1957

January

	Volume No			
1995				
1770				
CONTENTS				
Foreign Affairs Record	1957 JAnuary			
VOL. III	No. 1			
CONTEN	VTS			
COLOMBO PLAN Review of India's Economy	1			
FOREIGN AND HOME AFF President's Republic Day Br				
INDIA AND THE COMMON Standards Conference	WEALTH 4			
INDIA IN THE UNITED NA Statement on People of India Statement on Economic Dev Statement on Geographical	an Origin in South Africa 7 velopment of Underdeveloped Nations 21			
PAKISTAN Trade Agreement Recovery of Abducted Perso	27 ons 31			
SYRIA President Kuwatly's Visit President Kuwatly's Speech Nehru-Kuwatly Joint Staten	32			

UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS

Marshal Zhukov's Visit			 . 35		
Marshal Zhukov's Speech			 3	5	
Schedules to Trade Agreeme	nt Exte	nded	 		36

<Pg-iv>

SRI LANKA INDIA SOUTH AFRICA PAKISTAN SYRIA UNITED KINGDOM

Date: Jan 01, 1957

Volume No

1995

COLOMBO PLAN

Review of India's Economy

The fifth Annual Report of the Consultative Committee of the Colombo Plan, issued in January, 1957, reviewed the economic and financial situation in India in 1955-56 and said that the last year of India's First Five-Year Plan was characterised by an increased rate of developmental activity in both the public and private sectors. Industrial production increased somewhat faster than in the preceding year, but the level of agricultural production was lower than in 1954-55 by about 2 1/2 per cent.

The Report added that prices moved upwards during the year, principally because of higher investment outlays and a lower level of agricultural production. Wholesale prices rose by 11.6 per cent in 1955-56, as compared with a fall of 11.9 per cent in the previous year. The increase in prices in 1955-56 was thus a corrective to the earlier downward trend.

In 1955-56, despite increased imports of iron and steel, machinery, and other developmental commodities, the balance of payments position remained satisfactory.

In the first six months of 1956-57, however, there has been a further appreciable rise in prices, and the continued increase in developmental imports has led to a substantial fall in foreign exchange reserves. Recent economic trends thus indicate the emergence of some strain on the economy associated with the rising tempo of developmental activity.

After reviewing recent trends in agricultural and industrial production, developmental outlay and its financing, prices, employment and balance of payments, the Report emphasised that the

Indian economy has shown considerable resilience in recent years in the face of expansionist forces. The large expansion in developmental outlay during the last three years of the First Plan was achieved without any significant pressure on prices or the balance of payments.

The problem for the future, according to the Report, is basically to limit the growth of demand so as to enlarge the flow of savings as levels of investment rise, and to strive for the greatest possible increase in productivity.

In addition, the requirements of the Plan call for external assistance on an increasing scale. The foreign exchange reserves, which are now being drawn on at a greatly increased rate, have to be conserved while external resources in other forms are brought into play.

The Report recognised that the accelerated tempo of development in the Second Plan will put a strain on the resources available to the community and said that this situation will call for a review of programmes of development from time to time.

The Report held that the overall results of the First Plan had been encouraging. National income and the rate of investment had increased and, on the whole, the economic situation on the eve of the Second Plan was distinctly better than it was on the eve of the First Plan; there was greater confidence in the country's ability to achieve the desired goals of social and economic policy and there was readiness all round for greater effort.

Significant as the achievements of the First Plan have been, they can be regarded only as a beginning. Considerable unemployment, for example, has been carried over into the Second Plan period, quite apart from the underemployment existing in the rural and urban areas. The Second and subsequent Five-Year Plans, therefore, have to carry forward and accelerate the process initiated in the First Plan period.

In giving details of India's principal achievements during the First Plan in different fields of activity, the Report referred particularly to agricultural production, irrigation facilities, generation of power, flood control measures and expansion of industrial and transport capacity. The Programme of Community Development, which

<Pg-1>

covered a little over one-fourth of the rural population, also received a special mention.

Commenting on the Second Five-Year Plan, the Report said that the Second Plan had to provide for a larger increase in production, investment and employment. It further emphasised that in the

preparation of the Plan every effort had been made to ensure that the Plan embodied a widely considered and agreed programme of development calculated to secure optimum results, economically and socially.

After describing briefly the main features of the Second Five-Year Plan, the Report said that like all plans, it will have to be adapted to circumstances. The assumptions made with respect to internal and external financial resources the consistency of production programmes and targets in the light of the changing supply conditions and the administrative limitations under which projects are drawn up and executed, all call for vigilance and continuous review. The Plan is thus conceived as a flexible guide to action and effort within the broad framework adopted.

SRI LANKA INDIA USA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC LATVIA

Date: Jan 01, 1957

Volume No

1995

FOREIGN AND HOME AFFAIRS

President's Republic Day Broadcast

President Prasad made the following Republic Day broadcast to the nation on Jan 25, 1957:

On the auspicious occasion of the seventh anniversary of our Republic, I feel happy to offer my greetings and good wishes to my countrymen. On this day it is customary to rejoice and look back in order to assess the achievements of the year that has passed and also to prepare ourselves for still greater tasks in the coming year in a spirit of dedication and cautious self-confidence. For a nation occupied with a programme of reconstruction covering all aspects of life, such an opportunity is of utmost importance. It helps us in measuring our capacity as against the jobs to be undertaken during the year that begins today.

We all know that our goal is the establishment of a Welfare State in this country. Let us see how far we have advanced on that path. Soon after we became masters of our destiny, we decided to follow the pattern of Planned economy. In course of time we launched our First Five-Year Plan which was fully implemented last year, yielding place to the Second Five-Year Plan, the working of which is now in operation. The targets of production and progress fixed in the First Plan have been luckily achieved, in certain cases the results being an improvement on our targets. The achievements of this Plan are now

beginning to come to surface so that the people can see and feel for themselves that the country is moving forward. Some of the river valley projects, work on which has been going apace for years, have been completed partially. Mighty rivers, like the Sutlej, the Damodar, the Mahanadi and the Tungabhadra, which have long been associated with devastating floods, have at last been dammed. Their waters rushing into the newly-laid canals are a symbol of hope for the people of the respective regions. The same can be said about the power generated from plants attached to these projects. Cheap electricity turning the wheels of industry and illuminating the dark countryside is in the eyes of the common folk the first tangible fruit of our nation-building programme. To the generality of people it is an indication of the potentialities of our planning.

It is, however, in the countryside, in India's out-of-the-way and far-flung villages that a silent, but real, revolution has been taking place. Our villages today are in a state of ferment. The National Extension Service and the Community Development Programme have widened the mental horizon of our village folk who are lending full help and co-operation to the administration in changing the face of rural India. As the nation-building work progresses, villagers are shedding old prejudices and learning to help themselves with new implements and fresh ideas. It is the prosperity of this section of the community which is our foremost hope, because among themselves the villagers account for about three-fourths of India's population even today.

<Pg-2>

In respect of industrialisation also we have made sufficient progress during the year. Two new major steel plants are being erected and a programme of increasing the all-round industrial output of the country is under way. Along with the establishment of heavy industries, we are also reviving and giving encouragement to smallscale industries. These latter industries are easier to set up and manage and, what is far more important, they have great potentialities for providing employment to large numbers of people. The importance of this work cannot be exaggerated in view of the high incidence of unemployment in our country, particularly among the educated sections of the society. Putting our young men on to industries, which, in order to produce more do not have to resort to labour-saving devices, is the best way of improving the prospects of employment in India. It is for this reason that the Government have been devoting special attention to the needs of small-scale industries and have made a much bigger provision for them in the Second Five-Year Plan than could be made in the First Plan.

One of the highlights of last year was the world-wide celebrations in connection with the 2500th anniversary of the Mahaparinirvana of Lord Buddha. India as the land of Buddhism, where the Lord lived and preached his gospel and from where the "bhikshus" went forth in all directions to spread the benign message of the Buddha, was naturally the centre of these celebrations. The various public meetings,

exhibitions and seminars held throughout the country in this connection have given an impetus to Indian art and thought which had already started surging through the impact of the forces released by our freedom. It is gratifying to see that side by side with our march to economic prosperity, there are signs of a renaissance focusing attention on our great heritage in the domains of art and literature.

While we can claim that all that is possible for husbanding our material resources in order to increase the nation's wealth and for reviving our age-old traditions of art and learning is being done, we particularly feel happy that the march of democracy continues unhindered in India. Beset though we were and still are with all manner of problems that a vast country determined to raise the standard of living of its teeming millions has to contend with, we held our first general elections five years ago. That witnessed the world's largest democracy going to the polls. We are now preparing for the next general elections in accordance with the provision of our Constitution. The success with which we held the last elections and with which we hope to conduct the forthcoming elections, will do us credit, so that even our worst critics will agree that democracy is taking firm root in India.

We feel happy that in the light of our principles and deep-rooted convictions we are able now and then to make our humble contribution to the maintenance of peace, amity and goodwill among nations. The doctrine of Panch Sheela, based on non-aggression, non-interference and peaceful co-existence, has found wider acceptance among nations of the world during last year. It is indeed, fortunate that the outbreak of hostilities on Egyptian soil, which came as a grave threat to world peace, was localised and later brought to an end through the efforts of the United Nations and its peace-loving members.

In recent months we have had the privilege of receiving in this country His Majesty the Emperor of Ethiopia, the President of Syria, the Prime Minister of China and Their Holinesses the Dalai and Panchan Lamas.

Happy as we feel to see that the country is moving forward on the road to prosperity, we cannot afford to be complacent. The road leading to the valley of progress is necessarily zigzag with all the ups and downs associated with a difficult terrain. United by the bond of common objective and achievement we must strive hard till the goal is reached. In this great task of nation-building the co-operation of every citizen, high or low, will count at every step. Let us resolve on this memorable day to dedicate ourselves to this Work of ushering in the desired era of welfare, happiness and prosperity in this country.

Let me once again send you, men and women of India, my greetings and all good wishes on this day of rejoicing.

Date: Jan 25, 1957

Volume No

1995

INDIA AND THE COMMONWEALTH

Standards Conference

The Third Commonwealth Standards Conference was held in New Delhi during the latter half of January, 1957. Inaugurating the conference on Jan 21, 1957, Shri Morarji Desai, India's Minister for Commerce and Industries, said:

The First Commonwealth Standards Conference was held in London in October, 1946, which was a very remarkable year in the history of standardisation in the world. In the same year, a few days later, an international conference hold under the auspices of the U.N. resolved formally to close down the activities of the International Federation of National Standardising Associations, briefly known as the I.S.A., which had flourished in the period of the League of Nations but had, for several years, lain dormant and inoperative, and ultimately shared the fate of the League of Nations.

In place, of the I.S.A., this international conference set up the International Organisation for Standardisation, or the I.S.O., with a new constitution. India had been much exercised in mind for some years about the need, for a national standards body and the Government of India gave its approval, also in 1946, for the starting of the Indian Standards Institute.

The Commonwealth Standards Conferences have been at intervals of five years. India has participated in the first and the second conferences held in 1946 and 1951, both in London. It is particularly gratifying that the third conference is being held in India.

Apart from the special pleasure and privilege we have in welcoming the delegates to our country, it is but right that consultative conferences within the Commonwealth are held in different countries by rotation. This leads to a considerable amount of exchange of information and experience not only in the limited number of important subjects included in the agenda but also in the general field of standardisation, and matters not brought within the agenda. Standardisation is team work. The host country can arrange that a number of representatives of manufacturers, technologists and

consumers' interests are given an opportunity to share in and study the pattern of collaborative team work between the Commonwealth countries as demonstrated in the Commonwealth conferences.

The First Commonwealth Standards Conference in 1946 revealed that there had been close and sustained co-operation between the then established standards organisations of Australia, Canada, New Zealand, South Africa and the United Kingdom. This was in fact expected because the British Standards Institution, the oldest amongst the national standards bodies in the world, established more than 50 years ago, had set an excellent pattern which others could and did follow.

It was, however, realised that standardisation is a dynamic activity. You do not lay down standards for all time and for all conditions. Standards have a vitality of their own. They develop, evolve, and grow, and in that process they undergo continual change. Unlike several other fields of human endeavour, they permit of no secrecy. In fact, the greater the agreement between standards of different countries the better.

For this to be achieved, standards must the placed on a pooling system. Those that collaborate must do so on a free, voluntary but two-way basis. They must give and take. To ensure such continued cooperation, the first conference upon some 34 recommendations relating to general policy and procedures of standardisation as also on some technical issues like screw threads, universal decimal classification and glossary of terms. We may also recall that in addition to the general session of the First Commonwealth Standards Conference, a separate session was held on dairying standards and a recommendation was drawn up concerning the programme of work in this field.

The second conference was held in 1951. As stated in the report of this conference, "the primary object of the conference was to further the collaboration between the

<Pg-4>

national standards organisations of the Commonwealth and to secure agreement on common objectives and principles of operation in the interests of Commonwealth relations and trade".

The review of the progress and the trends during the previous five years and of the general procedural recommendations of the 1946 conference showed that the national standards bodies in the Commonwealth had implemented to a very satisfactory degree the recommendations of 1946 and that the intra-Commonwealth agreement in standards had been fostered without conflict with the needs for international agreement under the I.S.O. which too had, by then, completed the first five years of its life.

This conference helped to establish the fact that while all the Commonwealth standards bodies had exercised their independent judgment in respect both of their national programme and their participation in international activities, the consultation and cooperation that had developed between the Commonwealth countries had led to a commendable degree of practicable alignment of the standards issued in the Various Commonwealth countries. The conference adopted 33 recommendations of which 18, relating to policies and procedures, endorsements of the recommendations made in 1946. Unlike the conference of 1946, no special or technical session was held in 1951.

The programme of the current conference includes, besides the general session of the type held in 1946 and 1951, four technical sessions relating to: electrical equipment for machine tools; cables; safety requirements for domestic electrical appliances; and steel.

This is a very welcome reversion to the practice initiated in 1946 of including separate technical sessions in the Commonwealth conference. The task of the standards bodies is to lay down standards. Repetitive reviews of policies, which progressively become axiomatic at least within the Commonwealth, would not, by itself, long remain a sufficient incentive for busy people in all parts of the Commonwealth to undertake laborious and expensive journeys. To make these conferences stimulating and increasingly more worthwhile, we should endeavour to feed them on technical discussions relating to subjects of topical and common interest.

If, as is clearly intended in the Commonwealth conferences, the superior claims of international understanding on standards are kept well in mind, the intra-Commonwealth consultations and if necessary, disputations, would not only lead to alignment between the Commonwealth countries but assist in streamlining a common point of view in the international field. We, in India, are happy that for the first time four technical sessions are being held in New Delhi. This will enable the technical personnel of the Indian committees to benefit by exchange of views with their compeers and peers from other countries. In the same manner, other countries can enjoy this benefit when they, in their turn, act as hosts. The Standards Conferences would thus become, as they rightly should, a pool on standardisation.

At the time of inauguration of this conference it would not be proper in any way to anticipate discussions or decisions of the far-reaching and general importance, namely, the metric and inch-pound systems of measurement to which a reference may not be out of place, especially as it provides both a testimony and a guide in respect of the policies of Commonwealth conferences. After a long history of study, disputations and vacillating decisions starting from 1867, the Government of India has decided to "go metric". The other Commonwealth countries continue with the inch-pound systems.

This is ample proof of the fact that there is no thought of regimentation of standards within the Commonwealth and that national standards bodies are perfectly free to adopt measures suited to the needs of their countries.

From the papers received, it would appear that through South Africa does not contemplate a change-over, she would be inclined to adopt it if other Commonwealth countries were to do likewise. The views of other national bodies will probably be started during the discussions, but one aspect of the deliberations may be spotlighted even now. One of the hurdles which comes up again and

<Pg-5>

again the path of international standardisation is the question of conversions from one system to another. The protagonists of the two systems are naturally apt to take a partisan view, making agreement somewhat difficult. India with its recent tradition of inch-pound system and its need for making the change-over gradual and practicable will have to search out the maximum of common meeting ground between these two systems.

The Commonwealth conference not only streamlines the Commonwealth point of view but also, through such subjects as metric and inchpound systems, provides the proving ground for compromise that might lead to a world agreement.

We are also glad that there is to be a technical session on steel. Unlike most other Commonwealth countries, India is very deficient in steel production. In our bid for self-sufficiency, we have not only to aim at greater production but better utilisation of our resources. One may suppose that in the competitive world of today, such economics are always of interest to any country, but in the case of India, which has to plan for a several-fold increase in its production at heavy capital cost in the next five years, the need is paramount for the most economical utilisation of what we produce by a proper reassessment of the improvements in the quality of steel which have been made during the past decades as also by encouraging the newer techniques of welding and improvement in design.

The advice and guidance of our colleagues from overseas will be particularly welcome in this field and what they formulate as a result of their deliberation may not be without profit also to their own countries

There is one vital problem in India which raises important issues of standardisation. India is still largely an agricultural country and the consumer needs have been met to a large extent by cottage and small-scale industries. With rapid industrialisation in other countries, Such industries have succumbed to the pressure of organised large-scale production for profit. India is thickly populated. Its land cannot for ever support its teeming population. Large-scale industrialisation provides employment only for a minor fraction of the people. We cannot allow such industrialisation to throw the cottage or small-scale producer out of employment. So we are attempting to give all technical and some financial aid to our small-scale producers so that they may build themselves more enduringly into the economy of the country.

Standardisation has much to do in aid of such efforts. We may standardise some of the raw materials which the cottage workers use, but what is more important is the standardisation of their products so that they may hold their own in competition with or as alternatives to products of big industry. We should be grateful for any assistance which the present conference or its successors could give us in this field.

The conference has a heavy programme of technical work before it and would be busy in more than 40 working sessions during the next 10 days. More than 50 delegates or observers are expected from Australia, Canada, New Zealand, Pakistan, South Africa and the United Kingdom. India is providing a contingent of about 80 delegates. One may expect that the labours of such a large number of technical men from different countries, with convergent but by no means identical interests, will produce tangible and worthwhile results. But men does not live by work alone. The I.S.I. Committee responsible for the organisation has quite rightly attempted to mix with this hard but useful fare some social events and visits to important historical places.

We are glad that the delegates from abroad will be able to take part in some of the Republic Day celebrations.

All of us can freely and heartily share in the joys of this celebration because it commemorates one of the greatest political experiments in history whereby a nation won its independence without guns and bloodshed and without laying the seeds of eternal hatred between the two countries which, by agreement and common resolve, decided to revise their mutual political relationships.

It is also heartening that a good many of the delegates from abroad will find time to visit the Bhakra-Nangal area which is one of several major Indian development projects calculated to remove the industrial back-wardness of the country and to raise the

<Pg-6>

standard of living of the large but poor population of India. Because of our long history, we have a lot to show by way of art, culture and craftsmanship in this large and ancient land of ours, and we only wish that all the delegates from overseas could prolong their very welcome stay in the country to see more of India.

INDIA USA UNITED KINGDOM RUSSIA AUSTRALIA CANADA SOUTH AFRICA NEW ZEALAND PAKISTAN

Date: Jan 21, 1957

Volume No

INDIA IN THE UNITED NATIONS

Statement on People of Indian Origin in South Africa

Shri V. K. Krishna Menon, Leader of the Indian Delegation to the United Nations, made a statement on Jan 06, 1957, in the Special Political Committee of the Eleventh Session of the United Nations General Assembly, on the People of Indian Origin in South Africa. Shri Krishna Menon said:

The item that is now before the Committee is what some people have, unfortunately, come to regard as a hardy annual. There could be no greater tragedy than this idea and, so far as my delegation is concerned, we report on this item not simply to keep it on the agenda, or because it has become part of our political or mental habit. We participate in a consideration of it each year for the same reasons, and with the same degree of responsibility and concern, that we introduced it in 1946--or even earlier, when, in South Africa, the great leader of our nation, Mahatma Gandhi, entered into negotiation with General Smuts.

In other words, our approach to this problem is not one of debate and retort. It is an approach from the point of view of the sufferings of the people who are affected by it, from the point of view of human rights and of a solution in terms of conciliation.

Eleven years ago, the item came before the Assembly; it was placed on the agenda by a very considerable vote of the General Assembly, in spite of the very solid opposition of the Union of South Africa, supported by a handful of other delegations. The objection against inscription of the item, at that time, was based not on its merits, which came up for consideration later, but in the view that the Assembly had no competence in this matter. Year after year, this question of competence has been argued, and each year there has been an increase in support for the competence of the Assembly. This year, however, my delegation does not propose to argue this question because, unfortunately and I say this in all sincerity--the delegation of the Union of South Africa is not present at this meeting, and the objection has really been raised by that delegation. I have no desire, therefore, to take up the time of the Assembly on a matter on which the Assembly is in no doubt, and on which there is no objection. I share with my colleague Pakistan his regret at the absence of the representative of the Union of South Africa, because we still believe, even after 11 years of what may appear to be infructuous debate, that the time will come when South Africa itself will either take the initiative or cast is vote in favour of a solution of this problem in terms of the Charter of the United Nations.

For two years, repeatedly, my delegation has said, at plenary meetings, that, resolutions on this subject are adopted by large majorities, the one vote that is really required has not been forthcoming, that is, the vote of the Union of South Africa. Until we are able to persuade the Union of South Africa, since our approach to this problem is a peaceful one, the Assembly must continue, consideration of this item year after year, and must not fall into the attitude of, "What is the use of passing resolutions, since nothing happens?". If the Assembly were to adopt that attitude at any time, not only would it be a defeat on this question; it would be a retrogression so far as the United Nations is concerned, and, if I may say so, taking the long view of it, a great disservice to the peoples of South Africa itself, by which I mean the peoples today who have political rights that is, the European population. It is they who must be brought, by persuasion, by reasoning and by the force of public opinion, to an acceptance of human decencies.

Various devices have been suggested by this Assembly. Going back to early days,

$$<$$
Pg- $7>$

when the delegations Mexico and, France,--on the distinguished initiative of Mexico's Foreign Minister and of the great French civil servant, Mr. Parodi--tried to find conciliation, my delegation was the first to come forward and proclaim, but that anything leading to conversations would be adequate. Since then, we have had prescriptions from this Assembly, committees of good offices, and United Nations representatives, and have had direct negotiations and various other formulas, on each of which the Assembly had adopted a resolution.

If the Committee will look back into the records, it will be found that on each of these my Government and, in this matter, the Government of Pakistan, both severally and jointly, have conformed to the instructions of the Assembly and pursued it to the best of our ability. In every case, while we would not, and we shall not hereafter, sacrifice the support of the United Nations, or disregard the fact of United Nations responsibility in this matter, since it was seized of the item, and while we shall not conduct negotiations on the condition that the United Nations is to be excluded, we have at the same time offered the South African Government a basis for talks without the sacrifice of any positions held.

At this time there are new members in this Committee and therefore it becomes important to go back a little on the position. The present situation arises from, so far as my delegation is concerned, the document A/3113, which was submitted to the Assembly in pursuance of last year's resolution. Last years resolution asked us to negotiate-to enter into negotiations--directly with the Union of South Africa. The Governments of Pakistan and India took the step of doing so and I would like to read these letters so that they will be incorporated in

the records:

I have the honour to invite a reference to paragraph 2 of the resolution on the item entitled `Treatment of people of Indian origin in the Union of South Africa' by the General Assembly of the Nations at its 554th plenary meeting held on 14 December 1955.

The Government of India desire to inform the Government of the Union of South Africa that they desire to act in accordance with paragraph 2 of the aforesaid resolution and in conformity with the statement made by the Chairman of the Indian delegation at the 554th plenary meeting in respect of it. They, therefore, desire and die prepared to initiate and pursue negotiations with the Government of the Union of South Africa in pursuance of the aforesaid resolution.

The Government of India suggest that such negotiations may conveniently be held between the representatives of the Governments of the parties concerned at New York. They would, however, be willing to consider any alternative venue that the Government of the Union of South Africa would desire to suggest. They also seek the view of the Government of the Union of South Africa in regard to a suitable date for such negotiations to begin.

The Government of India earnestly trust that the Government of the Union of South Africa will welcome the initiative now taken and accede to the request made in pursuance of the decision of the General Assembly of the United Nations. (A/3186, Annex I page 1)

This was signed by the Ambassador of India.

Now, it will be noticed from this letter that, first of all, we have gone out of our way to make no difficulties with regard to South Africa's accepting in terms the principle of the jurisdiction of the United Nations, but we feel obliged, and we will continue to feel obliged, to say that these negotiations are in continuation of United Nations resolution. To do anything else would be a dereliction of our duty in regard to the United Nations itself. We also offered to the Union of South Africa the opportunity to negotiate wherever they like, at whatever time they choose, because the Government of India, having broken off diplomatic relations with the Union, has no representation in South Africa.

The reply to that letter is also contained

<Pg-8>

in document A/3186, as Annex II, along with our letter. The representative of the Union of South Africa, Mr. Louw, in speaking in the Assembly on the admission of this item, has referred, apart from other matters, to two things. First of all, the delegation of India-and I note that the onus is placed upon the delegation of India-have been pursuing this matter as a vendetta. Let that stand alone. I leave the Assembly to judge whether our approach to this problem

during the years has been of a character that did not spell conciliation but on the other hand spelt hatred or the desire to find fault.

In applying himself to the reasons why the Union of South Africa would not respond to our letter of 21 May 1956, the Deputy Permanent Representative of the Union Government in New York, replied as follows on 5 July:

I am directed by the Minister to remind you that on 17 December 1954 the Government of the Union of South Africa took the initiative in suggesting to the Governments of India and Pakistan that discussions be held between the three Governments concerned on the subject of the treatment of persons of Indian origin in the Union of South Africa, such discussions to be without prejudice to the juridical position consistently taken by South Africa on the subject of domestic jurisdiction.

While telegrams were passing between the Governments concerned, the Prime Minister of India in two public speeches made violent and unsavoury attacks on the Government of the Union of South Africa.

The Government of the Union of South Africa, therefore, could come to no other conclusion than that the Government of India was not serious in its response to the initiative taken by the Government of the Union of South Africa in trying to discuss the matter on a friendly basis.

In view of what happened on that occasion, the Government of the Union of South Africa can hardly be expected to regard the offer now made by the Government of India as being serious and, in the circumstances, must respectfully decline to run the risk of a similar experience.

Moreover, it is noted that the offer of the Government of India is made in pursuance of the decisions of the General Assembly of the United Nations' and that the proposed discussions be held in New York, which is the headquarters of the United Nations.

