its authority, it must do so; and the custodial duties must be exercised in such a fashion that the Members of Parliament will be able to come to the Parliament and function freely and satisfactorily and, if necessary, add to the neutralization of any area.

I am quite certain that this Assembly will endorse any course of action of this kind, which will prevent civil war and which will rescue Africa from the blood bath that will follow. Let me be quite clear about it. All of these fine phrases will disappear, because the greater part of this area, thanks to imperialist rule, has been left neglected, without a system for the administration of law to assist it. I am not talking about this as

if the place is savage, or anything like that, but there has been so much administrative neglect under imperial rule that if tribal war or fratricidal war should break out it would be the most sanguinary thing that ever happened. Taking that into account, I am quite sure that the large number of African representatives in the Assembly, with their great influence, will urge the Assembly to support any action that would facilitate the meeting of the Members of Parliament, the neutralizing of any area and the preventing of unauthorized troops, such as those of Colonel Mobutu, from interfering with them. After all, if Colonel Mobutu is the only one that is strong, it should not be difficult for 20,000 people to deal with him.

Thirdly, we would say that once this Parliament has met we should be in a better position to say that the Congolese must decide their affairs themselves. At the present moment it is not the Congolese; it is the Belgians and a few people in the Congo, who have emerged out of a coup d'etat.

The resolution that is now before you, which is contained in document A/L.331 and which has been put forward by five or six countries, including ours, is a humble attempt at pointing out that the mandate contained in the Security Council and General Assembly resolutions--and I have carefully read these backwards and forwards--is entirely adequate for our purposes. At this point, therefore, I would like to refer you to the Charter. Before doing so, however, the Secretary-General, in referring to my contention about changed conditions, said that he somewhat agreed with this pragmatic view so far as there was no change in principle, and turned around and asked if it is true that conditions had changed in these ways and is it also not true that conditions affect the positions of personalities. I suppose the implication is, "Can we set the same stock in regard to the members of the previous Government who were sanctified by Parliament?" So what does the Secretary-General say? He says "changed conditions, without sacrifice of principle". In this regard, the principle here is the constitutional authority. Therefore, I have

the good authority of the Secretary-General in feeling that these changed conditions justify vigorous action, which action has been asked for

by the Security Council and the General Assembly time after time.

I refer the Assembly to Article 14 of the Charter, under which we are operating. Every time I have come to this rostrum and have quoted the Charter I have always submitted that the Charter must be conceived as one instrument. You cannot treat it in isolation. The Charter must be treated as an entire institution. Article 14 reads :

"Subject to the provisions of Article 12, the General Assembly may recommend measures for the peaceful adjustment of any situation, regardless of origin

The words that are important here are "situation" and "regardless of origin". We are not dealing with an international dispute. We are dealing with a situation which exists in the Congo, and the Charter has been very careful to provide for these situations. It says "regardless of origin" Therefore, it does not matter whether it is an international war or the war of the Belgians upon the Congo by way of aggression, which the Secretary-General has testified to, or whether it is a war that arises from a fratricidal conflict. No matter what, it must be deemed to impair the general welfare. That is the definition : "any situation, regardless of origin, which it deems likely to impair the general welfare..."

What is "general welfare" ? It does not refer to welfare as between nations. General welfare can only be construed in its natural meaning, the welfare of the generality of the people. The Charter, at the beginning, says, "We the peoples of the United Nations". They are the people who formulated the Charter and, therefore, when the welfare of the people of the Congo as a whole is affected, the provisions of the Charter are attracted. The Article goes on to refer to "situations resulting from a violation of the provisions of the present Charter setting forth the Purposes and Principles of the United Nations". My delegation submits that there has been a violation of the provisions of the Charter in regard to its Purposes and Principles. Therefore, I would request that we again look at the Purposes and Principles of the Charter in Chapter I. where it states :

"...to take effective collective measures for the prevention and removal of threats to the peace"-and there is no question about a threat to peace, because it has come out in so many United Nations documents, apart from the facts that stare us in the face--"and for the suppression of acts of aggression."

If the Belgian authorities are still there with the monopoly of its military power, then the suppression of acts of aggression is required. The Article goes on to refer to "other breaches of the peace", and this Assembly would like to know from the Secretary-General whether, if Mobutu's forces commit an act of aggression against the United Nations, that is a breach of the peace.

These are the purposes of the Charter which are covered by Article 14. Therefore, so far as my Government is concerned, we do not think there is anything in this that requires any particular modification or about which to be squeamish, and it is necessary that we should take action in order to deal with this position.

So that the authority of my Government may be introduced into this argument, I should like to read another extract from a statement my Prime Minister made only a few days ago:

"it just seems to me to be a very extraordinary state of affairs for the United Nations Mission. If they cannot function properly, well, they are doing more harm than good. Now, as I said, I do not want them to go away. I think that would be fatal but I do think that they should be made to function properly ; they should be given authority by the Security Council, and there should be no vagueness or shilly-shallying about this question as there has been."

He points out that he cannot understand this quibbling about the legality of this question. He went on to say:

"Looking at this matter apart from the question of our nationals being

there and even apart from the fact that much has been done by the United Nations which has not seemed to us to be right I think it would be a disaster if the United Nations Mission were to be withdrawn. It would really be defeat, a confession of defeat, and an act of despair and it would leave the Congo to go up in flames affecting the whole

406

of Africa and certainly affecting international affairs very greatly and intimately.

"It is obvious that the United Nations can only remain there if they can function properly ; they cannot remain there just for some little humanitarian work which they are doing well, and just to bolster up some odd regime or some odd party there and to carry out their orders.

"But two or three things stand out. One is that in this welter there is not much law and order left in the Congo. There is no real Government authority functioning except in some local areas where a bit of the army is present. The army itself is completely undisciplined and ill-disciplined, and does more or less what it chooses."

He goes on to say that

" persons coming in by illegal means cannot assume a legal garb. Now, Colonel Mobutu appointed a number of students from college as a Commission to carry on the government of the country, and where is the authority for this ?"

There is much more I could have quoted to the General Assembly if I had the time, but it is not necessary. Therefore, I commend this draft resolution, which I have been asked by the sponsors to present to the Assembly, in all humility. In explaining this draft resolution, I will not go through the preamble in great detail. It is based on previous resolutions passed by the Assembly and by the Security Council. It refers to the grave and ominous developments and continuing deterioration in the Congo". These

are mild words. The "grave and ominous situation" is the situation of a blood bath in Africa, a challenge to the position of the United Nations in Africa, the possibility of an international conflict and, what is more, a fall in the prestige of the United Nations in the world, which would be harmful to the cause of humanity, especially in the present time when the world must disarm if it is to survive.

Secondly, we say that the deterioration continues, because just before this meeting was called came, I will not call it a climax the position where the United Nations forces themselves are opposed by force by Mobutu's troops. The draft resolution goes on to say:

"Noting with grave concern the hostile attitude and resistance of armed detachments to the operation of the United Nations in the Congo as recently reported by the Special Representative of the Secretary-General and also the continuation of lawlessness, violence and continuing deterioration of the economic situation in the Congo; "

That is what Mr. Hammarskjöld referred to the other day, when he said there are two hundred deaths every day, there is poverty and suffering, there are refugees everywhere, and so on. But how can the economic affairs of that country be put right when there is civil war and when those in authority are using blood and pressure for the purpose of promoting them, and the one authority that has been sent there for this purpose, namely, the United Nations, has desisted from acting to the fullest of its mandate. Therefore, the draft resolution continues to state :

"Conscious of the inescapable and urgent responsibility of the United Nations both in the interests of the Congo as well as in the interests of peace and security which stand endangered and for the avoidance of grave civil war;"

Then we go on to say what we think should be done. The first operative paragraph states

"Considers that the United Nations must henceforth implement its

mandate fully to prevent breach of peace and security, to restore and maintain law and order and the inviolability of persons, including United Nations and diplomatic personnel and property in accordance with the Charter and to take urgent measures to assist the people of the Congo in meeting their most pressing economic needs ;

2. "Urges the immediate release of all political prisoners under detention"--therefore, no one can say the sponsors are acting in a partisan way, we say all political prisoners--"more particularly, members of the Central Government of the Congo and officials of Parliament and others enjoying parliamentary immunity ;

"3. Urges the immediate convening of Parliament and the taking of necessary protective measures thereto by

407

the United Nations, including custodial duties ;

"4. Urges that measures be undertaken forthwith to prevent armed units and personnel in the Congo from any interference in the political life of the country as well as from obtaining any material or other support from abroad."

It was the Secretary-General who told us in the Security Council that the army has entered politics. That creates a new situation. It is called an army only by courtesy. It is an armed rabble, a lawless lot of people who are offering resistance to the United Nations, committing pillage and arson, robbing people, stopping their cars and heaping indignities upon them, and if I were a Congolese, I would be heartily ashamed, whatever political party I belonged to. Therefore, we say that these men, the so-called Congolese Army, must be disarmed, Mr. Secretary-General, and there is no question that if you, as Secretary-General of the United Nations have sent out an appeal for the orderly forces of other countries to go to their rescue, it is not right that we should be thrown into the middle of a rabble. If decent

people are invited to a party, people who cannot observe the dignities of it should not be there. Therefore, we say that this so-called Congolese Army has no function in the Congo in the sense that it is not maintaining law and order, it is not protecting the country from a foreign enemy and it is not assisting the United Nations; it is a promoter of lawlessness. Has not the United Nations in the past acted against the people in Stanleyville? Has it not protected Lumumba against people who were trying to arrest him in the early days? Therefore, we say there is no halfway house except to disarm this army, confine the men to barracks or find them other occupations if they are useful individuals. There is plenty of technical work for them to do.

I submit to the Secretary-General that it is not right. We cannot defend in our national legislatures the idea that men bearing the President's commission, men of the Indian army and women of the Indian nursing services should be exposed to these indignities in the Congo. We are not among those who would want to withdraw on the slightest pretext. More than our dignity, more than our safety, more than our pride is involved. It is the United Nations which is involved, and we are entitled to consideration from the Secretary-General, not as an individual, but because he is the embodiment of this business, that we cannot be invited to a party or be expected to remain there when the ordinary decencies of social life are not observed. Similarly, no regular organized army abuses the law of its country. It is under martial law. Any-Indian army personnel in the Congo which commit the slightest breach of discipline are amenable to Indian Army law and are severely dealt with, and I give a guarantee of that on behalf of my Government and on behalf of myself. That has been the position in Korea and it has been the position everywhere, and if troops go out at great sacrifice to themselves, as Mr. Hammarskjöld said to this Assembly a few months ago, it is no joy-ride, it is no picnic to go there, and, therefore they must not be asked to shake hands with murder. I say that the members of this so-called Congolese Army are gangsters, a gang of murderers who have committed havoc, who have heaped indignities upon people. Those among them who are decent should be enlisted in the United Nations Force and made to drive trucks and do other work, and

the rest of them should be disarmed and confined to barracks. We should like to know why those people who were at one time confined to barracks have now been released.

You may say that this is strong language. But then we are facing a situation in the Congo which may set the world in flames. I think the United Nations must wake up to this responsibility and must stand fully behind the authority of the Secretary-General in taking strong action. This organization is not weak. This Organization was strong enough even before the new admissions took place. Now it is even stronger because 178 million people, including the people of the Congo, are represented here. We are doing a service to the Congolese people by taking this position. We are in the Congo for their service and not in order to inflict what one representative said was a kind of joint imperialism. We know enough about the nature of imperialism; nobody can teach us anything about the ways of imperialism.

We have come to a situation now when every Congolese, whatever might have been his political profession in the past, particularly the young men, must set his heart and mind and must make the sacrifice of coming forward so that law and order, the authority of the United Nations, the cause of peace and the ideas of liberty in their own country might prevail by their co-operation for the maintenance of peace and security in the world. That should be their primary concern and not the occupation of any place of glory or power.

We once again affirm that the mandate that

408

has been given to the United Nations Secretary-General is adequate for this purpose. Unless the United Nations Command shakes itself up for this purpose, there will be more and more grievous situations, and no good will come out of them. What we do not do today with comparatively limited resources, limited sacrifices and limited harshness and unpleasantness will have to be done later with much greater sacrifices, harshness and unpleasantness.

We are not a country that cries out for the use of force. We are not a country that wants

to trample upon law. We are proud of our sovereignty, as you are aware. We shall guard it against any intruder. But here we are not trampling down on the sovereignty of a country; we are protecting the authority of the Charter of the United Nations. We are seeking to support such measures as will rescue the great land of Africa with its tremendous resources and potentialities where, largely owing to the impact of public opinion organized through the United Nations, after ages and ages of servitude and slavery, this land has come into emancipation. We from Asia are the people who are deeply shocked and grieved. Those of you who come from whatever State it might have been, whatever your past might have been, whatever your present associations are, there cannot be one African in this Assembly who is not moved to shame by the situation that has arisen, and, what is more, who would not want to throw his weight on the side of the observance of the principles of the United Nations Charter.

INDIA CONGO YUGOSLAVIA USA INDONESIA BELGIUM CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC
FALKLAND ISLANDS GERMANY SWITZERLAND NIGER NIGERIA LATVIA KOREA PERU

Date : Dec 01, 1960

Volume No

1995

INDIA IN THE UNITED NATIONS

Shri Krishna Menon's Statement in General Assembly on Colonialism

Shri V.K. Krishna Menon, Leader of the Indian Delegation to the United Nations, made a statement in the General Assembly on December 13, 1960 on the granting of independence to Colonial Countries and peoples.

The following is the text of the statement:

We are now coming very near to the end of a great debate which has taken several days of the working time of this Assembly, some seventy speakers having participated, and over fifty speak-

ing hours engaged. Now, it is easy to say that words do not have a real effect, but the very fact that the Assembly, in the seriousness of its business, has devoted its time, and a number of nations, both those who have been here for a long time and those others who have recently joined, on whom the impact of the subject which we are discussing is more recent than some of the others-it should not be forgotten, however, that some of the more powerful nations of today who are here have also gone through the phase of being under colonial rule, and it is much to their credit and the advantage of the world as a whole that they still have memories of it and the impact it has made upon the history as well as their effort to throw it off, what this impact has been upon the history of the world.

Now, the subject comes here just this time, thanks to the initiative of the Soviet Union, in the shape of an item on the agenda ; but it is by no means a new matter to the United Nations, being written into the Charter. I will not read these words and clauses, which are so familiar to everyone. Not only is it written into the Charter, but a chapter of the Charter deals with this problem of Non-Self-Governing Territories, though perhaps in 1960 not as adequately in the present circumstances of the world as they may have appeared in 1945.

Again that reminds us of one of the reasons that even the Charter, good as it is, is not like the proverbial law of the Medes and the Persians, unalterable, but has to be vivified, has to be made more useful, by being responsive to the developing conditions of the world.

Colonialism, as it is called, expansion of countries outside their borders, usually into far off lands resulting either in conquest or occupation, and what is called government from a distance-that is what it used to be called in the nineteenth century-this is no new phenomenon, so far as we are concerned. I do not want to go into all the ancient history of this. It goes back perhaps to the early stages of the pre-Christian era, when Alexander the Great embarked upon his expeditions right to the frontiers of our own country, where he won his battle, but from where he returned and did not thereby establish an empire. And then we had the whole period of the development of Europe, where they won

concerned with their own internal troubles, European nations either coalizing with each other or throwing the yoke of one on the other.

So that the present colonial lands of Asia and Africa did not attract attention for along time except through such connexions and such effects as the connexions to the foreign nations and others who traded.

409

Now we come to the more important period of today. I say this because we should not think that suddenly, with the industrial civilization, a new idea developed in the mind of man, because then we are likely to think that we should not ever guard against these evils in the future. So in the more recent times there has been expansion. This expansion has partly been the result of exploration, partly the result of the attempt to gain riches, partly in order to provide for migration, and dozens of causes—the merchant ; the explorer ; the promoter of enterprises ; the missionary ; the political leaders in the countries ; the advancing might of the military arms, in the form of the soldier ; more and more in recent years, particularly since the industrial revolution, the engineer ; and also sometimes the very nationalistic, patriotic expansionist who saw in the conquest of other territories the glory of his own. All this is depicted by—I will not call it the newer surge of nationalism.

I want to say a word about this conception of the nationalism, because it at once is the course, the soul of empire ; it is also the mainspring of the resistance to it. After all, colonialism, as we understand it, is the attempt to expand power from one's own territory into another area, as I said a while ago. Europe, particularly, having gone through the phase somewhere about the sixteenth century, or perhaps a little earlier, of having evolved into nations from small tribal States, found in that unification the possibility of greater unity. Now, as then, it was often coloured by idealism : either it could be talked about in the shape of pan-Christian ideas or the spreading of some universal doctrines, or the spread of the gospel, or whatever it may be. In fact, you will find in the expansion of all these areas the source of authority has come from charters or other instruments given to explorers which gives the sovereign powers of life and death over non-Christian peoples. It appears in the clauses of

the charter of the East India Company in regard to India, where Queen Elizabeth gives these merchants, who were private citizens in her kingdom at that time, sovereign rights of life and death over non-Christian people. That is how her empire began. But it is a great mistake to think that one motive or another can explain this.

And so we go through various phases where, in search of wealth, people explore everywhere and do not find it, or as in the case of Columbus, by mistake stumble upon another land of vast riches, and so on and so on. Skipping over this period from the early times of the explorers, or the Phoenician period, we hear of the discoveries that gave America its name by the Italian explorer, as it is said-I do not vouch for this-afterwards, the expansion, by and large, to the four great territories-Asia, Africa, the Caribbean, and the American continent-resulting in what today-or yesterday, I should say-what yesterday was the situation where a small number of people in each of these metropolitan countries ruled a very considerable number of people in other areas. But fortunately this phenomenon, with the exception, of one or two countries, or one or two combinations, is under way. If I may submit without being misunderstood, one of the most potent resistances, one of the greatest impediments in the way of progress, is not to recognize that progress is being made, because if we do not recognize that progress is being made, we are likely to apply the same remedies, have the same reactions to changed conditions as the condition was previously, and thereby get all our orientation and our policies misrepresented, misunderstood, and misapplied. Similarly, if we do not recognize that progress is being made, it is very likely that those who have been either pressured into progress by the agitations of colonial peoples or liberal sentiments in their own countries are encouraged to fall back and point out to their own peoples, "We told you so." So therefore, we have to recognize that some progress has been made.

In modern times, since the fall of Constantinople, as it was then, the European peoples, not knowing the preservation of their meat foods, had to resort to spices, and it was about that time that they learned the art of cooking properly. So when Constantinople went out of the Christian

ambit as such, the sea routes became open and then we have all the European population, led by the Portuguese and the Spaniards. followed by the Dutch and the French, and the English coming last, coming into all these areas. They spread out into the new world in America, they spread out into Asia, and later on, much later on, in some cases they spread out into Africa. Here we have the position that the first part of this was a real desire for people either to travel to these lands, the great sea dogs of the time people who just wanted to explore for the sake of exploration. But these exploration enterprises remind us sometimes of some of our modern sports tournaments ; that is to say, some person who wants to establish himself in a very big way in this and wants to go and play tournaments abroad gets promoted by some manufacturer of some commodity useful to it. In the same way, behind the explorer gathered those interests who could gain by his explorations, and through economic interests got tied up with this pioneering spirit. But again, we must not

410

forget that the great urge was nationalism, that the birth of nationalism in Europe of nations States, where, with the pride of a flag, with the rivalry with other nations the fear that other nations may establish themselves in areas much to the disadvantage of themselves-all this pushed people forward time after time.

First we have the phase, and again when we speak about phases we have to look for clear-cut, sharp division lines-first we have the phase of the empires of settlement. Those empires of settlement may have arisen either as a result of the deliberate policy of sending out peoples or because-I will not mention names-in some cases of great imperial countries they used these faraway places to deport personalities whose liberal ideas were not acceptable at home-therefore the convict settlements, as they were called at that time-not necessarily the places-were composed of miscreants anti-social people, as we would call them now. But they were probably the pioneers of revolutions, those who rebelled against the old order at home, so they were sent abroad; they became the colonies of settlement. We have an outstanding instance of this character. In these areas the indigenous populations-and we will draw a curtain over, their history-by and large became extinct and they became practically

patches of the old country in a new area. They were the colonies of settlement which are now full-fledged nations, and they have in various ways contributed both to progress and to regress in regard to this colonial system.

Then we come to the period from the beginning of the third part, from the nineteenth century onward where, on the one hand, moved by the results of the second industrial revolution, the growth of technology and whatnot and, what is more, by mercantile expansion, the search for markets and raw materials begins, that is to say, machines produced large quantities of goods. Sweated labour was available in the home country for sometime, but that market was wasted because the people who were drawn from the rural part of the countryside in countries like the United Kingdom, for example, were lured into it. They saw the attractions of industry and a way to live better, and so they began to put pressure on those who owned the machines because they wanted higher wages.

Therefore there was a field of this underpaid labour and there was no particular difficulty in obtaining these labourers. Most of these territories were not democratic. Public opinion of course always exists but by agreement between individual rulers and whatnot, agreements were reached which were to the advantage of these colonizing nations.

So we have a period where raw materials are produced by sweat-shop labour on the one hand and vast markets of underpaid people whose purchasing power was small but who made up for it by their numbers. Thus you have an empire which it is generally argued is an Empire of profit. That was so in the old days because it was most unlikely that most of these colonizing expeditions would take place if there was no profit involved and no incentive to it.

Then came the break with imperialism, and I believe that in the break with imperialism there have been many pioneers from distant times up to more modern times. The first break with imperialism was when some of these colonies revolted and in the other cases those colonies, as I said, were colonies of settlement and they began to organize themselves into communities and as a result of the breakaway of some of the others,

some concession had to be made. I will not go into great detail about this or into the controversies that prevailed in the home countries. The most outstanding instance of this is the breakaway of the thirteen American colonies which were achieved under conditions which are well known in history by this time. This hour had an effect- I suppose I may be wrong-on the expansion of the United States in later times because right through history you will find that the consolidation of that territory as it is today was by and large not achieved by the process of conquest but by methods which today perhaps we would decry but which at that time were regarded as progressive, namely, the purchase of territories. Thus we have the purchase of Florida, of Alaska, Louisiana or Rhode Island, which is very different from the way the colonial frontiers expanded in regard to other imperial territories.

In more modern times the most outstanding instance of the abdication of colonialism was soon after the revolution in 1917 in Russia when the imperial possessions of the Czar were dispossessed by the Russians themselves. I will not go into the details of it, and this is no reference to modern history, it is only a historical survey of a situation. However, by that time other events had taken place. Apart from the economic factor in this, that in more modern times the rule of colonial people has been of one race over another and thus the racial element was important, what is so important was to create doctrines which now are perpetrated in South Africa or other places : "There are some people who are born to rule and some others to be ruled,

411

and it is not possible to train people of certain racial origins to practise self-government". As against that, there were both in the metropolitan countries and in the countries so ruled a revolt against it. So the racial doctrine became opposed and assisted, which also was responsible, in the growth of slavery, But with the abolition of slavery on the one hand and the progress of liberal doctrines in the home country on the other, this came to an end.

However, the most outstanding instance in the context of our thinking was the blow to this racial superiority which was struck-it seems far-fetched today-when in 1905-06 the Japanese defeated the Russians in the Russo-Japanese War.

Those were not the days when we think of economic ideological and other questions as we do today. But the whole of Asia saw this as the defeat of a European empire by a small, short-statured Asiatic people. I am not going into the question of the relevance of this struggle or the title to Port Arthur or anything of that kind. I am only dealing with the psychological part of it.