I am asked to point out that ever since this matter was first raised at the United Nations in 1946, the Government of the Union of South Africa has consistently taken up the attitude that in terms of Article 2, paragraph 7, of the Charter, the United Nations does not have the right to interfere in a matter which falls within the domestic jurisdiction of a member-State. Matters relating to persons of Indian origin in South Africa are essentially of a domestic character.

Reference to the telegrams which passed between the Governments concerned will show that in its telegram of 17 December 1954, in which the Government of the Union of South Africa took the initiative, and suggested discussions on a friendly basis, there was no suggestion that such discussions should be in pursuance of a

resolution passed by the United Nations General Assembly. It will further be noted that the Governments of India and Pakistan in their identically-worded reply, referred to implications which have an international significance', and added that the, two Governments (India and Pakistan) were `unable to disregard the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations and the resolution passed by the United Nations from 1946 onwards and the obligations arising therefrom'.

In its reply to this telegram, the Government of the Union of South Africa indicated that if the Governments of India and Pakistan proposed

<Pg-9>

that the suggested discussions should be conducted with due regard to the purposes and principles of the Charter and resolutions of the United Nations, then the proposal would constitute a complete refutation of the Union's views in regard to domestic jurisdiction. The Union Government would not be able to agree to such a proposal.

For the reasons set out above, and more particularly in paragraphs 2, 3 and 4, the Government of the Union of South Africa is of the opinion that no good purpose would be served by traversing the same ground, and repeating the attempt to initiate discussions, made by the Government of the Union of South Africa in its telegram of 17 December 1954--an attempt which was wrecked by the Prime Minister in his speeches delivered at a public meeting in Delhi and in the Indian Parliament, respectively, at a time when the exchange of telegrams was actually taking place--and when members of the South African Government were scrupulously refraining--

and I would like the Committee to listen to this--

... when members of the South African Government were scrupulously refraining from any critical or unfriendly remarks about the Government of India.

In conclusion, I am asked to say that the Government of the Union of South Africa would welcome an improvement in its relations with the Government of India, and suggests that such an improvement would more easily be achieved if the Government of India would appreciate that the Government of the Union of South Africa cannot agree to disavow a principle in which it firmly believes, and which moreover is in accordance with the principles of the United Nations as enunciated in Article 2, paragraph 7, of the Charter.

Now, I have read these letters in their full text, partly, only partly, that the Assembly may be seized of its implications. But, of course, members can read this for themselves. However, mainly because the other side is not present, and, in all of these matters, when the other side is not present, we bear the responsibility of putting their case as fully as possible. The burden of this reply of the

South African Government is, one that the Prime Minister of India misbehaved by making two speeches and, secondly, that negotiations taking place at the headquarters of the United Nations, references to United Nations. General Assembly resolutions, and what is more-let it not be forgotten--references to the principles of the Charter of the United Nations were not acceptable to the Union Government.

Therefore, I submit that this issue, apart from all its very gruesome and very serious implications, not only to South Africa but to the stability and order in that part of the world, perhaps in the world as a whole, to racial relations and the prospects of racial conflicts of a very tremendous character--apart from all that--this reply is a challenge to the United Nations itself.

I shall deal with the first of these matters; I think that the Assembly should be seized of them. The speeches referred to were made by the Prime Minister of India, so far as I recollect, sometime early in 1955, long before the session of the Assembly--in autumn, 1955-took place, so that all of the decisions of the United Nations Assembly had taken into account whatever sins of commission the Government of India and its Prime Minister may be have committed in this regard. Let us assume for a moment that the Prime Minister's speech wag objectionable--let us assume for the sake of argument that it was objectionable--in the terms in which the South African Government has pointed out. But this speech was made before the Assembly passed its last resolution; are we to be asked to accept the position that, because the speech was made sometime, this question can never be opened? And, what is more, does the South African Government expect the Prime Minister of the Government of India to consult it, or its convenience, or its susceptibilities, in addressing his own Parliament on a matter which, for the last 50 years, has stirred Indian public opinion to

<Pg-10>

its depths. Furthermore, it was the only issue--and I think I am right in saying that it was the only issue--on which the then British Government of India and public opinion in India were in accord; it was the only issue during the period of pre-independence, when we were in conflict with British authority, where the British Government of India of the day and the peoples of the day were in full accord. That is a measure of the depth of public opinion.

I have looked through the speech and I cannot find anything that is new; I cannot find anything in it that has not been said, not only by my delegation but even more forcefully by the delegation of Haiti in this Committee. Therefore, to argue that the Prime Minister made two speeches, and, therefore, we cannot discuss the matter, appears to me to be unreasonable and unsound; if that stood by itself, it would not be adequate. The complaint is about two speeches made by the Prime Minister of India which is pleaded to bar negotiations. Now, what has been happening in South Africa? The Prime Minister, taking the count of the Union Government--and I am prepared to do that in their

absence today--has made two speeches. But what did the South African Government do? The South African Government, in the meantime, not only disregarded, but insisted on disregarding, the United Nations and, what is more, said that its headquarters in New York--even New York--is unacceptable for the holding of the talks; and, secondly, the resolutions could not be mentioned and, further, the Charter was not competent in this matter.

Not only that; while we are accused of making speeches, the South African Government not only had initiated legislation but was practising it with great severity, to which I shall refer later on. The Committee may recall that on a previous occasion the Governments of Pakistan and India, after having initiated talks, had to break them off because while the talks were just about to begin, or had just begun, the South African Government initiated the Group Areas Act, and I would like the Committee--and, particularly, those members who do not belong to our part of the world, the Asian Continent--to realise that this Croup Areas Act is not the crux of the Indian question; it is the crux of the whole question of apartheid, that is, the segregation of populations because their racial origins, complexions, or their civilisations are different. The Group Areas Act is the crux of this matter and the Group Areas Act--the suspension of which we hoped for and the General Assembly requested-was enacted and, furthermore, very cruel acts to which I shall refer have been undertaken in that connection. Therefore, if it is a question of introducing any controversy, of doing something unfriendly or contrary to the spirit of negotiation--even placing on the Government of India and its Prime Minister the full onus of stating and re-stating what has been said for the last 50 years--it has to be placed side by side with the legislation in South Africa and I ask this Committee, in all conscience: Is the Head of a Government to refrain from telling his Parliament what is happening in South Africa when human rights are violated in this way, with particular application to peoples of Indian origin? And, as I shall point out later, this has a relation to treaty obligations and treaty relations existing between the South African Government and ourselves, which has also been a part of negotiations, admitted at one time by the Prime Minister of South Africa to be proper and, what is more, to which the Government of India has made its full contribution. That is the background of this situation.

Now, first of all, I think that for the information of this Committee I should very briefly go into the history of this case, and I say "very briefly" because the Committee has heard this time and time again. This problem of the people of Indian origin in South Africa goes back to the earlier part of the last century. The Indian people did not go there in search of wealth or in search of fortune; the Government of India at the time, the British Government at that time, was not so keen to send people over to South Africa. It was the desire of the Colonial Office, which was then responsible for the rule of South Africa, that persuaded the Government of India of that day--you know that there were two hands of the same body: the Colonial Office on the one hand and the India Office on the other;

the Colonial Office persuaded the India Office and the Government of India of that day--to send labourers to South Africa because South Africa, at that time, was an undeveloped country, and the greater

<Pg-11>

part of its sugar, rice and agricultural production is the work of the Indian populations who had gone there.

We deny the right of the South African populations, other than Africans and Indians, to claim that the country is theirs. The Africans in the main, the Indians, and all of the other populations that went there, out of the wilderness have built something that today is very much a part of an improved State. Therefore, in those days, we sent these people, and from 1860 onwards, we have had this problem on hand. But, if it were merely a problem dating back, it would not make so much difference. I want to submit to this Committee that, in sending these populations, the Government of India of the day took care to mention what would be the status of these people and Lord Salisbury, that distinguished British statesman who cannot be accused of any ultra-liberal tendencies because he was the arch-spokesman of British conservatism, he, as Secretary of State in India in 1875, told the House of Commons:

Above all things, we must confidently expect as an indispensable condition of the proposed arrangement that the Colonial laws and their administration will be such that Indian settlers--

he referred to Indian settlers, not Indian immigrants--

who have completed the term of service under indenture to which they have agreed as the return for the expense of bringing them to the colonies will be free men--

will be free men--

in all respects with privileges not inferior to those of any class of Her Majesty's subjects resident in the colonies.

For purposes of brevity, I merely quote this statement. But this is an undertaking given to the Government of India of the day, by the Colonial Government. In other words, the successor Governments are bound by this. The successor Government to the Government of India of the day is ourselves. The successor Government of the Colonial Office is the Union of South Africa.

Lord Salisbury made a further statement later on, in 1908, when he had become Secretary of State for the Colonies; he had shifted from the India Office to the Colonial Office--a phenomenon that takes place usually in the British Government.

Lord Salisbury, the Secretary of State for the Colonies in 1908, said--and this must be regarded as a statement of the Union because

they are the predecessor Governments--

It will be a matter of the greatest difficulty to enumerate any conditions under which it will be possible to justify the interdiction of a particular class in the State from engaging in normal legitimate and necessary occupations. It will be still harder to justify dispossessing them from their existing means of livelihood--

it looks as though the present situation has been anticipated and, as I shall point out in a moment, that is what is happening--

however liberal might be the terms of compensation. But the imposition of such liabilities on a class which owes its presence in the colony to the colony's own necessities, and whose policy of successive Colonial Governments, over a period of 15 years since the advent of self-government, would appear on its merits to constitute a hardship of a specially grievous character.

This was after Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman had conferred self-government upon South Africa, and here the Colonial Secretary, who is responsible for the original sin, so to say, is speaking after South Africa had become independent. I read this out particularly because I would like the distinguished representatives of the United Kingdom, New Zealand and Australia, who represent successor Governments to the British Government which was responsible for this action, and who have consistently voted against us on this question, to take their responsibilities into account. Here is the Colonial Secretary speaking after South Africa attained self-government, still accepting responsibilities, saying that what was done in South Africa, and is still being done, is wrong, is contrary to all the principles which

<Pg-12>

they must respect and the obligations undertaken by the British Government. That is the background of this question.

Then, earlier in this century, Mahatma Gandhi appeared on the scene.

In the early period of indenture the Indian populations were a very valuable commodity indeed. They had to clear the bush, cultivate the sugarcane; they developed Natal and helped to develop the Transvaal. They worked in other spheres; they supplied the human material for that particular element in trade which was not worthwhile to the European community, namely, the small trader, the domestic servant, the repairman--all those things which were below the economic standards or, if I might say so, the racial dignity of the white population. That was carried on the backs of the Indian populations.

From 1890, the Colonial Office put the screws on, and, even before the situation had reached its present heights, Mr. Gandhi appeared on the scene. He represented to the Government of India and to the Viceroy of India at that time the hardships of the Indian populations. In the early part it was in the way of asking for remedial measures of one kind or another, and it led ultimately to great movements of resistance by the Indian populations. Mr. Gandhi nursed the gospel of passive resistance and non-co-operation on the soil of South Africa, a gospel which was afterwards to shake the very foundations of the British Empire in India, and these peoples who were regarded as belonging to an inferior civilisation--as a South African professor said on the British Broadcasting System the other day--were the material, the soldiers in the great war of non-violent resistance. They set an example to those who were practising cruelty and discrimination against them. Mr. Gandhi mobilized them, and right through this period they asked for conferences.

The history of the Indian people in South Africa in this matter will bear examination. From 1906 onwards, until General Smuts and Mr. Gandhi signed an agreement in 1913--and that breaks the back of any idea that this is a matter of domestic jurisdiction--the people, who were the victims of the policies carried on, practised non-violent resistance and were always willing to negotiate and to confer. This was a South African phase under the leadership of Mr. Gandhi.

Then came the period of conferences. In 1917, 1921, 1924 and 1926, at various meetings then called the Imperial Conferences, we shift from the negotiations between the leader of the Indian people, who was not an official, and the South African Government, which was official, to a situation in which the Government of the United Kingdom sits in conference with the Government of South Africa, and this matter came up there. Although India was not internally self-governing it had a seat at those conferences. It never had a seat of equality--the conferences were called the Imperial Conference of Great Britain and the Dominions and India--but it had a seat. The settlement of this problem of peoples of Indian origin in South Africa was the subject of discussion, and every successive British Government has stated the case for the Indian settlers. Whatever might have been the final result, every successive British Government, both in India and in Britain, has stood by the position that apartheid cannot be practised, and we ask them to stand by that position in this Assembly.

At these Imperial Conferences, General Smuts and various other members of the Union Government were present, and the main concern of the South African Government at that time in connection with this problem was not that there should be disabilities heaped upon the Indian people; it was afraid of unrestricted immigration. I ask the members of the Committee to apply their minds to this problem. The plea of General Smuts was what has been called in other places "the peril of a racial invasion". I do not know why the white populations in any part of the world should be so afraid of the invasion of inferior peoples; their superiority should certainly be able to develop the inferiority. But, at any rate, the complaint of General Smuts was that, "We are afraid of unrestricted immigration, and too many Indians, with their teeming populations, will come over to these areas".

The Committee knows that of the population of India, which is today nearly 400 million, there are only 12 million people of Indian origin in the entire world outside of India, of which only perhaps two or three

<Pg-13>

million are Indian born. So we are not a colonising people. We did colonise South Africa some three or four thousand years ago, but not now. At any rate, the fear of General Smuts was that of immigration.

Rightly or wrongly, the British Government of that day--and I believe with the support of Indian public opinion as it then was--agreed not to foster any further immigration. There is no fresh immigration to South Africa. That should be understood. This is not the Indian Government fighting for its subjects; these people are as much South African as any white man who lives there. They built the country, they were born there and in many cases their fathers and their grandfathers were born there. They know no other land, no other environment and no other surroundings. We--the Government of India of that day--to the extent that there was public opinion in India at that time on this matter, acquiesced in this view, and General Smuts was satisfied that this matter was out of the way. I wish the Committee would kindly listen to what he said in 1917:

There is still a difference of opinion on administrative matters of detail, some of which are referred to in the memorandum which is now before us, and I have always felt sure that once the white community in South Africa was rid of the fear that they were going to be flooded by unlimited immigrants from India, all other questions would be considered subsidiary and would become easily and perfectly soluble.

This is the position in which we are now: that the fear which formerly upset the settlers has been removed. As General Smuts said:

The fear which formerly upset the settlers has been removed, the great principle of restricting immigration for which they contended is in our Statute Book with the consent of the Indian populations.

Is there any member-State in this Committee which can tell us that even in those years, and right through, we have not been reasonable, or that the peoples of Indian origin in South Africa have not been reasonable?

The principle of restricting immigration for which they--

the South Africans--

contended is in our Statute Book with the consent of Indian populations in South Africa and with the consent of the authorities in India, and that being so I think that the door is now open for a

peaceful and statesmanlike solution of all the minor administrative problems which occur and will occur from time to time.

There is a great deal that can be said about this. General Smuts felt so at the time when he made the above statement and there is nothing in our history and nothing in the history of this question which indicates that we have not co-operated as well as anyone could have done. That fear is removed. I respectfully disagree with the late General Smuts in his claim that fear is gone from the hearts of the white population, or sections of the white population--I am very careful in making this distinction--and from the Government of the Union of South Africa. Why are they afraid? They are afraid because they are guilty. It is guilt that causes fear; it is not strength that causes fear. That fear still continues to exist.

So far as the Indian population is concerned, you can put them in a desert and they will survive. This problem, however, now exceeds the bounds of half a million Indians in South Africa--less than half a million people of Indian and Pakistan origin in South Africa. It has become the crux of the question of the future of that entire continent. It is responsible for the defiance of the Government of South Africa of the Charter of the United Nations, not only in regard to this matter but in the illegal and unwarranted annexation of mandated territory. It is responsible for all the legislation which has been passed.

This is again addressed to the Government of the United Kingdom. When she handed over the Government of South Africa to the present Union Government--an act

<Pg-14>

which in itself was proclaimed as the perfection of liberalism and which we are not disputing--the forefathers of the present rulers of that country made provisions designed to combat discrimination of this character. The succeeding Governments have continually attacked these so-called entrenched clauses and have removed all provisions designed to guard against discrimination.

In the years following 1917, the Government of India, through its representatives, then dominated by the British Government, negotiated with the South African Government. It may seem strange to some but these negotiations ended in an agreement upon repatriation. The Government said that it was willing to grant entrance to India to as many people as wished and could come there.

Logically, that was a position which should not have been taken. The people involved are nationals of another country. They are not Indian nationals. For the sake of peace, however, we agreed upon these provisions in accordance with the Cape Town Agreements.

I have recently heard it said that we violated the spirit of these agreements and did nothing about the matter. We were also told that

these Indians were so comfortable in South Africa that they would not want to return to India. Our answer to that is: Comfortable or not, it is their country and they are entitled to stay there. We hope that they will stay there in spite of all hardships. Our advice to Indian people has been to be loyal to the country in which they are born and from which they draw their sustenance.

What I wish to point out here is the view of the South African Government on the performance of the Government of India with regard to this agreement on repatriation. That is to say, when we said that we would take as many Indians as possible, in accordance with the agreement, how did we conduct ourselves? That conduct is now challenged by the spokesman of the Union Government. We are again at a disadvantage in making this point because of the absence of the other side.

I do not think that anyone in this Committee--not even an apologist for the Union Government--would say that Dr. Malan suffers from any liberal views with regard to the racial question. He is the archpriest of recialism in South Africa. Dr. Malan, who is a very nice and kind gentleman when you speak to him in private, was chairman of the conference held in 1932 on the question of repatriation. He said:

In establishing these facts we wish to establish as our considered opinion that the non-success of the Cape Town Agreements with regard to repatriation was in no way due to any failure or laxity on the part of the Government of India in the fulfilment of her undertakings. We are convinced that they faithfully, as far as it lay in their power, done everything that could reasonably be expected from them. We rather ascribe it to the difficulties beyond their and our control that had not been foreseen, and further, to the fact that the possibilities of assisted emigration must, in the nature of the case, be limited and must in the future become so increasingly.

With regard to the Indians, he went on to say:

Now the other aspect which you emphasise is this: After all, we must, recognise, on both sides, that a very large section of the Indian population is permanently settled in South Africa. Whatever they may do with regard to assisted emigration from the country, we can only succeed to a limited extent; for good or evil, the Indian Population resides in South Africa permanently.

This was the position taken by Dr. Malan. This matter has become very important now because we have reached a stage--although only because of the general troubled state of world affairs--where the General Assembly is not aware of the fact that there are now going on in South Africa actions of a character which uproot populations which have been settled for years. Their property is taken away and they are pushed into what is virtually the bush. I say virtually because I do not want it to be said afterwards that we are exaggerating. People

who had homes are being forced to leave them under the provisions of the Group Areas Act. Whole communities--not only individuals--are being uprooted from their agricultural and urban settlements. In this process they are not only losing their homes. I believe that in one township in Johannesburg--I am speaking from memory--there are some 20,000 people of Indian origin, of whom some 1,500 may be working at occupations which may be described as being of a subsidiary character, or which arise from trade, and upon whom the others are dependent. If these people were sent to isolated communities they would have no hope of earning a living. A problem is thereby being created. The problem is not only that of their being uprooted. Their properties have to be sold by the Group Areas Board at a price fixed by that Board. If the Group Areas Board cannot sell it the owner may sell it to a private party. You can well imagine that such procedure is permitted only when there are difficulties involved. When the owner has sold his property, if he receives more money than the amount fixed by the Group Areas Board, that additional amount goes to the Board. It is a matter of, "Heads you win, tails I lose". These people are practically being pushed out of these places.

Furthermore, I notice that the purchase of any kind of habitable land in the new township involves the finding by the person who goes there of a minimum of 350 pounds. This is a rather large fortune for some of these people who make their living by waiting on tables in restaurants and so on. These people are really forced into a state of destitution. The bulk of these people, as I have said, are ordinary hard-working people. They cannot be expected to leave South Africa.

The Group Areas Act which has now been enacted states that work is to begin--or supposedly has been started--in the township of Lenasia. I hope that those members of this Committee who are interested in this problem will, even after the meeting, have the time to go through some of these clippings taken from South African newspapers. My delegation will be very happy to lend them to any members of the Committee who would be interested in seeing them. I cannot refer to all of these clippings since there are so many. In one instance it is stated that:

More than 22,000 Indians owning property in Johannesburg valued at something like 10 million pounds will be uprooted under the Group Areas Act and made to move to Lenasia, a privately owned township--

that is to say, they will be in the hands of property speculators--

about 20 miles from Johannesburg and off the main railway line.

That is pure euphemism. What is happening is this: There is a jungle track from this town to Johannesburg and that is all there is. Great credit is due to many minority groups in South Africa. There are Europeans there who are putting up a very good fight at great prejudice to themselves and I shall refer to this later.

A Johannesburg city councillor, Mr. A. J. Cutten, told The Star today:

For all the Government's well-known apathy to the Indians, to take from them Pageview Township--specially set aside for Indians by the Council and recognised as such by both Houses of Parliament in 1941--and give them absolutely nothing in return must surely be one of the most callous acts even in the history of this Government.'

Mr. Cutten qualified his use of the word `nothing' by saying that it indicated his opinion of Lenasia.

He added that the recent proclamations must have brought shivers of horror and distaste to all tolerant people not only in South Africa but to enlightened public opinion all over the world.

'In a poorly serviced township notwithstanding its great age, this Coloured community has built up its area into a respectable suburb with houses worth up to 4,000 pounds and totalling 500,000 pounds in value.

<Pg-16>

'The people have not been told by what date they must go or sell, but as compensation they are offered the use of the township'--

two names are mentioned--

'which they may occupy, but which the declaration does not say they may buy'--

because once they go and occupy it, they improve it and then they are pushed out again.

"This implication, coupled with the fact that these new areas are both industrial townships in which the land is extremely expensive, makes this particular action all the more shameful.

'What its practical consequences will be nobody can say, except that it will bring impoverishment, hardship, misery and suffering to many thousands of human beings.

'The provisions of these declarations are unreasonable. They are unjust and they are unmerciful.'

That is what a South African said.

I hesitate to read all these extracts from newspapers of the reports of meetings because they add nothing new. I should like to point out, however, that this is a continuing question and that eviction under the Group Areas Act has begun with a vengeance. You will find in American newspapers, in British newspapers and in newspapers all over the world, accounts of the hardships that are inflicted on people.

In the South African Parliament there have been protests about this development, which is directed particularly against the Indian community, where it was stated that in terms of the proclamations, there are 9,000 Indians, an equal number of Coloureds and several thousand Africans living in the six western areas of Johannesburg who must sell their property and move within the next two years. Some have to vacate their premises within a year. Failure to comply with these requirements renders the person concerned liable to prosecution.

Now I shall go on to say what this prosecution involves. The 9,000 Indians evicted by this proclamation are roughly one quarter of the total Indian population of the Transvaal. The entire community will have to move to a site called Lenasia within 22 miles of the city of Johannesburg. This reallocation has been described in the Johannesburg "Star" as mass callousness. The Anglican Archbishop of Cape Town, the Most Reverend Geoffrey Clayton, has stated that "it is wrong to move people around like pawns, regardless of their wishes, to satisfy some ideology".

Then we come to an American comment about this. The Washington "Post-Times Herald," on 15 November 1956, states, that:

For the 800 Indian shopkeepers in the city and their employees this means they will lose their businesses. They cater to the needs of the white economy and cannot survive by trading among themselves.

The Bishop of Johannesburg, whose name is well known in the world outside, referred to,

the harshness and injustice which must shock everyone into realising the cruel effect of the Group Areas Act. New houses will have to be built in distant areas. Hundreds of traders will be deprived of access to their present customers. A further consequence will be the unemployment of thousands of workers.

We now see a shift of opinion inside South Africa itself. The Dutch Church, which has at all times been a very strong supporter of the Government of South Africa, has come out much more in the open, largely because of pressure from its opposite numbers in the United States and elsewhere. I shall refer to that when we deal with the item on apartheid because it is more general.

With regard to the Indians, the "Graphic" of 8 September 1956 says:

Indeed our rulers display hard-heartedness in permitting owners of

<Pg-17>

Lenasia to acquire a million pounds land not worth more than 24,000 pounds--

they are a speculating people--

allow the rich to purchase more than one land and deprive the poor dispossessed ones of accommodation. Where is the breadth of vision in this sort of administration or the idea of parallel development in the whole affair?

No solid reasoning has been advanced in the contention that group areas offer a solution to the colour problem of South Africa. There is, on the other hand, a widespread belief among the students of history that segregation engenders bitterness, creates separatist tendencies, robs the affected group of the pride in the country of its birth, and aggravates race tensions. It is likely that a few Indians might leave South Africa rather than face the humiliation and disgrace of Lenasia, but what about the 95 per cent of the Indians who, like the Afrikaners and the Africans, know no other home than South Africa? They are a people with as much right as any other race in the country and can in no way be described as aliens for the purposes of segregation or repatriation. They have an equally wide urge to uplift themselves in all spheres as the Europeans. To arrest their growth is to spell their ruination which could not be defended on any grounds.

The time has obviously arrived for cultivating the breadth of vision and to realise, for the welfare of us all, irrespective of our caste, creed or colour, that only in foresight, amity and goodwill lies the solution of our racial problem. Let us not forget that the proclamation of the group areas is as much a challenge to Asia and Africa as the Egyptian nationalisation of Suez is to Europe and the West.--

I do not agree with that part of it--

It has no sanity to force a solution in terms of force and political power. Apartheid as such has no allies either in Europe or America. It has been tried and rejected without regrets.

I have read enough to draw the attention of the Committee to the fact that we are not dealing with a problem that is just a historical survival. We are dealing with a situation in South Africa where persecution has gone beyond anything that has happened in the past.

Now I should like to refer to some other opinions which are important. One is from the "Osservatore Romano", of Vatican City, which says:

In the belief that it is protecting the white people, the Government of Mr. Strijdom is adopting ever more stringent measures which differ even less from Hitler's racial policies. We are faced with systematic and theorized contempt for the human person, with oppression of innocent populations which, however, are used as cheap, unskilled manpower.

It goes on to say that this policy of apartheid, which is called the Group Areas Act, is unjust and immoral, both in the goals it pursues and the means it uses. I shall refrain from reading much more about this.

Now we come to the way it is enforced and that is where prosecutions come in. These prosecutions today are mass prosecutions. I will not go into the details of this because that has to be dealt with under the other item. There are some 20 or 30 Indians involved in this mass trial of 150 people and I think I must state to the Committee frankly that the Committee should not fall into the trap of drawing Communism as a red herring across the path of adequate thinking.

There is in Africa what is called the Suppression of Communism Act and a Communist in South Africa is anybody who stands for decency. Any African who is against racial discrimination, any African who asks for higher wages, or anything of that kind, is a Communist. Under the Suppression of Communism Act, the whole of the group areas people are brought under

trial and they are tried en masse--and we are speaking about law, individual liberty and such things here. In South Africa, a founder-member of the United Nations, not only are they tried en masse, but they are tried under conditions of degradation, cruelty and injustice.

The proceedings are in Afrikaans and the majority of the people, or all of the people, who are the defendants in the case cannot speak Afrikaans; they cannot understand it. There is no reason for using Afrikaans because . everybody in South Africa speaks English and certainly the judges and counsel in court do. So this trial is, first of all, an expression of arrogant nationalism and, what is more, they are tending to put the defendants in a place of disadvantage. They are brought into court huddled together in cages. We in India had forgotten the history of cages as part of trial proceedings. We have got to go back to the days of the Amritsar Affair when leading Indians were put into cages which were far too low for them in height. But that is a chapter of history we have forgotten and our relations with our former rulers are the most friendly and cordial.

But to bring these people imprisoned in cages before the court, without proper defence, and hurl them back into prison-I can only say that, despite experience of trials of various kinds, this passes all understanding. That is how the Group Areas Act is operating.

I should now like to refer to justification, and I think the Committee should understand the South African mind if it is going to do anything about us. I wish to refer, not to a politician, because politicians sometimes give to a doctrine a kind of divine halo to further their own political purposes, but to a man who is a university professor and is regarded as one of South Africa's

intellectuals. He spoke recently on the British Broadcasting Corporation programme, and this is the newspaper report:

A Boer Professor who recently gave a B.B.C. talk said about Africans south of the Sahara that they had little more in the way of culture than is associated with the Stone Age.

Now it is for the Assembly to decide, who is the more cultured: The people who inflict the kind of thing I have spoken about, or the people who are its victims?

To continue the quotation:

'They had no wheel, sail or plough, used fire-hardened digging sticks to till their fields, lacked all but the most elementary mechanical devices, knew no written language and had only the simplest notion of number or the division of time.'

If this were true--if we were to assume that it is true--all the more reason for compassion, for care, and for extra consideration from the Government whose responsibility they are. But it is not true. The newspaper comment continued:

To this a British lecturer in Cultural Anthropology replied that the learned professor had ignored another and similar and parallel line north of the Sahara, namely the mountain range from the Atlantic to the Carpathian Mountains in Europe. North of this line no indigenous European had ever invented the alphabet or writing, originated agriculture, architecture, plough, pulley, astronomy, the calendar, money, law, metallurgy, medicine, carpentry, irrigation, weights and measures, etc. And he (the British lecturer) quoted Caesar's remark to Atticus, 'Do not obtain your slaves from Britain because the are so stupid'--

that is, the ancient Briton, not the modern one--

`and so utterly incapable of being taught that they are not fit to form a part of the household at Athens.'

To continue with the quotation:

The South African professor, who is no doubt proud to trace his line back to Holland, belongs to this area, which emerged from barbarism thanks to the Roman Empire and the impact of Mediterranean civilization--

<Pg-19>

to which we made a humble contribution.

Yet the professor appeared to believe that the African was permanently below the European level. As for Indians, another argument is trotted out--the argument of inferior civilisation being obviously absurd--and that is that the Indian has a low standard of life. He is also regarded as an interloper in Africa. Both are obviously false. The Indians have gradually raised their standards and would rise even more rapidly if given the opportunities. And as immigrants to Africa they are on the same footing as the whites, who also arrived on African soil quite recently. The segregation of the Indian and African which is now being attempted by the South African Government is bound to fail in the long run, because the South African economy depends upon their labour. The Boers have in fact shown no talent for industrialisation, which is largely in the hands of people of British descent. Even as farmers they have shown little efficiency and depend on African labour. The attempt to isolate Africans in locations and special reserves and force Indians out into remote areas where facilities for trade and industry are lacking will only impoverish South Africa and create fresh problems. The Assembly of the United Nations has appreciated the position and condemned the folly of segregation.

It has not, but we find this man thinking it has.

It should not hesitate to take the South African Government to task for refusing to negotiate with the Government of India on this issue.

This is a British view.

We have now come to the stage where the Government of India is placing no resolution before this Committee. The reasons are simple. We would like the Assembly to feel that this is no longer to be considered a problem in which the Indians have a special vested interest. Half a million people in the context of 400 millions of the Indian people are a small proportion. But it is a problem that has bedeviled our history--our relations to a certain extent, if I may say so with respect, with the Western world. We like to live with South Africa in peace. Our economies are complementary. For the last ten years we have imposed sanctions upon them--unfortunately broken by a number of people by trading behind the line. But we like to think that the time has come when, after 11 years, when every resolution of this Committee has been disregarded and, what is more, now that we are moving into a situation where--short of large-scale racial war in which all the Asian peoples and the Africans would combine along with the liberal Europeans, leading to a state of unsettlement in this peninsula--where the problem is not regarded as one of half a million Indians being uprooted, but as a violation of human rights, the disregard of treaty obligations and, what is much worse, putting before the world apartheid as a pattern. This is the worst of it. The South African Government sincerely, it appears, says to the world, "We are doing a service to humanity by the solution of multi-racial problems". This is what Hitler said. For that reason it becomes very much more an Assembly concern than it ever was.

We are submitting no resolution. We hope there will be some member-States who will feel an obligation to do so. We feel the time has come to ask the South African Government to accept its obligations. We are prepared to go into conference; we are prepared to talk at any time. But my Government, so far as we are presently instructed, will at no time forsake the protection of the United Nations. We are not prepared to go into conversations which impose the condition that we must not mention the United Nations. We are quite prepared to go into conversations without prejudice to the position held by South Africa on the question of domestic jurisdiction, as they have asked. And we hope, therefore, that when some member-State puts forward a resolution—as I hope it will—the Assembly will pass it unanimously.

My Government desires to make a special appeal to the members of the Commonwealth countries, because they are in part responsible for the situation. The United

<Pg-20>

Kingdom Government is a party to the treaty obligations. The United Kingdom Government until our independence was a spokesman of this problem in South Africa. At every imperial Conference they took that line. The peoples of their countries are solidly with us in this question. The Governments of Australia and New Zealand are successor Governments who equally have responsibility; and nothing pains us more on this question than for them to take sides with the country that is the accused in this matter.

So far as South Africa itself is concerned, we have no feeling of hatred towards that Government. We believe the great majority of the people of South Africa--by which I mean the eight and a half millions Africans, too, for they also are South Africans, half a million of us, and at least half the white population--stand against this vicious principle and practice. They realise its dangers.

Today this problem may be regarded here as one of those things which come up year after year, but I would like to tell you that my Government feels, in all conscience, that its neglect is bound to lead to a situation the dimensions of which are at present immeasurable. I am rather restricted by the fact that there is another item before the Committee. The use of the Suppression of Communism Act, or the attempt to draw this problem into some other conflict and thereby turn the world against the oppressed, is something we have to guard ourselves against.

So far as the Indian population is concerned, if this takes a hundred years they will still offer resistance. But let it not be said that the community of the world was callous to their plight, and, what is more, let it not be said that this Committee does not realise that the Group Areas Act which is pleaded as domestic legislation is the crux of this whole problem, dividing humanity by racial barriers. No, not by racial barriers but by racial prejudices.

If this is to be accepted, then your country and mine, which is multi-racial, the great continents of South America and North America and great parts of Europe, where no country today can trace back its origins in a racial group--they will all be split up again and the peoples will be returned to their origins of two or three thousands years ago. This is the spectacle facing us, this would be the consequence of the African problem.

We make no apologies for reporting to the Assembly; indeed, we have a mandate to do so. We hope the Assembly today--and it is the eleventh time that it is considering this problem--will show the same degree of concern, and the same degree of desire to find a solution, and will not be diverted from its path by the unjustified and saddening action taken by the South African Government in not being present. We hope that the United Kingdom Government, and the Governments of Australia and New Zealand, which are particularly concerned in this matter, will be able to support the position we have taken, so that the voice of the civilised world will stand against this proposition. We ask for no condemnations of anybody--we have never done so. But we do think that the time has come when some-thing more than mere pious statements, merely another resolution asking for negotiation, is required for this purpose. We have offered solution after solution. The Assembly has been generous. But it is not enough even to be generous at this time; it is necessary to realise that a challenge is thrown, and not against these half a million Indians who are fighting, along with eight million Africans, the battle of human rights in the continent of South Africa.

INDIA SOUTH AFRICA USA PAKISTAN FRANCE MEXICO HAITI CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC AUSTRALIA NEW ZEALAND EGYPT OMAN VATICAN CITY LATVIA GREECE

Date: Jan 06, 1957

Volume No

1995

INDIA IN THE UNITED NATIONS

Statement on Economic Development of Underdeveloped Nations

Shri M. Gopala Menon, member of the Indian Delegation to the United Nations, made the following statement of Jan 10, 1957, on the Economic Development of Underdeveloped Nations, in the Second Committee of the Eleventh Session of the United Nations General Assembly:

We are happy to find from the discussions which have taken place on this item, that is, the Economic Development of Under-developed Countries, that there is complete unanimity of views on the need, in the words of the U.S. delegation--I quote--"to make the most constructive and effective contribution to the efforts of the

Governments and

<Pg-21>

the peoples of these countries to create in their territories the strongest possible national economies".

In the preamble to the Charter of the United Nations, the peoples of the United Nations expressed their determination to employ international machinery for the promotion of economic and social advancement of all peoples and in Article 55 of the Charter all members pledged themselves to take joint and separate action in cooperation with the organisation for the creation of conditions of stability and well-being and the promotion of higher standards of living, full employment and conditions of economic and social progress and development.

My delegation feels that this is a stupendous task, the most challenging and difficult mankind has ever faced. The greatest production of food and other raw materials, leading even to vast surpluses in many countries, the biggest industrial plants and organisations, the best known techniques, the largest number of skilled workers in all history, the most advanced form of medical aid, the highest average expectation of life, exist side by side with intense want, misery, ignorance, disease and malnutrition, death early in life, primitive methods of agriculture and industry. More than 70 per cent of the world's peoples still subsist in a condition of poverty and penury. If the existing imbalance is allowed to continue between the haves and the have-nots, the highly developed and the underdeveloped countries, it would, apart from being a source of misery and unhappiness, be continuously a source of trouble and conflict. As in the past, in the future it is bound to lead to bitterness and struggle, revolutions and wars. Another world war, we are all painfully aware, may not even leave any historians to chronicle the sad story.

As the problem is global, the remedy has also to be global. This organisation founded for saving "succeeding generations from the scourge of war" must rise to the full height of its glorious objectives and purposes and supply the leaderships and sinews of peace. The results of such action in material and moral terms are beyond measurement. If the nations of the world can display the same faith in their ability to win peace as in their ability to bring death, destruction and annihilation, mankind could yet be saved.

The Indian Delegation is happy to recall that even in the darkest days of our struggle in the midst of our non-violent battle, the Father of Our Nation, Mahatma Gandhi, asked our people to turn the light inwards and concentrate their energies on a constructive programme. "Build up the villages in which more than 70 per cent of India's population lived; make more cloth for covering the half-naked; remove the curse of untouchability"--these were some of his battle cries. He gave the same emphasis to our economic regeneration

and social advancement as to our political freedom.

Peace cannot any longer be spoken of in abstract terms. We have to translate into action every weapon of peace as assiduously as some of us are trying to forge the weapons of war. We must perforce reverse some of our thinking. In the words of a great author if we invest pennies and cents in peace and dollars in war we scorn the former and invite the latter. It is however gratifying that there is no lack of awareness or goodwill. There is perhaps a lack of imagination to grasp the immensity of the needs and the magnitude of the task. It is not possible in the world of ours today to have a cheap war or a cheap peace. Peace today needs as much money, effort, faith and courage, as war. The biggest enterprise in our century is going to be the common enterprise of waging peace and of investing in human skills, in human energy, in God's bounties which nature has given, in short, in investing in peace till mankind realises that "peacefare" is bigger and better than "warfare". We can only do this job by acting together, working and struggling together in this what my Prime Minister called "an exciting adventure".

Whatever our differences might be, on the question of disarmament, the method, the stages, the quality and the quantity of it, we are all united in the urgent need for fighting poverty, disease, want and illiteracy. In our national spheres, even the most heavily armed countries have not hesitated to tackle problems of unemployment, higher standards of living, higher education, industrialisation in spite of their heavy military budgets. The need for international action is as great as

<Pg-22>

the need for national action in all these fields and therefore it is the view of my delegation that the establishment of SUNFED should not be contingent on the progress or otherwise of disarmament. Both are vital needs for peace and friendly relations. The one can only help the other. Progress in one, should lead to progress in the other.

We cannot agree more with the ideas expressed by the United States and certain other countries in the phrase that only "Europeans can save Europe". To us it is an article of faith that only "Indians can save India". Planning and working together, we in India have achieved, well-nigh, miracles in the agricultural and industrial fields in the course of a few short years.

We are happy to state that the First Five-Year Plan which was inaugurated 3« years after our independence came to a successful conclusion in March, 1956. The primary object of this Plan was to lay the foundations of a more progressive and diversified economy. Certain urgent problems such as shortage of food and raw materials and persistent inflationary pressures were taken up. The Plan was intended primarily for building a base for more rapid advance. It paved the way for an economic and social order based upon the values of freedom and democracy in which there will be a substantial rise in

employment and largest measure of social justice. The Plan was not conceived in the interests of any section but was national in character. Its purpose was to strengthen our political and economic democracy.

The important targets proposed in the First Plan have been realised and some of them, in fact, exceeded. We had a five million ton deficit in food which we have nearly covered. Some 17 million acres of land have been brought under cultivation during these five years. Agricultural production on the whole went up at the rate of three per cent per annum and industrial production by six per cent. India's national income increased by 18 per cent over the five-year period as against the target of 11 per cent. The generation of power increased from 2.3 million kilowatts to 3.5 million. The investment in private sector came up to expectations and in the public sector the development expenditure in 1955-56 is over 2« times the level in 1951-52. The Plan introduced a new dynamic element in a long static situation.

Our guiding principle in the acceptance of external aid has been that it should be used only to supplement resources of the country and is to be marginal in character. The total aid received from outside sources for the First Five-Year Plan was only about 10 per cent of the entire outlay. It will be observed that we have borne the major burden in spite of the immense difficulties we have had to face. Countries from which aid has been received include Australia, Canada, Norway, New Zealand, the United States, the Soviet Union, the United Kingdom and many others. We have also received technical assistance under the Colombo Plan, the Indo-United States Technical Co-operation Programme and the United Nations programme of technical assistance. We are deeply grateful to the countries and organisations which have helped us to achieve the objectives of the First Five-Year Plan.

However, the unsolved problems are enormous. Therefore a big and bold advance is envisaged in the Second Five-Year Plan. This Second Plan which has gone into operation has four principal objectives.

The first, is to secure a sizeable increase in the national income. For the first time after the inauguration of the First Five-Year Plan the growth of national income has over-stepped the growth of population. The Second Five-Year Plan envisages securing an increase of 25 per cent in the national income and 18 per cent in the per capita income.

The second objective is rapid industrialisation with particular emphasis on basic and heavy industries.

The third objective is to provide large expansion of employment opportunities. We hope to absorb about 11 million unemployed by the end of the Second Five-Year Plan.

The fourth objective is to reduce the present inequalities in income and wealth and provide for a more even distribution of economic power.

A country like India which starts late on industrialisation has to encompass within a relatively small period processes of development which took several generations for the

<Pg-23>

more advanced countries of today. Therefore one of the essentials is to co-ordinate our planning to enable us to use all the resources available with efficiency and speed.

The total outlay on the Second Five-Year Plan is going to be about, 15 billion dollars. Here again, about 75 per cent of the total amount required would come from the country itself. We are marshalling all the resources of our people to take us forward in our next step.

I have mentioned our targets and achievements in the First Five-Year Plan and our goal and hopes in the Second Five-Year Plan only to emphasise that the main burden of the co-operative effort to attain economic stability and to achieve agricultural, industrial and social progress must necessarily rest on our people. The effort, the struggle and the sacrifice involved in a projected development of more than 20 billion dollars, in the course of 10 years, for a country with the very low income levels, standards of living, high illiteracy, agricultural and industrial backwardness as ours would be stupendous. It would therefore be superfluous for us to state that we recognise international co-operation and assistance are crucial factors for us, as well as for all underdeveloped countries in building tip their economies.

In our attempts to industrialise our country we look for friends in all the industrialised countries. Just as in the political sphere we have tried to cultivate the friendship of all countries in the interest of human peace and progress, in the economic sphere, we have not confined our contacts to any particular country, bloc or camp. Here again, we have tried to assess our needs and the offers to meet them, on their economic merits. The best illustration of this approach of ours is the pattern we have followed in the steel industry. The Tata Iron and Steel Company, which is a private company, is expanding her production approximately from one to two million tons of ingot a year through the technical advice provided by Americans and capital from the World Bank. The consultants of the other steel company, the Indian Iron and Steel, are British. Government themselves are setting up three new steel plants through the help of the Germans, the British and the Russians. In the dye stuff industry the American Cynamide and Hilton. Davis Corporation, the Imperial Chemicals of the United Kingdom and the CIBAS of Switzerland are helping us. In the field of automobile engineering, we have agreement with the Chrysier and Willys Corporation in the U.S., with the Nuffield group in the United Kingdom, the First Group in Italy, and the Mercedes-Benz in Germany. Such examples could be multiplied.

While receiving aid we have tried to give economic and technical aid to our neighbours to the limits of our limited capacity. The sphere of this regional loop and co-operation is bound to enlarge our economy and our ability to help grow.

Towards the Expanded Programme of Technical Assistance we have steadily increased our contribution. During the last six years we have doubled our contribution. Starting with 250,000 dollars in 1951 we have pledged to give 500,000 dollars in 1957. We ourselves have greatly benefited by this programme. Though we have received more than we have given, we could certainly do with more. It has been particularly valuable to us as it enables us to get assistance from countries with which we have no bilateral arrangements for technical aid.

Mr. Philippe De Seyves, the Under Secretary for Economic and Social Council, made a very significant statement, in opening our debate, to the effect, that-the per capita income disparity is widening between developed and underdeveloped countries and he has not observed any tendency to reverse or even arrest this progress. According to his figures, while developed countries increased the per capita income by 40 per cent, underdeveloped countries during the same period could increase theirs only by five per cent. This imbalnce would have to be rectified by both national and international effort.

My delegation was happy to hear the views of the French Delegation regarding the necessity of multilateral aid and an overall plan for the same. Practically all the countries who have participated in the debate on this item have expressed their support of measures for organising multilateral aid. What form this should take, when and how it should be operated, these are matters on which we hope we would come to some agreement.

<Pg-24>

We have closely studied the draft resolution sponsored by Canada and Norway asking the Secretary-General to undertake a study of the bilateral and multilateral economic aid programmes. Canada and Norway have been two of the foremost countries among the more advanced ones to offer generous and large assistance to underdeveloped countries. We have tried to understand and bring the most sympathetic approach to the proposals put forward by these two very friendly countries. We have been unable to find any justification for supporting this resolution. It is not academic studies and lengthy surveys that the people of the world need or expect from the United Nations. We would, therefore, urge the Canadian and Norwegian Delegations not to press for a vote their wellmeant resolution.

The time has come to plan on a planet-wide scale and put the plan into immediate operation. A bold, broad and global programme is what the world needs. It would not only help the underdeveloped countries but would eventually weld groups that are unfortunately suspicious

and hostile today.

The health and vigour of the developed and industrialised countries can only increase with the higher standard of living and industrialisation in the backward countries. Canada and Switzerland are great examples of how advanced and industrialised countries can and do import many times more than the less fortunate ones. The United States exports to Canada are twice than to the whole of South America which have over 10 times the population. The United States exports to Canada are 18 times more than to India which has nearly 25 times its population. If the standard of living and the purchasing, power of about a billion and half people move up to the heights of the other billion, the economy of the latter would naturally soar to heavenly heights and, more than all the material gain, it would bring to all of us a moral and spiritual strength resulting from the sense of realistic participation in the great and glorious work of alleviating human misery and suffering, and bringing peace and plenty to the waiting dumb millions all over the world.

INDIA USA AUSTRALIA CANADA NEW ZEALAND NORWAY SRI LANKA RUSSIA SWITZERLAND GERMANY ITALY

Date: Jan 10, 1957

Volume No

1995

INDIA IN THE UNITED NATIONS

Statement on Geographical Distribution of U.N. Staff

The following is the text of the statement made on Jan 08, 1957 by Mr. R. Venkataraman, representative of India in the Fifth Committee of the United Nations, on the Geographical Distribution of the Stall in the United Nations:

The delegation of India brings up the question of proper geographical representation in the Secretariat of the U.N. almost every year. We are sure that the Secretary-General and his representative is as tired of listening to them as we are of making them. Nevertheless, we see justification for bringing: up this question again and again because we feel that a greater effort should be made to remedy the imbalance which exists in the Secretariat.

The delegation of india is fully aware that under Article 101 of the Charter the paramount consideration in employment of the staff and in determination of the conditions of service shall be the necessity of securing the highest standards of efficiency, competence and

integrity. The General Assembly at its Second Session adopted Resolution 153 (II), stating that the principle of balanced geographical distribution "does not conflict with the paramount consideration of employment of the staff as laid down in Article 101 paragraph 3 of, the Charter, namely the necessity of securing the highest standards of efficiency, competence and integrity".

The object of securing a proper geographical distribution was explained by the Secretary-General, in the following terms:

Rightly understood, the cardinal principle of geographical distribution is not that nationals of a particular nation should have a specified number of posts at a particular grade or grades but that in the first place the administration should be satisfied that the Secretariat is enriched by the experience and culture which each member-nation can furnish and that each member-nation should, in its turn, be satisfied that its own culture and philosophy makes a full contribution to the Secretariat.

We realises that overrepresentation of

$$<$$
Pg-25>

some countries was, inevitable at the start of the U.N. Organisation, and also that progress towards proper geographical distribution would be slow, as members of the staff once recruited cannot be displaced merely to make room for the principle of geographic distribution. We also note that some progress has been made in the direction of better balanced distribution and we have every confidence that the Secretary-General will pursue his efforts in this direction.

The delegation of India wishes to make it clear that in raising this question we are not seeking jobs for our nationals. The gigantic Second Five-Year Plan which India has launched has made a very great demand on her own personnel, and actually emergency recruitment of personnel for the great task is going on in the country. Our purpose is to ensure that the Secretariat does represent all the cultural and intellectual qualities of all member-States. In its membership, the U.N. is approaching universality, and the Secretariat must reflect that fact. It is our firm belief that the more it does so, the stronger and richer will be this body of international civil servants.

With this preface, the delegation of India proposes to examine the Note Document A C.5 689 presented to us by the Secretary-General. With a view to meeting the demand of better geographical distribution, the Secretary-General made a suggestion at an earlier session that greater use should be made in United Nations Secretariat of fixed-term staff obtained largely by secondment from Government Services, universities, and similar institutions. The Expert Committee on Salary Review have commended the suggestion in paragraph 53 of their report. It is stated:

Apart altogether from the advantages of such a policy in correcting unbalanced geographical distribution of staff, the Committee agrees with the view put to it that a constant and substantial influx of new ideas and experience is essential if complacency and bureaucracy are to be avoided.

Subject to certain reservations that the fixed-term appointments should not unduly block legitimate aspiration for promotion to higher grades, the delegation of India is in general agreement with the proposed policy. It has noticed from the Note of the Secretary-General that this principle has already been given effect to and that 52 or 2/3 of the total appointments were fixed-term appointments, secondment from national civil service, etc. But in the distribution of even these fixed-term appointments, it is regarded that the imbalance in geographical distribution persists. For instance, there were nine new appointments from the United Kingdom of which two are career appointments are the rest seven fixed-tenn appointments. The total number of staff from the United Kingdom in the United Nations is 152. This instance is cited not as a complaint against the United Kingdom, the efficiency for whose civil service we have the highest regard, but as an illustration that even in the, distribution of fixed-term appointments, the problem persists.

In paragraph 3(d), the Note states:

The aim should be wide geographical distribution not only numerically but also in the higher levels of the Secretariat and in those phases of its work in which different backgrounds and contributions can be so important.

That is to say that in the higher echelon and policy-making levels, there should be a balanced geographical distribution to enable the Secretariat to reflect the, different cultures and philosophies of member-States.

Let us examine from this point of view the changes in the Secretariat effective during the year under review. Table four gives an account of the number of staff at the level of principal officer (D-1) and above, between 31 August 1955 and 31 August 1956. It is only officers at that level that can make a contribution to the plans and policies of the Secretariat as distinct from purely professional work.

An analysis shows that out of 97 officers at the level of the principal officer and above, 25 are from the United States; 32 from the Western European countries, that is, the United Kingdom (14), France, Sweden, Netherlands, and Switzerland; 11 from Eastern European countries; 11 from African and Asian countries including five from China; seven from Latin America.

<Pg-26>

It is a pity that 2/3 of the humanity represented by the African-Asian countries should have only 11 out of 97 officers and that 20

Latin American countries have only 7 out of 97 officers. At the same time, the Western European countries contribute 113 of the total number of officers.

Even in the matter of promotion, my delegation feels that due consideration should be given to the principle of geographical distribution. According to the Note A/C.5/689, there appears to have been eight promotions in the officers' level of which one goes to a Latin American country and none to the African Asian countries.

The delegation of India is deeply sensible of the great pains that the Secretary-General takes over this question of better geographical distribution. The statement which my delegation just now made is no reflection at all on his endeavours in the pursuit of this ideal. It is a legacy coming down from the initial and past recruitment. Therefore, while taking note of the report, the delegation of India will appeal to the Secretary-General to continue his efforts towards the objective of staffing on as wide a geographical basis as possible the posts in the Secretariat.

[Shri V. K. Krishna Menon's statement on the Kashmir question in the UN Security Council on 23 and 24 January 1957 has been published separately. Copies can be obtained on request from the Information Service of India (External Publicity Division), New Delhi.]