All through that Period, when we were but children, this idea-which may have been a very half-cooked idea-that there was no longer a superiority of race spread. Then came further expansion, as I said, in the period of the first great world war. I am not for a moment suggesting that wars are to be prepared for or that they should take place in order that colonies should be liberated. But at the time of the First World War a great part of the world-I would not like to say how much, the greater part of the world-was under colonial domination or under something of that kind. Here I should like to say that a colony is a colony-I would not say under the definition but under the kind of description I gave before, whatever it may be called. I think that the British system with which I am more familiar-there are so many types of colonies such as crown colonies-not the crown is on the colony but it is the private property of the crown at the beginning-the dependencies-India was a dependency, not a colony, whatever it was called-the protectorates and protected States. There are places like Malta which thirty years ago was called a British ship. Then there are other areas, but all these from an economic, social or political point of view are really part of the colonial empire.

So in modern times we have the great colonial Powers, the United Kingdom, France, the Netherlands, Portugal and Spain. It is interesting that it is the most powerful of these empires that have given way first, and this has been due to a large number of circumstances, and world organizations played their part in this, and I the International Labour Organization in this connexion. This was one of the survivors of the League of Nations which even survived the outbreak of the Second World War. With the impact of the International Labour Organization it became difficult for countries that respected conventions to maintain standards of labour in dependent countries and impossible to do so formally.

Secondly, there was the spread of movements devoted to the emancipation and elevation of the working classes. This also made it difficult for the Continuation of this process, so when we come to some of these instances, not all of them, you will find that empires have ceased to Pay. Although empires have ceased to pay, this does not mean that some people did not make considerable profits on account of Political power or that some countries did not do so. However, what is usually forgotten is that the great military arm of the Powers, the item that goes under the consolidated account with regard to obligations undertaken for these purposes, also comes under the cost of empire. So while it is quite true that it could be said that such and such a country spent so much on a territory, and that its balance of trade is favourable or unfavourable, that presents only one part of the picture. But at any rate there is very little doubt that this was one of the considerations.

Then later, when the world began to be divided up-one of those things that we must take care of in the future-between the great Powers, even another category of empire was introduced or came into existence, that usually called "spheres of influence", and the modern expression "filling a power vacuum" is a descendant of these. "spheres of influence". So when France and Germany and Great Britain claimed various spheres of influence in various places, while those territories were sovereign they still did not have independence.

Now, there are cousins, descendants, of this today. As I said, there are vacuums in this in the way of representatives in countries who are not viceroys there, but who are ambassadors sometimes functioning in that way. There is also the attempted penetration or conquest of the mind, as it is called-or conquest of the body, it may be. These things still resurrect themselves in various forms.

Now, why do I say all these things? Because, looking at the figures, we would find a last liquidation process--I will give you the figures

412

in a moment-a vast liquidation process where we are told that these great, enormous empires are now shrunken. But as to independence of

the former colonies, we have to see whether the real substance is there, and if it is there, whether it is likely to last. In that connexion one would like to say that while we debate here day after day-and seventy speakers have taken part-there is an air of unreality about the whole of this business, considering what happened in Algeria only two days ago ; when there are countries today like France and Portugal that claim the people of these places are not nationals, but nationals of the metropolitan countries. As I have repeatedly said to this Assembly the British did not insult us by calling us Englishmen the Portuguese and the French do.

So, having regard to the war that is raging in Algeria for seven or eight years now this could not be called a Moslem revolt, an Arab revolt or a revolt of anybody else ; it is really a war of colonial independence, of the same type that occurred in this country, of the same type that has occurred in China. This has not occurred in our country because we achieved our independence by other methods, though you could also call it a war in some other form if you like. It is the resistance of the people against the force of arms, against the armed might of great empires.

That brings us to the consideration of several other problems concerned with world politics, and I want to spend the little time I have not in the description either of the balance-sheet of empire in terms of pounds and pence or dollars and cents, or in terms of the costs of this and that and the other. I think we must be realistic; we must realize that the empires can flourish only in one way, and that is by imperialist methods. That is to say, when you want to suppress somebody, you will suppress them. So we have to take this in our stride and see how the modern world is likely to assist in the survival or the liquidation of imperialism.

On the one hand, after the period of the first World War, with the break-up of the Ottoman Empire the greater part of Western Asia began to achieve its freedom irrespective of whatever internal progress in democracy might have been made. The Ottoman Empire, defeated in the war, in the old days would have had its territories annexed; but with the revolution in Czarist Russia, one of the great Allies in the war was removed from the context of the empire. With the emer-

gence of the United States, after a year or fifteen months, or whatever it was, as one of the great Allies, having, therefore, one of the strongest voices in the making of the peace treaties, its President brought up all that conception once more before the world, but it was called "the sacred trust--I am not talking about trusteeship at the moment. But there were no other peoples in the world that professed this. This brought in what, in the future, would emerge as a new theory of sovereignty, that is, sovereignty thrust on the people but not conferred upon them. What the empire does is just to oppress them; it remains latent and legal. And then the empire is lifted and the sovereign people come into their own. This really should be the modern theory of sovereignty instead of the command of a sovereign, anyway in the modern period.

So first of all there was this conception that there would be no annexations of territory, and though the discussions at Versailles and Geneva did not produce the results that were required, there, was a break with imperialism; and so you find a third phase, where the attempt is made-at least in words they decide to do so-to expand or transform empires into what may be called "brotherhoods".

This is all the positive side of it. But at the same time there is the other side of the picture as I said. There is Algeria, there is South Africa, where there is a situation of another type-I am not referring to the Union itself-where a Trust Territory has been misappropriated by the Administering Power and treated as part of an empire; there is the situation in the Portuguese territories, where alone in the world today forced labour bordering on slavery prevails; there is, again, the attempt by France by force of arms to subjugate a people who are as capable of, and as much entitled to freedom as any community sitting here, and who have, what is more, demonstrated to the world that their sacrifices, and capacities, in spite of their limitations, could be as great as their aspiration for independence.

But in this matter we must not forget-and this is where, perhaps, there should be some soul-searching on the part of the people concerned-that the great military alliances of the world are an aid to these empires. It so happens that these great colonial Powers-let us take Portugal as an

example-great colonial Powers like France and Portugal depend on these alliances. Portugal is a member of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, and this organization, NATO, definitely states that these alliances are not only in regard to the metropolitan countries but in regard to the whole of the sovereign areas. Now, it is quite difficult, shall we say, for a country like United States, which has no colonies except for the territories in

413

the Pacific area which could be considered in this broad category-it is quite difficult for them to say that they will make an alliance, but minus these territories. Whether or not there is going to be any such alliance, that would be a matter which I would not wish to go into. But it becomes an alliance with an empire. It is as though a free man were making a friendly agreement with a slave-master in regard to both his own free possessions and the master's possessions.

So these great military alliances, whether in the North or in Europe or elsewhere, become part of an agreement with colonialists of the worst type. It is not only in theory that this is bad-and here, now, there may be reservations on this; we believe that the resources of metropolitan France and Portugal for the oppression of the colonies, their moral power to maintain them, the size of the opposition that the revolting people have to face-all these, we believe; are affected by this factor. Portugal has proclaimed before that its presence in NATO attracts the friendship of its oldest ally, the United Kingdom. One of the oldest treaties in existence is that between the United Kingdom and Portugal.

Although the United Kingdom has made great strides to advance independence--sometimes tardily, sometimes under pressure, sometimes under various circumstances as in the case of our own country, or, as in the case of the United States, by revolt followed by agreement--there still remain these vast possessions. And these vast possessions have to become free countries.

Here certain problems have to be considered at this stage. First, what is to happen to small are-as of 50,000, 100,000, 200,000 people who are as conscious of nationalism as any large country? To say to them that they are only a small speck of land somewhere and that they cannot be independent would neither fit into

the Charter nor satisfy their desire for liberty in their own lands. That is one of the problems that both the United Nations and the metropolitan countries have to face. And I would like to submit that any attempt either to disregard their desire for national independence on the one hand, or to tell them they will be free in their master's home on the other hand, would not in the long run meet the bill. The Assembly will remember the recent example of Cyprus. Cyprus, incidentally, brought modern Greece into the context of anti-colonialism-and I hope it remains there. They found one of those great European countries, a NATO ally, standing up ultimately for colonial independence; but when they first came here, the idea was to divert the agitation in the colony by forcing it either as a defence problem, or a security problem for some people or making the Cypriots a bargain for a cut-up among two or three people.

My own Government took the view, that there was no question of this being anything but a colonial matter. Cyprus, by law and by circumstances, by economic factors, political factors, sociological factors, was a colony and nothing but a Colony and, therefore, should be treated as a colonial country entitled to full independence, and although it took a great deal of struggle in the United Nations-perhaps not always with the assistance of everybody concerned, even of the foes of liberation-Cyprus ultimately attained its independence, though on that basis it has been vitiated by circumstances. What I want to point out is that in the attempt to argue against the people who want freedom, often extraneous circumstances are introduced, which may perhaps provide some help for some time, but ultimately the people claim their own; and all that is left behind is a great deal of ill-will and newer problems, newer complications which, if subject peoples do not take enough care, will become what will be called a joint imperialism.

I think it is right to say that a mandate, a trusteeship, and so on certainly represents the idea of the sacred trust and of divesting the old country of its colonial territories, but if the United Nations does not stick to the principles of the Charter and the spirit of its intent, then it is likely to become a joint domination of a helpless people by a more powerful people.

This is always in the minds of the colonial peoples.

Next I should like to say, before I come to specific problems, that sometime in 1939 the colonial territories of the great Powers were the following: the United Kingdom alone had about 13 million square miles; France had a huge empire of about 4 million square miles, eighty times that of Belgium; the Netherlands had its own colonies. AR that is now dispersed, but still there are in this world somewhere about 75 million people who are under colonial rule. Out of the 75 million people, some 20 millions belong to the British hegemony which are on the path towards self-government. Therefore, there actually remain some 50 millions still to be liberated ; and when we think that out of this 50 million, 14,871,195 belong to the empire, of Portugal, we have the situation that the Portuguese are the biggest Imperial Power in the world. And it would be no answer to say that they are

414

not imperial, that they are Portuguese citizens. I think this has been argued before here. So the greater part of this 50 million people are the 14 to 15 millions in the Portuguese empire and the 11 to 12 millions in Algeria. Thus, between France and Portugal can be divided the largest colonial possessions-not the most scattered, but the largest colonial possessions.

In regard to their position in Africa, certain new problems are faced. Unless colonialism is totally liquidated on the African continent, it is more prone to become the scene of contending ambitions, either real or suspected, which will place the fortunes and development of the African people in serious jeopardy. Therefore, the total withdrawal of the empire from these territories is necessary and, as in the case of peace and war, there is no half-way house in this : either you have an empire or you do not have an empire. And that is why we do not believe that it would be possible to progress from stage to stage at this period of world evolution.

There is no country in the world that is not capable of governing itself. We have all our own experiences in which, just before our imperial rulers left us, we were told : who will command your armies ? Who will command your air force

and your fleet ? Who will administer ? Who will run the finance ministries, and so on. None of us found very serious difficulties with it any more than other places, and I believe that these problems are common to independent countries as well. But then we are told that there are countries in Asia, such as Pakistan, India and Ceylon, which have ancient civilizations and, therefore, have had long periods of the court of rule, and soon, but it is our submission that civilization is not a peculiar monopoly of any part of the world. All we mean by making this distinction is that those of us who speak about it probably do not understand other people's civilizations; so we must abandon this distinction also and go straight to the position that this world must really be free in that sense. There should be no territory under foreign rule, no country whose territory can be used by someone else for purposes that have no relation to the benefit or the advantage of the people who inhabit it. That is why, particularly in this present time of these vast military alliances, when the old version of strategic points, lifelines of empire, etc. are being transformed into the position of holding the strategic areas for purposes which are not strictly germane to the progress of the country, we must present our opposition.

As a result of this debate, whatever may have been the nature of the facts presented, we have the position that the attention of the world which we represent is largely focussed upon it. We have also the situation that the resources of the world are a greater subject of attraction of world attention than before, and even if it is a question of world development, every item of liberation, the mote people we bring into the area of dynamic freedom, then the more people there are for constructive endeavour.

Let us take the case of Africa-the vast untold resources of the world are in Africa. This is not a counsel for other people to go and exploit them. In an area of somewhere about 11 million square miles, with a population of about 222 millions, 98 per cent of all the diamonds in the world, 94 per cent of all the columbite, 84 per cent of the copper, 55 per cent of the gold, 45 per cent of the radium, 33 per cent of the manganese, and so on, are in this continent; and these are required not necessarily for the purpose of building armaments, but in order that the world

may move to higher standards of civilization. Therefore, even from the point of view of making available the resources of the world, and making those resources available without the cost of blood and pressure-which is what a colonial war means -it would be to our advantage to introduce this gospel to implement the Charter in its reality. The Charter says this in what may be called more or less embryonic language, but it should be made a reality in that we must now address ourselves to the total liberation of these territories.

It is not a question of setting targets and dates. The only limitation of time on this should be the time required for transfer. And if one may say so, those people with the responsibility should not be permitted to take the attitude of the gauntlet with the gift in it : that is, to say as in the case of the Congo : there is freedom-and then come back the other way because there had been no preparation for it. I think that the Belgian Congo as it was formerly is the most distressing instance of an empire of modern times. After 70 or 80 years of colonial rule nothing has been left in the political, administrative or other organizations, and what is more, after the withdrawal of the empire, the former ruler comes back. That is one thing we have to guard against.

The second thing is that no Trust Territory shall be intimated to us as being ready for independence; independence being given without our being shown and with the United Nations taking care that the transfer of power will be done in such a way as to make the re-entry impossible. In the

415

Fourth Committee soon we shall be discussing the problem of Ruanda-Urundi, and my Government takes a serious view of this position. I informed the Security Council only two days ago that, to the best of our knowledge, there were troop concentrations in Ruanda for the purpose of operations against the Congo. But over and above that, we have now been told that Ruanda-Urundi is fit for independence and, therefore, an election is to take place in a short time. I do not want to discuss the details here because it will come up in the Fourth Committee, but while we yield to no one in the passion to limit the period of transition, we do not want to see that used in such a way that independence becomes "independence"-that

is, things change only to remain the same or become worse, That position should not arise.

Thirdly, I would like to say that we of the colonial areas who have been liberated, we have to take to ourselves to heart the lessons of the empires in the past, the fate of the peoples who are still not liberated; and therefore the Assembly and particularly those nations, who naturally have views on this different from ours on colonial questions, should bear with us when we feel moved, when we seem to concern ourselves with something that is not our own territory. The place of every liberated country-I am not saying of the others-is with the struggle of the colonial peoples. It is the determined policy of the Government of India that while we shall not participate in external military or other movements, while we shall not promote trouble in any areas, while we believe that no revolutions can be exported, our sympathies and our solidarity are with those who struggle for independence. It is part and parcel for the attainment of the national independence of a country that it does not run away from the whole campaigning for human freedom, for the freedom of colonial peoples.

Again, it is necessary that people like ourselves who are liberated from colonial empires should see to it that our place in world politics is a functional situation which leads to progress rather than to regression. That is to say, that our independent positions should not be used by us or utilized by others in order to further the aggressive causes or to fasten tutelage upon other people. It would be the greatest tragedy if some of our liberated countries found themselves aligned against the campaigns of independence or the liberation of other peoples. That independence is not real, even though it may have all the forms and the trappings of independence. The reality of independence must come from the people themselves. And that reality is really not only political but also in economic terms.

We, ourselves, do not object, in fact, it is a good thing if there were fraternities formed of either the liberated territories or from their former rulers on the basis of freedom. But any idea that this is merely another name for empire-whether you call it a commonwealth or co-operation, whatever it is-that would not meet the situation. So those of us who are liberated had to make use of our

liberation. We should not be subject peoples under another name.

It is in this sense, the advancement of our territories in economic terms : of more food, more shelter, more sanitation, more education and of more use of liberation-that is the implementation of independence.

We constantly say in India that on 15 August 1947, what happened was not independence but we removed the main obstacle to independence, mainly foreign rule; independence had to be attained hereafter, that is to say, when people have adequate food, adequate shelter, adequate sanitation, adequate dignity, the capacity to exercise them-that is independence.

We should in no circumstances be drawn, willy-nilly. even in any kind of alliance, in any kind of alignment which either promotes war or the domination of that country. Far be it for me to say that sovereign territories which are independent cannot make their own policies. But we have the right to hope that people who have seen the consequences of the worst wars in history-the great wars have been imperialist wars-whatever form they may take, that they should not contribute their might, their ideals, their moral authority, in order to extend the areas of peace.

That is Why you will find, in spite of the great conflicts in the world, colonial territories tend more and more to move into the position. even if they are formally members of an alliance, of asking to be left alone. And I think the most outstanding instance of this is the United States of America which for 150 years wanted to keep free from foreign entanglements and wanted to be left alone for its own economic development.

So, whatever behoves those who are powerful people, who have other interests-not other interests necessarily of a selfish character-but who see things in another way-leave these territories alone to develop for themselves. The cause of the peace of the world would be assisted by the contribution that liberated peoples can make with enthusiasms which they bring, and that is more, giving evidence to the world that human

advancement.

It should not be forgotten that in the last few years, apart from all alliances, apart from all Charter provisions and so on, the conditions in the liberated territories, which have an economic impact upon other countries, have led to the process of co-operation. There is no country in the world today which either refused to receive or does not receive or does not give assistance in one form or another. Therefore, willy-nilly, a form of world co-operation develops. But for all this, it is necessary that there should be no reservations in this matter : give with one hand and take away with another. That is why a young country like ours stands very strongly against any imperialist power making agreements before independence in regard to either political, territorial or other rights. That is to say, if these areas are in tutelage before they become free, to establish either bases or trade agreements or military agreements in such a way at the price of freedom: that is not freedom.

What is more, the liberty that the liberated territories get is conditioned by the burdens which they cannot carry. And I think the great countries of the world must take the risk that in the conditions of freedom, peoples would act sensibly, would act in the line of progress and not otherwise; and immediate advantages should not take precedent over these distant ideals.

It is one of the great phenomenon of the world that while some forty-fifty years ago maybe 1,200 million or 1,600 million people were under one form of subjection or another-and if we exclude China which though colonial in an economic and social sense, was not so in a literal sense-nearly a thousand million people were under colonial rule. As I said, only some 75 million people are left, but they are scattered all over the world. They form a cancer on the body politic of the world. So long as there is any place in the world which is not liberated, so long as the people struggle for it, no attempt to give it other names, no show of force, no military alliances or anything of that kind, would succeed.

We have made progress on this subject at the present session. That progress has resulted not only from the fact that we have debated

these matters here, but from the fact that the United Nations has asked Portugal to supply information. Portugal is the last stronghold of colonialism, and that stronghold has not fallen but it is very badly beleaguered. Spain has agreed to accept the provisions of the Charter; Portugal has not agreed, and therefore stands today isolated. If this last stronghold falls, we shall make another advance.

But we must not forget that the real objective is to abolish from this world any kind of rule by one nation or people of another nation or people-particularly if it is based on racial discrimination and similar considerations. After all, a people's own economic interests are more important to it than the economic interests of someone else.

There are various draft resolutions before the Assembly on this subject. The first (A/4502) has been submitted by the Soviet Union. We have read that draft resolution, and we find nothing in it to which we can object. That is to say, we are in favour of national States' achieving their freedom in accordance with the freely expressed will and desire of their peoples; we are against extraterritoriality in any form; and we are in favour of the implementation of the principles of the Charter.

The second draft resolution (A/L. 323) is sponsored by my delegation, among others. It is quite true that the draft resolution could have been shorter; perhaps there is a certain amount of repetition. On the whole, however, it represents what I have been trying to submit to the Assembly. There is no attempt at recrimination, no attempt to place responsibility on anyone but the United Nations as a whole.

I would conclude by saying that the emergence of so many countries into freedom is one of the great assets of the United Nations. While we may not always say this in so many words-and it is not applicable to every country-we have to pay a tribute to those countries which, whatever their past, have in more recent times made progress. We must recognize that progress is being made-but not fast enough. And the fact that progress is being made is no argument for our stopping our efforts. In the next year or two we should see the liquidation of all these

dependent and colonial territories. All these places-whether they be small, like the Island of Malta, or large, like Algeria-should emerge into complete statehood and become Members of this Organization, unless they themselves choose something else. We would be the last people to say that because a State is independent it should not seek its fraternity. In fact, that is our hope and it is the purpose of the present debate.

I hope that the draft resolutions on the

417

liquidation of colonialism will pin the unanimous approval of the Assembly. It will be recalled that when the decision was taken to discuss this item my delegation said that we did not very much care where it was discussed so long as it was discussed. It was unanimously decided to discuss it in plenary meetings of the Assembly. That was a vote which was created by the arguments presented here and it is an index of our capacity to persuade each other and of the desire on all sides of this Assembly that colonial territories should be a thing of the past, that this world should become really free and that the process of peace and world co-operation should be facilitated.

INDIA USA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC RUSSIA SOUTH AFRICA JAPAN MALTA FRANCE
PORTUGAL SPAIN GERMANY ALGERIA CHINA OMAN SWITZERLAND CYPRUS GREECE BELGIUM
THE NETHERLANDS PAKISTAN CONGO

Date : Dec 01, 1960

Volume No

1995

INDIA IN THE UNITED NATIONS

Shri Krishna Menon's Statement in Political Committee on Algeria

Shri V.K. Krishna Menon, Leader of the Indian Delegation to the United Nations, made the following statement in the Political Committee on December 15, 1960 on the question of Algeria:

Once again, for the fifth time, the General Assembly is called upon to consider the question of Algeria, and I say the question of Algeria deliberately this time, with a significance. It is the question of the Algerian people and of the implementation not only of their desires and demands, but of all the pledges made by the world as a whole, which we represent, through our various resolutions, and by President de Gaulle himself for the Algerian people to establish their independence.)

With other delegations, we regret the absence of France, not only because of the contribution she has made to the international Organization in the past, but because this item appears on our agenda with the assent or the acquiescence of the French Government itself, and we would like to express our regret that a leading Member of the United Nations, one of the permanent members of the Security Council, one of the founders of the United Nations, and, what is more, a doyen in the realm of international relationships, should so disregard her own decision. She had the opportunity at least to protest once again against the inscription of this item. This was done some time ago and was waved aside by the General Assembly. Since then, the French Government has not objected to the inscription of the item and, therefore, the absence of France in a sense is an affront to this Assembly by saying, "you can inscribe it, you can talk about it, but we are not going to be there". This is a form of non-cooperation which no world organization can develop on the basis of the Charter.

Today, we are faced with a situation in Algeria about which we must naturally speak in terms of restraint, but where this is not warranted. We speak in the background of bloodshed and massacre. We speak in the background of promises repeatedly made as late as December of this year, promises which are not implemented but promises which are broken not only in performance but actually in administration from day to day.

Only a day or two ago, in the plenary session of the General Assembly we adopted a resolution on colonialism by an overwhelming vote of about eighty-two of our Member States, with no one, not even excluding France, voting against it, A

number of present and past colonial Powers voted in its favour, but, I regret to say, not all the Members of the United Nations voted for it. But, at any rate, we passed a resolution which meant the termination of colonialism in all its manifestations, a resolution which endorses the stand taken by the countries of Africa and Asia at the Bandung Conference some years ago. It is in that background that we meet, and we have before us a brief resolution. My delegation, like all others, is limited by pressures which must weigh upon you, as upon the Assembly, and therefore, if it is not possible to develop these arguments in full, the Assembly, I am sure, will take them for granted. What is more, the weight of evidence, the fact that the demands for liberty and the sacrifices of the Algerian people, the concern of the world, the situation in Africa and the impact of this very problem on peace and security in the world, will so outweigh all other considerations that the resolution which is before us, which has been submitted by a large number of countries, will be passed without opposition in this Assembly.)

This will be a call; this will not be by way of a retaliation, a diplomatic reprisal against French policy, but a last and a final appeal to President de Gaulle and his Government that the world does not look kindly upon these policies of massacre of peoples. Whether or not his Government is responsible, the fact remains that for all practical purposes the writ of France runs in Algeria, and that is the only reason for the denial of its independence. It cannot be had both ways. On the one hand, people cannot by force of arms liberate themselves. That is regarded as an unconstitutional rebellion. At the same time they

418

are held as though in a ring by the ruling power to safeguard the atrocities of a minority of people who have taken the law into their own hands.

This is not the first time in history, whether it be the rebellion of the Ulsterman or the rebellion of other reactionary groups arising against the vast mass of the population, they will only gain the support of the powers that be. We have had instances of that in more recent times in many places, and therefore we approach this Algerian question with much more concern and with

almost a feeling of great urgency so that the General Assembly has, for the first time, tried to come to a decision quickly, even putting a self-denying ordinance upon itself.

(With regard to the Algerian question, my delegation would like to place this issue in its proper context, and I am quite sure that our colleagues from the Arab countries and the representatives of the Free Algerian Movement who are in this building will not misunderstand the position.) It is necessary to call things by their proper names. (Algeria is a colony, and I think the first thing in Algeria is to recognize enslavement. Algeria is a French colony, and nothing but a French colony. It is not a protectorate, as was Morocco and Tunisia, and a colony therefore confers upon us the right to shake off the colonial rule. That is, suppression has its corollary, namely break through it. In this land, whose independence has been framed upon the idea that people have a right to overthrow forms of government with which they are not in agreement, that is the rule which must obtain in this case.

Algeria was conquered by force of arms in 1830, where she occupied a position of independence, as much as there was independence in those days under international systems, under the serenity, it is true, of the Ottoman Empire. It was a serenity that lay so loose that her independence under the Sultanate and the Sublime Port was recognized as practical. In 1830, the conquest took place. I am not going into a historical survey of this except to point out that from that day, or from two-years afterwards, 1832 onwards, there has not been a moment of peace so far as the Algerian people are concerned, and there has been no acquiescence and no surrender to this conquest. From 1832 began the rebellion of resistance, a rebellion even as in my own country when, in 1857, the pacification, after what is called the Great Indian Mutiny-took place-from that day onwards came the resistance to it. Quite true, in other forms. So from 1832 came the rebellion of the Algerian people, first led by Abdul Kadar-and I am not going into the chronology of it, as I had intended to if I had the time-until movement by movement took place and the Algerian people established what was the prerequisite of their present provisional Government in the shape of their own chief.

But by 1870, with the changes that took place in Europe, especially out of the second industrial revolution and the tightening of the rule of France on her colonial territories after her own defeat in the Franco-Prussian war, there was perhaps a subsistence of this movement which came to light again in the early part of the present century. With the outbreak of the First World War and during and after the First World War arose other circumstances, one of which was President Wilson's fourteen points, which assured to every people, and led people to expect, that they would have the right to self-determination.

The Algerians fought side by side with French troops in the First as well as in the Second World War, and the degree of education had spread which it is not possible for any empire to withhold. With all these circumstances, together with the breakup of the Ottoman Empire, which liberated Western Asia and brought into existence the free countries of Arabia, the withdrawal of the protectorate of Britain from Egypt and the overthrow of the rule of force in that area-although in the middle, as it is looking at it from the point of view of today, all this had a tremendous impact upon the peoples in North Africa.

Then came the modern period where, in 1944, the present President of France conferred some sort of franchise on the majority of the Algerian population. I do not like this expression, but they are called Algerian Moslems, the reason, of course, being-because we do not believe in a thematic state, of introducing religion into political organizations-the reason" of course-there is a political reason here-because although-I will not again go into chronology-at various times France conferred status of one kind or another but if you examine all this, whether it be the departments of France or the conferring of so-called Algerian citizenship on them-I want to say this particularly in view of the fact that there are so many Member States today who come from former colonies of France-although they were called citizens of France, or the areas were called departments of France, in political terms they were all colonial, that is to say, they were administered without the consent of the peoples, without their having any participation whatsoever. I would just point to one item in this. Sometimes it is argued that

these people in Algeria-now 9 million; there might have been less in those days-had equal rights with Frenchmen, they were French citizens, they were entitled to elections, and this, that and the other ; but it was not until 1944 that the religious disqualification with regard to franchise was removed, thereby creating two separate electoral colleges, and in the submission of my delegation, not creating equality of citizenship by the proclamation and solidification of two classes of citizenship. So in no sense has there been any equality in the French empire, either in Algeria or anywhere else.

For a long time, the peoples of the French empire, until Guinea asserted itself, were lulled into the belief that they were Frenchmen in spite of their racial origins and the fact that they were denied every form of liberty. But now gradually it is beginning to dawn on them, perhaps not as much as some of us would wish. There is no doubt that the disabilities imposed upon the Algerian people are the disabilities which colonial people suffer themselves.

Then came other circumstances. Algeria, being proximate to France-only the Mediterranean, which at that time was called a British sea, separating France from this great colonial empire-and France, although her population was depleting, sent out as a result of the second industrial revolution some of her older landlords. It is the same phenomenon as is taking place in East Africa, where the Hartingtons and others have migrated from Britain into East Africa and become African landlords, dispossessing original possessors of the soil. So the landlords who were dispatched from France migrated to the north, some of them making no contribution either to the production of goods or services, and they now form what is called the groups of colons. About them I will speak later. But any way, they became a kind of fortress for the Imperial Power, a kind of trinity college that was established in the middle of this great country-because to us, those of us who speak on behalf of Algeria here and take this view, Algeria is a country, though its political status is that of a colony.

And then came the situation where the Algerian people brought this matter before the United Nations. It is up before the United Nations, encouraged thereto by the conditions, as

I said a while ago. of the nineteenth century. Then the formulation of the Charter, the emergence of Tunis and Morocco as independent, and later now practically the greater part of the French empire in Africa with the exception of Algeria, with its 800,000 square miles and 11 millions of population, which again is the largest slice of the French colonial empire. Then came the position- of more recent times, when the Fourth Republic. itself was overthrown. The Fourth Republic itself was overthrown, and while no history book will say so, there is very little doubt that with the political conflict in France arising from the killing in Algeria, from the considerable sacrifices Made by the French people themselves in lives- where at one time it was said the officers that came out of the academies were consumed by the Algerian war sooner than they came out- and though the reactions of the Algerian war in France, economically, politically, morally, psychologically, in human terms were such that shook the foundations of the Fourth Republic- and while I will not go into the domestic situation- ushered the Fifth Republic into existence. Now, that is largely a matter for Frenchmen, not for us to talk about.

But President de Gaulle, one of his acts was to proclaim self-determination for Algeria, and I confess that we were one of the people who thought that at that time France would not lose its opportunity. It was not so long a time ago when in this Committee effort after effort was made to find a compromise, a way of conciliation, and what was counselled at that time, considered extreme by the French side, is now no longer acceptable. Three or four years ago it was possible to resolve these matters in terms more suitable, more cooperative, and with less bloodshed and violence.

President de Gaulle has promised self-determination to Algeria, but history, particularly the history of the colonial people, is replete with the plenitude of promises and the lack of performance. The only thing that will convince the Algerian people, convince the world, and, I hope, convince the United Nations, is the implementation of these pledges. The implementation of these pledges would see a liberated Algeria taking her place side by side with us as a Member State of the United Nations. This is what we look forward to. Now, it is said that it is not possible

because there are no Algerians to negotiate with, and I say, since 1832 came this rebellion, much later, somewhere at the beginning of this century, the Algerian National Party was formed, and in 1942 the present Prime Minister of the Provisional Government of Algeria initiated one of the great national movements of the time, which, along with other movements in the past, other splinter groups and what not, were composed into the National Liberation Front, which is the sole fighting army of Algeria. I think President de Gaulle will recognize, as a soldier, that, if nothing else, these

420

men have fought for seven or eight years, gone through blood, sweat and tears, made every sacrifice possible against tremendous odds, not only of France, but of other colonial allies.

And here I want to say without reservation that the imperialist countries and the non-imperialist countries who are members of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, the blood of the Algerian people must be on their consciences, because it is NATO, the vast resources, moral and material, that are made available to France--as indeed it is to Belgium, Portugal and other countries--that is responsible for the colonial exploitation of Africa and Asia at the same time. I think the time has come to mince no words in this matter. My country has at all times, while registering its objection to military blocs, kept away from detailed criticism of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, it not concerning us so intimately. But now the position is such that the arms, the aeroplanes, the bombs, the power, the moral support that there is in NATO that enables France to suppress the Algerian people in the way of suppressing them--and today France has emerged as an atomic Power, and not only had she emerged as an atomic power, side by side with it, the President has proclaimed what is called atomic isolation, that is to say, those atomic weapons are not merely for the purposes that are cited by some of the other Powers. In a condition of atomic isolation, no doubt, these weapons, for whatever they are worth, may be used against the Algerian peoples themselves.

We have the phenomenon that only two years ago this Assembly passed by a very large majority a resolution requesting France not to

explode its bombs in the Sahara. France did that despite the resolution, and therefore there is no reason to think that it will respect public opinion in this way. Therefore, the liberation of Algeria has become a matter of urgent and pressing importance.

There has been a great-deal of controversy at this time. The former Governor of Algeria, who is not now on so friendly terms with the President--these people have a habit of falling out ; some people do fall out in this way--expressed some difference with his former chief in regard to the casualties. In the course of an interview he said that all of these massacres and casualties in Algeria were exaggerated. I therefore do not want to go into the Algerian figures or the figures issued by Arab countries or even by ourselves. So far as we know, on the Algerian side there is a small band of 130,000 men who are engaged in warfare. These men, like the men in other places--indeed, as the men in Indo-China who fought for seven or eight years--will fight to the end until the empire of France is broken, broken in its back, broken in its spine, broken in its every nerve. There is no doubt that it is impossible today to suppress people to the extent that they will fight no more. These 130,000 men constitute the force of the National Liberation Front. As against that force, France has a minimum--and here I use French figures--of half a million soldiers in Algeria.

If we are told that armaments and soldiers are necessary in order to maintain the peace of the world, while we may not agree with it ourselves, it would be difficult for those who believe in that to justify the position that a greater part of all that is being used today to conduct colonial warfare. There are half a million men on one side fighting against 130,000 unarmed men--half a million soldiers who are led by highly trained personnel, the young men who come out of the academies and who are decimated as soon as they come out.

And what is more--I do not know what the position is today, 15 December 1960--they have also been using African people themselves as colonial soldiers of France against fellow Africans in Algeria. The empire has always engaged in this practice of getting Asian to fight Asian, African to fight African, and probably now of getting Asians and Africans to fight each other.

Two thirds of the French air force, which again is a great NATO responsibility, is also there. France would not be able to release these planes for colonial wars if it were not for NATO, but would want them for the protection of its own metropolitan territory. However, air protection and air strength are taken care of by the supply of NATO weapons for this purpose. Indirectly, therefore, it is NATO planes that are bombing the Algerian people, innocent people who cannot engage in air combat.

While it is quite certain that none of the Western countries would supply airplanes to these people, even if they could afford them or could use them, supposing, as a result of that, they were to get planes elsewhere-what a United Nations cry there would be in this place. I do not wish for this to happen, because it would only complicate the situation even more. But two-thirds of the air force of France is tied up in Algeria. Can there be a situation which would arouse our feelings and our passions. more than the fact that these innocent men are forced to fight in the mountains because it is only there

421

that the French soldiers cannot get to them. It is therefore an unequal combat. It is an unequal combat from the point of view of the National Liberation Front because of numbers and because of recruitment. But from the point of view of the French, it is an unequal combat because of the strategy and tactics employed by the so-called guerrillas who have reached the mountains where they can only be smoked out by the air force.

I hope that the NATO allies of France will take note of the fact-and I say this deliberately-that the colonial war is being waged not only by France but also by the allies of France, the members of NATO. Some of them who have taken a different view of the Algerian situation bear an individual responsibility.

One half of the French navy is employed against Algeria, and Algeria does not have any ships. The French navy is being employed in Algeria not so much to kill the Algerian people but rather to blockade them and to prevent them from getting supplies, to strike terror into their minds--this is a war of terror.

In addition, there is the entire police force of France, special security units, torture squads and the civilian militia, which was dissolved in January 1960. Here is a war in modern terms with all the equipment of modern warfare, on the one hand, and also the medieval machinery of oppression and cruelty. According to French sources-again I should like to use French sources-by November 1959 a total of 13,000 French soldiers were killed as against 145,000 Algerian soldiers. I am not trying for a moment to set up a scoreboard in this matter. I regret, as I am sure the rest of the Assembly regrets and as a large majority of the French people regret, the tragedy of the killing of these French people in Algeria for purposes which are not to the glory of France but to its everlasting shame in the sense that the Algerians are unarmed people engaged in unequal combat. It is also to the credit of the French people that there is such violent opposition to the Algerian campaign in France itself. In contrast to that, almost 150,000 Algerian men have-been killed. And we know that for every one person who is killed there are seven, eight or ten who have been wounded. Therefore, the figure of 600,000 or 700,000 Algerian casualties becomes accurate.

I note that the former Governor of Algeria contested this figure and said there were not 600,000 casualties when our colleague from Ghana pointed out that almost three-quarters of a million people have been sacrificed in Algeria. According to the French figures themselves, the casualties over this period have been very large.

In addition to this, there are the economic circumstances and the repercussions in relation to the human factor. More than half a million Algerians are reported to be displaced. This world is full of refugees in one way or another, and most of them became refugees through acts of imperialism-by people being driven from their national homes and being told that they shall live somewhere else. These refugees who are the casualties of the colonial empire should be provided for by that empire itself, which in its day has profited by imperial colonization. One half million Algerians are reportedly displaced and are the victims of enforced settlement in resettlement centres of the French army. I suppose a few years ago we would have called them concentration camps, but now it is not a very fashionable

word and people would probably regard it as a word of exaggeration. But when you displace people by military occupation, when you displace them from their home territories and force them into camps, they can be nothing but concentration camps. Approximately 100,000 Algerians are being held in military detention camps and there are 300,000 refugees in Tunisia and Morocco.

France, which has recently been occupied and overrun by the Nazis during the war--and though we were not willing partners in the war our own personnel assisted in the liberation of France and so did the colonial peoples of France--is today spending \$ 3 million a day, and this deficit is being made up by NATO support in regard to other matters.

France is a signatory to the Geneva conventions in regard to the treatment of prisoners of war. This war, in which the troops on one side at any rate, are led by men of the regular army, comes very strictly and fully under the provisions of the Geneva Convention. The Secretary-General of the United Nations has the inescapable responsibility of reporting to this Assembly in regard to the violation of the Geneva Conventions. I submit, with great respect to the Secretary-General that this is a responsibility of the United Nations. The initiative must be taken by the Assembly. It is a responsibility of the United Nations to see that, this Treaty which is based upon humanitarian acts and which is being violated by a permanent member of the Security Council, a founding Member of the United Nations, is observed. The facts should be made known. The violation of the Geneva Conventions with respect to the treatment of the people of Algeria in this war is something that must shake the conscience of the world.

422

It is quite true that if we read the papers-- and my Government and I both hold this view,-- we see that General de Gaulle is making an honest effort--I do not wish to go into the question of motives--but here was an approximate effort towards independence. He has said: "An Algerian Algeria"; he has spoken in terms of self-determination. Self-determination is one of those words which has deluded humanity so far. It depends on which "self" and I say, speaking for my Government that the cry of Algeria--I do

not speak for the Algerian people-is not for self-determination but for independence. Algeria has determined that it was to be independent. It is not necessary for it to determine hereafter, and therefore it requires its independence which may be established by one method or another.

When General de Gaulle promised self-determination is a first step to it--and I do not know why when a thing of this kind is agreed upon there should be so many steps; that seems to me to be one of the modern ways of avoiding anything, to say that something is a goal and a goal is usually understood as something that you do not allow the other fellow to reach. It is kept and everyone who tries to reach that goal is prevented from reaching it. That seems to be the international interpretation of a goal these days.

Similarly, phases are things which prevent a final conclusion. The first phase of it was when the representative of the Provisional Government of Algeria met the French authorities in regard to the modalities of negotiations and those modalities-I am agreeably surprised that the Provisional Government of Algeria is prepared to take this step and send its plenipotentiaries because if we throw our minds twelve years ago to the history of Fontainebleau when the plenipotentiaries of Indo-China went there to negotiate, when they came back they found their country all divided up and their partisans in prison. These are acts which are not done by civilized nations today.

However, let us not take Press comments in the Arab countries or in India or anywhere else, but let us look at the American Press on this question. It was in July 1960 when these preliminary negotiations were taking place, in Melun, and these preliminary negotiations showed what was going to happen thereafter. The New York Times, writing about this said that this representative, Ahmed Boumendjel:

"Was treated as a virtual prisoner...

To outsiders it does seem as if the Algerians have a valid point in asking that the talks take place in a free atmosphere".

The Christian Science Monitor writing on the subject at about the same time said :

"It is understandable that the

rebels now should wish to see joint plans for elections further clarified"-that is in relation to our draft resolution-"even stipulated-in a cease-fire agreement".

Then, the next week, The Christian Science Monitor wrote:

"A curious insensitivity to world opinion, let alone that of Algerian Moslems and other North Africans, appears in the latest statement by French President de Gaulle regarding Algerian rebel leaders, who took part in preliminary-ceasefire talks".

The Economist, which is known for its conservative views and for no great sympathy for the colonial peoples, if I know them very well, said :

"The Algerian conflict is moving towards its moment of truth. Last week General de Gaulle made his bid to Pet the Algerians to Paris, not by any explicit new pledges, but simply by omitting from his statement passages that had been considered unacceptable".

Thus we have these facts, that the negotiations themselves take place under conditions where it is not possible to hope for anything else.

Therefore, it is not necessary for me to speak any more except to say that the promise of self-determination in the words that appear in this draft resolution should not lead us too far away. What is wanted is the independence of Algeria and an immediate demand, so far as we are concerned, for the implementation of this independence.

My delegation usually does not support the intervention of the United Nations in regard to supervision and control unless invited by the parties, but here we have a special set of circumstances ; here we have a state where an imperial country is waging actual war on its peoples by means of its land, air and sea forces and with all the panoply, with its allies aiding and abetting it either directly or indirectly. Therefore there is a war on a colonial people, a situation where the peace

and security of the world is endangered, where these people have nowhere else to turn. Therefore, it is necessary that this draft resolution, which has been sponsored by so many countries from Asia and Africa, and which will also be sponsored by other countries-and we shall go on with a sense of strength and unity to tell France that whatever it may do, it will not have any responsible, respectable or thinking opinion of the world on its side. If President de Gaulle wants to go down in history as a person who dishonoured the pledge in its implementation-he has promised us self-determination and this should not be followed by the massacres that took place in the last two weeks. I do not say it was done by the bidding of the French Government. But that should open his eyes to the fact that there is no half-way house in this matter, that there is only one way to end the thralldom that is imposed upon Algeria and that is to end it and establish its independence.

INDIA ALGERIA USA FRANCE INDONESIA MOROCCO TUNISIA OMAN EGYPT GUINEA BELGIUM
PORTUGAL CHINA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC GHANA SWITZERLAND

Date : Dec 01, 1960

Volume No

1995

INDIA IN THE UNITED NATIONS

Shri M.H. Samuel's Statement on U.N. Special Fund

Shri M.H. Samuel, Member of the Indian Delegation to the United Nations made the following statement in the Economic Committee of the General Assembly on December 9, 1960, on the U.N. Special Fund and Technical Assistance Board.

Very rightly and very properly, in full conformity to the U.N, Charter and objectives, and in full conformity with our governmental policies

and principles, we have the honour of introducing the resolution now before the Committee No. A/C. 2/L. 529 on "The Progress and operations of the special Fund and Programmes of Technical Assistance" calling for an increase in the contributions to the Special Fund and the Expanded Programme of Technical Assistance.

According to the Preamble of the United Nations Charter, one of the objectives of the United Nations is (I quote) "to employ international machinery for the promotion of economic and social advancement of all peoples". I would also like to recall in this connection the provisions of chapter 9 of the Charter on "international economic and social co-operation"-Articles 55 to 60.

Much work followed later, Mr. Chairman. to put these Articles into effect and in 1951, the Indian delegation had the honour of submitting a draft resolution (Document A/C. 1/669, dated November 26, 1951) recommending (I quote) "the creation of a United Nations Fund for reconstruction and development;" but, at the time, the Big powers were too involved in their domestic and international affairs, and none gave any thought to the economic well-being of the peoples all over the world-in spite of the very evident and obvious fact that ultimately, it was the economic conditions that disturbed the peace of the world-the peace that the United Nations is pledged to maintain. (Imagine, Mr. Chairman, what it costs to maintain the peace of the world ! Apart from \$ 100 billion dollars spent each year on armaments-it is said, to maintain the peace of the world-the little United Nations operation in Congo itself is to cost, before the end of this month, 60 million dollars-also to maintain peace in that part of the world !) But, by 1958, the small seed sown in 1951 by its draft resolution (Document A/c. 1/669). bore fruit, and the policy of some of the Big Powers; so to say, changed. Thus, on October 14, 1958, the General Assembly passed a resolution No. 1240/XIII, establishing the Special Fund. By that resolution the Special Fund was asked (I quote) "to direct its operations towards enlarging the scope of the United Nations programme in certain basic fields of technical assistance so as to include special projects." It also mentioned a number of other fields of activity, which are well-known to the Committee, and I need not quote them fully.

My delegation, Mr. Chairman, attaches great importance to the work of the Special Fund and the Technical Assistance Board. My delegation very much appreciates the work already done by these two bodies, and looks forward to their increased operations in all the under-developed areas of the world.

In 1959, the work of the Special Fund was as varied as it was valuable. It approved, during that year, projects for survey of land and water resources and an Agricultural Station in Afghanistan. For Management Development and Electric Power Study in Argentina, for Agricultural Training and pre-colonization survey in Bolivia, for Survey of the San Francisco River Basin in Brazil, for Mineral Survey and Hydro-metric and Hydro-meteorological Stations in Chile, for Vocational training and Soil Survey in Columbia, for the expansion of Meteorological and Hydrological Services, a Fisheries Institute and Pre-Colonization Survey in Ecuador, for a Survey of the Volta River flood plain in Ghana-and so on, in many other under-developed countries-in addition to

424

some regional and inter-regional projects. In my own country, we have had the benefit of a number of projects surveyed or initiated by the Special Fund, and we extend our appreciation of its efforts.

For 1960, the Special Fund approved in May, this year, the setting up, in my country, of a Central Public Health Engineering Research Institute, a Fisheries Training Institute, a Central Mining Research Institute and Surveys of Water Supply Resources of Greater Calcutta and of potential Hydro-Power Sites. It has also approved several projects in other countries in 1960, which I need not mention. Altogether, during 1959 and the first half of 1960, the Special Fund Governing Council approved 74 projects in 49 countries and territories, at a total cost of 135 million dollars-to which the Special Fund would contribute 55 million and the remaining 80 million by the assisted countries--a good work indeed.

But, it seems to us that the period for which allocations are made-which is about 3 1/2 years on the average for each project-is a bit too long. The contributions on which allocations are based are yearly, and the expenditure in the first year

of the project is seldom more than 10 or 15 per cent. It would seem appropriate that the Governing Council should approve projects in such a way that the total allocations at any time do not exceed, by more than one-third of the total of cash in hand and pledges on the books. This would inevitably leave large cash reserves with the Fund, and my delegation would like to support the idea of creating a Reserve Fund with the money so accumulated. Such a Reserve Fund could be used either for refundable projects or for other large-scale projects. This may not be within the scope of the Special Fund at the moment, but, we confess, we certainly envisage it in the not too remote a future. This is a limitation on the functions of the Special Fund, which, we hope, will be lifted with the passage of time.

My delegation, Mr. Chairman, would also like to enlarge the scope of the Special Fund assistance so as to include fields like Secondary education. At present, technical education is said to be within the scope of the Fund. The training of teachers for Secondary education is almost a vital necessity before technical education can be launched. I am glad that the Managing Director of the Fund has indicated his willingness to consider such a programme for eligibility for assistance in special circumstances, particularly in Africa.