INDIA USA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC FRANCE SWEDEN SWITZERLAND CHINA

Date: Jan 08, 1957

Volume No

1995

PAKISTAN

Trade Agreement

Negotiations between the Trade Delegation from Pakistan and the representatives of the Government of India for strengthening and developing commercial relations between the two countries began in New Delhi on Jan 15, 1957. The negotiations resulted in a Trade Agreement which was signed on 22 January 1957 on behalf of the Government of India by Shri S. Ranganathan, Secretary, Ministry of Commerce and Consumer Industries, and on behalf of the Government of Pakistan by Mr. Aziz Ahmed, Secretary, Ministry of Commerce.

A Press Note issued in New Delhi on 31 January 1957 announced the ratification of the agreement by the two Governments and stated that the agreement will come into force from 1 February 1957.

The following is the text of the Trade Agreement:

The Government of India and the Government of Pakistan being desirous of strengthening and developing commercial relations between their respectives countires have agreed as follows:

ARTICLE I:--The two Governments recognising the needs and requirements of each other for foreign exchange in the context of their developing economies and having regard to the present disequilibrium in their trade and payments position undertake to explore all possibilities for expansion of trade between the two countries on the basis of mutual advantage.

ARTICLE II:--With regard to the commodities/goods mentioned in Schedules `A' and `B' attached to this agreement, the two Governments shall facilitate imports from and exports to each other's territories to the extent permitted by their respective laws, regulations and procedures.

ARTICLE III:--Imports and exports of the commodities/goods mentioned in Schedules `A' and, `B' shall normally take place through ordinary commercial channels, except where either Government finds it necessary to buy or sell part or whole of the quantity/value of any item on Government account.

ARTICLE IV:--With respect to commodities/goods not included in Schedules `A' and `B' export or import shall also be permitted in accordance with the laws, regulations and procedures in force in either country from time to time.

<Pg-27>

ARTICLE V:--Each Government shall accord to the commerce of the country of the other Government treatment no less favourable than that accorded to the commerce of any third country.

s of Article V shall not apply to: (a) any advantage which either country has accorded or may accord at any time during the period of validity of this agreement to other bordering countries in order to facilitate frontier traffic; (b) any advantages accorded in connection with a Customs union or free trade zone of which either country may become a member; (c) preferences or advantages accorded by either country to any third country prior to 15 August 1947 or in replacement thereof.

ARTICLE VII:--The two Governments recognising the need for entering into special arrangements as contemplated by Article XXIV (11) of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade agree to enter into such arrangements. The commodities covered by such special arrangements and the nature and scope thereof are set out in Schedule `C' (not included in this issue).

ARTICLE VIII:--In order to meet the day-to-day requirements of the people living within a ten-mile belt of the border between West Bengal, Assam and Tripura on the one hand and East Pakistan on the other and with a view to providing facilities to these people to dispose of their goods, border trade shall be allowed in the commodities specified in accordance with Schedule 'D' to this agreement.

ARTICLE IX:--In order to facilitate the implementation of this agreement, the two Governments shall consult with each other as and when necessary and in any case review the working of the agreement every six months.

ARTICLE X:--Subject to the approval of the Governments of India and Pakistan this agreement shall come into force with effect from 1 February 1957. It shall remain in force up to 31 January 1960, provided that after the expiry of the first year it may be terminated by either party giving six months' notice in writing to the other. The Schedules attached to the agreement will be subject to revision by mutual consultation before the commencement of the year 1958 and 1959.

Done at New Delhi this Twenty-second day of January, 1957.

(Sd.) S. RANGANATHAN (Sd.) AZIZ AHMED For the Government For the Government of India of Pakistan

SCHEDULE 'A'

EXPORTS FROM INDIA TO PAKISTAN:

(Commodities/goods): Coal; stone boulders; stones (Pakur); silpatta; fire bricks; lime and lime stone; mica; bauxite; barytes (white); pigments and dry colours; dyeing and tanning substances; chemicals; drugs and medicines, including Ayurvedic and Unani medicines; mill board and straw board; machinery and mill work, e.g., textile machinery, agricultural machinery, sugar-cane crushing machinery, rice, flour and oil crushing machinery, printing machinery, centrifugal pumps; workshop equipment including hand tools and machine tools; electric instruments, apparatus and appliances; electric cables and wires; fluorescent electric tubes; electric insulation material; accumulators and batteries; bicycles and spare parts; scientific instruments, including laboratory glassware; glass bottles, jars and phials; iron and steel bolts, nuts and screws; sanitary ware; agarwood; canes and rattans; cinema films; books, periodicals and newspapers; essential oils; sugar; tea for blending; coffee; betel leaves; biri and hukka tobacco; biri leaves; spices; fresh fruits; catechu; potatoes; buffalo horns; conch shells; gums and resins; synthetic stones.

SCHEDULE 'B'

EXPORTS FROM PAKISTAN TO INDIA:

(Commodities/goods): Raw jute; hides and skins; fish including dried fish, poultry and eggs; betel leaves; betel nuts; fresh and dried fruits; coriander and methi seeds; spices; honey; books and periodicals, and newspapers; cinema films; cement; salt-petre; machine tools; bicycles and spare parts; surgical instruments; sports goods; wood and timber all sorts, other than hard wood.

SCHEDULE 'D'

PROVISIONS RELATING TO BORDER TRADE REFERRED TO IN ARTICLE VIII

<Pg-28>

OF THE AGREEMENT: These facilities shall apply only to the trade across the Land Customs frontiers between West Bengal, Assam and Tripura on the one hand and East Pakistan on the other.

- 2. These facilities shall be available only to persons holding `A' category visas.
- 3. As from the expiry of a period of six months from the date of entry into force of this agreement, however, all such persons may cross the border for this purpose only once a day in each direction and only through such routes as may be authorised in this behalf. Each Government will, after such consultation with the other as may be necessary, be free to prescribe an adequate number of such routes having regard to the requirements of bona fide border trade.
- 4. The carriage of goods covered by the Schedule shall be free from import, export and exchange control restrictions as well as Customs duties and Customs formalities except those required for purposes of paragraph 6 below.
- 5. The persons engaged in border trade may carry in cash a sum not exceeding Rs. 5 in Indian currency when going from India to Pakistan and a similar amount in Pakistan currency when going from Pakistan to India.
- 6. Either Government may maintain such checks and such preventive measures, including the right to search, as are considered necessary to ensure that these concessions are not exceeded or abused.

[The commodities for trade in this area include items of daily consumption like fish, poultry and eggs, soap, vegetables and fresh fruits, milk and milk products, kerosene, betel leaves, fodder and firewood.]

Letters were exchanged between Shri S. Ranganathan and Mr. Aziz Ahmed clarifying certain points raised during the discussions between the two delegations. The following is the text of a letter dated 22 January 1957 from Shri Ranganathan to Mr. Aziz Ahmed:

My dear Aziz Ahmed,

During the course of discussions between our two delegations which resulted in a fresh Trade Agreement between India and Pakistan which was signed today, matters relating to Ziratia tenants were also discussed. It was agreed that the question of facilities to Ziratia tenants was connected with the prevention of smuggling and improvement of facilities for the transit of foodgrains through East Pakistan to Tripura. As a result of these discussions, the following understanding was reached:

- (1) The Ziratia tenants residing on either side of the Tripura-East Pakistan border, who have land on either side of the border within a ten-mile belt, shall continue to be allowed to take across the border, within a reasonable period after the harvest, 40 maunds of paddy per family or the total produce of such land cultivated by them, whichever is less.
- (2) The representatives of the two Governments shall meet before the end of February, 1957, with a view to devising as early as possible measures to improve the facilities for the movement of foodgrains through East Pakistan to Tripura. The steps set out in the attached enclosure, which have been suggested by the Indian Delegation, will among others be considered in this behalf.
- (3) As from the expiry of a period of six months after 31 January 1957, all Ziratia tenants may cross the border with paddy only through such routes as may be authorised in this behalf. Before the expiry of this period, the representatives of the two Governments will meet to consult with each other about the routes to be prescribed for the purpose and measures necessary. for the implementation of the provisions in (1) above without the concessions envisaged therein being abused.
- (4) The two Governments shall, before the end of November, 1957, enter into consultation with each other for reviewing the implementation of the arrangements relating to Ziratia tenants and the improvements made in the transit facilities through East Pakistan into Tripura.

<Pg-29>

I shall be grateful if you will confirm that the above correctly sets out the understanding that was reached between us.

Yours sincerely, (Sd.) S. RANGANATHAN

ENCLOSURE REFERRED TO IN SHRI RANGANATHAN'S LETTER REGARDING ZIRATIA TENANTS: Suggestions for improvement of movement facilities between East Pakistan and Tripura:

- 1. The Liaison Officer of the Indian Railway at Shantahar may be provided with the assistance of one more Inspector who may be posted at Akhaura. These two officers should look after the timely transit of wagons for Tripura.
- 2. Clearance facilities should be provided at Kasba Railway Station.
- 3. A siding from Kasba Railway Station inside Tripura territory should be provided.
- 4. Sidings into Tripura territory should be provided by extension from Balla and Belonia Railway Stations.
- 5. Demurrage for non-clearance of goods arriving by M. G. wagons at Akhaura, Balla. and Belonia should not be charged so long as the responsibility for delay does not lie on the consignee. Particularly no demurrage should be charged on M. G. wagons which bring only part of goods transhipped from M. G. wagons and not allowed to be cleared till the remaining component M. G. wagons have arrived.
- 6. Certificates of short delivery should be given at points of destination in East Bengal territory in respect of goods cleared for Tripura.
- 7. Railway out-agency should be provided at Agartala.

The following is the text of Mr. Aziz Ahmed's reply dated 22 January to Shri Ranganathan's letter:

My dear Ranganathan,

I write to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of today's date which reads as follows:

(not reproduced)

I confirm that the above sets out the position correctly.

Yours sincerely, (Sd.) AZIZ. AHMED

The following is the text of another letter dated 22 January 1957 from Shri Ranganathan to Mr. Aziz Ahmed:

My dear Aziz Ahmed,

We have exchanged letters today regarding the concessions to Ziratia tenants. I write this letter to seek confirmation of the following three points which arose during the discussions:

(1) With reference to paragraph 1 (2) of that letter we agreed that the discussions between the representatives of the two Governments in regard to improvement of transit facilities to Tripura through East Pakistan need not necessarily be confined to improvement in transit

facilities in relation to food-grains only.

- (2) With reference to paragraph 1 (4) of that letter you maintained that the fact that the transit facilities through East Pakistan to Tripura were in the judgement of the Government of India inadequate would not justify their withdrawing the facilities for the Ziratia tenants. I, however, made it clear to you that it was my understanding that in the event of the improvement in the transit facilities through East Pakistan to Tripura, not being adequate in the opinion of the Government of India, the Government of India will be free to reconsider the entire rarangements relating to the Ziratia tenants.
- (3) We also agreed that these arrangements regarding Ziratia tenants set out in the correspondence referred to above, will come into effect after ratification by our respective Governments.

Yours sincerely, (Sd.) S. RANGANATHAN

The following is the text of Mr. Aziz Ahmed's reply dated 22 January to the above letter of Shri Ranganathan:

My dear Ranganathan,

I write to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of today's date which reads as follows:

(not reproduced)

<Pg-30>

I confirm that the above sets out the position correctly.

Yours sincerely, (Sd.) AZIZ AHMED

The following is the text of another letter dated 22 January 1957 from Shri Ranganathan to Mr. Aziz Ahmed:

My dear Aziz Ahmed,

During the course of the discussions between our two delegations which resulted in a fresh Trade Agreement between India and Pakistan, the difficulties being experienced by the Persons residing in the border areas between India and East Pakistan, resulting from the non-issue of `A' category visas in sufficient numbers and the present complicated procedure followed in issuing them were discussed. It was agreed that these questions should be discussed at an early date between representatives of the two Governments, with a view to resolving these difficulties.

I should be grateful if you would kindly confirm that the foregoing

correctly sets out the understanding reached between us.

Yours sincerely, (Sd.) S. RANGANATHAN

The following is the text of Mr. Aziz Ahmed's reply dated 22 January to the above letter of Shri Ranganathan:

My dear Ranganathan,

I write to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of today's date which reads as follows:

(not reproduced)

I confirm that the foregoing correctly sets out the understanding reached between us.

Yours sincerely, (Sd.) AZIZ AHMED

PAKISTAN INDIA USA UNITED KINGDOM CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC MALI

Date: Jan 15, 1957

Volume No

1995

PAKISTAN

Recovery of Abducted Persons

A Press Note was issued in New Delhi on Jan 24, 1957 giving details of the important decisions taken at the Indo-Pakistan conference on the recovery of abducted persons held in July, 1956. The Press Note said:

The Governments of Pakistan and India ratified on 22 September 1956, and 15 October 1956, respectively, the decisions taken at the Indo-Pakistan Conference held in Karachi on 28 July 1956, on recovery of abducted persons. Some of the important decisions taken at the conference were:

1. The principle and desirability of a joint fact-finding commission to ascertain the extent of outstanding work of recovery was reemphasised and the two high-powered officers were asked to submit their report in this connection as early as possible.

- 2. The need for associating the District Administration with the recovery work was recognised, and it was agreed that the local officials should be encouraged to give clues for tracing the abducted persons. The identity of the informants would be kept secret. Officials and non-officials who do commendable work would be suitably rewarded.
- 3. It was decided that the responsibility of the village lambardars to supply information regarding the whereabouts of abducted persons should be re-emphasised.
- 4. Political organisations in the two countries would be requested to lend their support to the cause of this humanitarian work.
- 5. Relatives and guides would be given full facilities to visit the other country for tracing the abducted persons.

<Pg-31>

PAKISTAN INDIA USA

Date: Jan 24, 1957

Volume No

1995

SYRIA

President Kuwatly's Visit

At the invitation of the President of India, His Excellency Mr. Shukri Al-Kuwatly, President of Syria, visited India during January, 1957. His Excellency arrived in New Delhi on 17 January and on the same day President Prasad held a State Banquet in honour of President Kuwatly and Madame Kuwatly. Speaking on the occasion, President Prasad said:

It is with great pleasure that I rise to welcome here in our midst His Excellency Mr. Shukri Al-Kuwatly, President of Syria, and Madame Bahira Al-Kuwatly. We welcome him as the Head of a State with which India's relations are very cordial and long-standing. May I say that, like India, Syria is a country with a great past with its cultural traditions rooted in its soil? Syria has seen the rise and fall of empires and civilisations.

There is enough historical evidence to show that there were contacts between the people of Syria and those of this country in pre-Christian era and also for a few centuries after Christ. Those early connections and friendly ties, I am glad to say, have found full fruition in our cordial relations in the modern era when both India and Syria have emerged as independent States. Our connections dating from ancient times have found great support today when our two countries are marching forward on the path of reconstruction for the prosperity of our respective peoples. These facts, the keen desire of India and Syria to maintain world peace and to do all that is possible for the achievement of that objective and our community of interests and ideals provide a strong background to our relations as two friendly States.

We in this country are busy with the task of raising the standard of our people and increasing the prosperity of the nation. For this purpose we have recently launched the Second Five-Year Plan after the completion of the First Plan. I am sure Your Excellency will visit at least some of the places where our major nation-building works are in progress.

The increasing cordiality and understanding between our nations has been a matter of profound satisfaction to the Government and people of India. We are happy to see that in our approach to world problems our countries are animated by the same desire to maintain friendly relations with other countries on the basis of the noble principles of the Bandung Declaration. It is our fervent hope that mutual understanding should grow and cultural and commercial relations between Syria and India should develop still more closely to our mutual advantage. Continued mutual co-operation between Syria and India is sure to advance the cause of peace.

India is a secular State and our Constitution enjoins equality of opportunity in public services and other walks of life for all citizens irrespective of class, colour or creed.

We are all so happy to see Your Excellency in our midst and feel sure that Your Excellency's visit to this country will further strengthen the bonds of friendship and fellow-feeling subsisting between the people of India and Syria. While thanking Your Excellency and Madame Bahira Al-Kuwatly once again, I extend you a hearty welcome and hope that your stay in India will be pleasant and comfortable.

SYRIA INDIA UNITED KINGDOM USA INDONESIA

Date: Jan 24, 1957

Volume No

1995

SYRIA

President Kuwatly's Speech

President Kuwatly, in his speech, said:

We are delighted to be here amongst you in this great homeland of India. I am greatly delighted to have responded to the invitation extended by Your Excellency, this invitation which provides us with a valuable opportunity to come here and visit your great land and witness for ourselves your great projects, your great schemes for the development and reconstruction of your great land. I am delighted to visit this historical land

<Pg-32>

whose history is one of the prominent chapters in the history of mankind, whose history in the past was a centre of radiation for the ancient world, whose history at present is a source of inspiration for mankind in its march for liberty, freedom and dignity, whose history is bound to be in future a source of guidance for all kinds of efforts of mankind, in order to establish a better world based on freedom and democracy. We are delighted to visit this country in order to become familiar with the great awakening and renaissance of India and its march for advancement and for the raising and lifting of standards of living for the people of India. We are delighted to visit the homeland of the great Master, Mahatma Gandhi, who had awakened the minds and hearts of all its people for liberty and emancipation, for the independence and sovereignty of India. Our visit to this great homeland of yours will be of great valuable experience for us. And India after all with all its values, with all its contributions is no possession of its own people but it is the possession of mankind in establishing a better world for the whole world.

Your Excellency, although this is my first visit to your great country but still this is not the first contact between our two countries. We have met in the past on many a common ground. Our contacts in ancient times, in medieval ages, are to be found in the history of civilisation and in a brilliant chapter of common culture amongst our two countries. Now, with the knowledge of the fact that India was a great centre of culture, a great storehouse of human knowledge and a great reservoir of learning, it was from that reservoir that the Arabs have been able to create a synthesis of culture, which they have given to the world and which has formed the backbone of the present civilisation, the backbone of the present renaissance. We in Syria who have fought for our liberty and independence and have passed through hardships and suffering in the movement for the liberation of our country, and looking forward for the unity and liberation of the rest of the Arab world, we find in our visit here an invitation for a common front, for a common platform, where through-our common efforts we will be able to make our valuable contribution to mankind in its march for progress and dignity. And it is on the basis of the Five Principles for which

India has become best known in the world, those Five Principles which formed the basis of the Resolution of the Bandung Conference as an epoch in the history of human relations. It is on the basis of those resolutions and on the basis of these principles that we have formulated our policy of non-alignment, a policy of positive neutralism, which in no way means a policy of isolation, but it certainly does mean an active policy on which we base our attitudes on the merits of any international situation, with no intention of being isolated, with no intention of taking sides with this or that bloc. The recent aggression that has been committed against Egypt was only one evidence to show that it was through the policy of the Arab world--a policy of non-alignment and positive neutralism--that we were able not only to save our countries from the devastation and destruction of war, and to prevent this incident developing into a global war, but also to be an active factor in establishing peace and tranquility all over the globe.

Your Excellency, I should like at the end to express my thanks, gratitude and thankfulness for the warm reception and welcome extended to us and to my party. I am quite confident that our visit will not only strengthen the ties of friendship which already subsist between our two countries, but they will grow further to strengthen the bonds between India and the Arab world, so that all of us will make our valuable contribution to the establishment of peace for the rest of mankind.

SYRIA INDIA USA INDONESIA EGYPT

Date: Jan 24, 1957

Volume No

1995

SYRIA

Nehru-Kuwatly Joint Statement

After talks in New Delhi on International Affairs, Prime Minister Nehru and President Kuwatly issued a joint statement on Jan 22, 1957. The following is the text of the statement:

At the invitation of the President of India, His Excellency the President of Syria paid a visit to India. He arrived on 17 January and after three days' stay left Delhi to visit other parts of India. During his stay in Delhi, talks were held between the President of Syria and the Foreign Minister of Syria, and the Prime Minister of India. These

related to the international situation, and in particular, to the situation in the Middle East. The talks, which took place in a most cordial atmosphere, have shown a close similarity of views over a wide range of international problems.

It was agreed that among the most signal developments in recent times has been the emergence into freedom of a large number of countries in Asia and Africa. With freedom from colonial and imperialist domination has emerged a new thinking. This is embodied in the Joint Communique by Asian and African States in Bandung in April 1955. The desire of Syria and India for peace and friendship with all nations and to regulate their international relations on the basis of the Bandung principles was re-affirmed. These principles, particularly those of peaceful co-existence, non-aggression and non-intervention, deserve to be commended to all nations. It is necessary that conditions should be created favourable for the development of international thinking on the lines of the Bandung Declaration. The policy of non-alignment pursued by the two countries can best contribute to peace and harmony and to the realisation of the Bandung principles.

The prime need of the hour is that the passions and conflicts which have recently convulsed the world and threatened world peace should be allowed to subside. All nations should help in this process, and nothing should be done which would aggravate the tensions and conflicts in the Middle East. Progressive forces working for freedom and stability and for the realisation of the national aspirations of the people in this area should be encouraged so that they may help in healing divisions and conflicts. The United Nations with its recent increased authority can assist in this process. A special responsibility lies on the big powers in this regard.

In reviewing the recent grave events in the Middle East, satisfaction was expressed during the talks at the clear and unequivocal stand taken by the United Nations in regard to the aggression against Egypt. The several resolutions adopted by the United Nations in this regard represented a triumph of those principles upon which are founded the faith and hope of countries which have lately emerged into full independence. It is a matter of gratification that the common loyalty of the two countries to these principles had led to a widening area of co-operation between them.

In Egypt, it is a matter of concern that, while most foreign troops have been withdrawn, Israeli troops continue to occupy a part of Egyptian territory and the Gaza strip. Any further delay in the withdrawal of these troops is likely to create new dangers. It is hoped that the United Nations will ensure the complete withdrawal of all Israeli troops behind the armistice lines.

The problems of the Middle East can only be solved if the countries in that area are able, in complete freedom and without domination by

any foreign power, to develop in accordance with their genius and traditions, more particularly in the economic and social fields, in order to raise the standards of living of their peoples. A military approach to the problems of this area will only serve to create further disharmony and instability, besides contributing to the heightening of tension and endangering world peace. Intervention by the big powers in the form of military pacts and alliances is detrimental to peace and stability in the Middle East. The Baghdad Pact has caused bitter conflicts and divisions in the Arab world and has greatly increased international tension.

The two countries have subscribed to the declaration at Bandung that colonialism in all its manifestations is an evil which should be brought to an end. They reaffirm their support to the cause of freedom and independence of all peoples under foreign domination which constitutes a denial of fundamental human rights. In particular they declare their strong support for the movement for national freedom in Algeria. They trust the Algerian people will be enabled to exercise their right of self-determination and independence without further delay.

The President and the Prime Minister note with satisfaction the close and cordial relations existing between the Governments and peoples of Syria and India. They reiterate the desire of the two countries to strengthen further their relations, and to this end they are resolved to bring about increasing cultural and economic co-operation between their countries.

<Pg-34>

SYRIA INDIA INDONESIA EGYPT ISRAEL USA IRAQ ALGERIA

Date: Jan 22, 1957

Volume No

1995

UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS

Marshal Zhukov's Visit

At the invitation of the Government of India, Marshal G. K. Zhukov, Soviet Defence Minister, paid a visit to India. He arrived in New Delhi on Jan 24, 1957 and on the same day a Dinner Party was held in his honour by Dr. K. N. Katju, India's Minister for Defence. Welcoming Marshal Zhukov, Dr. Katju said:

On behalf of the Government of India, I extend to Your Excellency a

very hearty welcome to this country, and to the capital city. Last year, we had the pleasure and the honour of welcoming the Prime Minister of your great country and Mr.Khrushchev. Your Excellency's visit, as that of Mr. Bulganin and Mr. Khrushchev, is, if I may say so, a token of the friendship that exists between our two countries, and between our peoples. We trust that Your Excellency's stay in this country will be pleasant, and that, within the all-too-short period of your visit, you will have the opportunity of seeing something of our country and of our people, and also to form, at first hand, impressions of what this country has been able to accomplish during the few years of our independence, and to understand and appreciate the ideals for which we are constantly striving. I am particularly happy that Your Excellency's visit has coincided with the celebrations connected with our Republic Day--a day of very great significance to us, and which we endeavour to celebrate in a fitting manner.

The Government of India have arranged a programme of visits for Your Excellency, and I am glad to see that though the period of Your Excellency's visit is short, the visits have been so arranged as to enable Your Excellency to observe a fair cross-section of our activities. I can assure Your Excellency that wherever you may be visiting in this country, you are certain to receive a most warm welcome from our people. Although this is Your Excellency's first visit to India, you are already well known to the Indian people as one of the greatest military leaders, who made an outstanding contribution to the victory of the Allies during World War II. Your fame and renown has spread to distant lands throughout the world.

The greatest need of the present day is a stable and just peace in the world which is possible only through international understanding. You, who know so well the tragedy and horror of war, will undoubtedly agree that the urgent need of humanity is to avoid war and establish a durable peace. Such a lasting peace is possible only through knowledge of each other, and there is nothing that facilitates this knowledge more than personal contacts. It is in this context that the exchange of friendly visits between people from different countries can be a means towards bringing together the peoples of the world and promoting mutual respect and friendship.

We are extremely happy that Your Excellency has found it possible to accept our invitation, and we trust that, when you return to your country, you will be able to carry with you the recollections of a very pleasant and happy visit.

UNITED KINGDOM INDIA USA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC

Date: Jan 24, 1957

Volume No

UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS

Marshal Zhukov's Speech

In his reply, Marshal Zhukov said:

I sincerely thank the esteemed Minister for Defence, Dr. Katju, for his expression of warm feelings addressed to the Soviet Union, its peoples, the Soviet Armed Forces and to me personally.

Allow me now to convey to the Indian people the best wishes of the Soviet peoples, the Soviet Armed Forces personnel, as well as of my own.

My friends and I arrived today in India on a mission of friendship at the invitation of esteemed Mr. Jawaharlal Nehru. We all cordially thank Mr. Nehru for his kind invitation.

It will be a great pleasure for us to get

<Pg-35>

acquainted with your beautiful country, a country of great and ancient culture, with your industrious people for whom the Soviet peoples entertain the most sincere feelings of friendship.

In its relations with India, the Soviet Government proceeds from the Leninist policy of peaceful co-existence and international co-operation, based on the principles of equality, sincere friendship and non-interference in one another's domestic affairs.

I am happy to state here that since the mutual visits Mr. Nehru, N. A. Bulganin and N. S. Khrushchev the friendly feelings of our peoples for the Indian people have become much stronger. Neither the differences in our political systems nor the different paths of our economic development prevent our countries from successfully developing a disinterested friendship, mutually beneficial cooperation or from fighting for peace and peoples' security.

Being a military man I should like to say a few words about peace.