We would also like to urge, Mr. Chairman, a better geographical distribution of Special Fund Assistance. We do so, not with a view to question the competence or judgment of the Managing Director; we do so merely as a suggestion. We welcome the convention which is said to be followed in the Governing Council to leave this matter to the Managing Director's best discretion and judgment, and leave the matter at that, with the mere expression of our suggestion.

We would also like to suggest a reduction in the minimum limit of the foreign exchange component of the Special Fund Assistance, in suitable cases. This minimum limit is now 250,000 dollars; and, in the present context of world trade and commodity prices, it would seem to exert considerable strain on the foreign exchange resources of the underdeveloped countries. This is certainly so, as far as my country is concerned.

Another suggestion we would like to make relates to the greater use of the agencies of the

participating governments as executive agencies' by the Special Fund. In our view, there are advantages for the Special Fund in enlisting the agencies of the participating governments as executive agencies for its projects.

Mr. Chairman, the expanding and increasing activities of both the Special Fund and Technical Assistance Board, if they mean anything point to one fact- a stark fact-namely the great need for such activities. That need imposes on the two organisations both an obligation and a responsibility, which, they or we in this Committee or the Economic and Social Council cannot ignore; or ignore it by the surrender of the obligations enjoined both in the Charter and the General Assembly resolutions. Many countries have become independent in recent years and in this year, and have become members of the United Nations. AU of them are underdeveloped. Their needs are, in every sense of the word, unlimited-unlimited. They are up and awake-awake to their independence, awake to their place under the sun, awake to their poverty, ignorance and disease, awake to their long exploitation, and awake also to the prosperity in other areas of the world-the areas whom they helped to become prosperous. To meet their unlimited needs, the activities of the Special Fund and the Technical Assistance Board need to be increased. You cannot place any limit on the expansion of their activities. That would be a dangerous thing to do. The challenge has to be met. You can't shirk it. It is both an obligation and a responsibility. And yet, the money available for them is too limited, too little. The Special Fund's resources this year are expected to be only 40 million dollars. Recall to your mind the United Nations expenditure in the Congo up to

425

the end of this month as I said a little while 60 million dollars. The sum of 40 million I admittedly a pittance, and Mr. Hoffman has asked for 100 million dollars before 1962 and called it a "modest sum." That is a modest sum any man, faced with such tremendous responsibilities in Africa and elsewhere, can ask for-a "modest sum" to maintain peace in a peaceful way (against the immense sums expended in armaments)-a "modest sum" to lift poverty, ignorance and disease from three continents, and thereby to ensure economic well-being and contentment alone ensure peace, not armaments.

May I say a few words, Mr. Chairman, about the amendment proposed by the United Kingdom. We, the co-sponsors, gave the amendment our very serious and earnest consideration, and if unanimity could be secured, we were willing to accommodate some of its aspects. But, it seems to us that the target date mentioned in the operative para 2 of our draft resolution is vital, of utmost importance. The needs of the under-developed countries, (as I said) are unlimited; their demands are increasing; and Mr. Hoffman, Managing Director of the Fund, has himself for his "modest sum" "not later than for the 1962 Programme". I think, Mr. Chairman, Mr. Hoffman has very valid and weighty reasons for asking for his "modest sum" before 1962. For he has to do the job. Therefore, it would seem unrealistic to introduce in the resolution the words "as soon as possible", as the amendment proposes. It would also seem unrealistic, in our opinion, to consider even a staggering for the realization of the "modest sum", because the needs of the under-developed countries are urgent, and they are increasing.

We the co-sponsors, Mr. Chairman, are deeply actuated by very realistic considerations in bringing forward this draft resolution, and I can assure the British delegation that there is no unrealism in our approach. The real realistic approach to the Special Fund is the realization of the poverty of the under-developed countries, their great and increasing needs, and the urgent necessity of doing something about them. There is no other realistic approach. We hope the Committee will give its unanimous approach to the resolution.

INDIA USA CONGO AFGHANISTAN ARGENTINA BOLIVIA BRAZIL CHILE ECUADOR GHANA

Date : Dec 01, 1960

Volume No

1995

INDIA IN THE UNITED NATIONS

Shri M.H. Samuel's Statement on Dissemination of Scientific Knowledge

Shri M. H. Samuel, member of the Indian Delegation to the United Nations, made the following statement in the Social Committee of the General Assembly on December 6, 1960 on the dissemination of scientific knowledge:

I will begin by saying that the report we are now considering is one that will prove to be of much value-both generally and specifically, and I should like to join others in extending our appreciation of it.

Science, pure and practical, has now invaded our lives-on this planet with a bang, and, with it, we are probably going to invade other planets of the universe equally with a bang-if this is not so already. It has done so with (what is called in the introduction of the report) the "acceleration of history"; or perhaps the "acceleration of history" has given it an impetus.

Therefore, the fact exists, that science and scientific research has grown enormously during the last 100 years, and will assuredly grow more as years go by. But, it is also a fact that it seems to grow more in some countries and less in others. The benefits of science and its researches, already enjoyed by a few only a few, countries in the world, however, do not reach the vast mass of mankind.

Dissemination of scientific knowledge in those countries, which have not so far reached that standard or still in infant stages of development, is a task which is necessary and essential, not only for the general advancement of science but also for the fostering and building up of peace in the world. Remember the ILO Charter-Poverty anywhere is a danger for the prosperity of others.

I shall not go into the various branches of science-fundamental and applied-and their discipline patterns or inter-discipline synthesis, I will, however, indicate our general views on the subject of scientific research and as to what has already been achieved in my country in this respect.

The first of the General Recommendation declares : "The growing influence of science and technology on the level of living of the people

makes national scientific policy out of the foremost preoccupations of Governments today".

This report, Sir, was presented this year, But, early in 1958, our Government, the Government of India-issued a Resolution on its scientific policy. It was placed before our Parliament and approved.

Let me quote a few lines of it. It said.

426

"Science has developed at an ever-increasing pace since the beginning of the century, so that the gap between the advanced and backward countries has widened more and more. It is only by adopting the most vigorous measures and by putting forward our utmost effort into the development of science that we can bridge the gap. It is an inherent obligation of a great country like India, with its tradition of scholarship and original thinking, and its great cultural heritage, to participate fully in the march of science, which is probably mankind's greatest enterprise today".

Then, the Resolution went on to declare the aims of the Government's Scientific Policy. It said.

"The Government of India has, accordingly, decided that the aims of their Scientific Policy will be:

- (i) To foster, promote and sustain, by all appropriate means, the cultivation of science and scientific research in all aspects-pure, applied, and educational;
- (ii) To ensure an adequate supply, within the country, of research scientists of the highest quality, and to recognize their work as an important component of the strength of the nation;
- (iii) To encourage and initiate, with all possible speed, programmes for the training of scientific and technical personnel on a scale adequate to fulfil the country's needs in science and education, agriculture and industry and defence;
- (iv) To ensure that the creative talent of men and women is encouraged, and

finds full scope in scientific activity;

(v) To encourage individual initiative for the acquisition and dissemination of knowledge and for the discover of new knowledge, in an atmosphere of Academic freedom;

(vi) And, in general, to secure for the people of the country all the benefits that can accrue from the acquisition and application of scientific knowledge."

You will see in the passages I have quoted, my Government's full appreciation of the value and necessity of scientific research, and our determination to go ahead in this branch of knowledge for our growth and for peaceful purposes. Let me emphasize this point-our entire Scientific Policy, as our other policies, are directed for peaceful ends. Today, the Government of India has a specific Ministry-called the Ministry of Scientific Research-to devote its full time and energy to this end, to fulfil the aims and objectives of our Scientific Policy Resolution of March 14, 1958.

But, science has no national or international frontiers. Therefore, there can be no two opinions on its dissemination; indeed, not to do so would not only be a disservice to humanity but a disservice to science itself--both scientific research and industrial technology. I realise, there is no agency in the United Nations, as the report says, "Concentrating on the international aspects of technology, applied research and industrial developments, as distinct from technical assistance in the strict sense of the term." And the report hints at a need for establishing either an appropriate service within the U. N. family or a new organization to concentrate on these matters. Whatever the agency contemplated, if and when it comes into being, it could receive papers on the latest discoveries, inventions, patents and technological questions from the member-nations, collate knowledge which is often superficial and discontinuous in time and space, and both acquaint the member-nations and publish them periodically-not yearly or half-yearly, but at least quarterly, if not monthly, in view of the very rapid developments in this field now-a-days. Such an arrangement under the auspices of the United Nations, would provide an authoritative source material for further scientific research-

pure and applied-and, by its very wide dissemination, obviate duplication of work or continued wasteful effort on questions clearly solved and settled.

Besides, it could undertake documentation as the basic method of disseminating scientific knowledge-standardization of titles, leading thereafter to easy indexing, and coding, and an information service on current work. Let me emphasize the point that in spreading scientific knowledge in whatever way you choose, documentation (with standardized titles) and indexing and coding are very essential, and it is more than possible that if more than one agency (national or international) attempts it, there will inevitably arise confusion and complexities.

I have no doubt in saying that Regional Scientific and Technical Training Institutes, as suggested in the Report, will prove to be invaluable not only in disseminating scientific knowledge

427

but also in helping the technological progress of the less industrialized countries. Such Institutes may provide : (1) a means of training the research personnel and teaching staff of member-countries ; and (2) give further training to the existing research and teaching staff at short courses, designed to put them in touch with new techniques essential to their work.

But, I am not quite sure if the operation jointly of such Institutes by several countries in a given area would work satisfactorily or effectively. A more cohesive pattern may have to be thought out to get the best out of them for the countries concerned.

True, international Scientific Conferences also provide a forum for the dissemination of scientific knowledge. We have in our country, every year, annual sessions of the Indian Science Congress-an old organization which has done, and is doing very useful work. At each session, many eminent scientists from other countries are present and give and take each other's knowledge and experience. I would wish, however, that at each such session in every country. by the course of its discussion, preferably of an interdisciplinary nature, young scientists are guided into new fields of thought and research.

There is much to be said for a Central Registry of all bilateral and multilateral Agreements and Conventions between the member-states to be maintained; though it is doubtful if sovereign member-states would like any advice from a study center on, whether or not, to accede to the existing agreements or for preparing new agreements.

I realize that time is not ripe to consider this report in substance. The Economic and Social Council has already circulated it to all the Governments, and it will consider it next year in the light of the comments received from them.

Therefore, I shall not go into the various recommendations-general or specific-contained in the Report, except to say that the conservation and improvement of natural environment is essential for the survival of the human race-particularly in this nuclear age-and that sustained and coordinated research is urgently needed, not only in physical and chemical sciences but also in Biological Sciences (like molecular biology, Neuro-physiology, Immunology, Genetics and Radio-biology); Earth and Space sciences, and, of course, applied sciences (like Medical, Agricultural and Energy).

My delegation agrees with the approach of the joint draft resolution presented by Australia. May I recall in this connection that, in 1958, my delegation had expressed its doubts as to the advisability of submitting the survey to the Economic and Social Council. Our doubts have now proved valid. The consideration of the Survey has been delayed for a year. However, from the practical point of view, my delegation feels that, after having accepted the resolution of 1958, there is no other course but to wait for a report from the Economic and Social Council. My delegation, therefore, supports the draft resolution.

However, I would like to offer a drafting suggestion for the consideration of the co-sponsors. Operative paragraph I refers only to the views to be expressed by UNESCO. It would be appropriate, and indeed essential, to include in the same paragraph a reference to the views and comments to be received from the Governments of member-states. I am not offering this suggestion as a formal amendment, but I hope, the sponsors of the Resolution will appropriate the suggestion if they think it necessary. In our opinion, our suggestion merely repeats in operative paragraph

I what is said in the Preambular paragraph 3.

As to the amendments submitted by the distinguished representative of Saudi Arabia, my delegation feels that the additions he has suggested will add to the usefulness of the resolution and deserve acceptance by the co-sponsors, The additional preambular paragraph, he has also suggested, expresses a very basic and fundamental point of view and, in the opinion of my delegation, deserves to be accepted. I have just heard the distinguished representative of Australia explaining her attitude to the amendments of the distinguished representative of Saudi Arabia, and we are happy that she approaches the amendments favourably. I hope the other co-sponsors of the resolution also regard them favourably and that the Committee will accept them.

INDIA USA AUSTRALIA SAUDI ARABIA

Date : Dec 01, 1960

Volume No

1995

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

Prime Minister's Statement Initiating Rajya Sabha Debate on Foreign Affairs

Initiating the debate on foreign affairs in the Rajya Sabha on December 20, 1960, the Prime

428

Minister, Shri Jawaharlal Nehru, said:

Mr. Chairman, Sir, I beg to move:

That the international situation, with particular reference to the matters that came up before the United Nations General Assembly in its current session, be taken into consideration.

I am moving this Motion and I am naturally responsible for it, but I feel that it is slightly out

of date in the sense that when this was considered, the main subject before us was for me to report on my visit to the United Nations on the subjects that had been taken up there. It is not very long since I went there but already it appears to be rather remote because so much has happened since then and so many things are now confronting the United Nations and indeed the world.

I always welcome this opportunity of addressing this House and placing before them some of these international problems that we have to face and profiting by the ideas, suggestions and advice that might be given here. I must confess to a feeling of--well, I do not like to use the word 'confusion' but anyhow--a lack of clarity about this world sense today. It is an extraordinarily complex one and anyone who seeks to deal with it in a few simple sentences, well, has my goodwill but I am inclined to think that he has probably not understood the situation at all if he wants to simplify it in that way. Wherever you may look, you find confusion, difficulty and conflicts, and what is much more, behind those conflicts, the shadow of a tremendous conflict, of war, even possibly world war. And therefore, in these circumstances, one has to be a little cautious in action and sometimes even in one's speeches or talks.

When I went to the United Nations, the chief problems there were disarmament--of course, it is a, basic question--and the situation in Africa, more specially in the Congo. In connection with that situation in Africa, the broader question of colonialism came up. And therefore one might say that the two basic questions before the United Nations were at the time disarmament and anti-colonialism, the ending of colonialism, one of the immediate issues being the situation in the Congo which had become more particularly a responsibility of the United Nations. There were other very important problems also like Algeria and the situation that was developing then in Laos. Now, if I stand here and speak on this subject, I would have to refer more particularly not only to the Congo, of course, but to Algeria and to Laos and to Ethiopia. Almost every other day when one opens one's newspaper or listens in to the radio, one hears news of some upset, some upheaval, of something happening round about the world,

which has a larger significance in that small or big country itself. I mentioned Ethiopia. I have nothing much to say about Ethiopia because apparently the revolt that took place there is over but in other places, in Loas, the conditions there are very difficult and very disturbing. In Algeria, recently developments have taken place which are most disturbing in the sense that a very large-scale killing has gone on there. It is estimated that thousands of persons, maybe hundreds of thousands, have been killed.

Looking at this picture all over the world, one has a feeling or I have a feeling that we have arrived at some acute crisis in world history, an acute crisis in the future of the United Nations which represents the world community and an acute crisis in the various parts of the world like Africa or South East Asia. People talk about legal governments and rebels. Nobody knows who is a rebel one day and what is the legal government the other day. It has been seen that some governments recognise some people as the legal government and some other governments recognise the so-called rebels as the legal government and the others as rebels. So, one can take one's choice, that is, if we favour somebody, we can call it the legal government; if we do not like them, we call them the opponents to the legal government or the rebel persons.

The general tendency in the world for some years had been towards a relaxation of tension and gradually this had worked up towards what is called the Summit Meeting. But owing to the failure of the last Summit some five or six months ago, this tendency was reversed, or it was even before that, and nothing has happened yet to check this progressive deterioration. We may, of course, express our opinions as to this country's fault or that person's fault in this matter. It is an easy exercise to sit down and do so but we do not profit much because ultimately it is not a person's or any country's fault that is all that counts, but it is rather the attempt to produce conditions when such errors and faults do not take place or when they do not affect the world situation very much. Take the Congo for instance. There the situation is definitely in many ways much worse than it was when we were in the United Nations. The House will remember that when first these troubles arose there, soon after independence, the then Prime Minister invited

the United Nations to come and help them. That

429

help was very badly needed even for the day-to-day activities of Government. It was still more needed to carry on not only law and order but health and the normal activities of the country. Of course the whole thing had completely collapsed immediately after independence by the rather extraordinary developments that took place because of the attitude of the Belgian Government.

The Belgian Government, in its colonial days in the Congo, had built up--more than many other colonial countries--a fairly good health system and some other social services, a fairly good system of primary education--much more than in other country--but nothing more than primary education. In fact, it appears to have been their deliberate policy to prevent higher education so that, curiously enough, in the Congo today you find a relatively large proportion of people who have got primary education. It is a good background, a good reservoir to draw from, but very very few indeed--hardly any, it can be said--there are who have gone beyond that stage.

Take even primary education; I forget the exact number, but I think there are about 30,000 schools and I believe that every single teacher of these schools was a Belgian. So the sudden withdrawal of all these Belgian functionaries, whether it was education, whether it was health or whether it was any other activity, left a complete vacuum. There was some trouble in the Congolese army and they demanded that the Belgian officers should withdraw and there was some violence on the part of the army. That did not last long and that was rather exaggerated at the time.

Now the United Nations came in and in one of its earliest resolutions the Security Council decided that the Belgian military and paramilitary personnel should be withdrawn, that is to say that broadly the Belgians should withdraw except probably those in some social services or other essential services. That was the first thing they decided apart from any other decisions. Then all kinds of internal troubles took place, internal conflicts within the Congo, and it began to appear that outside powers were encouraging and helping the inner contestants for power there. Some

sided with Mr. Lumumba who was the elected Prime Minister, some with President Kasavubu who was also elected and who later had apparently fallen out with the Prime Minister. Some definitely sided with Col. Mobutu who emerged as the Army Chief and who originally had been appointed by Prime Minister Lumumba. The position of Col. Mobutu was very peculiar. He had been appointed by Prime Minister Lumumba, but later he turned against him, turned against even President Kasavubu, put an end to Parliament, and in fact there was a coup d'etat in which more or less he had captured power and said there would be no parliament at least for a long time, and he set up a few senior students from the university there and called them Commissioners to carry on the government, the country-the few students who had some university education in Belgium at the University of Louvainne while President Kasabubu also appointed, independently, another gentleman as Prime Minister, he having dismissed or tried to dismiss Mr. Lumumba.

Now all that produced a very conflicting situation in which authority was all spread out; it was not in anybody's hands fully, but broadly speaking, the Congolese army, which was to some extent under Col. Mobutu's control-to some extent only-was the authority ; they had the arms and they used them indiscriminately without any reference to discipline or law or order, and so this Congolese army-force publique as it was called in Belgian times-this national army as it has become now, was useful to Col. Mobutu in suppressing his opponents, but was not helpful to him or to anybody in preserving law and order. In fact it was a most disorderly element in the situation and it was not under a unified command. People looked at the constitution of Congo and lawyers said that Mr. Lumumba still continues to be the Prime Minister in law even though he might be under some kind of detention and that nobody can put him aside. All these difficulties arise.

Now when I was in the United Nations I made a suggestion-and others also-that in those circumstances the only real authority which should decide finally should be the Parliament. Parliament may not perhaps-if I may say so with respect-consist of very high standard people. Whatever it may be, there it was ; they were the

elected people from all over the Congo and they should meet, and if they quarrelled in Parliament, let them quarrel and decide. If they want to solve the confusion arising from two persons claiming to be Prime Minister and a third group calling themselves Commissioners and overriding the Prime Minister, who is to decide ? Nobody else can decide. President Kasavubu was also a legal entity, because he had been elected. According to some people Mr. Lumumba was the Prime Minister but anyhow the Prime Minister was not functioning ; he is in detention. President Kasavubu was functioning. So we may have to say that there were only two legal entities there. President Kasavuba was

430

admittedly legal, but the rest have some doubt and Parliament was not allowed to meet by Col. Mobutu's rabble soldiery, and President Kasavubu, however legal his position as President might be, it was a limited position, and he is not an autocrat or a dictator doing what he liked. That is why we recognised President Kasavubu. We did not agree to his discharging all the functions of parliament and everything combined as a dictator might. Now this thing went on.

And then President Kasavubu went himself to the United Nations and there was a very heated debate in the General Assembly as to whether he should be allowed to sit in the Assembly as representing the Congo. Now only a few days before that there had been a proposal that a delegation of Afro-Asian countries should go from this Assembly, who under the Secretary-General's direction had formed themselves into an advisory committee on the Congo, that they should go to the Congo and report. It had also been decided that till they report, a discussion on the Congo should be postponed, but hardly a few days after that, four or five days after that this question of President Kasavubu came up, and after a debate which created a good deal of heat, by a majority President Kasavubu was accepted as the representative of the Congo. Now this rather put an end to the previous decision about the Commission going there because their first step was to decide that no Commission need go or should go there. So, the process which it had tried to support, or some kind of conciliation etc. in the Congo was hit on the head and the Commission has not gone.

There are all kinds of talks still. and in that state of affairs in the Congo which showed no equilibrium, no balance, the weight of the U.N.'s acceptance of President Kasavubu as the representative of the Congo made a difference and Col. Mobutu, who was by no means closely allied to President Kasavubu, profited by this very much.

Then, of course, the House will remember that Mr. Lumumba escaped from his place of detention, was later arrested and treated very brutally and is still in jail. And so far as I know, even up till now no independent doctors or Red Cross people have been allowed to go to him in spite of the efforts of the United Nations.

Now, the position of the United Nations in the Congo meanwhile underwent a change ; that is, they became less and less effective and Col. Mobutu became the most effective person, though not wholly so and the curious situation arisen there is that the United Nations group, their forces there, their personnel which went there with great hopes of doing something, became quite ineffective. They could not do anything. The instructions that they got were that they must be completely neutral. Whatever that might mean, it was right that they should be neutral. Actually how this was interpreted was this Mat in front of them killing was going on by one group against the other on a big scale but they looked on. So, from the point of view of law and order they had no position at all because of the instructions or the interpretations of the instructions of the Security Council. In effect, the Congo gradually began to disintegrate. There had been the Katanga province which had declared its independence under Mr. Tshombe, and now the Orientale province with Stanleyville as its capital also went adrift. In fact, it calls itself the Government of the whole Congo ; Katanga was only the capital for Katanga. That is the position now, and the U.N. still looks on helplessly and is becoming weaker and weaker.

One major thing that has happened during these months is the return of the Belgians in considerable numbers and with considerable authority, though exercised not directly but exercised through those people whom they favour. The persons whom they favour are Col. Mobutu and Mr. Tshombe of Katanga and others, of

course. In fact, all these people have got Belgian advisers--military advisers, civil advisers and other advisers-and all that. The Student College of Commissioners have all Belgian advisers who, presumably, do all their work although it may issue in the name of the Commissioners. In effect, therefore, we have a return in a different garb, in a different form, to the Belgians functioning in the Congo in all fields. The Belgian Government says that there is none of their officials there ; these are non-officials who go there. May be so, but many of the non-officials coming in thousands here were formerly recruited in Belgium and sent here. It is difficult for me to say how far the Belgian Government are responsible for that but certainly it acquiesces in it, it encourages it.

And all this jumble of circumstances has produced, therefore, an extraordinarily complicated and dangerous situation, dangerous for this reason. Internally dangerous it is and, of course, externally dangerous also because a number of countries in Africa and a number of countries outside Africa are not prepared to accept today the present state of affairs there, i.e. with Col. Mobutu functioning or the Belgians being there in large numbers. Some of them have done or are on the verge of recognising the Stanleyville

431

Government as the Government of the Congo, and meanwhile arms How in there for one side or the other from one country or the other. So, gradually the situation is becoming, as is said, something like the old spanish situation when the Spanish civil war took place thirty years ago or so. That is apparently the internal situation, contestants supported by big powers outside with arms and other kinds of help.

Now, that is a very bad outlook. Apart from this, the African countries concerned, many of whom have got their contingent of forces there-not all, but many of them-do not accept Col. Mobutu at all; they are in favour of Mr. Lumumba who is in prison. Some have withdrawn their forces, others may withdraw them later. And there are proposals to the effect that apart from the United Nations force, an African force should be constituted from various countries in Africa and they should go into action. Now, it is not clear to me what such a force can do in these

circumstances. Obviously, this force would not be under the United Nations. Therefore, it will be an independent force of some countries. It cannot represent any organisation like the United Nations. If such a force comes, it is inevitable that other forces will come in to oppose it from other countries. We have, therefore, not viewed it with favour, indeed we have been unable to understand what such a force can do.

We have felt all along that first of all in the circumstances in the Congo the United Nations coming in was desirable and almost inevitable; otherwise there would have been a civil war there; also, that after their coming in, they did not function with any effectiveness, maybe, their instructions were such-whatever they were-and outside powers went on intervening in various ways, throwing their weight about encouraging one side, some other power encouraging others, arms flowing in and the United Nations looking on rather helplessly. That was the position some months ago. It has not only continued but has become much worse now. Now there is the possibility of rival governments claiming authority over the Congo supported by great powers, one bloc supporting one and the other the other.

In spite of these difficulties and doubts in our mind, we have all along felt that if the United Nations fail in the Congo, it will be a disaster, not only for the Congo but for the world, and while we have criticised the activities of the United Nations and made various suggestions, we have also felt that we must go on supporting the United Nations and we have done so. The suggestions that we should withdraw our contingent, have not been approved by us. Our contingent, of course, is not of combat troops but they carry out certain services like signalling, supplies, transport and medical help but the fact remains that if the U.N. cannot effectively deal with the situation, it would fade away in the Congo and its reputation will continue to suffer. The fact remains that under present conditions, even our men or any country's men there, are frequently insulted and man-handled by the Congolese soldiery, under Col. Mobutu and there is a limit to what a country can put up with in that way.

We have put up, we shall put up, with many

difficulties that face us but I cannot guarantee if our people are not treated properly and given opportunities to do the work for which they were sent, the question does arise whether it is worthwhile keeping them or not. Normally we would have withdrawn them but we have hesitated and we hesitate to do so because it would mean really the collapse of the United Nations work there and that would mean almost inevitably not merely leaving the Congolese to fight it out among themselves but the intrusion of foreign powers with their troops and therefore war, not merely between the Congolese but among others too.

It has been a matter of great surprise to me how the obvious thing in this situation of convening the Congolese Parliament has been deliberately avoided, how that has been obstructed. I can understand the objection to this from those people like Col. Mobutu, who do not like it. Obviously he must have thought that if the Parliament comes in, his position would go but what has amazed me is that great powers should have come in the way and made excuses which are singularly inane, like "Oh I How the Congolese Members of Parliament will be able to attend ? Some may be stopped." These are excuses made to prevent it simply because,, obviously it was not felt desirable for- the Parliament to meet, the Congolese Parliament, and it was thought that if it met, the present authorities in the Congo might not be able to have the support of that Parliament There it is. I do not know what is going to happen. There are new proposals made by some of the great powers saying Yes, the Congolese Parliament should meet, ought to meet, as soon as the conditions are ready." Conditions apparently are not ready yet but as soon as they are ready, it might meet. That is one subject.

Then take Algeria which has been a continuing tragedy for the last eight years and the

432

sacrifice of the Algerian people has been amazing. It is really so. I do not know if there are any parallels in the history of a country, that big, parrying on such a war of independence year after year at enormous cost in life and other things. Now, recently, President de Gaulle went there and when he first went there, he had a rather fierce and violent reception from the Europeans there,

the Colons, chiefly French. That was checked. Immediately following that came the African reaction, the Algerian reaction, which was also big and rather violent but on a much bigger scale in regard to numbers. The French army surrounded these people apparently and shot them down in large numbers. This has created a tremendous impression, naturally, not only in Algeria, not only in Africa but elsewhere and the difficult situation which existed previously has become now almost impossible of solution in the existing circumstances.

General de Gaulle announced about a month ago or more that there would be a referendum in Algeria without giving details but for the first time he referred to an Algerian Republic linked to France by a treaty. Now at that time it was proposed to hold this referendum early in January ; part of it will be held in France itself and part in Algeria. It is not quite clear what the precise subjects will be on which votes will be taken but broadly it is said that it is on a policy of Algerian self-determination, broadly on what President de Gaulle. said was his policy of Algerian self-determination, connected with France and for the provisional establishment of a new governmental institution in Algeria, ensuring some degree of self-government pending the referendum. It was after this that President de Gaulle's visit came.

Now, recently, there has been a Resolution in the Political Committee of the U.N. which was fathered by a number of Afro-Asian countries including India. I think only this morning news came that this Resolution was passed by the Political Committee minus its last clause. It is not clear to me as to what has been passed. I Will not read the whole Resolution as it is rather long but as far as I understand, the part of the Resolution passed is this:

"Recognising the right of the Algerian people."

I am not reading the Preamble--

"...to self-determination and independence;

Recognising the imperative need for adequate and effective guarantees to ensure the successful and just implementation of the fight of self-

determination on the basis of respect for unity and territorial integrity of Algeria."

But the last part was:

"That a referendum should be conducted in Algeria organised, controlled and supervised by the U.N. wherein the Algerian people shall freely determine the destiny of the entire country."

As far as I have been able to find out last night, this last clause about referendum and control by the U.N. was not passed by the requisite majority. That is the position in Algeria. I am not using strong language but both the Congo and Algerian situations are exceedingly grave and behind this is the broad effect of all this in Africa and the possibility of great powers intervening in Africa in various ways. In Algeria one of the main complaints of the Algerian people's representatives has been not only against the French Government but against certain powers, the NATO Powers, who directly or indirectly support the French Government.

In Laos also, strange things have been happening recently and the Government of the day under Prince Souvanna Phouma was pushed out. Prince Souvanna Phouma himself became a refugee and at present General Phoumi is controlling Vientiane. During the last few days, specially for about 3 days, Vientiane city had a very very bad time. It was bad, it was much worse than organised violence. Both the parties were enjoying shooting and throwing rockets and other things, falling everywhere. There was no aim nothing. The whole city was in a state of part destruction and part panic. Telegraph communications were cut off and it was difficult for us to find out what was happening. It was only this morning that I got telegrams from Vientiane from our people dated 13th, 16th and 17th. They came in a bunch, a week late. Now apparently there is some kind of a lack of fighting and fighting has stopped in a big way, though petty fighting is going on, may be in the heart of the city. But the wives and children of our Embassy personnel have come away. First they came to Bangkok and then some of them have come to Delhi. The regular personnel, of course, remains there.

The trouble with Laos and indeed with all

these places has been the attempt of parties outside Laos to influence and to help with arms etc. the contesting parties in Laos. Considerable

433

quantities of arms have gone in. Now, the very basis of the Geneva Agreement affecting Indo-China was that these countries should be left to fashion themselves and that - they should not be drawn into the cold war and should not be helped, should not be pushed in any direction, that the only safety for the Indo-China countries was in some measure of neutrality, in keeping out of these military blocs. Unfortunately, however, this policy was not fully followed and repeatedly help has been given. Supplies have been given to one group or to the other and lately to both groups, of course by different countries. And so the very thing which the Geneva Conference was meant to prevent has now come into being. So long as the International Commission was there, of which India was Chairman, there was some check and it was not easy to do this publicly-privately they could do it-and so the situation, though bad, was being controlled. But our Commission, the Laos Commission, was withdrawn or suspended, you might say, and that check was removed. Ever since then, there has been a progressive deterioration there and it has landed us in the present position.

Two days ago I communicated with the two Co-Chairmen of the Geneva Conference, namely the Foreign Ministers of the United Kingdom and the Soviet Union, drawing their attention to this and saying that at least, the functioning of the Laos Commission might be of help. It cannot decide anything, but it might help somebody or some authority to check this kind of a thing happening. We strongly resisted the suspension of the Commission at that time. But then the Government of Laos insisted and so the great Powers supported them and so we had to come away. So we have again said that they should function there and in a sense, both the Governments concerned, that is to say, the United Kingdom and the Soviet Union, have accepted that as a principle and the U.K. Government only last night have stated that they are agreeable to this, but the authorities in Vientiane now have to agree before this can be done. I believe they have addressed them to this effect. Now, in Laos again, it becomes a little difficult to know who is

the government and who is a rebel. It is a choice of any country, we or the United Kingdom or the Soviet Union or the U.S.A. calling one set of people the government and the other rebels.

As a matter of fact, we have expressed ourselves fairly strongly for the last month or so in favour of Prince Souvanna Phouma who represents an attempt to keep Laos out of this cold war and in a more or less neutral position and to bring the warring parties together. We have been supporting him in so far as verbal declarations are concerned. And we still think that he would be the most suitable head of a government there. But at the present moment it appears that in Vientiane itself his opponents are in control.

There is one matter that I may refer to before I finish with Africa, and that is the recent events in Pondoland which is part of South Africa. Very little news has come about that but from what has come, it appears that the South African Government, the Union, Government, has crushed with great severity some of the agitation that was going on there against the government. But as news is suppressed, one does not know what happens. But it does show the state of affairs in South Africa.

As the House knows, our officials have been carrying on talks with Chinese officials about our conflicts and troubles on our frontiers. These talks ended a few days ago and only this morning our officials presented to me formally the joint report, as it is called. This joint report runs into, with its appendices and the rest, about 570 foolscap pages of typing. The minutes of their proceedings, the verbatim minutes, run roughly to some 3,000 pages and I have been presented with this report which is fairly thick, only this morning. And such a report has been sent, no doubt, to the Chinese Government.

I said not in this House, but in the other House, I think in August last that I would place the report before Parliament and I shall, of course, do so. But I do not know when. First of all, we have to examine these bulky documents. I mean both the Governments, and then decide when to do it. To some extent we have to function in this matter after reference to the Chinese Government. So I cannot, I am afraid, place it before the House immediately. We have

to examine it thoroughly and then consider later what possible steps might be taken.

Next I would like to say a word about Goa. Both because of internal developments and the developments in Africa, the question of Goa or rather of Portuguese colonial possessions, has become one of the urgent issues. We have little evidence of what is happening in the Portuguese possessions in Africa, but what we have shown that there the Portuguese Government has been treating the people there with great and rather brutal severity. These, of course, have their effect in Goa. Otherwise too. Internally itself- and I speak naturally moderately on the subject- I do not think that the present state of affairs in Goa, that is to say, Goa continuing under

434

Portuguese domination, can continue for long. I cannot fix a date, obviously. All these questions are so tied up with the world situation, with other powers, that we have preferred waiting and exercising some patience, even though it was often rather painful to do so. But we have always been clear in our minds that the freedom of India cannot be complete till Goa becomes part and parcel of India. Sometimes, the question is asked about Dadra and Nagar Haveli, as to why we do not include it in the Indian Union. There is no obstruction and there is no legal difficulty. It is merely a question of timing it properly and including it. In fact, indirectly we have been functioning there. They asked for officers and we have sent them competent officers and at "a suitable moment, they will be taken in because the people there certainly desire this.

Lastly, Six, I would like to say a few words about a recent event which no doubt has exercised all our minds, that is, what has happened in Nepal. Anyhow, if such an event had happened in any part of the world, it would be a matter of regret to us but happening in a country on our threshold, a country with which we have such intimate relations as with Nepal, it has been a matter of great concern to us. We have not at any time sought to interfere in Nepal in the last ten years or so since it gained its freedom from the old regime. We have helped them to the best of our ability. Even in the old days we had treaties with them which were renewed. It is not a question of any interference but we had close

relationship and were consulting each other when there was any danger from abroad, and that represents the actual position both for them and for us.

Apart from all these political and other aspects, our sympathies always go out to any country which is trying to gain freedom, as Nepal was ten years ago, or which wants to advance in the democratic way, and in regard to economic improvement we have been trying to help them to the best of our ability. We have got an Aid Mission there now. We helped them also in training their Army. We sent a Military Mission which did, I believe, a lot of very good work and which was much appreciated there. It has been reduced very greatly now. It is still there but the numbers are about a quarter or less of what they used to be before. We have built the big road connecting India with Kathmandu. So, our interest is inevitable.

When this news came to us, news of the Proclamation of the King, it was not in a sense a surprise. Nevertheless, it did come as a bit of a shock just at that time. I say it was not a surprise in the sense that we had been conscious of different pulls there and the possibility of something happening. The King and the Government were not working very harmoniously for months past, and yet, curiously enough, the latest reports as they came to us before this action of the King were that the Ministry and the King were working more harmoniously than before. I am not saying anything about our Ambassador's report-I am not referring to that-but what I am saying is from what the King himself had in the course of conversation and by his behaviour led people to believe. That was the impression there but that was a temporary thing no doubt.

Now, I have read-and the House must have read too-the Proclamation made by the King. The Proclamation refers to the failure of the Nepal Government and the Ministry to improve the administration and accuses them of corruption, crude economic theories and the rest. These are vague charges and it is difficult to say anything about a vague charge. Nobody can call any Government an ideal Government, more especially a Government in Nepal which has been fighting against very difficult conditions in the last ten years ever since various Governments came in.

May I say that right from the first day ten years ago when there was an upheaval against the old Rana regime, the previous King made it clear that he was working for, and he wanted to establish, a democratic system of Government. Difficulties came in ; Governments were formed and dismissed and all that and there were fairly big periods of King's rule without any other Government. Even then it was made clear that that was a preparation or an interval before going back to democracy and we were happy when the present King announced a constitution and later followed it up by elections. In the elections, the Nepal Congress Party got a very big majority and they have functioned since then. It is not for me to judge of their functioning but it is fairly easy to find faults. They had a tremendous task and, I believe, the impression we had generally was that for the first time Nepal had some ordered Government which was trying to do its best to improve things. Whether they succeeded much or not is another matter.

I do not know what reasons lay behind What the King has said in his Proclamation because they are vague charges. There is reference, as I said, to crude economic theories. The only economic step that they were trying to take, so far as I know, was in regard to land. Land in Nepal

435

in the past had been held by a very few people, and I believe that they have hardly paid any taxes on it. It was free there, birta land. This was an attempt to have a somewhat better, what I consider very moderate, land laws or a taxation system on land. I do not know if this was the case. They passed some kind of a Bill, not passed it; they proposed it or they passed it in the Parliament there but it has been for a long time past with the King awaiting his approval. It has not been passed regularly. I do not know whether this kind of economic advance was considered by the King as a crude method of dealing with these problems. Anyhow, the basic fact remains that this is not a question of pushing out a Government even though it has a big majority. This is a complete reversal of democracy, the democratic process, and it is not clear to me that there can be a going back to the democratic process in the foreseeable future. That is the main thing and naturally one views such a development with considerable regret.

One thing I may mention. Some people have criticised our Ambassador being away from Kathmandu that day. As a matter of fact, General Thimayya had been invited to go to Nepal. General Thimayya had been offered a decoration; we did not agree to this but we did agree to a second proposal that he might be made an Honorary General of the Nepalese Army. So the decoration was not taken but he went there to accept this Honorary Generalship. He got there on the 8th December. On the 13th he was given this Honorary Generalship at a ceremony.

On the 14th he was invited and our Ambassador was also invited by the Commander-in-Chief of Nepal for a shikar in the foot-bills. They both went. The Commander-in-Chief did not accompany them because he fell ill. He had fever that evening; so he remained behind although these people went as his guests. This was on the 14th. On the 15th the King assumed full powers and issued this Proclamation and all that. That was on the very next day. And immediately our Ambassador and General Thimayya returned from where they were on the 16th morning. They were in a rather remote place and General Thimayya returned to India.

Another interesting feature is that at this time when the King took this step most of the Ambassadors were not in Kathmandu. There are not too many Ambassadors there. There is the Soviet, there is the American, there is the British and all of them were away, gone a few days before, somebody on leave, somebody for some purpose or other. Now, the first step was this coup to arrest the Prime Minister and his colleagues. As a matter of fact the broadcast of Proclamation came some hours later.

Another thing I might mention, Sir, and that is the French Government's proposal for another nuclear test, atomic test, in the Sahara, and the announcement that has been made that some form of nuclear arms are going to be supplied probably to the NATO Armies. So while we discuss disarmament and other proposals, actually this frightful race for arming and nuclear arms goes on and disarmament is still being discussed rather academically and without much result. In a sense all these questions that confront us are linked in some way or other with this question of disarmament and it would be a most dan-

gerous disastrous thing if all efforts to bring about disarmament failed and we went on inevitably to world disaster.

One fact which one must welcome is the Resolution passed recently by the United Nations on Colonialism. It is a good Resolution and I have no doubt that it will have some effect. In spite of all delays and obstructions I have no doubt that a world opinion is being built up which would make it more and more difficult for any colonies to continue.

USA CONGO ALGERIA LAOS ETHIOPIA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC BELGIUM FALKLAND ISLANDS FRANCE INDIA SWITZERLAND CHINA UNITED KINGDOM SOUTH AFRICA NEPAL

Date : Dec 01, 1960

Volume No

1995

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

Prime Minister's Reply to Rajya Sabha Debate on Foreign Affairs

Replying to the debate on foreign affairs in the Rajya Sabha on December 21, 1960, the Prime Minister, Shri Jawaharlal Nehru, said:

Mr. Chairman, Sir, Shri Ganga Sharan Sinha in the course of his speech yesterday pointed out that these discussions and these Resolutions that we have tend to become mechanical and not connected with any immediate issue. I think that that criticism is justified. In fact, yesterday I myself pointed out that I was not satisfied with the wording of the Resolution which I was putting before the House. There was nothing wrong in it but it just seemed rather stale. It would, I think, be a better practice if we could take up any important event that happens and I make a statement or there is a brief discussion instead of this wide range of the entire world that we consider from time to time. I would like to do it but there are difficulties in the way. I do make statements when something happens

but something is happening every day; Sir,

436

I can hardly go on making a statement about some foreign development every day or every other day. So I only come here when there is some particular information which has not appeared in the papers which I think the House should know or some particular development to which I want particularly to draw the attention of the House.

Now, Sir, in the course of the debate yesterday Hon. Members said many things which either more or less agreed with the broad policies we have adopted or made some suggestions which did not affect the basis of that policy. Dr. Kunzru asked certain questions. I am sorry I was not present here for many of these speeches because I was unfortunately engaged with a Bill in the other House but I have taken the trouble to read the record of most of the speeches delivered here. Now, Dr. Kunzru asked me various questions. One of them was what I meant by saying that there should be three Deputy Secretaries or Assistant Secretaries in the U.N. I did not make any precise proposal; I had thrown out an idea but I had laid stress even then that the post of the Secretary-General could not be divided up into three because I could not conceive of any joint functioning, any effective functioning, if there were three heads of this great institution, but I thought that it might be helpful if we had some others—in my mind there was vaguely the idea of a small cabinet if you like; it is a bad word; I did not mean a cabinet but some people—associated with the Secretary-General who could bring to bear on his mind the reactions, the thinking, of the various parts of the world.

This House may remember that the whole concept of the United Nations when it started at San Francisco 15 years ago was to take the world as it is, with its conflicts, with its differences, and help bring them together. The idea of unanimity in the Security Council in regard to the five permanent members was based on this. It was realised that the five permanent members differed from each other, some of them very greatly. It was realised that it was not possible in the world as it is for some of the great powers, let us say, to condemn by Resolution another great power, because that meant war. One great power may

be condemnable. It is a different matter. But if the United Nations, at the instance of one or two great powers, puts in the dock the other great powers, the result is likely to be conflict. Therefore, it was laid down in the Charter something that is not democratic, that is not in a sense logical, but nevertheless it was a practical recognition of the world as it was and as it is—what is called the veto principle. 'Veto,' of course, is not technically a right word. The principle is unanimity of the five Powers, and yet if one of them does not vote, it can be called a veto.

So, it was this recognition and you apply that to the general working of the United Nations. The United Nations breaks up if there are two strong pulls in different directions among the great powers. You can put up with pulls so far as the smaller countries are concerned. But if there are strong pulls from the great powers, let us say, the United States and the Soviet Union, absolutely opposing pulls in regard to important matters, and neither will agree to some common enunciation of policy, well, they break, and that is why danger. We have been living through this period of difficulty and danger because such pulls are getting more and more acute and one does not know when they might break. It is rather a secondary matter, if I may say so, as to who is in the right and who is in the wrong. Of course, it is basically important. Nevertheless, it is secondary in the sense that if something leads to that break, and therefore it upsets the whole United Nations functioning, it is a very serious matter.

Now, we have come up, in the course of the last six, seven or eight months, against these powerful pulls in every direction. Whether it was coming out of the last attempted Summit Conference, which upset so many things or what happened just before and subsequently, or the African situation, the Congo situation, everything today is producing these tremendous pulls in different directions which are not easy to reconcile and therein lies the danger. Now, it may be that some Hon. Members may be quite convinced that this party is right and some may be convinced that the other party is right. It may be so. But if they cannot reconcile themselves, well, it ends in danger or even disaster. That is the whole point.

Now, how is the United Nations to function

in such circumstances? On the one hand, as I said, you cannot have a great organization like this without a head or with three heads. I do not think three heads can function. On the other hand, there is this risk and danger of this aspect, the picture of the pulls among the nations in the world not coming up adequately before the head of that organisation, except through resolutions of the General Assembly, etc. That is a different thing. Therefore, it seems important that some steps should be taken by them to tighten the burden of administration and to create conditions so that these various aspects are fully considered before a decision is made. The decision ultimately has to be made, in so far as executive action is

437

concerned, by the Secretary-General or by the Security Council. As a matter of fact, before Mr. Hammarskjöld became Secretary-General, to some extent that was the policy of the organisation in the U.N. under Mr. Trygve Lie. He had Assistant Secretaries-General. The names do not matter. What matters is the quality of the persons there. There are risks whether you call them Deputy or Assistant Secretaries-General, and they come with fixed ideas from a fixed group to hold on to them, and not at all inclined to agree, to compromise and the same difficulties would arise. These difficulties are in the nature of the situation itself that we have to face. I was pointing out that the way it is done at present is not very satisfactory, that is, at the top levels of the U.N., apart from the Secretary-General. I was pointing out that and there is a tendency for these aspects not to be brought up properly, apart from these heated discussions in the U.N., and some methods should be found to have those aspects discussed before they are subjected to those heated alterations in the General Assembly. In the early days, as I was pointing out, there was some such thing-not allocation of work and all that. There was this to some extent, which sometimes helps, not always.

Then, a point at the present moment is this. Apart from the inner dangers in the Congo situation, the real dangers, whether it is the Congo or whether it is Laos, a rise from this fact of the clash between the great powers there. And the local leaders or whatever they are-they may be important or not-really become symbols of this great power struggle. Take Laos. In Laos,

broadly speaking, there were three groups. which are referred to in rather colloquial language as rightists and leftists and somebody in between. The Prime Minister, Prince Souvanna Phouma, was a little while ago there and he tried to follow a policy of having some kind of Government with representatives from each side. It is not for me to say whether his Government was a good Government or a bad Government. But the attempt was 'to resolve these conflicts there by constituting a Government following a middle-of-the-road policy, without inclining to any military group. Now on the other side, there was the Pathet-Lao, backed up to a large extent by the North Viet-Nam Government, which is a Communist Government. Pathet-Lao is no Communist, but it has Communists in it and it is an extreme nationalist force with a considerable affiliation with the Communists of the North.