It is known that the Soviet Union suffered incalculable losses in the last war against fascist Germany. Fascist troops destroyed and, plundered a considerable part of our country, they killed, crippled many millions of our men, women and children. There is no other country in the world whose peoples have suffered such great distress and sorrow in the last war.

A third world war, if it should ever be provoked by the enemies of peaceful coexistence and if it should break out regardless of

peoples' desires, will be a great destructive war threatening mankind with mass extermination and destroying its economic and cultural achievements.

The whole Soviet people, who know very well what war brings to mankind, is a great supporter of the policy of peaceful co-existence and is against any war. We whole-heartedly welcome the friendly Indian people, the Government of India and personally Mr. Nehru for their consistent and courageous struggle for peace and peoples' security....

The Soviet people are confident that the peoples of the socialist countries and peaceloving peoples of other countries, as well, will stand even more firm in the struggle for peace and independence of the peoples.

The Soviet people wholeheartedly welcome the Government of India and Mr. Nehru personally for the moral support given by them to the freedom-loving Arabian peoples of the Near and Middle East.

UNITED KINGDOM INDIA USA GERMANY

Date: Jan 24, 1957

Volume No

1995

UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS

Schedules to Trade Agreement Extended

Letters were exchanged in New Delhi on Jan 30, 1957 between the representatives of the Government of India and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, extending the validity of the Schedules 'A' and 'B' attached to the Trade Agreement which was signed on 2 December 1953.

The Schedules have been modified to include the following items:

SCHEDULE 'A' (For import into India): Aluminium and rough emeralds.

SCHEDULE 'B' (For export from India): Cashew-nuts; hydrogenated oils; footwear; woollen fabrics and mica.

The Trade Agreement is valid till 2 December 1953.

<Pg-36>

INDIA

Date: Jan 30, 1957

February

Volume No	
1995	_
CONTENTS	
Foreign Affairs Record 1957	
VOL. III No. 2	
CONTENTS	
CEYLON Agreement on Avoidance of Double Taxation on Income 37	
INDIA IN THE UNITED NATIONS Statement on Egyptian Situation	
INDONESIA Trade Agreement Extended 45	
PAKISTAN Migration from East Bengal 46	
TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE Indo-U.S. Agreement 48 Assistance for Geological Survey 49	
<pg-i></pg-i>	

INDIA EGYPT INDONESIA PAKISTAN USA

Date: Feb 01, 1957

Volume No

1995

CEYLON

Agreement on Avoidance of Double Taxation on Income

The Indo-Ceylon Agreement on the Avoidance of Double Taxation of Income between the two countries was notified in an Extraordinary issue of the Gazette of India published in New Delhi on Feb 08, 1957. The agreement was signed in Colombo in September, 1956. The following is the text of the agreement:

Whereas the Government of India and the Government of Ceylon desire to conclude an agreement for relief from or the avoidance of double taxation of income chargeable in the two countries in accordance with their respective laws;

Now, therefore, the said two Governments do hereby agree as follows:

ARTICLE I:--The taxes which are the subject of the present agreement are:

(a) In India;

the taxes imposed by the Indian Incometax Act, 1922 (XI of 1922).

- (b) In Ceylon;
- (i) the tax imposed by the Ceylon Profits Tax Act, 1948 (No. 5 of 1948),
- (ii) the tax imposed by the Ceylon Income-tax Ordinance, 1932 (2 of 1932) exclusive of the taxes mentioned in sub-clauses (i), (ii) and (iii) of section 45 (4) (b) of the said Ordinance.

The present agreement shall also apply to taxes that may be levied in India under a Profits Tax Act, similar to the Ceylon Profits Tax Act, 1948 (No. 5 of 1948), passed after the date of the present agreement.

ARTICLE II:--The present agreement shall come into force on the date on which the last of all such things shall have been done in India and Ceylon as are necessary to give the agreement the force of law in India and Ceylon respectively, and shall thereupon have effect for the assessment year 1950-51 and subsequent assessment years:

Provided that in respect of the two assessment years 1950-51 and 1951-52, instead of the abatement provided for in Articles III, IV and V of this agreement, double incometax relief in respect of incomes taxed both in India and Ceylon shall be computed and allowed as if the provisions of (i) the Incometax (Double Taxation Relief) (Ceylon) Rules, 1942, in India and (ii) section 46 of the Ceylon Income-tax Ordinance, 1932 (2 of 1932), in Ceylon, apply.

ARTICLE III:--Each country shall make assessment in the ordinary way under its own laws; and where either country under the operation of its laws charges any income from the sources or categories of transactions specified in column I of the Schedule to this agreement (hereinafter referred to as the Schedule) in excess of the amount calculated according to the percentages specified in columns II and III thereof, that country shall allow an abatement equal to the lower of the amounts of tax attributable to such excess in either country. (The Schedule is not included in this issue. Column I of the Schedule relates to "source of income or nature of transaction from which income is derived", while columns II and III relate to "percentage of income which each country is entitled to charge under the agreement".)

ARTICLE IV:--Where any income accruing or arising outside the two countries is chargeable to tax in both the countries, each country shall allow an abatement equal to one half of the lower amount of tax attributable in either country to such doubly taxed income.

ARTICLE V:--Where at the time of assessment in one country the tax attributable in the other country to the excess or the doubly taxed income referred to in Articles III and IV is not known, the first country shall make a demand without allowing any abatement, but shall hold in abeyance for a period of one year (or such longer period as may be allowed by the Income-tax Officer in his discretion) the collection of a portion of

<Pg-37>

the demand equal to an amount estimated by him to be the abatement likely to be due. If the assessee produces a certificate of assessment in the other country within the period of one year or any longer period allowed by the Income-tax Officer, the uncollected portion of the demand shall be adjusted against the abatement allowable under the agreement; but if no such certificate is produced within the aforesaid period, the abatement shall cease to be operative and the outstanding demand shall be collected forthwith.

ARTICLE VI:--An individual of Indian domicile, who is non-resident in Ceylon, shall be entitled to relief from the Ceylon Government equal to the excess of the Ceylon tax paid by him, by deduction or otherwise, on his Ceylon income for any assessment year over the amount which bears the same proportion to the amount which would be payable by him for that year by way of Ceylon tax if he were resident in Ceylon and chargeable in respect of his total income from all

sources, wherever arising, as the amount of such Ceylon income bears to the amount of such total income from all sources:

- (a) in respect of the five assessment years commencing with the assessment year 1950-51, and
- (b) in respect of any assessment year subsequent to the assessment year 1954-55 provided that during that assessment year the option provided for in the first and second provisos to sub-section (1) of section 17 of the Indian Income-tax Act, 1922, is available to individuals resident in Ceylon in regard to the Indian tax payable by them.

ARTICLE VII:--(1) The taxation authorities of the contracting Governments shall exchange such information (being information which is at their disposal under their respective taxation laws in the normal course of administration) as is necessary for carrying out the provisions of the present agreement. Any information so exchanged shall be treated as secret and shall not be disclosed to any person other than those concerned with the assessment and collection of the taxes which are the subject of the present agreement. No information as aforesaid shall be exchanged which would disclose any trade, business, industrial or professional secret or trade process.

(2) As used in this Article, the term "taxation authorities" means, in the case of India, the Commissioners of Income-tax, the Assistant Commissioners of Income-tax of the Income-tax Officers; in the case of Ceylon, the Commissioner of Income-tax or his authorised representative.

ARTICLE VIII:--(a) Nothing in this agreement shall be construed as modifying or interpreting in any manner the provisions of the relevant taxation laws in force in either country.

(b) If any question arises in any country as to whether any income falls within any one of the items specified in the Schedule and if so under which item, the question shall be decided without any reference to the treatment of such income in the assessment made by the other country.

ARTICLE IX:--The Schedule to this agreement may be modified from time to time by agreement between the Governments of the two countries and reference to the Schedule in the foregoing Articles shall be read as references to the Schedule as modified.

ARTICLE X:--The present agreement shall continue in effect indefinitely but either of the contracting Governments may, on or before 30 September in any calendar year, give to the other contracting Government written notice of termination, and in such event the present agreement shall cease to have effect in relation to assessments for the years of assessment commencing after the said date.

INDIA SRI LANKA USA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC

Date: Feb 08, 1957

Volume No

1995

INDIA IN THE UNITED NATIONS

Statement on Egyptian Situation

Shri V. K. Krishna Menon, Leader of the Indian Delegation to the United Nations, made the following statement on the Egyptian Situation in the Eleventh Session of the United Nations General Assembly on Feb 02, 1957:

We are once again debating today a subject that came before us as a matter of emergency three months ago. It cannot be a matter of congratulation to ourselves or an assurance that the cause of peace is being furthered when we realise that, three months after the first resolution was adopted, we are still reiterating the same resolution.

After all the speeches that the Assembly has had to hear today, it is not my purpose to elaborate my observations to any greater extent than is necessary for the purpose of the two draft resolutions before the Assembly.

The resolutions that were formerly passed on the various dates that are set out in the two draft resolutions before the Assembly all had two purposes. One was the withdrawal of the invading forces, in this particular case the Israeli forces, from Egyptian and Egyptian-controlled territory. The second was the scrupulous observance of the Armistice Agreement. In different ways, these two purposes, either together or separately, appear in the resolutions of 2, 4, 7 and 24 November and 19 January.

Only a few days ago this Assembly passed a resolution asking for the total withdrawal of the Israeli invading forces behind the Armistice Demarcation Lines. It should be remembered that from the very beginning the Assembly has insisted that these forces should withdraw behind the demarcation lines provided by the Armistice Agreement of 1949.

Those forces are still, in part, on the Egyptian side or the Egyptian-controlled side of the Armistice Lines.

I should like further to say that the subject before this Assembly, from the beginning of the Emergency Session till now, is not the resolving of what has been known as the Arab-Israeli question. We were faced with the issue of invasion, the issue of aggression, and that is what we were dealing with. As Governments engaged in the consideration of these questions, it is inevitable that we should look at other related matters, but that would not take away the crucial fact that the central subject before us is the termination of the state of invasion so that other progress may follow afterwards. But that does not mean that there can be any condition attached to the withdrawal. Each one of these resolutions asks for unconditional withdrawal.

In order that there might be no apprehension that this applies only to one particular aggressor, I should like to recall to the Assembly what my delegation said on 7 November last in regard to the other invading forces. We said:

It is not a position that we can accept where the invading forces would lay down the conditions ostensibly in the interest of the invaded party. If we do that, we put ourselves in the position of justifying the invasion itself. And that is a position which my Government is not ready to accept.

Today we have two draft resolutions before us, and these draft resolutions deal with two separate matters. I wish to state without any ambiguity whatsoever that we do not regard the first draft resolution as a conditional resolution. They are both matters with which the Assembly is concerned. They are both matters which are related to the peace of the world and even to the Armistice Agreement itself.

The first relates to withdrawal, and I shall speak on that draft resolution first. It recalls the previous resolutions and it deplores "the non-compliance of Israel to complete its withdrawal behind the Armistice Demarcation Line despite the repeated requests of the General Assembly".

<Pg-39>

The first paragraph refers to the complete withdrawal of Israel, which means the withdrawal not only of its armed forces but of whatever elements there may be in the area which the invasion has projected. Therefore, there can be no question of civilian forces or civilian authorities or any kind of projection whatsoever. That is the meaning according to my delegation, which is one of the sponsors, and I feel sure that no sponsor would join issue on this: that "noncompliance to complete its withdrawal" refers to the withdrawal of everything connected with the State of Israel behind the Armistice Demarcation Line.

The second operative paragraph calls for the completion of this withdrawal behind the Armistice Demarcation Line without further

delay. In accordance with the usual practice of these resolutions, the language of this is mild; it does not seek to use exaggerated terms. But I think the Assembly is entitled to feel assured that this further call for a withdrawal, coming three months after the first resolution, means that withdrawal must take place forthwith, that is, there should be no intervening period between the passing of this draft resolution and the process of withdrawal, which can only spread over so many hours or so many days as the case may be, as is required in practice, as in the case of the other withdrawals from Egyptian territory, except that, the United Nations Emergency Force being now in operation and having gained experience from the previous withdrawals, it should be possible for this withdrawal to be completed very much more quickly.

That is with regard to the first draft resolution. I believe that, in examining the vote on previous resolutions, there should be very little doubt with regard to the support that will be given to it.

I come now to the second draft resolution. In connection with this, I repeat what I said before, namely, that it is a separate draft resolution and that it is not by way of a condition which should be satisfied or a price which is offered so that the first draft resolution might be implemented. On the other hand, it is related to the first draft resolution in the sense that nothing that is said in resolution A|RES|410 would have any meaning whatsoever unless what is said in the first draft resolution is implemented. To that extent there is a one-way relationship, but there is no two-way relationship so far as the two resolutions are concerned.

The complete withdrawal of Israel behind the Armistice Demarcation Line, as requested in the first draft resolution, is required before the United Nations can address itself to its general purposes, namely, those of conciliation in the maintenance of peace and the promotion of harmony.

I should like to explain the position of my delegation, as a sponsor of this draft resolution, so that there should be no doubt in the mind of anyone who is casting his vote as to exactly what the draft resolution stands for. First there is reference to the Secretary-General's report, which is before us. The Assembly will recall that after adopting the resolution of 19 January, we requested the Secretary-General to make an early report and we fixed the time-limit for it. We now have that report before us for our consideration. Having received and considered that report, the draft resolution states that the withdrawal by Israel must be followed by action which would assure progress towards the creation of peaceful conditions. Now that is the expression of one of the purposes of the United Nations. It is a statement that once withdrawal is completed, it will be possible for the United Nations and the parties concerned to proceed to other things.

The paragraph should be understood in the only way, which is its open and plain meaning. All proposals that are put before organisations of

this kind must be interpreted in their plain meaning.

The second operative paragraph calls upon the Governments of Egypt and Israel scrupulously to observe the provisions of the 1949 Armistice Agreement. I have stated previously in connection with this question that it is legitimate for us to look at performance. I have stated, in speaking on the first draft resolution, that performance as related to withdrawal is still incomplete. With regard to the scrupulous observance of the provisions of the 1949 Armistice Agreement, the essential provision of which is that parties should keep on either side of the Armistice Demarcation Line, there has been no compliance on the part of Israel with that scrupulous

<Pg-40>

observance. Furthermore, when I last spoke on the subject I referred to violations of the cease-fire agreement by Israel that had taken place after the acceptance of the cease-fire resolution.

Of the other side, the Secretary-General reports that in the course of the discussions which have taken place since the circulation of his last report, he has been informed of the desire of the Government of Egypt that all raids and incursions across the Armistice Demarcation Line in both directions be brought to an end and that the United Nations auxiliary organs afford effective assistance to this effect. The last part of that statement requires the close attention of members, namely, "that United Nations auxiliary organs afford effective assistance to that effect".

This draft resolution suggests that the United Nations forces, at the present moment the United Nations Emergency Force, should be placed on both sides of the Armistice Demarcation Line so that the Armistice Agreement might be better secured and so that there might be no violation of it.

It is the position of my delegation, as a sponsor of this draft resolution, that the United Nations Emergency Force can be placed only on both sides of the Armistice Demarcation Line, which is sketched for ready reference on the map at the end of the Secretary-General's report. The line goes from Rafah, on to the other side of the Gaza strip, down to a point just below Elath, on the Gulf of Agaba. The position so far as this draft resolution is concerned--and it is not the individual position of my Government but the position of the draft resolution--is that the United Nations Emergency Force, after the total withdrawal of Israel, may be placed on this Armistice Demarcation Line. That would mean the total evacuation of the Gaza strip and also the removal of the invading forces from that area in the Sinai desert between the red line on the map and the Gulf of Agaba. But there is no suggestion, and there can be no suggestion, that foreign forces, which the United Nations forces are, can be stationed anywhere on Egyptian territory without her consent. Here I want to go into the facts and into what might be called the law of this question.

The whole of the procedures involved in this question are governed by the resolutions which we have adopted and which incorporate, as members recall, paragraph 12 of that report of the Secretary-General from which the United Nations force emerged. My Government at that time laid down specific conditions in which we would participate in the United Nations force. But if we merely laid down those conditions, they would have little value except as being the view of one Government. Those conditions, however, were accepted. The Secretary-General accepted those conditions when we agreed to participate in that force. My delegation made reference to it again on 7 November when we were engaged in that last phase of obtaining the withdrawal of the British and French forces from Egyptian territory. We stated that it was understood that if the force was going to function on Egyptian territory, there must be Egyptian consent for that process. It has been basic to the whole functioning of the United Nations Emergency Force that it could not set foot anywhere on Egyptian soil except in full accordance with international law and practice and in conformity with recognition of the sovereignty of Egyptian territory.

This is not the view of only one Government; indeed, it is not only something that was agreed to by resolution, but it is an international agreement between the Secretary-General and the Egyptian Government, which is set out in the aide memoire (A|3375, Annex.), and the Secretary-General made reference to it yesterday:

The Government of Egypt and the Secretary-General of the United Nations have stated their understanding on the basic points for the presence and functioning of UNEF as follows:

- 1. The Government of Egypt declares that, when exercising its sovereign rights on any matter concerning the presence and functioning of UNEF, it will be guided in good faith, by its acceptance of the General Assembly Resolution 394 of 5 November 1956.
- 2. The United Nations takes note of this declaration of the Government

< Pg-41 >

of Egypt and declares that the activities of UNEF will be guided, in good faith, by the task established for the force in the aforementioned resolutions; in particular, the United Nations, understanding this to correspond to the wishes of the Government of Egypt, reaffirms its willingness to maintain the UNEF until its task is completed.

If that is not sufficient, the Secretary-General, in his report in document A|3512, has set out on page 2, paragraph 5, what must be regarded, in terms of this draft resolution, as the factors, the governing conditions, under which any recommendation, any suggestion, any proposal here can be considered, and I take the liberty of

reading them:

- (a) The United Nations cannot condone a change of the status juris resulting from military action contrary to the provisions of the Charter. The organisation must, therefore, maintain that the status juris existing prior to such military action be re-established by a withdrawal of troops, and by the relinquishment or nullification of rights asserted in territories covered by the military action and depending upon it.
- (b) The use of military force by the United Nations other than that under Chapter VII of the Charter requires the consent of the States in which the force is to operate. Moreover, such use must be undertaken and developed in a manner consistent with the principles mentioned under (a) above. It must, furthermore, be impartial, in the sense that it does not serve as a means to force settlement, in the interest of one party, of political conflicts or legal issues recognised as controversial.
- (c) United Nations actions must respect fully the rights of member-Governments recognised in the Charter, and international agreements not contrary to the aims of the Charter, which are concluded in exercise of those rights.

At the present moment among the points to be resolved is the evacuation of the invading forces from the Gaza strip. It is argued sometimes that there is some doubt as to the legal status of this territory, but there can be no doubt as to what its status was before the invasion; and what sub-paragraph (a) above says is that there can be no changes in regard to that. Therefore, the only solution, the only development, the only response that can be made by the invading party is to withdraw behind the Armistice Line in regard to that particular area.

There has been some reference in various speeches to the effect that the United Nations could go all round the world conducting elections and introducing troops and taking over the Governments of sovereign States. The Charter is very clear on this and, according to the provisions of Chapter VII, any such proposal would, in the present case, require the consent of the Government of Egypt. It is true that UNEF is an organ of the United Nations. To that extent it takes its instructions, its orders, its guidance from the United Nations, but, as the Secretary-General pointed out on previous occasions, it is equally true that it has to function on sovereign territory; so that, if there is the law on the one side, there is the law on the other side that sovereignty has to be respected. Therefore, arrangements must be made, which is what the Secretary-General has done, with the Government of Egypt, and the Government of Egypt has responded in good faith.

Therefore, there cannot be any question of ordering these forces to operate anywhere except in terms of Egyptian sovereignty and with Egyptian consent. Thirdly, the paragraph says, "must respect fully

the rights of member-Governments recognised in the Charter". The right of a Government under the Charter is the right to maintain its sovereignty. It must also respect international agreements—and I submit that the Armistice Agreement is an international agreement, and, therefore, its terms must be respected.

Now, if these are the governing conditions, then it follows that what is now proposed is merely the placing of these troops on a territory that is the frontier between Israel and the Egyptian-controlled area, which is the Armistice Demarcation Line. In placing them there, it is necessary that they should be placed on both sides of that line,

<Pg-42>

and their function, as the Secretary-General pointed out, if it is agreed to, would be to assist the present observation corps in order to carry out what Egypt has said it desires and to which it has agreed, according to page 7 of this report (A|3512) which I read out a while ago, namely, that "all raids and incursions across the Armistice Line, in both directions, be brought to an end".

With regard to the remainder of the territory which is still under Israeli occupation, the withdrawal not having been completed, the only function that the UNEF can perform in that area is the same kind of function and the same kind of exercise which it has been performing on the rest of Egyptian territory, namely, that of supervising the ceasefire and the withdrawal and the securing of that withdrawal. Therefore, the entry of this force anywhere else at any time would be governed by the conditions under which the Secretary-General and the Egyptian Government have come to an agreement. I refer to the Egyptian Government because all these operations are on Egyptian territory. It so happens that Egypt is the invaded country and not Israel. If Israel were the invaded country, this would equally apply to it, but the facts are that foreign forces are on the Egyptian soil, and it is for the purpose of removing them that this machinery of UNEF has been put forward.

I believe that paragraph 2 of the second resolution is common ground since it calls on both sides scrupulously to observe the Armistice Agreement. Paragraph 3, however, "considers that, after full withdrawal of Israel from the Sharm el-Sheikh and Gaza areas, the scrupulous maintenance of the Armistice Agreement requires the placing of the United Nations Emergency Force on the Egyptian-Israeli Armistice Demarcation Line and the implementation of other measures as proposed in the Secretary-General's report, with due regard to the considerations set out therein with a view to assist in achieving situations conducive to the maintenance of peaceful conditions in the area;"

I should like to take each part of this separately. There is reference here to the Sharm el-Sheikh and Gaza areas. Those terms are descriptive and are easily comprehensible if one looks at the map. There is no authority anywhere in the agreement reached, no

suggestion in this draft resolution, that any part of the Egyptian territory, whether it be the Island of Tiran or Sharm el-Sheikh or any of these other places, should be occupied. My Government has repeated time and again and has made a basic position in regard to UNEF, that at no time can it become an occupying force in another country. Therefore, its movements, its functioning in a territory that is Egyptian, must depend upon the agreements that have been made before. This explains the reference to "the Sharm el-Sheikh and Gaza areas", which is the geographical description of the territories that now remain under occupation. The wording used here is "on the Egyptian-Israel Armistice Demarcation Line". Some representatives have raised doubts about this, and it is quite obvious that a force, which is now about 5,000 could not stand on a line which bears a geometrical definition; that is, something that has no width. Therefore, it must be on either side. What is more, it is only in conditions, where this force that is intended to be protective can occupy both sides of the line by arrangements with both sides, that it can be other than an occupation force.

If it were only on one side, then it would be placing that country under protection and, to a certain extent, sharing the character of an occupation force. The arrangement proposed, however, is by the way of a boundary element for the purpose of security.

Then comes the next part of operative paragraph 3, which refers to the "implementation of other measures as proposed in the Secretary-General's report, with due regard to the considerations set out therein". The purpose of that paragraph is to say that there are other measures and that if there are other measures to be considered they must all be governed by the considerations which I have read out, from paragraph 5 of the Secretary-General's report, considerations which govern the whole of the procedure we are debating.

It would not be right to shy away from controversial issues; speeches have been made here on the question of freedom of navigation and various other issues, and even if the Supreme Being does not know, this General Assembly does know the number and the complexity of the issues surrounding this problem. Here, therefore, it is necessary to draw attention to the part of the

<Pg-43>

Secretary-General's report on which we have been asked to express our opinion. This is what it says:

In connection with the question of Israeli withdrawal from the Sharm el-Sheikh area, attention has been directed to the situation in the Gulf of Aqaba and the Straits of Tiran. This matter is of longer duration and not directly related to the present crisis. The concern now evinced in it, however, calls for consideration of the legal aspects of the matter as a problem in its own right. It follows from principles guiding the United Nations that the Israeli military

action and its consequences should not be elements influencing the solution.

There are at least three important ideas here which are covered by this phraseology in the draft resolution, "with due regard to the considerations set out therein". The first is that this matter is not directly related to the present crisis and that the concern evinced therein is related to legal aspects of the problem, which must be treated in its own right. In the next paragraph, the Secretary-General points out that the legal problems in this connection are not beyond dispute, not only not beyond dispute between the parties involved but not beyond dispute in the minds of jurists and not beyond dispute in the mind of the appropriate authority of the United Nations itself, because he goes on to say that the International Law Commission "reserved consideration of the question 'what would be the legal position of straits forming part of the territorial sea of one or more States and constituting the sole means of access to the port of another State". This description, says the Secretary-General, applies to the Gulf of Agaba and the Straits of Tiran and he adds that a legal controversy exists as to the extent of the right of innocent passage through these waters.

The Secretary-General himself having said that this problem is one of long duration, that it must be treated on its own and that there are legal problems, and when we have the authority of the International Law Commission that that commission itself has not made up its mind on the legal aspect of such a matter, there can be no question that the resolution put before the Assembly does not seek to resolve the question in that aspect. It must be considered if the parties are willing to consider it or if other circumstances arise. Therefore, so far as this resolution is concerned, it does not regard this problem as covered by the present operation. The present operation is merely to move the invading forces from the area to which reference has been made.

In paragraph 4, the draft resolution "requests the Secretary-General, in consultation with the parties concerned, to take steps to carry out these measures and to report as appropriate to the General Assembly". That is a normal request to the Secretary-General and it again points out that the co-operation of the parties in the implementation of the resolution is required. Therefore, I have made it quite clear what, in our view, and what, in the view of this draft resolution, the functions of the Emergency Force are. What is more, I should like to add that it is not possible to extend or modify those functions in any way, it is not possible to enlarge or contract them, without the consent of another party and even parties.

Paragraph 29 has often been quoted and I believe it is a paragraph that helps an understanding of this resolution, so I shall read it:

Israeli troops, on their withdrawal from the Sharm el-Sheikh area, would be followed by the United Nations Emergency Force in the same way as in other parts of Sinai.

That is to say, there is no difference whatever of category, kind or quality with regard to this process. The paragraph continues:

The duties of the force in respect of the cease-fire and the withdrawal will determine its movements. However, if it is recognised that there is a need for such an agreement, it may be agreed that units of the force (or special representatives in the nature of observers) would assist in maintaining quiet in the areas beyond what follows from this general principle.

<Pg-44>

Now, there is nothing new in that because it is open to those who have the authority for the United Nations Force on the one side, namely, the United Nations itself, represented by the Secretary-General, and the territorial power on the other side, to come to any agreement they wish. The paragraph goes on to say:

In accordance with the general legal principles, recognised as decisive for the deployment of the United Nations Emergency Force, the force should not be used so as to prejuduge the solution of the controversial questions involved--

and whatever controversies have been raging during the last seven or eight years, it is not a solvent for that purpose, it is merely an evacuating force with a temporary purpose unless, as in the case where it is put in on the Armistice Line for security purposes, it has assumed something different.

The UNEF, thus, is not to be deployed in such a way as to protect any special position on these questions, although at least transitionally, it may function in support of mutual restraint in accordance with the foregoing.

To summarise therefore, I would say: First of all, there are two separate resolutions. The first resolution is not conditional on the second, but the second, certainly cannot have any value unless the first resolution is operative. Secondly, the first resolution represents an attempt by the Assembly for, I think, the fifth or sixth time and three-months after its initial attempt, and therefore the words "without further delay" mean "withdrawal forthwith". And when that withdrawal is completed, then it will be possible for what is set out in resolution two to be proceeded with. Those procedures must be governed by the principles that have been set out, which I have read, and the placement of the Emergency Force can only be on the Armistice Demarcation Line and their placement in any other area or for any period of time must be dependent, on the one hand, upon the consent of the territorial sovereign power and also the exigencies as decided by the United Nations Command on its side. That is to say, it will go somewhere only if it is necessary and, if it is decided to be necessary, then it must get the consent of the territorial power. Therefore, it will function in the same way as in

other parts....

It is my submission that the acceding to and the implementation of the first resolution is in the interests of all parties concerned, including the invading power. My Government deeply regrets that even before the resolution has been considered by the Assembly there have been reports which may not be accurate--I hope they are not--that this will not be complied with. In the interval between the last resolution and this one we also have the report of a statement by the Prime Minister of Israel with regard to the withdrawal of these troops which also must cause us all concern.

In spite of all that, the Assembly, expressing its regret by the word "deplores", asks Israel to complete its withdrawal behind the Armistice Demarcation Line forthwith.

[Shri Krishna Menon's speeches in the United Nations Security Council on the Kashmir question on 8, 15, 20 and 21 February 1957 have been published separately. Copies can be obtained on request from the Information Service of India (External Publicity Division), New Delhi.]

INDIA EGYPT USA ISRAEL CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC IRAN

Date: Feb 02, 1957

Volume No

1995

INDONESIA

Trade Agreement Extended

A Press Note issued in New Delhi on Feb 15, 1957 announced the exchange of letters in Djakarta between the representatives of the Government of India and the Government of Indonesia, further extending the Trade Agreement between the two countries. The agreement, concluded on 30 January 1953, was last extended up to

<Pg-45>

31 December 1956. It will now remain in force for a further period of six months up to the end of June, 1957.

The items referred to in the Schedules to the agreement for export from and import into either country are as follows:

EXPORTS FROM INDIA: Jute goods; tobacco manufactures; Tobacco

unmanufactured; woollen piecegoods; cotton piecegoods; handloom goods; cotton yarn; vegetable oils (linseed oil, castor oil); coal; building hardware, including screws, bolts, nuts, locks etc.; soaps; paints and varnishes; pharmaceutical products; chemicals and chemical preparations; tea chests; lac including shellac; sports goods; rubber tyres and tubes; procelainware including insulators and pottery; paper paste-board and stationery; machinery including agricultural implements and tools; house-hold wares including sewing machines, hurricane lanterns, utensils and glassware; electric fans; electric motors; industrial machinery, including diesel engines, sugarcane crushers and textile machinery such as carding machines; motor vehicle batteries; dry cells; machine tools; and handicrafts and cottage industry products.

IMPORTS FROM INDONESIA: Copra; coconut oil; palm oil; essential oils; spices and betelnuts; timber; tin; rubber; hides and skins, raw; canes and rattans; gums, resins and dammer; barks for tanning, cutch and gambier; sisal fibre; tobacco wrappers and palm kernels (fresh and dried fruits).

INDONESIA INDIA RUSSIA USA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC

Date: Feb 15, 1957

Volume No

1995

PAKISTAN

Migration from East Bengal

The six-monthly review of the progress of rehabilitation of displace persons from East Pakistan, released by the Union Ministry of Rehabilitation, on Feb 05, 1957howed that the influx of refugees from East Pakistan touched the record figure of 320,000 in 1956 showing a four-fold increase from 1953.

The total number of displaced persons from East Pakistan was estimated to be 3.987 million, the number of migrants being 76,100 in 1953, 118,000 in 1954 and 239,000 in 1955.

In an effort to find more land for the settlement of the increasing number of East Pakistan displaced persons in States other than West Bengal, schemes were sanctioned during the period under review--1 July to 31 December 1956--for acquisition and reclamation of over 21,000 acres of land to settle over 5,000 families at a cost of Rs. 16.85 million.

In addition sanction was accorded during 1956 to land-acquisition schemes in West Bengal estimated to cost Rs. 5.84 million. In all, Rs. 100 million--over Rs. 15 million, on an average, every month-were sanctioned during the six months under review, for rehabilitation schemes and development projects.

To provide long-term employment and to ensure the economic rehabilitation of displaced persons sanction was accorded to set up 20 medium-scale industries with an employment potential of about 9,600 with Government investment of about Rs. 21.3 million. These included a scheme for setting up a sugar mill in Ahmedpur, Birbhum District, West Bengal, which alone was expected to provide employment to about 900 displaced persons.

For extending further the educational facilities to displaced students, schemes were sanctioned for the construction of over 150 more primary schools and Rs. 275,000 were given to educational institutions, including colleges, for expansion of their accommodation and for purchase of equipment.

More emphasis was laid on providing medical facilities to T.B. patients and schemes to reserve 100 additional beds in the Niramoy T.B. Sanatorium and the construction of a 200-bed hospital in West Bengal were sanctioned.

There was a fall, according to the review, in the pace of migration during the latter half of 1956, compared to the first half of the year. The average rate during the second

$$<$$
Pg-46>

half of the year was about 18,700 per month against 34,700 per month in the first half year; but, even this rate of migration was quite steep considering that it was about three times the rate of migration in 1953 and twice the rate of migration in 1954. The monthly average for the last four years (1953-1956) respectively was 6,300; 9,800; 19,900; and 26,600.

Out of 3.987 million displaced persons from East Pakistan, 351,000 were in camps and homes.

Owing to the continued heavy influx, new camps had to be opened in States other than West Bengal and, during the period under review, eight more camps were opened in Tripura; three camps in Madhya Pradesh for about 13,000 people were sanctioned; and proposals were under consideration for opening camps in Uttar Pradesh and Rajasthan and additional camps in Orissa. Two reception centres were opened at Banpur and Petropole in West Bengal on the Indo-Pakistan border to receive the migrants now coming into West Bengal and to arrange for their disposal to other States.

To relieve the pressure on homes, sanction was accorded to the construction of permanent buildings for four new homes in West Bengal

at an estimated cost of Rs. 7.8 million. Besides, sanction was given for the setting up of a home for 50 old women at Banaras, a branch of the Silchar Home at Arunachal in Assam for 200 women and a home for 35 boys at Abhoynagar in Tripura. The details for setting up a central home at Silchar in Cachar District, Assam, and an infirmary at Puri were also being worked out.

During 1956, sanction was accorded to land-acquisition schemes in West Bengal estimated to cost Rs. 5.84 million. This covered all schemes which had matured up to September, 1956. The total cost of the scheme so far approved was about Rs. 32.4 million. The total area acquired was about 50,000 acres, of which about 8,000 acres were urban, and 42,000 acres rural land. An interim allotment of Rs. 6.322 million had been placed at the disposal of the Government of West Bengal during the current financial year.

Efforts were continued to find more land for settlement of East Pakistan displaced persons outside West Bengal. A zonal conference was convened at Nagpur on 25 July 1956, by the Union Minister for Rehabilitation to consider the offers made by the erstwhile States of Madhya Pradesh, Madhya Bharat and Vindhya Pradesh. The progress made so far included the sanction of an expenditure of Rs. 3.18 million for reclamation of 4,780 acres of land in existing colonies in Cachar District, Assam; 13 schemes for the rehabilitation of 610 displaced families on 3,117 acres of land, at a total cost of Rs. 2.65 million in Bihar; three schemes for the rehabilitation of 444 families on 2,855 acres of land in the former State of Vindhya Pradesh at a cost of Rs. 2.018 million; a scheme for the settlement of 1,242 families on 7,875 acres of land in the district of Raigarh and Sarguja, costing Rs. 6.88 million; and nine schemes for the rehabilitation of 512 families on 2,761 acres of land at a cost of Rs. 2.122 million.

During this period, Rs. 53.1 million had been sanctioned as house-building, agricultural and business loans to displaced persons in rural and urban areas. Funds to the extent of Rs. 42.733 million had also been placed at the disposal of the State Government during the period under review to meet the expenditure on these loans.

Out of 40,158 applications received from the East Pakistan displaced persons up to 30 September 1956, by the Rehabilitation Finance Administration, 26,483 applications had been disposed of. Loans amounting to Rs. 43.3 million had been sanctioned and Rs. 31.9 million had been actually paid.

Forty schemes for setting up cottage industries and production centres were sanctioned at a cost of Rs. 2.601 million. These were expected to provide employment to 4,464 displaced persons.

Forty-one training schemes were sanctioned at a cost of Rs. 3.199 million for the training of 6,490 displaced persons.

To provide basic civic amenities in the townships and colonies of displaced persons, schemes for the construction of roads, drains, and sinking of tube-wells, involving a total expenditure of Rs. 6.266 million were sanctioned. A scheme for the electrification of

<Pg-47>

Habra township at a cost of Rs. 1.05 million was also sanctioned.

The first phase-work of construction of a township at Narsingarh, Agartala, had been sanctioned at an estimated cost of Rs. 403,000. The township would accommodate 1,300 families to start with. Schemes costing Rs. 656,000 for construction of markets at Gangulibagan, Sodepur, Madhyamgram and Ultadanga in West Bengal had been sanctioned. Proposals for the setting up of a housing colony at Jalannagar near Dibrugarh, and Chunsali and Kahilipara near Gauhati in Assam were under consideration.

The estimated cost of development and housing schemes, sanctioned during the period under review was about Rs. 17.4 million. If the cost of the schemes sanctioned in the first half-year were also taken into account, the total cost of development and housing schemes sanctioned up to the end of 1956 would be about Rs. 56.1 million.

A loan of Rs. 76,000 had been sanctioned to Silchar Municipal Board for providing Municipal amenities in the areas inhabited by the displaced persons.

So far, 23 squatters' colonies had been fully regularised and nine regularised in part, covering a total of 3,134 displaced families.

The Contracts Division under the Government of West Bengal which had been set up to execute the rehabilitation works through displaced persons had been very satisfactory. The daily average of the number of displace persons employed by the Division was about 1,500. The Division had so far disbursed about Rs. 700,000 to displaced persons in the form of payment for labour and supply of materials. The activities of the Division extended to about ten colonies and townships. It was being expanded to cope with a number of additional works proposed to be entrusted to it.

The creation of this organisation had not only helped the displaced persons to increase their earnings but had also served to revive their self-confidence and to instil in them the dignity of labour. At Gayeshpur, school-going and college-going students were also doing manual labour in their spare hours to enable them to earn some money. At Teherpur, the teachers had offered to work for the construction of a school building.

In addition to medical facilities given to T.B. patients, 25 beds had been reserved in the Mental Hospital at Ranchi for treatment of displaced mental patients from homes and camps in the eastern zone. This would involve an expenditure of Rs. 21,000 every year. A sum of Rs. 362,200 had been sanctioned for construction of 25 dispensary buildings in the rehabilitation colonies for displaced persons in

Tripura. A grant of Rs. 24,000 had been sanctioned to the Government of West Bengal for purchase of an ambulance van to carry displaced patients from camps and colonies to hospitals.

Besides, Rs. 75,000 were granted to the Institute of Child Health, Calcutta, for purchase of equipment for its operation theatre to provide increased medical facilities to the displaced persons, and Rs. 30,000 were given to Jitendra Narayan Sishu Seva Bhawan, Calcutta, for the construction of additional accommodation for putting up ten beds for refugee children.

The total number of displaced children receiving training under the National Discipline Scheme was 16,900 of which 9,500 were boys and 7,400 girls.

PAKISTAN USA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC INDIA

Date: Feb 05, 1957

Volume No

1995

TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE

Indo-U.S. Agreement

The Governments of India and the United States signed on Feb 12, 1957 a supplementary project agreement under which India will get 6.5 million dollars for her malaria control programme. This is the first agreement under the U.S. Development Assistance Programme for the fiscal year ending 30 June 1957.

<Pg-48>

The agreement was signed by Shri B. K. Nehru, Joint Secretary, Ministry of Finance, on behalf of the Government of India, and Mr. Howard E. Houston, Director of the Technical Co-operation Mission of the International Co-operation Administration of the U.S. Government.

The money will be used to obtain from year outside India 9,200 long tons of 75 per cent water wettable DDT powder and 200 long tons of 50 per cent water wettable Dieldrin powder.

Under the agreement, the Government of India will provide the rupee equivalent of 2.3 million dollars to meet the costs of local operations and inland transportation, etc.

India's nation-wide malaria control programme, now in its fifth year

of operation, envisages extension during the current year of the operations to give some measure of protection to about 200 million people living in malarious areas.

USA INDIA

Date: Feb 12, 1957

Volume No

1995

TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE

Assistance for Geological Survey

The Governments of India and the United States signed on Feb 21, 1957 two supplementary project agreements that will provide 500,000 dollars of development assistance funds for help in the current Geological Survey of India and 102,000 dollars of technical assistance funds for financing the work of the heavy equipment training centres at Kotah and Nagarjunasagar.

The agreements were signed by Shri B. K. Nehru, Joint Secretary, Ministry of Finance, on behalf of the Government of India, and Mr. Howard E. Houston, Director of the Technical Co-operation Mission, on behalf of the U.S. Government.

The additional photogrammetric equipment to be purchased with the development assistance funds will allow production of large scale maps required for projects under the Second Five-Year Plan in such fields as rivery valley development, natural resources, exploration, flood control, road and railway construction, land reclamation and general urban and countryside development.

The Government of India will provide inland transportation and local expenses for the imported items of equipment and the establishment charges.

<Pg-49>

INDIA USA

Date: Feb 21, 1957

March

Volume No 1995 **CONTENTS** Foreign Affairs Record 1957 March No. 3 VOL. III **CONTENTS BURMA** 51 Financial Agreement **FINLAND** Trade Agreement Extended 51 FOREIGN AND HOME AFFAIRS President's Address to Parliament 52 INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS Prime Minister's Speech in Lok Sabha 55 Shri Krishna Menon's Speech in Lok Sabha 63 **IRAQ** Trade Agreement Extended 76

BURMA FINLAND IRAQ POLAND USA GERMANY

Date: Mar 01, 1957

Volume No

1995

BURMA

Financial Agreement

India and Burma signed a Financial Agreement on Mar 12, 1957. The following Press Communique was issued in this connection in New Delhi on 12 March:

A Financial Agreement was signed in New Delhi on 12 March 1957 between the Government of India and the Government of the Union of Burma. Shri T.T. Krishnamachari, Finance Minister, signed on behalf of the Government of India and His Excellency U Than Aung, Burmese Ambassador in India, on behalf of his Government. The instruments of ratification will be exchanged at Rangoon as soon as possible.

The agreement provides for a loan of Rs. 200 million by the Government of India to the Government of the Union of Burma, with interest at the rate of 43/4 per cent, and repayable in 24 half-yearly instalments starting from 1 April 1960. If the Government of the Union of Burma so desire, any part of this amount can be transferred to Burma or to any other sterling area country.

In October, 1955, the Government of India had granted to the Government of the Union of Burma a loan of Rs. 200 million, but the latter did not draw any part of it during the stipulated period.

BURMA INDIA

Date: Mar 12, 1957

Volume No

1995

FINLAND

Trade Agreement Extended

A Press Note issued in New Delhi on Mar 21, 1957 announced the exchange of letters between the representatives of the Government of India and the Government of Finland extending the validity of the Trade Arrangement between the two countries until 31 December 1957. The exchange took place between Shri K. B. Lall, Joint Secretary, Ministry of Commerce and Consumer Industries, and H.E. Mr. Aaro Pakaslahti, Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary of Finland in New Delhi, on 21 March 1957. The Press Note added:

Trade relations between the two countries will continue to be fostered in accordance with the arrangements embodied in the letters exchanged between representatives of the two Governments on 12 January 1951 and 2 September 1952, under which the two Governments agreed to endeavour to expand direct trade between the two countries.

An official goodwill delegation from India visited Finland in 1956 and a goodwill delegation from Finland is now paying a return visit to India. As a result of these visits it has been possible for the two sides to visualise possibilities of increased trade. It is hoped that more direct contacts between exporters and importers in either country will now be established and the main obstacle to the development of direct trade will thus be removed.

The important items in the list of exports from India to Finland are: Tobacco; hides and skins; cashew-nuts; spices; jute goods; tea; coffee; shellac; coir yarn and manufactures; fibre for brushes and brooms; myrobalans and extracts; vegetable oils; handicrafts and cottage industry products; cotton textiles; coal and iron ore.

Among the items available for export from Finland to India are: Mechanical and chemical wood pulp; newsprint; various kinds of papers and paper products; boards; stationery; household and sanitary porcelain; steel files; machinery for farming, woodworking, plywood, road making, etc., and electrical and tele-communication cables.

< Pg-51 >

FINLAND INDIA USA RUSSIA

Date: Mar 21, 1957

Volume No

FOREIGN AND HOME AFFAIRS

President's Address to Parliament

President Rajendra Prasad addressed a joint session of the Lok Sabha and the Rajya Sabha on Mar 18, 1957. He said:

I am addressing you today after a full year, a year which has witnessed significant happenings in the world and considerable developments in our own country. We are meeting at a time when general elections are being held all over the country, and a new Parliament is coming into being as a result of these elections. This is the last occasion when I am addressing this Parliament. Some of you will come back to represent your constituencies in the new Parliament and some of you may not return. But I have no doubt that wherever your field of work may lie, it will be dedicated to the great task of building up this country of ours. I wish you success and good fortune in your field of activity.

Since I addressed you last, the world has seen a period of high tensions, particularly in the Middle East, and of conflict ending in the invasion of Egypt. The intervention of the United Nations and the impact of world opinion resulted in the withdrawal of the invading armies from Egypt; but the conflict has not only done great damage to Egypt but has added to the tensions which were showing signs of relaxation, and has left in its wake many problems to be resolved. Our country, which is deeply involved both on account of her concern for world peace and co-operation and her own interest, has sought to assist in resolving these difficulties. India has accepted greater burdens including participation in the United Nations Emergency Force constituted by the decision of the General Assembly of the United Nations which called for the withdrawal of the invading forces.

In Central Europe, the events in Hungary have disturbed us greatly and here, as elsewhere, we have stood for the withdrawal of foreign forces and against their use against peoples and national movements. At the same time, we have used our best efforts to assist in finding solutions to the problem at its various stages and extended our sympathy and our token of assistance to the people of Hungary.

The position in the Middle East casts its shadow over the prospects of co-operation and peace and the Suez Canal awaits opening for traffic. The policy of military pacts has divided the nations in this region and brought the apparatus of war more and more into Asia. We must, however, note with relief that the conflict in this region did not grow to greater dimensions.

Our Government and people rejoice in the fact that the former British colony of the Gold Coast, along with the former Trust Territory of Togoland under British administration, has now been constituted into the independent and sovereign State of Ghana and a full member of the Commonwealth of Nations.

We welcome the admission of Sudan, Morocco, Tunisia, Japan and Ghana to the United Nations. The continued exclusion of Mongolia and the denial to the rightful representatives of China of their place in the United Nations, cause us deep concern and we continue to devote our endeavours to remedy this situation.

We hope that Malaya will soon become a free and independent State and this will further limit the sphere of colonialism and extend the area of national freedom in Asia.

In the United Nations, the Indian Delegation, in the Eleventh Session of the General Assembly, has made effective and useful contributions in the prolonged debates on crucial issues in regard to the Middle East, Algeria and Cyprus, and contributed to peaceful solutions and procedures in respect of them. Disarmament has made no progress, but the United Nations unanimously resolved to continue its efforts to consider all proposals before it, including the proposals made by India. The Government of India are happy to have been able to assist in promoting this resolution.

$$<$$
Pg-52>

Our country, which was a member of the Preparatory Commission of the International Atomic Energy Agency, can derive satisfaction that the Agency has now been established. May it fulfil the hopes that atomic energy will be harnessed for peaceful uses and also diverted from destructive purposes.

I had the happy privilege of visiting our near neighbour, Nepal; and the Vice-President represented our country at the Coronation of His Majesty King Mahendra Bir Bikram Shah. The endeavours of the Nepal Government and people for economic and social development have our full sympathy, and we are happy that we have been able to extend technical and economic assistance to them in the implementation of their Five-Year Plan.

The Buddha Jayanti celebrations in India gave us the opportunity of welcoming in this country the Dalai Lama and the Panchen Lama, as well as leaders of Buddhism from different parts of the world. These celebrations reminded us and the world afresh of the great message of peace and compassion of the Buddha, which is so much needed in the world today.

We have been privileged to receive in our country many distinguished visitors to whom my Government and the people of India have extended their traditional hospitality. Among these eminent guests of ours have been Their Imperial Majesties the Shahanshah and the Empress of Iran, His Imperial Majesty the Emperor of Ethiopia, President Shukri A1-Kuwatly of Syria, His Royal Highness Prince Norodom Sihanouk of Cambodia, Prime Ministers of Burma, Ceylon, Indonesia, China, Nepal and Denmark, the Vice-Chancellor of the Federal Republic of Germany, the Deputy Prime Minister and Defence Minister of the Soviet Union,

the Deputy Prime Minister of Sudan and the Foreign Ministers of the United States, France and the United Kingdom. The President of the United Nations General Assembly for 1956, Dr. Jose Maza, and the Secretary-General of the United Nations were also among our distinguished visitors. Parliamentary, cultural, trade and other goodwill delegations from Burma, China, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Germany, Indonesia, Japan, Norway, Poland, Sweden, Syria and Uganda have also visited our country.

The Vice-President paid visits to the Soviet Union, Poland, Czechoslovakia; Hungary, Rumania, Bulgaria, East Africa, the Central African Federation, Indonesia and Japan and received a very warm welcome everywhere.

My Prime Minister visited the United States at the invitation of President Eisenhower. The visit and the talks between the President of the United States and my Prime Minister have assisted in the promotion of understanding between our two countries and greater appreciation of each other's point of view. My Government feel confident that it will lead to increasing co-operation in all fields on the basis of mutual respect and understanding.

My Prime Minister also visited Canada at the invitation of Mr. Louis St. Laurent, the Prime Minister of Canada. His visit has helped to enrich further the relations between Canada and our country, which have always been very friendly and close.

My Government regret that no progress has been made in regard to the solution of the problem of apartheid and discrimination against Africans and people of Indian origin in South Africa. This problem once again received the consideration of the United Nations at the instance of my Government. A further appeal to the Governments concerned to find a solution by negotiations has been made by the United Nations. The Government of India, as in the past, has readily subscribed to this resolution.

My Government deeply regret that Goa still continues to be an unhappy colonial outpost of the Portuguese Government, where every kind of liberty is suppressed and economic stagnation prevails. It is the firm policy of my Government that Goa should become free from colonial domination and should share in the freedom of the rest of India.

My Government regret that its relations with Pakistan continue to present difficulties and there has been no abatement in Pakistan of the campaigns of hatred and `jehad'. The policy of the Government of India and the general approach of our people have been that we shall not respond to these with hatred, but shall continue our endeavours to

<Pg-53>

promote friendly relations while defending our land and our

legitimate interests. The exodus of people from East Pakistan to India continued throughout this past year and assumed alarming proportions. Altogether, over four million people have come from East Pakistan to India, and these persons have cast a heavy burden on our country and, more especially, on the State of West Bengal.

The problem of Kashmir was considered by the Security Council of the United Nations once again, at the request of the Government of Pakistan. The Government of India's position has been stated in clear and unambiguous terms, that the Jammu and Kashmir State is and has been a constituent State of the Indian Union since October 1947, like other States which acceded to the Union. The present situation in Kashmir has arisen from aggression and on illegal occupation of Union territory by Pakistan in violation of international law and agreements and engagements reached in pursuance of United Nations resolutions. The Security Council has resolved last month to send its then President to Pakistan and India to confer with the two Governments. The Government of India, in accordance with its general policy, has agreed to receive and extend hospitality to Mr. Jarring of Sweden who is expected to arrive here soon.

The world situation as a whole, which was beginning to show some signs of improvement, gives us cause for less optimism at present. Our own country, however, continues to have friendly relations with all countries, but the deterioration in the world situation has adverse results on the development of peaceful relations and cooperation and economic development in our part of the world also. More particularly, the policy of military pacts based upon the balance of power, mutual suspicion and fear, has increased tensions in Asia and has led to the increase of armaments and extended the area of cold war. It continues to be the firm belief of my Government that only by a peaceful approach and agreed settlements can be found the right and hopeful way for solutions of the world's problems.

During the past year, the reorganisation of the States was completed, and this great task which had unfortunately roused much passion in some parts of the country, was accomplished. During the past year also, the First Five-Year Plan was successfully completed and the Second Five-Year Plan begun. This Plan, while continuing to lay stress on greater food production, emphasises the need for industrial development, more especially in regard to heavy industry. The Community Projects and the National Extension Service have been extended with phenomenal rapidity over our rural areas and now cover 220,000 villages And a rural population of 129 millions. In the community development scheme, special stress is being laid on the development of small-scale and cottage industries.

Mineral surveys have yielded promising discoveries of oil, and many new deposits of uranium ore have been located in Rajasthan and Bihar. The finds of thorium and uranium minerals in large quantities have more than doubled our known reserves of these minerals. The work of our Atomic Energy Department has made great progress, and India's first atomic reactor began operations last year. This is the first

reactor to go into operation in Asia, outside the Soviet Union.