On the other hand, there are the other groups which are called, shall I say, not precisely, rightists, whatever that might mean. Now, in this context of things, the Communist powers of the North are interested and would like Pathet Lao to be represented-that is nearer to them-while the United States especially and maybe other powers are anxious that the rightist group should prevail. That is the essential conflict and it is to avoid that conflict the Geneva Conference passed some resolution that Laos and Cambodia should not attach themselves to any military grouping like this and broadly follow a neutral policy. These pulls are there all the time. Now, what has happened is that ever since the Supervisory Commission went to sleep there or was made to adjourn indefinitely, one check on these different pulls was removed. Of course the Commission could not do very much by itself, but its mere presence was a check, and sometimes it was disliked by even outside powers-"It is there and comes in our way". Ultimately the then Laotian, Government asked the Commission to disband itself. We did not agree to this proposition that the Laotian Commission could do so, because we were there, the Commission was there under the authority of the Geneva Conference. Nevertheless if the local Government says "no", it is difficult for any Commission to function, and we agreed not to its ending but to its indefinite adjournment, to be called- back at any time when needed. Also one of the members of the Commission, the Canadian member, was withdrawn by the

Canadian Government.

As soon as the Commission went out of functioning these different pulls became stronger and stronger and gradually, apart from the internal pulls, arms began to flow in from outside. It is difficult to say who started this business of giving arms, because it is easier for Pathet Lao to get arms without any fuss because it is an adjoining territory. Arms coming for the other side, say, from the United States, have to come much more publicly, and they did come publicly, and they went on coming, there is no doubt about it, and because of objections being taken, of the public outcry, it was announced that the United States Government would stop sending. Stop when? On the 30th November, last month. That is of course after a great deal had come in. In today's newspapers it is announced that the United States Government have decided to renew supply of military and other aids to the Laotian Government. All these are disturbing factors.

I cannot tell the House what arms are coming on the other side to the so-called leftists, but I have no doubt they have come in. When precisely, what, I cannot say. They have come, so that you find this situation arising that great powers are helping the local contestants for power. When

438

great power prestige is involved, then the thing may grow, more and more arms may come and there may be more and more fighting.

Naturally a situation to avoid which the whole Geneva Conference came to decisions is being built up. We have suggested that this Commission should meet again, and Dr. Kunzru rightly asked what it could do. I do not know what it can do, and it may not be able to do very much, but its mere presence is some check, because it becomes a symbol of the world community, of the eyes of the world looking on, and there is some check. Of course it cannot do very much by itself. Some days ago, maybe a month or so ago, speaking in this House or in the other House I think, I expressed my earnest desire that the Government should not be attacked, should be encouraged to function, that is Souvanna Phouma's Government, and I still think that the only future safety for Laos is not to adopt extreme courses, and Prince Souvanna Phouma represented

that policy. Unfortunately that could not be done, and we have arrived at the stage when a few days back more or less a change-over took place in the City of Vientiane after a severe battle, not battle, that would not be correct, but after a severe killing-"There is no harm in killing just right and left anybody who came in the way".

Now a strange doctrine has arisen of the interpretation of law, about the legal Government. We have seen that applied in the Congo. We see that in Laos. That is, something happens illegally and that is given the cover of law; then you are helping the law. Ten days ago there was one Government in Vientiane. Four or five days later some forces came and captured Vientiane. Immediately after they are referred to as the legal Government. Now that is a very dangerous way of dealing with Governments. That is, any strong body of soldiers can upset a Government, and then that body has all the clothings of law, vestiges of law as though that is a legal Government. Another party may say that somebody who holds out is a legal Government. I do not think it is a fair way of dealing with such situations.

Take the Congo. The question was raised about the legal issues, issues of the interpretation of the fundamental law governing the Congolese Constitution. Who is the legal authority? Is Prime Minister Lumumba-Prime Minister he was-the legal authority or President Kasavubu Dr Col. Mobutu or somebody in Stanleyville or somebody in Katanga ? Well, lawyers can argue about these matters, but as far as we could see it seemed to us that President Kasavubu certainly had the garb of law. He was selected as the President. Also although Mr. Lumumba is not functioning, he is in prison, no step has been taken legally to remove him from his position of Prime Minister in law. But it is true that in actual practice he has not functioned as such for a long time, for some months. Now he is in prison. Before that he was in some kind of detention. So you can take any view you like. You can say that strictly in law he is Prime Minister. You may say that events have happened due to which he has ceased to be Prime Minister. But whatever the strict legal approach, would be, the fact is that there are these personalities in the Congo representing sometimes tribal people, who are declared a tribe, sometimes areas, and if one wants peace in the Congo, they have to co-operate, all of them.

If each one tries to crush the other and put an end to him, well, there is just a civil war on a big scale.

Soon after the United Nations went to the Congo when they were invited, a chance arose when possibly this might have been done, bringing them together. In fact the very election of the Prime Minister and the President was an act of trying to bring them together, Mr. Kasavubu and Mr. Lumumba, who represented different areas and different tribes and to some extent perhaps different views. Nevertheless the Parliament there selected them because it wanted them to pull together, because as I was told frequently by the African States apart from the Congo that the only hope for the Congo was for Mr. Kasavubu and Mr. Lumumba to pull together. I do not know either of these gentlemen, I cannot say, but one must remember this. If one tries to liquidate the other, the Congo first of all splits out into numerous parts, and secondly, the civil war continues, whatever that may be. That would have been had enough. But when outside powers come into the picture and encourage one group against the other, then obviously the difficulties are infinitely greater. That is what happened there. Outside powers—to some extent, even African powers and powers outside Africa—were constantly intervening and manoeuvring to encourage one of them to push out the other. Ambassadors there—there are ambassadors of many countries there—were very much outside the range of an ambassador and they were indulging in these efforts to encourage one party or discourage the other. It is difficult for me to understand this and I do not wish to mention names. But the whole place, Leopoldville, was an arena of ambassadorial pulls and pressures. And then the matter came up before the United Nations—it was coming up constantly—and, as I said yesterday, in this situation it seems to me that the only way is to go ahead and have the Parliament. It seems to me so obvious, so patent. Otherwise, you might

439

all pick and choose. If they want to have Mr. Lumumba, let them have him; if they do not want him let them push him out. If they want Mr. Kasavubu or even if they want Col. Mobutu, gallant Mobutu, let them have him.

So far as I am concerned, it is none of my business to push anyone out. But the curious

part was that many big and small powers constantly went on resisting the idea of the Parliament meeting. It is very extraordinary, and I have as yet been unable to understand how these great powers went on- resisting this obvious way and for the most trivial of reasons. Now, for the first time, it is being said on behalf of the United States and the United Kingdom that Parliament should meet sometime in future and that President Kasavubu should be helped to bring about conditions for the Parliament to meet. It is rather a roundabout way when one knows that President Kasavubu has no desire for the Parliament to meet.

There are two or three things that stand out in my mind. One is this constant attempt to prevent Parliament from meeting. The second is, here was the representative of the United Nations, Mr. Rajeshwar Dayal, who presented a report to the Secretary-General, which was placed before the General Assembly and which Hon. Members must have seen-it was distributed here. Here was a carefully drafted objective account by a person who ought to know, and it was a strong indictment of many things, more especially of Belgian activities there, how they came back in spite of the Resolution of the Security Council. And he stated in that report that these Belgians came back and were deliberately obstructing and coming in the way of the activities of the United Nations there, physically coming in their way and creating an atmosphere against them and inciting the Congolese to go against them from their base in Katanga especially. But you will notice that that Mr. Tshombe of the Katanga Province is there. Of course, the whole of Katanga is being run by the Belgians, both in the military sense by the Belgian commanders and, of course, in the governmental and other sense. But even in Leopoldville, these Commissioners-General and Col. Mobutu, all of them. have Belgians surrounding them, Belgian advisers and Belgian experts.

Without possessing an intimate and deep knowledge, it is obvious that it is the Belgians that are running all these things and their nominees whom they are supporting are coming in the way of the United Nations properly functioning there. That has been the position and it has been growing. But somebody asked me, "You say so much about the Belgians in the course of the debate. What about the other powers? That is a pertinent question because even Belgium would not have followed that policy unless it was

encouraged or at any rate other powers put up with it. I have no doubt at all that if the big powers had said "No", Belgium could not have followed it; it does not require war for that. Whether this was the NATO link, or whatever the link might be, the fact is that these great powers encouraged them, encouraged the people in the Congo which were supported by the Belgians. See the chain of events.

I am not for a moment saying that the supporters of Mr. Lumumba are free from blame or guilt. They have also indulged in various manœuvres and the like. But who am I to suggest this? The main point is this that in the situation as it is in the Congo, the only safe way out is its Parliament meeting and deciding and the function of the United Nations, I think should be to see that Parliament meets and to see to it, if I may use strong terms, even by using their force, if necessary, that is to use force against those who prevent people from coming to Parliament. Now that involves inevitably the release of political prisoners, the release of not only Mr. Lumumba but others, that is Deputies of Parliament. Leave out for the moment other political prisoners; Members of Parliament must be released. Otherwise, some people might be in prison and you cannot call a meeting of the rump as a meeting of Parliament. Somebody asked in the course of his speech yesterday, "Why do you talk about the release of Mr. Lumumba and not other Deputies?" Well, it is for the obvious reason that his name is known. He was Prime Minister. He is the leader of a group. But the demand for the release of political prisoners applies, certainly to all the Deputies, to all the Members of Parliament, and may be others too. I see no other way.

Now, an attempt has been made, first of all, by various steps to give legality, a cover of legality, to the present regime of the Commissioners, etc. and to Col. Mobutu too. Again, you see an illegal act, an essentially illegal act, that is the coup'd etat of Col. Mobutu, gets a legal cover step by step directly and indirectly through President Kasavubu. Now; President Kasavubu and Col. Mobutu sometimes cooperate, sometimes oppose each other. It is not as if President Kasavubu controls Col. Mobutu. When they oppose Mr. Lumumba they hold together. As soon as something happens, then they oppose each other.

So, in this confused situation, two Resolutions were placed before the General Assembly,

440

and as you might have seen or read in the papers this morning, neither of Resolutions could be passed. One was defeated and the other did not get the two-thirds majority. Now I do not propose to read out those two Resolutions to you; they are long ones. But I would like to refer to them briefly. The Resolution moved on behalf of some Afro Asian countries plus Yugoslavia said, first of all, after the Preamble--

"Conscious of the inescapable and urgent responsibility of the United Nations both in the interests of the Congo as well as in the interests of peace and security which stand endangered and for the avoidance of the grave civil war, considers.

That the United Nations henceforth implement its mandate full to prevent the breach of peace and security, to restore and maintain law and order and the inviolability of persons including the United Nations and diplomatic personnel and property in accordance with the Charter and to take urgent measures to assist the people of the Congo in meeting their most pressing economic needs;

Urges the immediate release of all political prisoners under detention, more particularly members of the Central Government of the Congo and the officials of Parliament and others enjoying Parliamentary immunity;

Urges the immediate convening of Parliament and the taking of necessary protective measures thereto by the United Nations including custodian duty;

Urges that measures be undertaken forthwith to prevent armed units and personnel in the Congo from any interference in the political life of the country as well as from obtaining any material or other support from abroad;

Draws the attention of the Government of Belgium to its grave responsibility in disregarding the resolution of the United Nations;

Demands that all Belgian military and quasi-military personnel, advisers and technicians be immediately withdrawn in pursuance of the Resolution of the United Nations and the repeated pledges and assurances given by 'the' Government of Belgium in the interests of peace and security."

It was this Resolution that was moved by India, I think. Anyhow, India was one of the sponsors of this Resolution which has now been defeated. The other Resolution was the one supported by the U.S.A. and the U.K., which failed to get a two-thirds majority, and if one reads it hurriedly, to some extent one gets the impression that it is an attempt to approach the other Resolution-the Afro-Asian Resolution-but really there is a very great deal of difference. I do not think I should read the whole of it-it occupies a few pages-but this is the paragraph which I shall read. After saying that peace and order should reign there, etc , etc., the paragraph reads:

"Calls upon all States to refrain from direct and indirect provisions of arms or other materials of war and military personnel and other assistance for military purposes.

Requests the Secretary-General with due regard to paragraph 4 of the Security Council. Resolution on 9th August to do everything possible to assist the Chief of State of the Republic of the Congo in establishing conditions in which Parliament can meet and function in security and freedom from outside interference."

This is the reference I said; this slight move forward by the U.S.A. and the UK. towards a meeting of Parliament, but such a roundabout way of referring the thing back really to the Chief of State does not go very far.

"Declares that any violation of

Human Rights in the Republic of the Congo is in consistent with the purposes that guide the United Nations" etc. etc.

so that the Secretary-General has to assist the Republic of the Congo in ensuring respect for these rules and for civil and human rights of all persons within the country.

"Expresses the hope that the International Committee of the Red Cross will be allowed to examine detained persons throughout the Republic.

Expresses the hope that the forthcoming round table conference to be convened by the Chief of State, and the

441

forthcoming visit, for the purpose of conciliation, to the Republic of the Congo by certain representatives appointed by the Advisory Committee will help to resolve internal conflicts."

It is a two-and-a-half page Resolution which contains a number of pious hopes but contains nothing you can get a hold of and which again comes up against the same difficulty which has been pursuing the United Nations work in the Congo, which is tying up the hands of the Secretary-General as to what he can do and what he cannot do. This has pursued him almost right from the beginning.

Originally, when the Security Council passed these Resolutions, this point was not so obvious, because it was taken for granted that they were sending 20,000 or 22,000 troops there to do something. Now it appears that their chief duty there is to protect themselves--an extraordinary position-in self-defence. "Self-defence" are the actual words used. That is to say, they can do many other duties of course, peaceful duties; they can do other duties which non-soldiers could have done, but where it is a question of any conflict, they must not indulge in any step in prevention or other except in self-defence. Now surely in the matter of self-defence, for which alone they might take steps there, they need not have gone there for this purpose; they could have remained in their home countries; they would have been completely safe. and the question of self-defence

would not have arisen. But they were sent there to help, not to interfere, not to encourage any conflict, but surely, sometimes, when the need for it arose. to prevent wrong-doing. But cases have occurred repeatedly where the Congolese forces under Col. Mobutu have been functioning with great brutality, and the United Nations forces have looked on very angrily being banned even to rescue the people who were being brutally man-handled or killed, because of the strict orders that they can only use force in self-defence. Now this is a very extraordinary position and this position has become a little worse and worse.

Previously if the House may remember, one of the chief things that the U.N. Representative, Mr. Dayal, did was where he had sought to control the so-called Congolese Army, because that was let loose everywhere. They used to indulge in loot, arson, rape, anything, and repeatedly Shri Rajeshwar Dayal reported to the U.N. that this must be controlled. Gradually this control grew and ultimately the Congolese Army was asked to march out of Leopoldville, the capital-to go outside. They did go. That is, the United Nations force was functioning to some extent by its prestige. They did not effect this by armed force, but it came about because of the fact that their armed force was there and of the fear that it might be used. So they were sent out-out of Leopoldville.

Now I do not know what happened after that, but a little while later, some weeks later, a couple of weeks or two or three weeks later came the United Nations Day, which we observed here too, and naturally the U.N. Representative in the Congo decided to observe the United Nations Day. There were the United Nations forces there. So there was parade, etc. At that time Col. Mobutu was permitted to bring his troops--the Congolese troops--back to Leopoldville to join in this parade. I think it was a very very wrong step to take after they had been gradually, peacefully pushed out. Well, they were back; since then they have been there, very much there, and in fact aggressively there. Now why have they been there in various fields? And in all these matters a great deal has depended on the attitudes of great powers and their representatives there, because they are powerful representatives representing powerful nations.

But I do not know what happened. But one

thing did happen which is public knowledge. Just at that time the question of a U.N. delegation going there-the Afro-Asian delegation-had arisen, and it had been decided after much difficulty as to who was to go. Now it was a 15-member delegation, and they were on the point of booking their passages and all that, and it was decided by the General Assembly of the U.N. not to consider the question of the Congo till the return of the U.N. Delegation and the presentation of their report. That was decided. Now, within four or five days of this decision, in fact the Congo question was brought before the General Assembly in a different way. The way was whether to recognise, whether to allow President Kasavubu to represent the Congo in the United Nations or not.

Now I am saying that President Kasavubu-whatever else has happened-certainly has been a permanent factor and I believe, strictly in law, he is the President, is the Head of the State. But the Head of the State has got limited functions; he cannot do everything for the State when the State itself was in trouble for which the State sought the assistance of the United Nations ; it is a question of the functions of the President, and Kasavubu was a matter in dispute in the circumstances. However, President Kasavubu came. Then there was in the United Nations a period of hectic activity, hectic activity, pressures, all kinds of inducements, etc. etc, Normally it is not

442

necessary whether he was put there or not. I do not quite understand how all that was happening. Ultimately, most of the African countries were opposed to it. But quite apart from this, the attitude taken up by the Afro-Asian countries as a whole was : "We have just decided not to discuss the Congo for a short time till our delegation comes back ; wait till then". Why ? I think it was right attitude. However, the General Assembly decided in favour of accepting President Kasavubu in the Assembly as the Congolese delegation.

There was no harm in it as such, but in the peculiar circumstances of the Congo, with these claimants for power and with the United Nations itself struggling to exercise its authority somehow against the Congolese army, against the civilians, this particular incident shifted the balance of power psychologically and practically in the Congo

suddenly. The United Nations forces became very ineffective because now it is said that the General Assembly has recognised President Kasavubu ; he is the authority there and because he, for the moment, favours Col. Mobutu, therefore, he (Col. Mobutu) is also a legal authority even though he might have come in through illegal methods. So, all this centre of gravity of the situation changed because of that.

You will find another thing. Just before that, a little before was this poor Report presented by Ambassador Dayal, the U.N, Representative, in which he had pointed out what the Belgians had done, what Col. Mobutu and the Congolese army had done. Suddenly, this is hidden away, put away somewhere. Here is the most important report about the Congo from an apparently impartial, objective authority. It does not come up for discussion. It is just pushed away and generally it is said "O, yes. It is a difficult situation. We must not be hard on Belgium and we must not be hard on so and so".

If you look at the whole context of events, how by gradual pressures a situation has been created in the Congo which we now have to face, which was on the way to gradual solution if the Belgians had withdrawn if, the Congolese Army had been kept out, the U.N. Force could have functioned there but they have been put in a most difficult position. They have been humiliated after and they have to watch humiliating spectacles and they cannot do anything.

At the back of this, a large number of African countries have been infuriated by all this. I am not defending the African countries in regard to what they might have or might not have done, but the patent fact is that many of them, not all-in fact, the only countries that did nothing in this business are the- ex-French colonies, they stand apart ; they sympathise. Perhaps, it is not very wrong for me to say that they are tied up to some extent still, in their foreign policy to their parent colonial power. So, it is difficult for them to line up with others, but most of the African countries are angry at the personal insults often given to their Ambassadors or to them and, generally, at the turn of events. They started withdrawing their forces from there. Ghana has withdrawn, the U.A.R. has withdrawn, Yugoslavia, not an

African country, has withdrawn and-I forgot Ceylon-Ceylon has withdrawn. Ceylon of course, did not have many-it had a token, may be a dozen persons ; it is immaterial. There are several others on the point of withdrawing. About Morocco, I am not quite sure.

This produced an extraordinary position that the very countries which have supplied forces there are withdrawing. The people who voted, the people who voted for the United Nations action there to continue, are people-let us say, the people in South America, a large number of them voted, 22 or 21 of them or whatever their number-who have no responsibility. They have no forces there. They have, of course, responsibility as members of the United Nations ; otherwise, the people who are most intimately concerned with Africa-other people, certainly Asia, certainly Europe and essentially the people of Africa-except outwardly the French ex-colonies, broadly speaking, are opposed to what is happening there.

Now, we hear that the Orientale province has declared a separate Government, not for itself but for the whole of the Congo. It is quite possible now that the great powers will pour in their arms and materials, some in favour of Leopoldville authorities now, some in favour of Stanleyville authorities, and that is what is called a reversion of what happened many years ago in Spain, that is local conflicts being backed by great powers, with a big difference today because big powers are much bigger, more powerful today, arms are more powerful, everything is more powerful and we live in a state of extreme world tension. So, all this is happening, whether it is in Laos or whether it is happening in the Congo, at a time when the world is suffering from extreme world tension between these great powers and the situation has been progressively deteriorating. That is very relevant because if the situation had Not been so bad, it would have been-much easier to handle it.

443

Now, we have this triple aspect of this situation there in the Congo. One is the internal conflicts between the tribal leaders, each of them with some authority in his own region. There is the conflict as between the African countries, inter se, to some extent and in their relations in

the situation in the Congo, and there is the conflict of the great powers coming into the picture and trying to influence this group of that group. And, finally, there are the Belgian authorities who, after going away, have come back with greater assurance than ever and are supported by some of the great powers. Naturally, India cannot do very much. When one cannot do very much positively, one tries to avoid doing something bad negatively. We hold on there; we do not want to come away, because we realise that India's coming away will give a tremendous shock to the United Nations functioning in the Congo.

As it is, it is becoming difficult because of the withdrawal of these people and for financial reasons and the rest. So, we stood on and we hope to stay on because we attach great importance to the work of the United Nations. Even though it may make mistakes, it is basically the only organisation that can, in theory or in practice, deal with such a situation. If we break with the United Nations on this, then I am afraid, the chances of continuing peace in the world would be very strictly limited. So we are there.

An Hon. Member--I think it was Mr. Ganga Sharan Sinha--referred to India's well, very good not playing an important part in these world affairs. I am surprised to read this because the usual complaint made is that India throws its weight about elsewhere. The fact of the matter is, no country, big or small, can be isolated and can refrain from doing its job in the world today. Our entire approach always has been not to get entangled in foreign problems but at the same time not to run away from some duty cast upon us by circumstances or otherwise. So we follow that here. As a matter of fact, I should have thought that Hon. members of this House knew that what India says, without arms and without money, counts a great deal in the world and influences other countries. They seek our advice--I do not mean to say that they always follow it because our advice is always one which neither group likes and so we may be --lightly unpopular--but we are respected all round and what we say counts. It is difficult for --e here to reproduce the atmosphere of the United Nations in regard to the Congo because that atmosphere, even when I was there, was tense, exceedingly so, was angry and since I have

come away, all these developments have taken place and it has grown infinitely worse. People are infuriated against each other.

Now in such circumstances, for a country like India, naturally, it is difficult to function helpfully. We do not wish to be swept, by a gust of passion, into doing something which, even though it might be justified, does not help in the situation. On the other hand, when a situation is deteriorating, one has to say things forcefully and forcibly as to what should be done. We speak gently usually. but sometimes we have to express ourselves with force and that is what has been happening and broadly speaking, some of these resolutions which we sponsored, are resolutions which, with a considerable effort on our part and after friendly consultations, we have tried to tone down, that is, from what some of our colleagues of other nations would like them to be, because they are angry and there is reason for their anger but anger is not a good guide anyhow. The series of developments there have angered the African countries. Now they expressed their anger in much stronger terms than we are used to and they demanded many measures which perhaps, we think, are not feasible. So, always our attempt is to put forward some thing that we think might avoid this element of anger as much as possible and be feasible and possible of giving effect to.

There is no doubt that our broad attitude is in favour of this afro-Asian approach. That does not mean that we agree with everything they say because sometimes, as I pointed out yesterday, in connection with the formation of an all-African force or something like that, we have been unable to understand to accept. I do not understand it because that can only mean pushing out the U.N. and once you push it out, then it would not be the all-African force that function there by itself. That means the great powers directly functioning there and then all kinds of other difficulties will arise.

I think Dr. Kunzru, in the course of his speech, referred to the speech delivered by our Defence Minister, who is the Leader of the Indian Delegation there. I presume it was the speech that was reported three days ago with big headlines, when he said something to the U.N.

people like "You must either govern or quit or get out" probably. I was rather surprised, listening to Mr. Santhanam's speech yesterday, that even Mr. Santhanam gave expression to some such sentiments, not exactly in the same language. It is a thing which one can understand,

444

whether the Defence Minister says it or Mr. Santhanam says it. That is a forceful way of saying that the U.N. must function there and not be helpless spectators. His argument is-which may be correct in law or not-that the authority given to the U.N. by the Security Council was adequate, if correctly interpreted, for them to take many steps which they should have taken.

The fact of the matter is that the Security Council Resolutions are drafted in the grand manner of the U.N. but they have a remarkable way of being interpreted in many ways. They are not clear. Logically it is clear to me, apart from the Resolution, that you send 20,000 people to do something, not for self-defence which has no meaning to me. but practically the Resolutions are vague and people have taken shelter under that and advance the theory that the U.N. forces should not interfere. I have not seen Mr. Krishna Menon's speech as the full report of his speech has not come but I read carefully, after hearing Dr. Kunzru, through the speech as in the newspapers. Apart from the fact that it is strongly expressed, what he says has been our policy throughout and is our policy today. I just do not understand how we can get out of this dilemma, unless the U.N. people there are permitted to function where it is necessary. That does not mean interfering in everything. Take for instance this. If we take that there should be a meeting of the Congolese Parliament, well. it should be the function of the U.N. Force to see that it meets, that is to see that people are not prevented from coming to it.

I think that-I would repeat this-throughout this period, of the many documents and papers and speeches that have come out, the one document which is of solid importance is Ambassador Dayal's Second Report about the conditions then. Lost of our troubles have arisen there because, for reasons which I may guess at, this report is not allowed to come up for discussion anywhere. It has just been pushed

away. It is a most extraordinary thing for me to understand. Thus, that mere act of pushing it away has reduced the authority of the representative of the U.N. there. He reports, he wants certain things done and nobody listens to him. In fact, people whispered that something exactly the opposite to what he says should be done. How can the U.N. function there with authority when some of the major sponsors at the U.N. disown their own representative's report ?

An Hon'ble Member referred to a speech I delivered at Bombay. According to him, I said "Goa will become free when African territories of Portugal became free". That, of course, is very very far and very different from what I said. I had said the exact reverse. I had said that the freedom of Goa depends on us and on the people of Goa but I had said that all these world developments, these colonial developments, anti-colonialism and all that, are making the whole background different, are changing it and that will no doubt have a powerful effect on developments. That is what I said. I have no doubt that they will have that effect, undoubtedly. I think that the Resolution passed by the General Assembly about colonialism or rather anti-colonialism-it is a very good Resolution-will certainly encourage these forces at work in that direction. Of course, I saw this morning, I saw it somewhere, that the Portuguese Government had taken up this attitude that it does not matter what happens in the rest of the world or what the United Nations does or says, we are in our territories abroad and we shall remain there. Well, that remains to be seen.

I am glad that Dr. Kunzru mentioned the Central African Federation. There is no doubt about it that in this great drama of Africa, what is happening in Central Africa is of the highest importance also and we are watching it with the closest interest and with some anxiety.

It need not be repeated in this House, that more especially in the last two years, or a year and a half, the relations of India and China have been powerfully affected by, various events and those who had followed those even expected-shall I say-a better attitude on the part of China, more than two years ago. But even so they knew that in the nature of things, and among the nature of things is the powerful factor of geography and

the changes that had occurred in China, a new situation had arisen and was arising which would create all kinds of difficulties for us and for others too, maybe. That was an obvious fact to any Observer.

It is true that the manner in which this came was not exactly what we had envisaged, or the timing of it. And it was affected very much by the events in Tibet. Anyhow, the fact remains that our future will be powerfully affected by our relations with China. Now, first of all, quite apart from our liking or disliking what is happening in China, it must be remembered that China is a powerful country, and it is to the interest of India and China that we should not irritate each other too much. We should not run into major conflicts.

Here I should like to say that I know, as I

445

said, perhaps more than Dr. Raghu Vira knows, about the strength of China, militarily and otherwise, and I have a healthy respect for China's strength. It is a powerful country and growing in power. But when Dr. Raghu Vira talks about China or Chinese masses sweeping everything before them like a broom and descending upon India or anywhere else, I disagree with him completely. I disagree with him, not because I expect China to do this or that, but because strictly speaking objectively and not talking vaguely, I say it is an extremely difficult task for China to do, with all her masses of five or six hundred million people. There is such a thing as India also, which he seems to forget, in spite of his love of India. There is such a thing as the determination of a nation. There is such a thing as a nation refusing to submit to any such challenge. But apart from all this, there is such a thing as the solid military aspect of a question. One cannot discuss these things here, but for the last year and a half, we have been very intimately connected with that very solid military aspect of the question of defence.

Dr. Raghu Vira mentioned a number of names, of a road that has been built from here to there and from there to somewhere else and so on. To most of the Members here that might be news, for the simple reason that they cannot remember all those Chinese names which Dr. Raghu Vira has learnt. But as a matter of fact, all that is

known very well and in the greatest detail. But he has forgotten-I may say quite frankly-that we have also built roads and are building them. and if I may add. they are much better roads than the Chinese roads.

So the whole question is this. A new situation has arisen, not now in the last two years, but several years ago, and it has become accentuated in the last eighteen months or more, following what happened in Tibet, and we cannot forget it. It is there all the time and we have to take such steps as to meet any contingency and any eventuality, internally, externally, whatever it is. And more especially in so far as defence is concerned, we have to build it up for that particular purpose, keeping that in view. Defence really means not guns only, but as I said, communications and all manner of things. I cannot just take pride in the fact that I can ignore the Chinese army. Of course not, it is a great power. How can I say that ? And because it is a great power and a dangerous power, if it acts against us, we have to be very wide awake and vigilant to take steps.

But one thing is quite clear! Great or small, so far as India is concerned, whatever our inner differences might be, there is going to be no yielding to any threat of any power across our territory, and I do feel confident in the Indian, people, more especially in the capacity of the Army, Air Force, etc. to face any such contingency that might arise, with credit and advantage to ourselves. In all these matters, naturally, there is the aspect of what one talks or does in the military sense. air sense, communication sense and all that'. But behind all that, always basically, the question of the determination of the people is the biggest factor of all, a determination which is not built up on momentary excitement of the day for a short period, which goes off in some demonstration, with some slogans, some shoutings, some denunciations. That may happen sometimes, but it is not a sign of strength. It is a reaction, maybe an angry reaction to events. But one must base one's determination on more important and fundamental characteristics. It is that we have to build up. It is there to some extent and we have continuously to build it up. It is the cohesion of the nation.

It is wise to recognise the nature of the challenge regardless of what is said or done by the leaders because to us it is a challenge inherent

in the circumstances regardless I say, of even the present big leaders of China. That is how we have to look upon it. Of course, the big leaders may make a difference this way or that- way undoubtedly they do, and in this connection I wish to add-I do not try to condemn anybody or any group but the fact remains-that some people in India, some groups or parties in India have tried always to tone this down and have sort of made out as if all that has happened in the last six or seven months is some imperialist conspiracy, to keep friction between India and China.

I am all with them or with anybody else who want to fight imperialism but it does seem to me very extraordinary that the occupation of Indian territory by Chinese forces should be connected to some imperialist conspiracy in India or some capitalist conspiracy. I fail to understand this. It is sought to be made out that the conspiracy is because they want this tension to continue. Well, they may want it or not, I do not know, but whether they want it or not, there are certain facts regardless of their wanting to. The facts are, and these are straight facts, always to be remembered that the territory of India is occupied by the Chinese forces. The Chinese, I admit, have denied that but that is our case and that is our belief, and what is more, a fact which cannot be challenged, I say, even by the Chinese Government is-whatever the past history might have been--

446

that during the last many years, at least since independence, that territory was in the possession of India. That is the basic fact.

Therefore, something has happened, some change has occurred over this frontier area. That change has not occurred because of us; therefore, it has occurred because of some steps that the Chinese Government or the Chinese authorities took. These are basic facts. History may show that in some part, in some little part here and some little part there, some mistake was made in the map or something. It is not a question of little patch here or a little patch there but it is a question of large areas, of a territory. It does not occur accidentally. There it is, but how should we react to it? Some Hon. Members say: "Why don't you take it back? March your army there." Others get hysterical about it. Well, it is neither hysteria nor folly that is going to pay us in such matters. We are up against,

nationally speaking, one of the biggest problems that a nation can face, not this minute, but broadly speaking, and we have to be strong, of course, but wise also in our actions and not get hysterical. Hysterical people waste their energy. We are trying to take such steps as we can to add to our strength but I again repeat that the basic thing is cohesion and the right approach in the country and a fixed determination.

I have been criticised because once or twice I spoke here in this House, I think, and elsewhere about the Communist Party in this connection. What I said was based on, I think, correct information, as to the kind of propaganda that is being carried on. The language may vary here and there but I shall quote presently a sentence or two of a well-known leader of the Communist Party from the speech made at a public meeting made at Mau in in Uttar Pradesh on the 6th December, not long ago, two weeks ago. There is nothing wonderful in it but I am merely quoting it to show that an attempt is being made to confuse people about the situation on our borders and to make them think that all is well there. Well, all is not well there. This is what he said:

"China would never attack India
as no socialist country can ever dream of
committing any aggression."

Now, this argument itself indicates the state of mind of some individuals or groups, that is, when a country becomes socialist, it becomes automatically so virtuous that it is impossible for it to commit any error. That is a dangerous approach and that means that whatever China may do, they would think it is right because it is a virtuous country. This inevitably follows from this argument. We are often in error. This is not helping in building up cohesion, in facing the situation with courage and determination.

We shall require plenty of courage and plenty of determination and not merely a resolution or a speech in the Rajya Sabha or the Lok Sabha is going to meet the situation or a procession in the streets, but it does require clear understanding of this problem and I want to say it perfectly frankly to this House that I do not propose to be hustled about this matter. It is too serious to be hustled or any step to be taken lightly.

We have just got, as I said yesterday, the

report of the official meeting, a report which runs into a thousand pages. The report itself with its appendices runs to three thousand pages, the detailed report of the meeting. First of all, we have to study these and then decide after studying, what further steps we should take. We shall have to give it very serious thought. Of course, as this is a joint report, the other party has also to study it and we have to give them time for that and see what happens. It is not an easy matter to deal with but broadly speaking, I can tell you even now, that the report is really two reports, our men's report and their report, rarely anything common between the two, anything practical. Nevertheless, it is interesting, I think, because it brings these problems before us and put them in relation to facts which is very important. It is no good our just claiming something without putting forward factual basis and it is no good China-doing it either. In this matter of our frontier, we must view it in its historical perspective as something, some development, which is very serious, with a long-range point of view and build up our strength and cohesion, to face any difficulties that might arise.

USA CONGO LAOS SWITZERLAND CAMBODIA FALKLAND ISLANDS CENTRAL AFRICAN
REPUBLIC BELGIUM YUGOSLAVIA INDIA UNITED KINGDOM GHANA MOROCCO SPAIN PORTUGAL
CHINA

Date : Dec 01, 1960

Volume No

1995

JAPAN

Speech by Crown Prince at farewell Banquet

Their Imperial Highness the Crown Prince and Princess of Japan who visited India from Novem-

447

ber 29 to December 6, 1960, gave a banquet in honour of the President of India, Dr. Rajendra Prasad at Ashoka Hotel on December 2, 1960.

Speaking on the occasion, the Crown Prince said:

Mr. President, Mr. Vice-President, Mr. Prime Minister, Your Excellencies, and Distinguished Guests,

The Princess and I are most happy to have you all with us here this evening.

Since our arrival in this country several days ago, we have been accorded the warmest welcome everywhere, and we have received the benefit of the kindest attention of the President himself and the thoughtful arrangement of the Government of India. All this has made us feel quite at home and has made our stay pleasant and fruitful.

In this heart-warming atmosphere the Princess and I could see, as much as possible in the very limited time available to us, the true picture of India today. I think I can now better appreciate the strenuous efforts being made by the leaders and people of this great Republic for their own interest and for the common good of mankind. And I have been convinced that there is a very wide field of co-operation between our two countries.

On behalf of the Princess and on my own behalf, I wish to repeat our heartfelt thanks to the President and, through him, to all the people of India. Our thanks are also due to many guests representing different countries in New Delhi for their friendliness and goodwill shown us during our stay here.

Now, Excellencies, Ladies and Gentlemen, may I ask you to join me in drinking the toast for the health of our most highly respected President, and for the prosperity of this great Republic of India?

JAPAN INDIA USA

Date : Dec 01, 1960

Volume No

1995

JAPAN

Reply by President Rajendra Prasad

Replying to the Crown Prince, the President Dr. Rajendra Prasad said :

Your Imperial Highnesses, Excellencies and Distinguished Guests,

May I thank Your Imperial Highness for the generosity of the remarks that you have made about my country and about me. It has been our pleasure and privilege to have Your Imperial Highnesses among us and I would assure you that during your short visit you have both won our hearts with your great charm and courtesy and the keen interest you have so kindly evinced in our country. You will leave with us memories that will endure and firmly cement the bonds of friendship that exist between our two countries.

We are happy that, in the limited time available to you, you have been able to see something of the composite picture of India and of the strenuous efforts of the people and the Government of India to improve living conditions and to maintain peace and friendly relations with all countries. Like your people, we too are dedicated to the belief that human progress and happiness are indivisible and can be attained only by the common efforts of all nations to live together in friendship, co-operation and mutual understanding. We are also convinced that the field of co-operation between our two countries is ever widening and our efforts will be directed not only towards our mutual good but also to the common good of humanity.

Now Excellencies. Ladies and Gentlemen, may I ask you to join me in drinking a toast for the health of His Imperial Majesty, Their Imperial Highnesses and for the prosperity of the people of Japan.

JAPAN USA INDIA

Date : Dec 01, 1960

Volume No

1995

PAKISTAN

Prime Minister's Statement In Lok Sabha on Berubari

The Prime Minister, Shri Jawaharlal Nehru, made the following statement on Berubari in the Lok Sabha on December 5, 1960:

Mr. Speaker, two or three days ago, when the House was meeting last, the question of Berubari came up, and I promised to make a statement in regard to the various matters which had been

448

referred to. The way this question came up here and the way it has been brought up by the West Bengal Government and the West Bengal Assembly has been in regard primarily to certain legal approaches and legal issues. I shall endeavour to deal with those matters. I fear I may have to seek your indulgence and the indulgence of the House for some time in order to do so.

When a State Government and a State Assembly express their opinion challenging the legality of some step that we have taken, it is only right that we should give full thought to it and give a considered reply. Therefore, I have to deal with this matter at some slight length.

The issue of Berubari, apart from the pure merits, has various questions of legality involved—how far we have acted in pursuance of the Supreme Court's advice, and further, how far the reference made by the President in this matter to West Bengal was the correct method or not. The West Bengal Assembly and the Government have challenged that reference and I shall come to that later.

As regards the pure legality of it, the West

Bengal Legislative Assembly has passed a resolution moved by the Chief Minister of the State expressing the opinion that the Acquired Territories Merger Bill 1960, which was referred by the President to the State Legislature under the proviso to Article 3 of the Constitution for expressing its opinion thereon is invalid and unconstitutional. The resolution sets out the grounds on which the State Legislative Assembly has formed its opinion. I shall deal with those grounds.

May I add that as I thought that many Hon. Members might like to refresh their memory about the Supreme Court's advice on this matter, I have had it printed and sent this morning enough copies for supply to all the Members so that, when the House would be considering it right here, it is available to all the Members (Some Hon. Members : We have not got it). I know that, The House had begun sitting when it arrived. But it is available to all the Members.

In order to examine the points raised by the West Bengal State Legislative Assembly regarding the validity and the constitutionality of the aforesaid Bill, it would be helpful to recapitulate, at the outset, the events leading to the proposed legislation. With a view to remove causes of tension and establish peaceful conditions along the Indo-Pakistan border areas, the Prime Ministers of Pakistan and India discussed various Indo-Pakistan border problems in September 1958, as a result of which an agreement was arrived at between India and Pakistan on the 10th September, 1958 relating to 10 items. Certain other outstanding disputes and doubts were also settled later by two other agreements, one dated 23rd October, 1959 and the other dated 11th January, 1960. The agreements dated the 10th September, 1958 and the 23rd October, 1959 dealt with border problems with both East Pakistan and West Pakistan while the agreement dated the 11th January, 1960 related to border problems with West Pakistan only. All the settlements made under the three agreements involve transfer by India of certain areas in India to Pakistan and the acquisition by India of certain territories in Pakistan as well as certain minor border adjustments.

West Bengal is concerned with the first two agreements only. The items in the first agreement respecting West Bengal are:

(1) equal division of Berubari Union No. 12 between India and Pakistan;

(2) exchange of all Cooch-Bihar enclaves in Pakistan and Pakistan enclaves in India;

(3) adjustment of boundaries between Khulna in 24 Parganas and Jessore.

The items in the second agreement affecting West Bengal relate to the demarcation of the boundary between West Bengal and East Pakistan in the areas of Mahananda, Bruhum and Karkatua rivers.

A doubt having arisen regarding the method of implementation of the agreement relating to Berubari Union and the exchange of Cooch-Bihar enclaves, the advice of the Supreme Court under article 143 of the Constitution was sought on the question, inter alia whether if any legislative action was necessary for the implementation of the agreement relating to these items, a law of Parliament relating to article 3 of the Constitution was sufficient for the purpose or whether an amendment of the Constitution was necessary in accordance with article 368 of the Constitution.

It may be mentioned that when the reference was heard by the Supreme Court, the State of West Bengal was given an opportunity to place its views on the reference, and the Advocate-General of that State appeared at the hearing for the State of West Bengal. Several political parties also

449

intervened in the matter and were represented by Shri N.C. Chatterice, Senior Advocate. The opinion of the Supreme Court was reported in the Supreme Court Journal 1960. For the purposes of this the following views, as expressed by the Supreme Court are relevant:

(1) There can be no doubt that under international law, the essential attributes of sovereignty are the power to acquire foreign territory as well as power to cede national territory in favour of a foreign State:

(2) Acquisition of a foreign territory by India in exercise of its inherent right as a sovereign State automatically makes the said territories part of the territory of India. After such territory is thus acquired and factually made part of the territory of India, the process of law may assimilate it either under article 2 or under article 3 (a) or (b);

(3) As an illustration of the procedure which can be adopted by Parliament in making a law for absorbing newly acquired territory, reference may be made to the Chandernagore Merger Act, 1954;

(4) Article 3 deals with the internal adjustment inter se of the territories of the constituent States of India. The power to cede national territory cannot be read in article 3 (a) by implication;

(5) Agreement in respect of Berubari Union involves the cession of the territory of India. A fortiori the agreement in respect of the exchange of Cooch-Bihar enclaves also involves the cession of Indian territory;

(6) Accordingly, acting under article 368, Parliament might make law to give effect to and implement the agreement covering the cession of part of Berubari Union No. 12 as well as some of the Cooch-Bihar enclaves which by exchange are given to Pakistan. Its implementation would naturally involve the alteration of the content of and the consequent amendment of article I and of the relevant part of the First Schedule to the Constitution.

(7) Parliament may, however, if it so chooses, pass a law amending article 3 of the Constitution so as to cover cases of cession of the territory of India in favour of a foreign State. If such a law is passed, then, Parliament may be competent to make a law under the

amended article 3 to implement the agreement in question. On the other hand, if the necessary law-is passed under article 368 itself, that alone would be sufficient to implement the agreement.

I have given you a summary of the various points referred to in the Supreme Court's opinion. It will be observed that according to the opinion of the Supreme Court, India has the power to acquire foreign territory as well as power to cede part of its territory, within the framework of the present Constitution. The cession of territory has to be implemented by an amendment of article I of the Constitution and the First Schedule under article 368, while the territory acquired automatically becomes part of the territory of India and can be assimilated by law under article 2 or 3 (a) or (b).

The Supreme Court also suggested that article 3 might be so amended as to cover cases of cession of the territory of India and after such amendment the cession of territory could be implemented by ordinary law passed by a simple majority in Parliament.

Government was not in favour of this suggestion of amending article 3, as suggested by the Supreme Court, because this would make it easy in future to enable cession of territories. We wanted this to be difficult and that it should not be done by a bare majority of Parliament because if that amendment suggested by the Supreme Court is adopted, then, the Parliament, by a bare majority, could cede territory. We thought that the cession of territory should be made a difficult operation and not easy. The only course open then was to give effect to a cession of territory by an amendment of article I of the Constitution and the First Schedule in accordance with article 368 and to assimilate the acquired territory by an order relating to article 3, as pointed out by the Supreme Court. This procedure necessarily involves two Bills, one for amendment of article I of the Constitution and the First Schedule and the other appropriating the added areas of the States, namely Pakistan Enclaves, under article 3. The Supreme Court itself has indicated the necessity of two Bills, one necessitating the amendment of article I and the First Schedule and the other

involving an ordinary Bill only. The two Bills cannot be rolled up into one as the procedure for the two and the conditions for passing are different. I am saying this because the West Bengal Government has laid stress that there ought to have been one Bill and not two. According to the advice given to me and my own views, this could not have been done and if we had tried to do that, it would not have been in conformity with the Supreme Court's advice in the matter. The Attorney General of India was also consulted in the matter and he too advised that two separate Bills should be prepared.

The Bill relating to article 3, the Acquired Territories Merger Bill, 1960, was required to be referred to the State Legislatures concerned under the proviso to article 3. The order of reference was accordingly made by the President and was transmitted to the Chief Secretary to the Government of West Bengal with a covering letter in which he was requested to bring the matter to the notice of the Chief Minister and make arrangements for the reference to be considered by the State Legislature. 400 copies of the Bill were sent to the State Government for circulation among the Members of the State Legislature. 400 copies of the other Bill-Constitution Amendment Bill-were also sent to the State Government. Both the Bills were examined by the State Government and they submitted certain comments.

As regards the Acquired Territories Merger Bill, 1960, they stated that no comment is called for except that there was no provision relating to the citizenship of the residents of the territories acquired. The question of validity or constitutionality of the Bill was not at all raised. The grounds on which the West Bengal Assembly had passed the Resolution that the Bill is invalid and unconstitutional may now be examined.

The first ground is a statement of fact and calls for no comment.

The second ground is also a statement of fact but it describes the agreement as one and indivisible. The agreement cannot be aptly described as indivisible as it cedes certain territories and acquires certain other territories. The provision regarding the cession of territories is separable from the provision regarding the acquisition of

territories. By advising two separate methods of legislation to implement cession and acquisition of territories, the Supreme Court itself has indicated that the agreement is not indivisible and the opinion of the Supreme Court necessarily involves two separate Bills, one for cession of territory and the other for absorption of the acquired territories.

The third ground is not conformity with the opinion of the Supreme Court, the third ground of the West Bengal Assembly Resolution. As stated above, the Supreme Court has held that Parliament can make a law relating to article 3 for the purpose of implementing the agreement in so far as it relates to acquisition of territories. It is only in respect of cession of territories, that the Supreme Court has held that the law relating to article 3 is not competent.

As regards the fourth ground, the Supreme Court has suggested two ways for implementing the agreement : one by amending article I and the First Schedule of the Constitution in accordance with article 368 to implement the agreement for cession of territory and a law under article 3 to absorb acquired territories. While passing, they mentioned another way, namely amendment of article 3 itself so as to cover cases of cession of territory and enabling after such amendment cession of territory by an ordinary Act under the amended article 3. The latter method has not been accepted by Government who have, therefore, adopted the former. It has not been accepted, as I have said before, as we do not wish to make it easy to concede territory by a law by a simple majority. It is, therefore, not correct to say that none of the methods indicated by the Supreme Court had been adopted in drafting the Bill.

With reference to the fifth ground, it is true that the provisions of article 3 are being utilised to give effect to part of the agreement only in so far as it relates to the acquisition of territories and this method is in accordance with the opinion of the Supreme Court.