We are about to complete the first year of the Second Five-Year Plan. Certain stresses and strains have emerged in the course of this year. Prices of certain commodities have risen and there has been a substantial draught on the foreign exchange resources of the country. These factors reflect the growing tempo of development in the country, in the public as well as in the private sectors. The growth of internal demand for consumption and for investment is a concomitant of rapid development and, up to a point, the emergence of such pressures is a sign that the resources of the country are being stretched in the interests of development. It is, however, essential to ensure that these pressures do not go too far. Government are determined to take appropriate measures to restrain the rise in prices and to reduce the drain on foreign exchange resources.

The major problem before the country in this context is that of conserving and increasing its foreign exchange resources. For a country which starts with insufficient facilities for producing machinery and equipment, a plan of industrialisation necessarily involves heavy foreign exchange expenditure. Since

<Pg-54>

it is difficult in the short run to enlarge foreign exchange earnings substantially, developing economies require an inflow of external resources in the initial stages. It is, however, incumbent on the country concerned to earn the maximum foreign exchange it can and to exercise the utmost economy in the matter of imports. The recent agreement with the United States Government, under which large quantities of wheat, rice and cotton will be available to us on credit terms, will help in checking the rise in prices and will contribute to the furtherance of the Plan. Considerable external finance will, we expect, be forthcoming from international agencies like the World Bank and from friendly countries. Nevertheless, the bulk of the resources required for development must come from within the country and the community has to be organised for a big production effort to make this possible.

The Second Plan gives high priority to industrialisation and to the diversification of the economic structure. This, in turn, requires a substantial increase in the production of basic necessities like food and cloth and of raw materials required for the developing industries. The Plan calls for more investment, and one of its principal aims is to enlarge employment opportunities. New incomes created by investment and employment are mostly spent on food and cloth and it is only if their supplies can be increased rapidly that the Plan can go forward without creating an inflationary situation. An increase in agricultural production thus constitutes the pivot of developmental effort and for this we need the fullest co-operation of every section of the community.

This session of Parliament will be a brief one and no major or

controversial legislation will be taken up during this session. Some Ordinances which have been promulgated since the last session will be placed before Parliament.

Five years ago this Parliament came into existence representing the vast electorate of this great country, and it has laboured for the well-being and advancement of India and for peace and co-operation in the world. These labours have produced substantial results which we see all round us in the country, and I wish to offer, Members of Parliament, my congratulations on the great tasks that have been accomplished. But there is no resting place for any of us and the great story of the building up of a new and prosperous India will continue to unfold itself, bringing happiness to all our people and serving the cause of world peace and co-operation.

I earnestly trust that the message of the Buddha, whose anniversary we recently celebrated, will ever guide us, and the spirit of the Father of the Nation will continue to inspire us.

EGYPT INDIA HUNGARY USA GHANA JAPAN MOROCCO SUDAN TUNISIA MONGOLIA CHINA ALGERIA CYPRUS NEPAL ETHIOPIA IRAN UNITED KINGDOM SYRIA BURMA CAMBODIA INDONESIA DENMARK GERMANY FRANCE NORWAY SLOVAKIA POLAND SWEDEN UGANDA BULGARIA CANADA SOUTH AFRICA PAKISTAN

Date: Mar 18, 1957

Volume No

1995

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

Prime Minister's Speech in Lok Sabha

Initiating the debate on Foreign Affairs in the Lok Sabha on Mar 25, 1957 Prime MinisterNehru said:

It is now, I think, about four months since we had a debate on International Affairs in this House. It was at the end of November last, I believe, when we had that debate, that we were confronted by a very serious situation which had arisen in the Middle-Eastern region, in Egypt, because of a military invasion of Egypt. Also, in Central Europe a serious situation had been created in Hungary. On that occasion, in November, I ventured to deal with these two matters. Many things have happened during these four months and considerable progress has been made in some matters, but I do not think I would be justified in saying that the general atmosphere in the world can be viewed with optimism; indeed there are many factors in it which are very disturbing.

So far as the situation in Egypt, in the Suez Canal and round about, is concerned, we have had the privilege of being in consultations with the Egyptian Government on the one side, and in the United Nations with others intimately connected with these matters, and we have tried to serve, in so far as

<Pg-55>

we could, the cause of peaceful settlement, a settlement which would not only guard the rights of nations or sovereignty of nations concerned, but also be fair to the interests of the international community.

I am not in a position to say anything very much about what is happening in Egypt now except that, I think, there are indications that a satisfactory solution may be arrived at in regard to the Suez Canal--the working or the functioning of the Suez Canal. Probably in the course of a few days, the canal will be open to traffic. The House will remember that much of the trouble of the last five or six months arose in connection with the Suez Canal and, therefore, if it is settled satisfactorily as to how it should work to the advantage of the international community and safeguarding the sovereign rights of Egypt, that will be a great gain.

I do not say that that will solve the problems of the Middle East. But, certainly, that will go a considerable way in easing tensions there. There are difficulties, as the House knows, in regard to Gaza, in regard to the Gulf of Aqaba and, generally, in regard to conditions in the Middle East. But, I suppose, you cannot expect them to be solved altogether; one has to go slowly, step by step.

Possibly, looking at the world picture as it is today, the Middle-Eastern region might be said to be the most difficult and potentially explosive region. In spite of the progress made towards a possible settlement of the Suez Canal issue and other matters, in spite of the fact that the invading forces were withdrawn from Egyptian territory, this area and the Middle East still continues to be a very difficult area. I do not mean to say that the area is inherently difficult, but it becomes a difficult area because of, I may say so with all respect, certain conflicts extraneous to the Middle East which are projected there.

Unfortunately, in a great part of the world real trouble arises partly from some local difficulties, partly from some distant difficulty which is reflected in that particular part of the world. This House knows very well our general views about military pacts, which are called 'defensive' but, which inevitably have a certain offensive or aggressive look. The moment one has a defensive pact aimed at certain other countries, the result is something more than 'defensive', and we have therefore ventured to say and repeat again and again, that these pacts, whoever may make them, do not tend to preserve peace, or further the cause of peace, or assure security.

Indeed, one of the obvious things that anyone can see, that has happened in the last few months in this Middle-Eastern region or Western Asia, has been the disturbing factor of these pacts. If I may refer to another place, Central Europe and Hungary, it is the pacts that came in the way; so that we have had enough evidence that these military pacts by one group of nations, presumably against another group of nations, do not help the cause of peace or security.

Unfortunately however, the pacts continue, and are even added on to. Only recently we have heard a great deal about the SEATO Pact and the Baghdad Pact. These two naturally affect us, India, muck more intimately and directly than any other pacts. The NATO alliance or the Warsaw Pact we can view distantly on grounds of certain principles and the approach we make to questions of world policy, but the Baghdad Pact and the SEATO, as everyone knows, have a direct effect upon India and, naturally, we have viewed them with suspicion and dislike.

In considering this question of military pacts, I am not, and I do not wish the House to consider that I am, trying to run them down, and to be presumptuous enough to criticise the policies of foreign countries in the past, or to a large extent in the present. It may be that at one time something was necessary. What I am venturing to suggest is that in the present context of events, these pacts do not help the cause of peace. In fact, they have the contrary effect and this has been borne in upon us lately with greater force than ever. But we saw how these pacts, notably the Baghdad Pact and, to some extent, the SEATO arrangement also, were utilised against us in connection with the Kashmir issue.

Presumably, the Kashmir issue has nothing to do with the Baghdad Pact or any other pact, but it was dragged into this picture and the members of these pacts functioned, well, as members of these pacts in regard to a particular issue which had nothing to do with it. Thus, we see how these pacts

<Pg-56>

which were meant presumably for some other purpose are used for different purposes and create, therefore, greater difficulties. Thus, because of these pacts, cold war comes and impinges upon the borders and frontiers of India. That is a matter of concern to us. We do not want the cold war anywhere, much less on the borders of India. I am quite convinced that the cold war approach is an approach which will continue to worsen international understandings for a certain basic reason, and that is, if the international situation is bedevilled today by fear, suspicion, dislike and even hatred, then you do not get over all these by the cold war. The cold war creates all these things or continues them. Some other approach has to be made, as I ventured say.

I cannot say that in this country or any other, we can give up, abandon, our defensive apparatus or do something which will involve

us in grave risks. No country can do that. Nobody suggests to any country that they should be prepared to take risks and hope that all will be well. But there is something in between these two policies. One is of just taking risks and hoping for the best. The other is taking no risks and yet working in the direction of peace.

Take even one of the major issues of today. What is going to happen to hydrogen bombs and the nuclear weapons and the like? I suppose it is the fear of attack by the other party that drives those countries which possess these weapons to go on enlarging them, everybody knowing that if once they are used, they may be destructive to both as well as to a great part of the world, everybody realising that they should not be used. Yet, they go on using them for fear that the other might have more of them. And so, we go on moving in this vicious circle and we do not get out of that vicious circle by the methods of cold war. It is obvious some other method has to be adopted, at the same time, protecting yourself against any possible danger or risk. I admit that. Great countries or small countries, both have to do that, but I do submit that the protection has not come in the past and will not come in the future by the systems of military alliances, whether they are with the Soviet Union or the United Kingdom or the United States of America or any other country. because, the whole effect of it is that the other party has them too and they go on balancing these nuclear weapons and other forms of armaments.

Take the question of disarmament. Lately, there have been some indications, some slightly hopeful indications, that this question of disarmament might perhaps yield some results. There is the disarmament conference. But, during the past months and years, there have often been some such indications which have not yielded any result that we hoped for. So, I do not wish to be too optimistic about it, but, anyhow, I do feel that there is something today which if pursued in the right way might lead to some substantial step later on. I cannot say more, because we have been disappointed so often in the past and it has become a little frustrating experience to hope too much.

Yet, the real reason for disarmament remains there, namely, that any other course leads to something which may end in utter disaster and that it does not, in the present stage, ensure security. In fact, it has the opposite effect; apart from the vast sums of money that are spent on armaments, so much is required for developing the countries of the world, for achieving higher standards for the people.

Recently, two of the great men of the biggest and the most powerful nations in the world--the United States of America and the Soviet Union--made certain proposals. The President of the United States made some proposals which are called the Eisenhower Doctrine now. The Soviet Union made some independent proposals. I do not presume, at this stage, to discuss or criticise any of these proposals. I have no doubt that both were meant to advance the cause of security and peace. But, What I ventured to suggest on another occasion was this

that proposals being drawn out from a distance in this atmosphere of suspicion and fear, even when they are good proposals, do, not take one far, because nobody accepts them or few people accept them as bona fide proposals.

I venture to suggest that the situation in the world is difficult and serious enough for these questions to be tackled face to face by the great leaders, more particularly by the great President of the United States and the leaders of the Soviet Union, as well as others if necessary, but more particularly those two.

<Pg-57>

It is just possible that that might lead to something better than we have seen in the last few months. On the one occasion that they did meet--it was about two years ago, I believe--that meeting resulted in a change in world atmosphere and the first hopes of some kind of peace.

This is not a question of favouring any particular proposal or not favouring it. I have no doubt that a great deal in President Eisenhower's proposals, more especially those dealing with economic help, are of importance and of great value. I have no doubt that many of the proposals that were put forward by the Soviet Union, on the face of them, are helpful. How they are carried out is a different matter.

But there is one approach that troubles me, and that is, this idea of thinking that areas in Asia, say in West Asia, are vacuums which have to be filled in by somebody stepping in from outside. That, I feel, is a dangerous approach, and an unreal approach when you say that every country which has not got sufficient armaments is a vacuum. At that rate, if you think in terms of armament, then there are only two countries which have an adequate supply of hydrogen bombs--the United States of America and the Soviet Union. You may say, all other countries are vacuums, because they have not got hydrogen bombs, which would be, of course, an absurd thing. What is the test then? Military power? Two countries stand out above all others. There are other countries, powerful military nations, great powers, two, three, four or five, whatever the number may be. Are all the smaller and militarily weaker countries vacuums, apart from these six or seven? What is the test of this vacuum idea? It is a dangerous idea, especially for Asian and African countries. It seems to me to lead to the conclusion that where an imperialist power gradually withdraws, or circumstances compel it to withdraw, you must necessarily presume that it has left a vacuum. If so, how is that vacuum to be filled? Suppose there is a vacuum in power. How is it to be filled? Surely if somebody else comes in, it is a repetition of the old story, may be in a different form. It can only be filled by the people of that country growing and developing themselves economically, politically and otherwise. Another difficulty is, when there is a conflict in the world, if one country wants to fill a vacuum, if I may use that word, or to have an area of influence, immediately, the hostile group

suspects the intentions of this country and tries to pursue a policy in which it can have its area of influence there or elsewhere. So, you get back into this tug-of-war of trying to capture as areas of influence various parts of the world, which are not strong enough, if you like, to stand by themselves or to prevent this kind of thing happening.

This thing happened, you will remember, two years ago, or probably more, three years ago, in Indo-China, where war was in progress. Ultimately an agreement on Indo-China was reached at the Geneva Conference, which agreement was essentially based on this fact that these great power groups should not push in aggressively in the Indo-China States, but leave them to function for themselves. In effect it meant that those Indo-China States should follow an independent and unaligned policy. They may have their sympathisers. Of course, they have them; nobody prevents that. But, there should be no military intervention, pacts, etc., of a military kind, because the moment one State had it, the other State wanted to have its own pact somewhere in that area and that upset the whole thing. In Indo-China they had a war for six or seven years before this agreement was arrived at and there was a ceasefire, some kind of peace, only on the basis of acknowledging some kind of a mutual agreement that we should not interfere in a military way or anything that might lead up to it. I do not say that everything in Indo-China has turned out to one's entire satisfaction since then, but I think it is true that that agreement not only stopped a war in Indo-China, a terrible war which had devastated parts of it, but also step by step has helped in keeping peace and in improving the situation. There are great difficulties still. We have to shoulder our burden there, as the House knows, because we have been and continue to be the Chairman of the International Commission there. It is a difficult and complicated task, a rather thankless one occasionally, but we could not possibly run away from it. We have been there and we have helped. As soon as we succeed in solving some small problem, others arise. Well, all I can say is that I hope gradually the situation will improve. One cannot do this by some sudden decision or sudden step that

<Pg-58>

you might take. That thing which applied to the Indo-China area in a sense might be considered in other areas too. Why interfere? If you are afraid of the other party interfering, surely the safer course is not to interfere oneself and thus prevent the other party from interfering. If the other party interferes even so, well, the matter can be considered and dealt with; arrangements can be made to deal with it. In other words, instead of spreading the area of pacts, the way of peace lies in coming to an agreement, in having less and less of these military pacts on both sides. After all, if the military pacts balance each other, the lack of them also will balance each other and will not endanger any one country more than the other. I do not say these issues are simple. Of course, they are not; they are complicated and the men of goodwill in every country think about them, want to solve them and yet find them difficult.

I mentioned it previously and the House knows that we have got a force at present in the Middle-Eastern region, mostly I believe in the Gaza strip of the Egyptian territory. It was made perfectly clear at the time when this force was first of all sent that it was sent after obtaining the permission of the Egyptian Government. We did not wish to move in at all, because it was Egyptian territory. Anyhow, we did not wish to take any steps in the matter without their permission. Secondly, this force was sent there on the express understanding that it was not to take the place of the invading forces, that is, it did not go there as an occupying force for occupying other's territory. It went there to help in keeping peace on the border on the Armistice Line and it has been serving there in this capacity. At first it was near the Suez Canal; then it was sent to the Gaza area. I believe the work of our officers and men has met with the approval of all the people concerned. I am particularly glad that the people there--I am not talking of the authorities--have also looked upon them with favour and they are popular with them.

Since the last debate we had here, some important developments have taken place, which would have been welcome anyhow, but which were doubly welcome because of the frustration we suffer from in other parts. One of the most important developments was the emergence of the old Gold Coast colony as the independent and sovereign State of Ghana. It was my earnest wish to go there myself on this happy occasion, but it coincided with the last days of our elections and the meetings of this Parliament. So, I just could not go, but naturally we sent our best wishes to the leaders and the people of Ghana. The emergence of Ghana as an independent State is, I think, of great importance and great significance not only because any such thing would be important, but because it is rather symbolic of Africa and the trends in Africa. I am particularly glad that a number of internal conflicts that they had in Ghana--party conflicts and others in regard to their Constitution and in regard to their other matters--had been resolved in a spirit of statesmanship and co-operation, which is of the happiest augury for their future. As the House well knows, the difficulties of a country come after independence. The real problems that they have to face come after independence; and, no doubt Ghana will be faced with those problems and is facing them today. I have little doubt that with goodwill and the wise approach that they have shown, they will overcome these problems.

The other day, only yesterday, I think, I had occasion to meet a Minister of the Malayan Government. Malaya is also rapidly forging ahead towards independence, and provisionally, I believe, it has been fixed that the date for Malayan independence would be somewhere towards the end of August. All these are happy signs which give one some hope for the future in spite of the other disappointments that we have to experience. Then, there is Nigeria adjoining Ghana which also, I hope, is on the verge of independence. Thus, on the one side, the colonial picture of the world is changing and yet, unfortunately, on the other side, it is getting stuck up and movements for freedom of colonies are met with by stern opposition.

Hon. Members will know that at present we have an eminent visitor from abroad, the Prime Minister of Poland, in this country. I believe members are going to have a chance of meeting him and listening to him. We welcome him specially not only because Poland is a country with a fascinating tradition of struggles for freedom, with a very powerful nationalism which has moved it throughout history, but also because of the

<Pg-59>

terrible sufferings they had in the last war, and the way they have built up their city of Warsaw and other cities which had been reduced almost to ground level. Apart from all these, Poland has been an example in the last year of the process of liberalisation and democratisation in the East European countries which has been welcomed by us and by many others. Because, we feel that that is the natural way of bringing about changes, relaxations and less rigidity and that to bring them about by some kind of compulsion from outside fails and, in fact, leads to greater rigidity. Therefore, Poland is also a symbol of certain powerful and very valuable trends in the Western world which have a larger significance.

We have also in Delhi at the present moment, Mr. Jarring, who was last month the President of the Security Council, and who has come here at the instance of the Security Council in connection with the Kashmir issue. I had the privilege of meeting him yesterday and having a talk with him. No doubt, we shall have further talks before he goes away. I need not say anything about our general position in regard to Kashmir because that has been made quite clear. Even in the President's Address, it was made quite clear in a few sentences. in the course of the debate on the President's Address also many references were made to it. There were, I believe, quite a number of questions which Hon. Members put, and the Speaker was good enough to suggest that instead of those questions being answered seriatim, perhaps, I might deal with them or most of them in the course of this debate. Perhaps some of them have already been answered. However, I shall refer to them briefly presently.

There is a problem which affects all our people here very powerfully and very deeply and that is the question of Goa. On the occasion of the debate here a few days ago on the President's Address, an Hon. Member of this House who had a good deal of personal experience of Goa and Goan Portuguese administration and Goan prisons, gave us some account from his personal knowledge and experience. I was not present in the House then, unfortunately. But, I read a report of his speech; others have, no doubt, heard or read it. No one can read that account without feeling a sense of horror as to what has been happening and is, no doubt, continuing to happen in Goa. The other day, some of our nationals were released by the Portuguese Government, and among them is an Hon. Member of this House who has spent a long time there under those very bad conditions. I want to make it clear that the fact of the release of some Indian nationals from there, welcome as that is-

we wanted them to be released naturally--brings little satisfaction to our mind. I do not want anyone to imagine that we are in any sense toning down our demands and our opinions in regard to Goa, and that this chapter is closed or anyhow postponed for the present. Goa is a live and vital issue. The House may criticise us for the type of policy we adopt or may wish to change it. That is a different matter. We may discuss that. But, it is for all of us, to whatever party we may belong, a live and vital issue and we feel deeply on it. I particularly want to say that--welcome as the Hon. Member is here, he has come back from prison and the others will come back-we must remember that hundreds and hundreds of Goans are in prison there and are treated worse even than the Indian nationals who were there. I do not know if my voice can possibly reach them; probably not. Anyhow, I should have liked to assure them that this question and their fate are very near our minds, and it is a matter of deep unhappiness to us that circumstances should be such that this problem cannot be solved easily and quickly. As with other problems, it becomes tied up with world issues, with international problems and one cannot touch a single problem which is tied up with other issues without, may be, creating all kinds of reactions to it. One cannot isolate this problem, and therefore, we have tried to follow there the broad policy which we have enunciated before the world, the broad policy or regard to foreign affairs or internal affairs, and I do not myself see how we can depart from it basically without giving up that broad policy, and without really launching out into an unknown course of action of which we do not know the results. At the same time, I do feel that we must give the most careful consideration to the various aspects of our policy; I am not referring to the broad approach to the problem which I believe is correct, and should be pursued, but I do think that we should give the most careful consideration to the various other aspects of our policies relating to Goa. In fact, we are in the process of doing that. These elections had come and

<Pg-60>

they rather came in the way--and other matters--but I hope that in the course of the next few weeks we shall be able to consult not only our own people who have been dealing with them, but others too. I hope we should be able to consult Hon. Members of the Opposition too in regard to these matters, and try to evolve courses of action which can be as effective as anything can be in the present circumstances.

May I refer to some of those questions, chiefly in regard to Kashmir and one or two other matters which the Speaker was good enough to keep ever for this debate?

There were questions about Mr. Jarring's visit. I need say nothing about it. As the House knows, he is here. The resolution under which he has come here, the resolution of the Security Council, is a simple resolution--it was passed after much debate, I need not refer to that--reminding him of previous resolutions and asking him to come here and to meet representatives of India and representatives of Pakistan in their respective places, and discuss this matter with

them and to report by 15 April. He has been to Pakistan, spent about a week there. He is here now. That is all I can say.

Then there were soveral questions about atomic weapons in Pakistan. References had been made about this matter both by my colleague, Shri Krishna Menon, in the Security Council, and by me occasionally here in some connection. Both our references were based not on any secret information--we leave that out--but on certain official statements or speeches by the Pakistan Commander-in-Chief. We did not say--neither I nor Shri Krishna Menon--that they had atomic weapons, but we only said what the Pakistan Commander-in-Chief had said, that in their, military exercises in last December, the use of tactical atomic weapons was envisaged and exercises were carried out from that point of few. That is a preparatory stage, preparation for the use of atomic weapons. I did not say they had them, and since then the United States Government has denied the fact of their having given any atomic weapons to Pakistan, or, indeed, to any other country. Naturally, we accept that denial, but the fact remains that these preparations and, exercises and the possible use of them are matters of some concern to, us, more especially when all this is tied up with this large-scale military aid which comes from the United States to Pakistan, and which has made a great deal of difference, I believe, to many problems between India and Pakistan. It has been my conviction--it was and is--that it would have been far easier for Pakistan and India to solve their problems, difficult as they were, after the partition, if other countries--outside countries--had not interfered so much, whatever the problem might be, whether it is Kashmir or any other, I am not for the moment criticising outside countries because often they have acted with goodwill in this matter, but goodwill or not, the fact is that this interference has come in the way of these two neighbour-countries solving their problems in some measure, if not with immediate goodwill, anyhow solving them.

Then there were some questions, I think, enquiring if Pakistan had annexed the area of Kashmir in Jammu and Kashmir State occupied by them. Well, the answer to that is, "Yes". Even by their Constitution they have stated that all the administered area is part of Pakistan-and undoubtedly this is one of their administered areas--so that they have for some time past, and practically speaking, for a long time past, and later even constitutionally, treated this as an area which is a part of Pakistan. It has been surprising that little reference has been made to this annexation of part of, in so far as area is concerned nearly half of, Jammu and Kashmir State area, while a great deal of discussion has taken place, about what is called the 'annexation' of Kashmir State by India. There has been no annexation. The word itself is completely wrong, inappropriate. There was accession, as the House knows, in October, 1947; the circumstances leading to it may have been different, but it, was an accession in exactly the same way as was applied to the hundreds of other States in India, the same legal, constitutional way. True, the circumstances were somewhat different but it was an accession. Nothing has happened since then to lessen that factor and nothing was necessary to add to

There were also questions about Gilgit and a story that was published in the press, a story emanating from Brigadier Ghansara Singh. We, of course, had known this story for a long time. Brigadier Ghansara Singh

< Pg-61 >

was sent by the Maharaja of Kashmir, the Ruler then, under an agreement with the British just prior to partition. They had handed over Gilgit to the Jammu and Kashmir Government, and this Brigadier was sent there to take charge. Some very extraordinary things happened when he went there. Soon after his arrival, after two, or three days, he was arrested by the Gilgit Scouts who were under the command of British officers, and the British officers of the Gilgit Scouts informed the Pakistan Government that Gilgit had acceded to Pakistan. I am not going into the merits, but the story was a very odd and curious one. Brigadier Ghansara Singh was kept in prison there or in detention for a considerable time. When he came out, we had met him, and he had given us this story then. Now, it was given out to the public.

I should like to make clear another thing. We have been asked as to the Government of India's position regard to the Pakistan-occupied territory of Kashmir, and what we propose to do about it. It is clear that in every sense, legally and constitutionally, by virtue of the accession of the Jammu and Kashmir State to India, the whole State acceded, not a bit of it or a part of it only; and, therefore, according to that accession, the whole State should form part of the Union of India. That is the legal position.

We may have, in the course of these nine years, in our extreme desire to come to some peaceful arrangement, discussed various suggestions, proposals, etc. But those discussions did not lead to any result. There they ended, although, sometimes, something that we said in the course of discussion, some idea or proposal or thought that was thrown out, is held up to us as a kind of commitment. Anyhow, in law, that is a part of the Jammu and Kashmir territory which is an acceded State of the Union

But it is true that we have stated in the Security Council and outside too--and in fact, this has been our position for a long time past--that we for our part are not going to take any steps involving armed forces to settle the Kashmir problem. Of course, if we are attacked, we shall defend, and indeed we have made it clear that if we are attacked in Kashmir, we consider it an attack on India, which it is. We have made that clear. But we have also made it clear that while we consider the Pakistan-occupied part of Kashmir as legally and constitutionally a part of India, of the Indian Union territory, we are not going to take any military steps to recover it or recapture it. We have given that assurance and we shall abide by it.

There were also questions about some messages that had come to me

from the Prime Ministers of Ceylon and China in regard to the Kashmir issue. As for those messages, the House will remember that the Prime Minister of China went to Ceylon; and they issued a joint statement there. In the course of that statement, there was reference to the Kashmir issue, a friendly reference saying that they hoped that this would be settled by mutual discussions or contacts between the two countries concerned, and hoping that other countries would not interfere. That was a friendly wish from two of our friendly countries. And so far as I know, there is nothing more that followed from it or was intended to follow.