It is said that the acquisition of territories is nothing but the result of an exchange involving cession of territories and that to give effect to the agreement by piecemeal legislation relating to matters which are inseparable is unconstitutional. It is not wholly correct to say that the acquisition of territory is the result of exchange involving

cession of territory. The exchange of territories is in respect of Cooch-Bihar enclaves only. The other items of cession of territory and acquisition of territory are decided on merits. It necessarily follows from the opinion of the Supreme Court that there are to be two separate laws and the two Bills drafted in accordance with that opinion are not therefore unconstitutional. Whether the agreement can or cannot be said to be inseparable is unimportant, in view of the Supreme Court opinion necessitating the passing of two separate Bills.

The sixth and the last ground states that the method of implementing the agreement by two

451

Bills is objectionable since the State Legislature is deprived of the right to express its opinion in respect of the cession of a part of its territory. Such a result flows from the provisions of the constitution itself. While a Bill under article 368 does not require reference to the State Legislature, the Bill under article 3 alone requires such a reference. The Constitution does not give the State Legislature an opportunity to express its opinion in respect of cession of territory. Dealing with this aspect, the Supreme Court has observed that this incidental consequence cannot be avoided. In defence of such a position, the Supreme Court adds:

"The Bill has to be passed in each House by a majority of the total membership of the House....."

That is the Central Legislature.

".....and by a majority of not less than two thirds present and voting."

That is to say, it should obtain the concurrence of a substantial number of the House which may normally mean the consent of all the major parties of the House and that is the safeguard provided by the article in matters of this kind.

It may be mentioned that with a view to enabling the State Legislature to have an idea of the complete picture, sufficient number of copies of the Constitution (Ninth) Amendment Bill were also sent to the State Government. It is not known if these copies were circulated to the Members of the West Bengal Legislative Assembly.

It is thus submitted that the Acquired Territories Merger Bill, 1960 has been framed in accordance with the opinion of the Supreme Court and cannot be regarded as invalid or unconstitutional.

Sir, I have taken so much time over this point because they have said in the West Bengal Assembly that this is unconstitutional and I have to point out that we have acted in strict accordance with the advice given by the Supreme Court.

Now, there is another point viz. the procedure adopted by the President was not correct : that is what they say. At the end of the Resolution of the West Bengal Legislative Assembly, there is an objection to the effect that the procedure that had been adopted in referring the Bill to the Legislature through the State Government is not in accordance with the provisions of the proviso to article 3 read with article 168. This proviso to article 3 states that the President shall refer the Bill to the Legislature of the State for expressing its views thereon within such period as may be specified in the reference. In the present case, the order of the President stated:

"Now, therefore, in pursuance of the proviso to article 3 of the Constitution of India, I hereby refer the Bill to the Legislature of each of the States for expressing its views thereon within a period of one month from the date of this reference."

The House will remember that there were several legislatures concerned-Assam, Punjab, as well as West Bengal. The President's reference to the legislature was dated 23rd October. As he gave a month, the period of reference expired on the 23rd November last. There is no doubt that the reference was made to the legislature. It said so, and in fact, it is recognised in the preamble of the resolution of the West Bengal Legislative Assembly which says:

"Whereas the Acquired Territories Merger Bill 1960 has been referred by the President through the State Government to the Legislature of the State for expressing its views thereon" etc.

The objection taken apparently is that the reference to the legislature by the President was

made through the State Government. The requirements of the introduction of such a Bill are two : namely, (a) there must be a recommendation of the President; and (b) the President must refer the Bill to the State Legislatures concerned for their views where the Bill proposes to alter the boundaries, etc. This latter requirement does not specify the procedure by which the President has to refer the Bill for the views of the legislature concerned. It is a settled principle of law that where the principle for the exercise of the statutory power is not laid down, the authority exercising the power can follow its own procedure so long as it is not contrary, arbitrary or capricious.

The procedure followed in the present case for sending the reference through the State Government for obtaining the views of the State legislature concerned was followed throughout, ever since the Constitution came into being, namely, in the case of the formation of the State of Andhra; in the case of the States Reorganisation Act; in the case of the alteration of the Bengal and Bihar boundaries; and in the case of Assam and Bhutan boundaries and so on. The same procedure was also followed when the President sent his recommendation to the Lok Sabha under article 117 which he does frequently.

452

The recommendation is sent to the appropriate Ministry for being conveyed to the Lok Sabha, the procedure for sending the recommendation to the Lok Sabha directly not being laid down in the Constitution. There is, therefore, nothing of substance in the objection on this point.

Apart from this, how else is the President to function ? Has he to write to the Speaker directly on the subject and in such a case who is to move the motion in the House ? Or, has the President to send it to the Governor ? If so, the Governor will have to send it to the State Government. It is only the State Government that can take action in the Assembly on such a matter. Thus, from the legal point of view as well as from the common sense point of view and the practice hitherto consistently followed, the sending of the reference by the President to the State Government to be placed before the legislature was correct, and cannot be objected to.

I might add that the rules of business of the

West Bengal Legislature even do not provide for any procedure for obtaining its views under article 3.

Thus far, on these legal matters which have been raised, I am sorry I have taken up so much time in a rather dry dissertation on the subject. But I wanted to make it clear that we have throughout taken the greatest care in taking the steps. Originally, when this matter came up, that is, after the agreement, we considered how we have to give effect to it. The House will remember that most of these things not the Cooch-Bihar enclave-were interpretations of the Radcliffe Award. That is, the view of Pakistan and the view of India differed as to the interpretation. In other words, if the interpretation was one, that interpretation was right from the very beginning of the Radcliffe Award. It is not that any step was taken, that is to say, as if an arbitrator or some judicial authority made it clear that this is the interpretation. According to us, that interpretation really applied from the very day of the Partition. It was not a cession of territory as such. Though it resulted in a cession, it was a recognition of something which Radcliffe had stated.

Replying to an Hon'ble Member, the Prime Minister said : Berubari Union was one of the matters in dispute in regard to the interpretation of the Radcliffe Award. But the interpretation of Pakistan and India differed and this has been before us for a number of years.

I was merely saying how we proceeded with it legally. So, technically, if it was not a cession in that sense, but a clarification of what Radcliffe had decided, the question about cession normative does not arise. Nevertheless, we attached value to this and we decided that this was such an important point that it should be brought before Parliament for Parliament's decision. Later, subsequently, it was I think on the 1st of April, 1959 or later-on the question of how best to do it, what was the best method to do it, there was some argument. So, we advised the President to refer it to the Supreme Court, and so it was referred and the Supreme Court gave its opinion after about a year.

Then again naturally the question arose Obviously we had to follow the advice of the

Supreme Court. And the Supreme Court gave two or three alternatives how to follow it. As I have already stated, one proposal was that we should change the whole Constitution so as to enable future cases of cession to be decided by a simple majority of Parliament. They did not approve of it but they said this can be done. We did not approve of it, as I said, because we did not want to make this a simple affair.

I want to refer to one fact which has been repeatedly referred to namely, the question how far the West Bengal Government or their representatives were consulted in this matter. As a matter of fact, a year and a half ago nearly, I made a statement in this House. Perhaps Hon. Members have forgotten what I said then about this very matter. So, I would like to go into some detail as to the process of consultation that took place. This dispute about Berubari was raised by Pakistan in 1952. It had since been the subject of much correspondence, as well as discussion between the Governments of India and Pakistan. Both India and Pakistan claim the whole of the Berubari Union according to their interpretation of the Radcliffe Award. I do not wish to go into every year's correspondence and all that. The West Bengal Government of course was, as other State Governments, often participated in this correspondence. There was no two opinion between the West Bengal Government and the Government of India, because our interpretation was that the whole of Berubari Union should come to India. So were theirs in fact. We were following their advice in this matter. Then, ultimately, matters arrived at a stage when all these various disputes between Pakistan and India in regard to the frontier came to a head and we tried to solve them to the best of our ability. Even in Pakistan there was that feeling because, as the House well knows, there were almost daily troubles in the frontier, questions here, motions

453

for adjournment and all that. We thought we should try to settle where the frontiers were, because most of the trouble arose on account of disputed frontiers.

There was a conference in August 1958 at the level of Secretaries. No agreement was reached then, though a number of proposals and counter-proposals were made. In September

1958 the then Prime Minister of Pakistan and the, Prime Minister of India met in Delhi. They asked their Secretaries to consider the remaining matters which had not been agreed to and discuss the various proposals made for settlement. The two Secretaries met. Now, when this argument arose with the West Bengal Government, soon after that, that is, a year and a half ago or so, the Commonwealth Secretary, who is most intimately associated with the talks right from the beginning, put down a long note and I am quoting from that.

"The two Secretaries met"

that is, Pakistan and Government of India Secretaries.

"After some discussion of the various proposals, the Commonwealth Secretary suggested that the representatives of the State Governments concerned in India (that is, Bengal, Assam and Punjab) should be invited so that their reactions may be taken to these proposals. The Chief Secretary of West Bengal as well as the Chief Secretaries of Assam and Tripura were called in from the India side and the Pakistan Foreign Secretary called in the Chief Secretary of the East Pakistan. The State Chief Secretaries of India said that they would like to consult their Directors of Land Records and other officials. The Chief Secretary of West Bengal stated that the proposals regarding West Bengal-East Pakistan boundary were practical but he would consult his colleagues."

May I say that they were considering a number of proposals, a package proposal, not merely this? This was not the only one but it was a package proposal both in regard to western and eastern sides. Bengal, of course, is concerned only with the eastern one. But there were several matters.

Shri Tyagi: Berubari inclusive?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: Oh yes, of course. So, the Chief Secretary of Bengal said-it is not a question of liking or disliking but taking a matter in all its aspects and approving of the

'deal' if I may use that word or not.

"The Chief Secretary of West Bengal said that the proposals regarding West Bengal-East Pakistan boundary were practical but he would consult his colleagues. The Commonwealth Secretary pointed out that there were two Cooch-Bihar enclaves shown in the maps as adjoining Berubari Union No. 12 and any decision regarding the Berubari Union required careful consideration, because of the question of access to these enclaves. The Chief Secretary of West Bengal consulted his colleagues and on return stated that the division of Berubari Union should be so made as to allow for communications to be maintained with one of the Cooch-Bihar enclaves to be retained by West Bengal, the other enclave along with half of the Berubari Union going to East Pakistan. This was agreed to by the Pakistan Foreign Secretary and the formula for the division of the Berubari Union was worked out in consultation with the West Bengal officials and incorporated in the recommendations of the Secretaries.

"The above represents the facts of the case and the discussion on the 10th September at the officials level. So far as the question of Berubari is concerned, according to this it is correct to say that the West Bengal officials did not recommend the division of the Berubari Union ; neither did the officials of the Government of India. But the division of the Berubari Union was a part of a number of counter-proposals made by the Pakistan Government and the question at issue was whether we should accept these proposals as a whole. The West Bengal officials did not object to the acceptance of the counter-proposals and worked out a formula for the division of the Berubari Union which would retain the area through which the essential communications passed in West Bengal. That is to say, as stated by the Prime Minister, an ad hoc decision was taken after consultation between the

officials of the Government of India and the Government of West Bengal. The responsibility, of course, for the decision

454

is that of the Government of India. It would not, however, be correct to say that the Chief Secretary of the West Bengal Government and other officials were not asked for any opinion in regard to Pakistan's counter-proposals in respect of Berubari Union."

I should like the House to remember that these two Chief Secretaries had come here for this purpose. They were constantly discussing these matters with them and the Government of India and, naturally their opinions we have been asking for. But Berubari does not stand out ; it is a whole scheme of things that we discussed.

Now, it may be, as I said on another occasion, that certain misunderstandings may have taken place; it is very difficult to say. But one thing is quite clear that they were consulted throughout and that they gave the impression, actively or passively; or may be they have done so because they thought this is the only way, whatever it may be, even without approving of it. But that is the impression that was given and that is what was conveyed to me. There is no doubt as to what was conveyed to me because I asked a straightforward question on Bengal as to who represented their Government, whether they were senior officials and so on. I was told that there was the Chief Secretary, the Joint Secretary of the Home Department and the Director of Land Records.

Soon after the conference with Pakistan was over, a meeting was held with the Ministry of External Affairs the very next day, 11th September, to consider the implementation of the agreement arrived at. At that time the Chief Secretary of the West Bengal Government had left but the other officials were still there. The following is taken from the minutes of the meeting in regard to Berubari Union:

"With regard to the division of the Berubari Union the Commonwealth Secretary explained that the horizontal division agreed to did not mean that the

demarcation should take place along a straight horizontal line regardless of the effect of such a division on the existing system of communications etc. which should be kept intact as far as possible."

After that, it is noted: "Action to be taken by West Bengal"! Usually there is a note as to who has got to take action. The minutes of the meeting were sent to the State Government on the 18th September 1958, that is, within a week of that conference, together with the documents regarding the agreement reached "with Pakistan with the request that necessary action might be taken. Subsequently, a letter was received from the West Bengal Government dated October 10, 1958, from the Chief Secretary. The only question raised in this letter was whether the change in Government in Pakistan-the change had taken place just a little before-whether that change had made any difference to the implementation of the decisions reached between the two Prime Ministers. The Commonwealth Secretary replied that the new regime in Pakistan had intimated that it will stand by all commitments made by the previous government, and therefore, the implementation of these matters should not be held up. On the 30th October 1958 a request was made to the West Bengal Government for population and other local data regarding the Berubari Union in answering questions in Parliament. On the 14th November the West Bengal Government supplied the information and added that the Deputy Commissioner at Jalpaiguri had been asked to furnish further information. This further information was supplied with the letter of the 24th November 1958. On the 15th November the West Bengal Government went so far as to propose certain amendments to the schedule to be attached to the draft Bill regarding the- exchange of Cooch-Bihar enclaves on the basis of the accepted division of the Berubari Union.

I cannot go on taking too much time but I have got a number of letters, long letters, my letters and our Secretary's letters to the West Bengal Government Chief Minister dealing with this matter. On this basis this has got to be done. It would thus be seen from all this correspondence which followed soon after the decisions taken at the conference that the West Bengal Government did not give any indication that the

decisions were not acceptable. In fact, the indications were exactly to the contrary.

On the 9th December, 1958, the Prime Minister dealt with the statement on the Berubari Union in the course of a debate here in Parliament on the international situation. On the 15th December a question was put in the West Bengal Assembly by Shri Jyoti Basu about the Prime Minister's statement. The Chief Minister of West Bengal replied to it to the effect that the Director of Land Records had not suggested a division. He asked me for the text of my statement and I sent it to him. I said, "I take the responsibility for this decision ; it is not the Director's." I did not wish to drag the poor Director in taking such a big decision.

455

Then I made a statement in the Rajya Sabha on the 16th December. All that is on the record. On the 29th and 30th December the West Bengal Assembly and Council debated the transfer of Berubari Union and passed resolutions to the effect that the Berubari Union should remain part of India. Subsequently, there was a good deal of further correspondence between the Prime Minister and the Chief Minister of West Bengal.

I should like to repeat that throughout this period of our talks with Pakistan the senior State officials were present in Delhi and obviously in touch with the negotiations. There was no indication at any time from them that the decisions were not acceptable to them. So also in subsequent correspondence even though the West Bengal legislature had passed resolutions disapproving of this. But I accept entirely, of course, that the major responsibility was the Government of India's and more particularly mine. The point is that I do not think it is at all right to say that people were not consulted. I can understand that as regards giving approval or not, some misunderstanding arose and the parties were not quite clear as to what they agreed to and what they did not. But even so tacit approval was shown throughout-then and in subsequent proceedings.

Legal interpretation of the Radcliffe Award made the position of Berubari rather doubtful. If no settlement was arrived at, not only the question of Berubari but any other questions

included in the settlement would have been left over. The matter would have been referred to a new tribunal. We definitely thought that the settlement as a whole was to the advantage of India and West Bengal. I should like to say frankly that we thought that it was advantageous for West Bengal and for India, of course, that this agreement should be arrived at not merely as a whole, but I would like to say even in regard to Berubari itself, that is the division of Berubari. The other alternative was of sending it to a tribunal which may have decided either way, either in favour of Pakistan or in favour of India. If it decided in favour of Pakistan, we would have lost the whole of the Berubari Union. So we thought that it was fair both in the larger context and in regard to this. Naturally, we knew, we did not like it but things which one does not like have to be agreed sometimes. So in the balance we thought that that was right.

This was then. Later, as I said, on the 14th April, 1959, it was referred to the Supreme Court and they gave their opinion on the 14th March-almost exactly a year, later.

Looking at this matter one has to keep in view that for eight years this was a pending matter on which there was a great deal of correspondence and discussion previously. Later the discussions became rather more pointed because it so happened that both parties, that is, we of course, but even Pakistan, had arrived at the decision to come to a settlement. Many of our conferences, this House knows, have not been productive because the attitudes taken up by Pakistan have not been helpful. In this matter they were definitely helpful. They wanted things to be done and we certainly wanted things to be done to get a peaceful frontier and put an end to it.

I should like the House to look at it in that context. This meeting takes place, each person desiring settlement—West Pakistan, East Pakistan and all that—and as regards Berubari naturally we would prefer the whole of Berubari to remain with us. But it was a question not only of the larger context but of coming to a commonsense decision, which we did not like, in order to avoid something which we liked still less. I still feel, therefore, that the agreement was a right one and a worth-while one both from the point of

view of West Bengal and India.

It is unhappily true that, may be, a number of people who might be affected by this would have to leave their homes. The population of Berubari Union is a little over 12,000. Half of whole of Berubari would be about 6,000. There are some Muslims. I do not know the exact figures; in fact, the exact line is not drawn-there are not many Muslims. They may be some hundreds. About two-thirds of that population of this half are refugees from East Pakistan. It certainly is a most unfortunate thing, namely, that persons who have been uprooted once should have to face a contingency which might lead to their being uprooted again. I think all of us anyhow-whatever our views may be-must sympathise with them and consider it our duty to help them if any need arises to the extent possible for us.

All the history that I have placed before the House indicates not some sudden decision suddenly arrived at but after giving consideration to it repeatedly and fairly. I must say that at this conference the discussion was a fair and just one and there were no pressures from Pakistan which would compel us to do something. We agreed to it, to each thing individually and severally and having regard to it we gave our word to Pakistan. We signed that document. Later it came up before Parliament in various ways. All this history I have related.

456

I need not remind the House that if I functioned there it was not in an individual capacity. Obviously I functioned in the capacity this Parliament has given me, that is, of the Prime Minister of India. Every matter, obviously, cannot come to Parliament as many things are being done daily in that capacity. The word of the Prime Minister of India, apart from being the individual concerned, is not a light thing. An agreement arrived at on behalf of the Government of India also has a certain not only importance but sacredness about it. It is the word of a Government and the word of a country. I do not want anyone in the wide world to say that we do not honour our pledges and our undertakings. I have no doubt in my mind that we must hold to our pledge. I do not like, as has recently been said not in very happy terms, that we do not hold to our pledges. We have been accused

that we did not hold to our pledges and our undertakings. So we have to face that issue. Of course, when there is an agreement between two parties, that agreement has to be fulfilled. The only possible way might be some agreement to vary the other agreement. There is no other way to that. Whether that is possible or not, I cannot say at the moment. I do not understand how at this stage we can just say that for this or that reason we resile from that agreement.

PAKISTAN USA INDIA BHUTAN CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC

Date : Dec 01, 1960

Volume No

1995

UNITED KINGDOM

Indo-U.K. Credit Agreement Signed

An agreement for a credit of Rs. 6.67 crores ((pond) 5 million) from the Government of the United Kingdom to the Government of India was signed in New Delhi on December 23, 1960 by Sir Paul Gore-Booth, the British High Commissioner, and Shri L.K. Jha, Secretary, Ministry of Finance, Department of Economic Affairs.

India will be able to draw on this credit for a broad range of imports from the United Kingdom during the current year of the Second Five Year Plan. With this, the British Government's assistance for India's Second Five Year Plan totals a little over Rs. 107 crores.

The credit is repayable in 20 years, the first instalment falling due on November 30, 1966. The rate of interest will be the same as that currently applied by the U.K. Treasury to a loan for a comparable period out of the British Consolidated Fund on the same date plus 1/4th of 1 per cent for administrative charges.

This latest contribution brings Britain's financial aid for the second Five-Year Plan to a total of just over Rs. 107 crores. The agreement provides that the repayment of this loan in respect of the Second Plan need not begin until after the Third Plan is over; and the final instalment does not have to be paid until more than 20 years from now.

The loan is in a form which makes it readily available for use in India's overseas payments. The last loan agreement for over Rs. 13 crores, which Mr. Malcolm MacDonald signed in this room on August 16 last, was in a similar form. The final drawing on that loan was made on November 25, just over three months after signature.

For the Third Five-Year Plan, the United Kingdom Government has already said that it expects to provide aid amounting to Rs. 66 crores --Rs. 40 crores as an initial act of assistance for capital goods from Britain required for the Plan and a separate provision of some Rs. 26 crores for the extension of the great Durgapur Steel Project.

These loans will bring the amount of official assistance (including finance by the City of London for the Durgapur Steel Project) since 1957 to Rs. 188 crores, a total which does not, of course, include the flow of British private investment and re-investment into the Indian economy.

UNITED KINGDOM INDIA USA

Date : Dec 01, 1960

Volume No

1995

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Indo-U.S. Loan Agreements Signed

The Governments of India and the United States signed in New Delhi on December 5, 1960

457
agreements covering loans to this country

totalling \$ 114.1 million (Rs. 54.3 crores) by the repayable in rupees. These rupee payments are not earmarked to pay for export of goods from India and will not be a charge against India's balance of payments.

The agreements represent the biggest single execution of finalised loans by the U.S. Development Loan Fund made to any country on any one occasion including three other loans approved by the Development Loan Fund in respect of which agreements have not yet been signed, the total of credits extended to India amounts to \$423.3 million (Rs. 201.5 crores).

At a ceremony presided over by Shri Morarji Desai, Minister of Finance, Shri L. K. Jha, Secretary, Ministry of Finance, Government of India, and Mr. Vance Brand, Managing Director, U.S. Development Loan Fund, signed five agreements in respect of loans to the Indian railways (\$ 25 million), extension to the Kanpur thermal Power Plant (\$ 1.6 million), and the Barapani Hydroelectric Project in Assam (\$ 2.5 million).

Simultaneously, an agreement was signed on December 5 1960 in Washington by Indian and American officials for a \$ 10 million loan to the Industrial Finance Corporation.

While the loans made by the U.S. Development Loan Fund will meet the foreign exchange costs of the Kanpur and Barapani power projects, the local currency (rupee) costs will be met by loans from the sale proceeds of agricultural commodities supplied to India under Public Law 480. Thus, these two projects will be financed in their entirety by the United States.

Details of the loans are as follows:

1. 15,000 kilowatts extension to the Kanpur thermal electric power plant--\$ 1.6 million (Rs. 76 lakhs). From the sale proceeds of agricultural commodities supplied under Public Law 480, a loan of Rs. 95 lakhs will be made to project to meet local currency costs.
2. Barapani Hydro-electric Power Project-- \$ 2.5 million. This involves the construction of a concrete dam across the Umiam river and will generate 27,000 kilowatts. From PL-480 funds, a loan of Rs. 6.2 crores will be made to meet

rupee costs.

3. Third Railway Loan--\$ 50 million. This brings the total of credits granted by the Development Loan Fund to the Indian Railways to \$ 115 million. The latest loan will be utilised for procuring electric and diesel locomotives and centralized traffic control equipment.

4. Capital equipment for private industries--\$ 25 million. The imported machinery will increase the productive capacity of private industrial enterprises in the fields of metallurgy, electrical installations, machine tools, earthmoving equipment, chemicals, etc.

5. Third Steel Loan--\$ 25 million. This will be utilised for the importation of steel and steel products needed by private and public enterprises. Two loans for the same purpose, totalling \$ 60 million, were granted in 1958 and 1959.

6. Industrial Finance Corporation--\$ 10 million to make available medium and long-term credits to private industries in India.

458

USA INDIA

Date : Dec 01, 1960