So, I have dealt with most of these questions which were put to us. One thing more I should like to refer to, which may be in the Hon. Members' minds--that is India's association with the Commonwealth of Nations. The question is an important one. And I can very well understand Hon. Members thinking about this matter much more now than they did previously, and enquiring from me, as they have done, sometimes in writing, sometimes orally, as to why in spite of all that has happened, whether in the Middle-Eastern region or whether in regard to Kashmir, that is, the attitudes taken by some Common-Wealth countries in rggard to Kashmir, which were certainly not impartial or neutral, which were siding with one party, and which were siding with a party which we considered the aggressor party, we still think it is right for us to continue this Commonwealth connection. They put this question to me, and we discussed it with them, but even more so, I have discussed it with my own mind and with my colleagues and others, because this is pot a matter which I can settle just because I feel one way or the other. Indeed, we cannot settle any matter that way. It can only be settled, not only after the fullest consultation, but without doing violence to public feeling. Sometimes, it may be that public feeling has to be restrained or even opposed for the time being, because people

<Pg-62>

may get excited, and they may think differently somewhat later. But in the final run, public feeling cannot be ignored, much less violated. So, this was a serious matter, and is a serious matter.

But I have felt, and for the first time I felt, the first time in these many years, that it may some time or other require further consideration. But in this as in other matters we are not going to act in a huff or in a spirit of anger merely because we dislike something that had happened. I feel, as I said here, that in spite of these occurrences that have happened and have distressed us, it is right for us to continue our association with the Commonwealth, for a variety of reasons which I mentioned then, among them being primarily the fact that our policies, as is obvious, are in no way conditioned or deflected from their normal course by that association. Nobody can say that there has been this conflict in our policies, that these policies have been affected. We consult other countries. We have close relations with other countries. But the decision is ours, and is not affected by the fact of our being in the Commonwealth.

Secondly, at this moment, when there are so many disruptive tendencies in the world, it is better to retain every kind of association, which is not positively harmful to us, than to break it. Breaking it itself is a disruptive thing. It does not add to that spirit of peaceful settlements and peaceful associations that we wish to develop in the world.

Therefore, after giving all this thought, I felt--and I felt clearly--in my mind, that it would not be good to break up this association in spite of the painful shocks that all of us had experienced in these past few months.

But again, no decision that we can take in these or other matters for today can be said to be a permanent decision for ever. All kinds of things happen and one has to review these matters from time to time in view of changing conditions. And I would remind the House that the Commonwealth itself is undergoing a change. Ghana is a member of the Commonwealth. Possibly Malaya will be member of the Commonwealth. Possibly a little later Nigeria might be. Its inner composition and content is changing, and changing, if I may say so, in the right direction. Therefore, keeping all these things in view and well realising the strong reactions that have been produced in the country in regard to this matter, I would still respectfully submit to the House that it is desirable in the present context, to continue this association with the Commonwealth.

USA EGYPT HUNGARY INDIA IRAQ POLAND CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC CHINA SWITZERLAND GHANA NIGER NIGERIA PAKISTAN LATVIA

Date: Mar 25, 1957

Volume No

1995

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

Shri Krishna Menon's Speech in Lok Sabha

Replying to the debate on Foreign Affairs in the Lok Sabha on Mar 26, 1957, the Minister Without Portfolio, Shri V. K. Krishna Menon, said:

Mr. Speaker, Sir, in the consideration of the motion moved yesterday by the Prime Minister before this House, there were, during the course of the debate, certain general criticisms of foreign policy in the background of the almost unanimous support of the House of that policy and its execution. In speaking at the end of this debate, Mr.

Speaker, with your permission, I would first of all like to deal with these general criticisms of principles and execution of foreign policy, and then deal with the specific matters on which clarification has been sought or criticism made.

But, before doing so, I ask your indulgence to join in the general expressions of happiness that have been uttered in this House in connection with the emergence of the Gold Coast an independent State. As we did at the United Nations, I think it is useful to read into the records of this House, that this is not a country that for the first time emerges into civilization but, like ourselves, whose civilization has been overlapped by the hand of imperial rule has now come back into its own. Speaking before the Legislative Assembly on 18 May, the Prime Minister of Gold Coast said:

The Government proposes that when the Gold Coast attains independence, the name of the country should be changed from 'Gold Coast' to the new name of 'Ghana'. The name Ghana is rooted deeply in ancient African history, especially in the

<Pg-63>

history of the western portion of Africa known as the, Western Sudan. It kindles in the imagimation of modern West African youth the grandeur and the achievements of a great mediaeval civilization which our ancestors developed many centuries before the European penetration and subsequent domination of Africa began. According to tradition, the various peoples or tribal groups, in the Gold Coast were originally members of the great Ghana Empire that developed in Western Sudan during the mediaeval period.

For the one thousand years that the Ghana Empire existed, it spread over a wide expanse of territory in the Western Sudan. Its influence stretched across the Sudan from Lake Chad in the east to the Fouta Dialon mountains in the west, and from the southern fringes of the Sahara Desert in the north to the Bights of Benin and Biafra in south. Thus the Ghana Empire was known to have covered what is now the greater part of West Africa, namely, from Nigeria in the east to Senegambia in the west. While it existed, the Ghana Empire carried on extensive commercial relations with the outside world, extending as far as Spain and Portugal. Gold, animal skins, ivory, kola, nuts, gums honey, corn and cotton were among the articles that writers had most frequently named. It is reported that Egyptian, European and African students attended the great and famous universities and other institutions of higher learning that flourished in Ghana during the mediaeval period to learn philosophy, mathematics, medicine and law. A famous Arabic writer has stated that there was during this period exchange of professors between the University of Santore in Ghana and the University of Cordova in Spain.

Mr. Speaker, I thought I would read this because it brings back memories to our minds and also a feeling that the old world which has been overlaid by certain aspects of modern civilization much to its detriment, is now coming back to its own. It is also appropriate that, while congratulating Ghana and expressing our good wishes to her, we should also recall that her independence in many ways has been reached in the same way as ours, that is, in the last stages by co-operation with the metropolitan power in conditions of peace, and I believe a tribute is due to that metropolitan power also in bringing an end to the imperial rule in this part of West Africa.

I may make, Mr. Speaker, a humble suggestion. Perhaps, in view of the unanimity of expression, you, in your wisdom, would consider in what way it is possible to convey to the Parliament of Ghana the wishes of this House.

The Hon. Member from Bhagalpur-cum-Purnea, in speaking on this debate, referred to the failure of our foreign policy. Normally, one would leave a general statement of this character unanswered. But, coming as it does from the elder statesman of this country, one who has served it in the struggle for independence and today occupies a place of affection in our hearts and minds, irrespective of the party labels he may wish to carry, it would be impolite to ignore his observations. I have read his statement very carefully, and I confess--I say it with great respect--I find it difficult to reconcile one part of it with another. The general failure of foreign policy on the one hand, we are told, arises from our addiction to slogans and that we have taken on too much. But the burden of the charge is that the foreign policy is not based upon what is fundamental.

Acharya Kripalani tells us that "every nation has to safeguard primarily its own interests and also to save itself from any possible danger; that there is no other objective in international diplomacy". If I may so say, would every one in the House subscribe to his statement? I dare to ask whether the endeavours for peace in this world, the establishment of friendship and international cooperation, the participation in the fight against racialism and standing by the side of those who still have to labour against colonial rule, the participation in the efforts to bring about economic amelioration and development of underdeveloped countries, in extending the advantages of modern health services through the World Health Organisation and various other things that we know

<Pg-64>

today, and what is more, keeping ourselves tree from entanglements or war politics--whether these are not in the interests of our country? Our primary interest in this world is in peace and co-operation. It so happens that in a condition like ours at present, there is no interest which is incompatible with international interests. Therefore, our policy--it may be called idealistic--is probably the most commonsense and practical policy that we could have followed.

We are told that in regard to various other matters, the pursuit of this-policy has landed us in a situation where we have no friends. With great respect, Mr. Speaker, one has to take this statement very seriously, because as it happens, this House, on the debates on Foreign Affairs, has a vast audience, and coming from such an Hon. Member, to say that this country stands unfriended in the world is a very serious statement. The facts are to the contrary. It would be a bad day if we counted amongst our friends only those who would support up. Friendship does not mean that another sovereign State. when it takes its own decision and has, if you like, its own prejudices, should take our side. It so happens that our country is among the few nations of the world that is still able to speak at all levels--governmental, ambassadorial, parliamentary--to peoples and Governments of States which have very divergent forms of political and economic systems. It would be untrue to say, looking at the large number of representatives of Governments and heads of States that come to this capital of ours week after week month after month, that we are a friendless country. No one suggests that they are coming here for the purpose of espionage. They come here on a friendly visit. Therefore, if any evidence were required for the man-in-the street and even Members of Parliament who are of the same species, here is incontrovertible evidence. I venture to say that the Hon. Member's statement is much to be regretted, because, while, all speeches in Parliament are happily reported in our Press, only certain speeches will be reported in certain countries and in certain sections of the Press and they tend to attain an importance out of proportion to the general context of the observations made in the House.

The Hon. Member from Mysore has made criticisms about the conduct of our foreign policy. He goes into considerable detail. I have not had the opportunity to consult the Prime Minister on the text of the speech, but I do not think this matter requires much consultation, because the thesis that has been put forward is that we should scrap parliamentary Government. Ours is a parliamentary Government with a responsible executive where the Government are responsible for the conduct of administration. Parliament has, at all times, the opportunity to turn out the Government. Therefore, when Parliament is advised to follow the practice that does not obtain in parliamentary countries, but in countries where there is no responsible executive as in the Congressional system, where the ambassadors must come before the parliamentary committees and be subject to inquisition and be criticised, then, we depart from this practice of the Foreign Minister taking responsibility for the ambassador or whoever represents the case. Similarly, in our system, treaties are not subject to the same procedures as in a Congressional system of Government.

This criticism may have arisen from objection to certain choices, certain procedures, but since it has been raised as a general principle, it goes far deeper than that. We have, for good or evil--I believe for good--established in this country the system of Government where the executive sits inside the legislature. We were sitting here this morning for one and a quarter hours listening to questions and answers on matters which no doubt every person who puts

the question considers to be of importance. We are here, as a Government, subject to criticisms on every detail of our policy.

Even in regard to Foreign Affairs, while it is said that there is no consultation, the number of debates that take place in the House is evidence of this consultation. The parliamentary executive alone must assume the responsibility if things go wrong. This form of open consultation is followed, except when the Minister responsible--the Prime Minister in this case--considers those things or any particular matter must be subject to a special form of consultation.

On the one hand, there has been a criticism that too many debates on Foreign Affairs are held. In the same breath, we are

<Pg-65>

told that there is no consultation. The Government believes that frequent debates in this House not only permit the Government to be able to assess the views and to react to the sentiments of various sections of the House, but they also proclaim to the world that the policy in general, or any particular action, has the support of the people in this country. Therefore, to respond to any of the suggestions made, that either the ambassadors should be appointed by Parliament or the conduct of foreign Policy should be entrusted to a parliamentary committee and the Government should, therefore, take instructions from an all-party committee of Parliament, while it itself has a parliamentary executive which is responsible under the Constitution, is something which cannot be reconciled.

The rest of the criticisms, coming from the Hon. Members, is directed to specific matters and to personal issues. The Hon. Member from Bhagalpur-cum-Purnea said that diplomacy dops not consist of certain things but consists of something else. He said that representatives are badly chosen and in this particular case, the representation on the United Nations in the field of foreign discussion is rather unhappy because the representative is not able to persuade. I have no doubt that the Prime Minister and the Government could make better choices than they make at present, but Government is not always the choice of the best but the choice of what is possible and some of us happen to be among the possibles. But this matter has been taken a little further than that, because our policies are not exalted by the personalities of individuals or representatives. The representatives of the Government in this country abroad are quite unlike Members of Parliament, because Members of Parliament are representatives, while those who go out are delegates. They get their instructions; they keep to those instructions and if they do not keep to those instructions, they will hear about it or some correction will be made afterwards. They are not in the position of Members of Parliament formulating policies on their own. This country does not run two foreign offices, but only one. Therefore, when we speak about our delegates hot having the capacity to persuade, I think we are entitled to ask this House to look back to the last six or seven years, look to the history of the independence of Indo-nesia or the

termination of war in Korea, the termination of hostilities in Indo-China, to the position in regard to the troubles which had recently arisen in the Middle East, the responsibility we have undertaken and the contributions we have made in this matter, however modest they may be--all these have arisen only by the result of persuasion. What other weapon have we got? In fact, the greater part of the time of our delegates is spent outside debating chambers, in the task of taking counsel and in what the Hon. Member has called 'Persuasion'. He asked me whether I resented his observations. I did not resent his observations in the least, on the other hand, it might do me a lot of good, because it is very bad for any representative to be simply the recipient of praise or of approval. What is more, the foreign Press and our own people should know that no one in this country, including the Prime Minister, is above criticism, as there is no inhibition here on the expression of opinion.

I now come to the more specific issues which have been raised during the debate. The first of these is the Middle East. It is necessary to refer to this, because during the course of the debate, after the Prime Minister had spoken, references were made to the statements made by the Secretary of State for External Affairs in the Dominion of Canada. Yesterday he has sent me an extract of lifs speech through his High Commissioner. This is a matter in which Canada and us are commonly involved. Incidentally, while the Prime Minister has spoken fully about the Commonwealth relations, I may as well draw the attention of, the House to this fact that there were two Commonwealth States--Canada and India--that stood against Britain and Australia, and others in regard to the situation in the Middle East in the United Nations. So, there is no question of inhibition in regard to judgments or policies. The greater part of the statement appeared in the Press and with much of it our Government is in agreement. The best way to answer this would be to consider the position with regard to the United Nations Emergency Force and the situation in the Gaza strip and the Middle East generally. Contrary to what may appear from newspaper reports, to the best of one's judgement the situation is much easier than it was some 10 or 15 days ago. The invading armies are withdrawing from Egypt and Egyptian-controlled territory--the last of

<Pg-66>

these elements that remain in the Gaza strip and what is called the Sharm el-Sheikh area. The legal position with regard to these territories is that both the Gaza strip on the one hand and that part of Israel which is not awarded to it under the 1947 resolution of the United Nations are legally equal in status. When India agreed to participate in the United Nations Emergency Force, it made it very clear and categorical and the assurance was given, which was endorsed by the United Nations, that the forces would not at any place be asked to violate the sovereignty of Egyptian territory; they would not take up the functions of invading forces; they would not be armies of occupation. We and the Canadian Government, according to the speech made in the House there, have slight differences in this

matter in that the Canadian Government apprehends that when the United Nations Emergency Force is placed on the Armistice Line, they must feel assured that there would be no attacks from the Egyptian side. So far as we are informed and so far, as our knowledge goes, there is no need for this apprehension. There are no disturbances in this area and until now the United Nations troops had not been fired upon either by Israel or by the Arabs at any time. There have been some slight incidents, in Israel five or six months ago, for which the Government apologised. Therefore, the statement in the Canadian Parliament which arises from the apprehension that the United Nations forces on the demarcation line may meet with difficulties when separating the two sides after raids from one side--only one side is mentioned--is not in our judgment in correspondence with the facts of the case. We have no reason to think that Egypt, which accepted the United Nations forces on the basis of the understanding with the U.N. Secretary-General to carry out the resolution of the United Nations in good faith, would not do so. To the best of our knowledge, there are no Egyptian armies moving in the Gaza territory and the Governor of Gaza is co-operating fully with the United Nations forces. Our Government has not agreed, and cannot agree, indeed, it would be ultra vires of the United Nations resolutons, to put these forces in the position of occupation of the Gaza strip. That would be a violation of the Armistice Agreement. Mr. Lester Pearson has said that the Armistice Agreement is the basis on which these territories rest and that is our position also. But to put in foreign forces in this strip, which is de facto Egyptian territory but whose status de jure is unsettled, would be a violation of the Armistice Agreement of 1949. Our country has always said that we would not take over the powers of occupation. Over and above that, what we are all looking for is a peaceful settlement of this matter, and if it were possible, the establishment of at least as much of non-conflict on this border which may lead gradually step by step towards a wider settlement of the question that involves the two countries and the other Arab States. Therefore, the functions of the United Nations forces are of a neutral character. Any police functions, except as requested by the Egyptian Government, would involve them in trouble and probably lead to incidents same as those which occurred in Port Said before the withdrawal. Therefore, I would like to say that the apprehension in this matter is unfounded, that the United Nations forces are functioning according to rule and according to the resolutions of the Assembly, and so far as our Government is concerned, such influence as it may possess, would be exercised on the side of moderation. As I said, on the whole, the situation has improved and it is a matter for congratulation that for the first time in eight or nine years, instead of raids taking place from one side on the other and the other way about where After the raids the United Nations observers report and allocate responsibility, now they have placed a cordon in between, where there are no weapons except weapons of self-defence, which would separate the parties; and, there are t hose who believe that this may be the beginning of finding a way towards a settlement. Our forces in this connection, it is not too well-known, have performed a task which does credit to this country. It is not known that the Indian Army, whether in Korea or in IndoChina or now in Egypt, under conditions of great difficulty, where it does not perform the task of killing its enemy or getting killed in return, but is there helping the cause of peace, is popular with the local population and does not get involved in politics of the place and exercises the strictest control and discipline among its own ranks.

The other problem in the Middle East that is confronting us again in relation to our foreign policy is one of our self-interest. We did involve ourselves in the discussions

<Pg-67>

in regard to the Suez Canal and the difficulties arising in connection with it after nationalisation, not because we could not keep out of the colourful picture, but because the Suez Canal to a certain extent is much more our life-line than it may be the lifeline of the Western countries. In the autumn last year, 70 per cent of our exports and 69 per cent of our imports passed through the canal. This country carried somewhere about 650,000. tonnage through the canal in that twelve-month period. Therefore, its re-opening which is vital to the progress of our Five-Year Plans to our economic life and to our food prices, is a matter of great concern to us. I think we can have a restrained optimism that when the canal is opened in the next few days for international traffic, the conditions will be such that at least for the time being, there will be a restoration to normality and the various apprehensions that were held with regard to discrimination of those who were using the canal before or with regard to its maintenance and conditions of navigations, etc., will disappear. We are not the Government concerned. It lies in the sovereign authority of the Egyptian Government to make a statement. They have said only last week, that just before the canal is opened, they will make known to the world their plans of operation and the general arrangement for its functioning etc. pnd there is every reason to think that this will be a practical approach which would meet the apprehensions of the world community.

The Prime Minister, in opening the debate, referred to military pacts. Acharya Kripalani went further and said that we must just talk of the pacts and say no more about them, after having told us that we should not place reliance on slogans. These pacts, again to us are not matters of moral rectitude. It is not a matter of difference of opinion. They are vital to our country. Today, the position is not what it was in 1947. Our neighbour is linked in military alliances stretclaing from Istanbul to our frontiers, and supported by some of the very powerful countries of the world including the former metropolitan country, the U.K. Therefore, when these pact system, apart from the general world context, protrude, project the instrument of war and threats of aggression to our own land and menace our security, it becomes absolutely necessary for us to say so.

Secondly, this country, both by its constitutional procedures and by

its affirmations both before and after independence, is wedded to principles of international behaviour and international law. Since the founding of the United Nations, we have been a loyal member of the United Nations. It has been our view which we held at the Bandung Conference that these pacts are--I am not now referring to the NATO and other older organisations--a violation of the Charter of the United Nations, They do not come under Article 51 which provides for collective defence. For example, under the SEATO Agreement, the powers concerned have taken under protection all territories below a certain latitude. So, without asking, we are under protection. It is not a situation which we can easily accept. Over and above that, it is a curious combination of a former imperial countries and former colonial countries, It is, more or less, a return in a pact form to colonial rule. It is our own view that these helpless countries, militarily weak countries, by joining these military alliances, simply bring back all the attributes of colonial rule in a different form. What can they provide? They can provide the terrain and their manpower. They could only become the instruments of bringing the cold war into our own areas. So while we have only the method of persuasion, we have only the method of protest, we have only the method of dissociation from the pacts, as a Government, in the pursuit of our pacific foreign policy, it is, necessary for us to use all constitutional procedures to international systems and to express our views in this way.

Furthermore, it has come to light in the last two or three years that these military alliances are also enlisted in support and in pursuit of the domestic policies of the countries as against others. The most outstanding instance is the adventures of the French empire in their colonial territories. There has been no disguising the fact, it has been repeatedly stated from the platform where the discussion has taken place, that the equipment supplied by the NATO organisation is used in very large and considerable quantities in the suppression of liberation movements in North Africa. The same applies to us as you may remember with regard to the debate on Portugal although the Governments concerned rather fought shy of the Portuguese insistence upon what they regard as a right in

<Pg-68>

this matter. More recently, last year both at Teheran and Karachi, in the meetings of the Baghdad powers and the SEATO conference, the issue of Kashmir was dragged in as if it was a matter within the competence of these pact systems. They can be called by whatever names you like. They are just offensive and defensive alliances. The offensiveness is not decided by the collective group of these powers but by each individual member. If you have any doubt, you have only to read the statements of Pakistan Ministers and military leaders in this connection.

Furthermore, in those liberated areas, for example, in Indo-China, the path of development lies in those countries being able to exercise sovereignty without outside interference free from

entanglements, even as the United States was for 100 or 150 years after attaining liberty. The introduction of these pacts, has divided the countries which were formerly united. We who have lived under empires have somewhat sinister and unhappy memories of the process of division. In the olden days they used to say divide and rule. The fashion now is to divide and leave, to cut up a country and go away. In the Arab countries, for example, the Baghdad Pact, instead of bringing about a sense of unity, has divided those people and set up one Arab nation against another and created fears, and what is more--I do not want to traverse on this to a great extent--brought into existence the so-called vacuum and attracted into this region the elements of conflict, which it is in the interests of those countries to avoid. Therefore, if our Government were to escape responsibility for expression of its opinion, both in its own interests and in the interests of peace in this region, and peace in the world, it would be guilty of dereliction of its responsibility. It is unhappy to feel that these pact systems not only appear to have come to stay, but they seem to be growing from time to time. Those of you who can think back far enough may remember the days of the North Atlantic Treaty Organisation, long before it was known by that name, when the world wad, definitely told of cultural alliances, economic alliances, and finally now, military alliances, as going to have an economic aspect. Similarly, in the case of the SEATO also. There are new nations coming into existence in our part of the world. We are apprehensive of their being drawn into the system of war activity.

(The Government, that is to say, the re-presentatives of the Government in the United Nations were criticised for certain other matters. Since it is a matter of some importance, one should refer to them. I would like to say that speeches of this criticism arises from the fact that speeches on these subjects are made before the reports come into this country. It is nobody's fault. That is how our news services and our present system work. We were criticised for our soft handling of Britain on the issue of Cyprus. I wonder how many Hon. Members have read the debates on this question. (We initiated in the United Nations the conception that the people mainly concerned are the Cypriot people, and that Cyprus was not to be bargained off between Turkey, Greece and Britain.) A few others are now looking in. The Syrians said, while Turkey is only 45 miles from Cyprus, Syria is only 37 miles. What is more, they said, we can see the Cyprus coast from our coast. Next year, there may be other people. We did not consider that the issue of Cyprus is a matter of the country being sliced up between various people. The view of our Government was expressly stated. If Iceland with a population of 167,000 people can be a sovereign State and a member of the United Nations, there was no reason why Cyprus with nearly half a million people, with its industry and agriculture, with its general capacity and trade and its position in the world, should not also be an independent country. (So, right along, not only this year but in previous years also the policy presented on behalf of our Government has been two-fold--that the Cypriot people are a nation, that nationalism is territorial. It may be that they may be of Greek--origin. No one suggests that because the bulk of the population of the United States is of AngloSaxon origin, they should go back to England. Similarly, because the people in Cyprus are of Turkish or Greek origin, we did not see any reason, unless they so wished and conditions were independent, that this should be made a matter of bargain between countries. After the first year, the Government of India succeeded in persuading the Greek Government to adopt this view. Therefore, the Greek Government has moved away from its original position of what was called "Enosis" and today supports self-government, an

<Pg-69>

independent Cyprus, in the same way as we are independent. And when criticism is made of Cyprus, it should also be said that while this issue was being debated and no solution could be found, it was our delegation that suggested the solution which was supported by Greece, Turkey, the United Kingdom, the United States, the Soviet Union, the Arab countries and the Western countries. I suppose that does represent a degree of, the success of the process of conciliation, and the basis of it was that the parties involved in it were the United Kingdom as a metropolitan power and the Cypriot people as the people who were not free, and therefore if they wanted to remain as part of the sisterhood of nations, of the Commonwealth, as we hope they would, it is up to them. We have always taken the view publicly and privtely that the remedy lies in recognising before it is too late, and by not giving too little, the demand of the Cypriot people for their independence.

The Hon. Meniber from Ranchi-West asked about Chittagong Chittagong is not part of external affairs But I think it is as well he should have drawn our attention to geography and various other factors. I hope this country will never put forward any claim to any territory on the ground that the population are Hindus, Christians, Muslims or anything else because we have stood against it, and we cannot have one remedy for one situation and another remedy for another situation. It is quite true that these things were done in the hurry of independence because independence being won in a short period was probably worth a great deal of sacrifice and naturally, when things were speedily done, there are rough edges. It is true, there were talks of negotiations at that time, but the House will certainly agree with the fact that this is not the only issue on which we have not been able to negotiate and come to an agreement with Pakistan. Therefore, while it is a very important matter and may have its relation to other questions and is receiving the attention and will receive the attention of the Prime Minister, there is nothing more one can say except that the talk about negotiation must still be regarded as alive.

The Hon. Member also referred to the question of sending delegations to the West African territories. The Prime Minister has already indicated that he would be willing to consider this, subject, of course, to the Finance Minister's views on the availability of foreign exchange.

Now, there are only two other matters of a specific character. In dealing with them, it is necessary to make one reservation. These two matters are Goa and Kashmir. Neither of these is really a subject of debate on foreign policy. They tre not foreign territories. They are Indian territories. They are parts of India. So, some explanation is required why we discuss Kashmir, for example, in the degate on Foreign Affairs. It is simply be cause it has become involved with the United Nations, and it has also become involved with the illegal occupation of a territory by an external power. That is the reason why we are discussing it. Otherwise, Kashmir is, as far as its local Government is concerned, a matter for the Government of Jammu and Kashmir, and in so far as it is connected with the Federal Centre, it is a matter for the Home Ministry.

Various problems have been raised in regard to Goa and Kashmir. The Hon. Member from Berhampore who has been in prison in Goa, spoke about conditions there and also said something more had to be done. I feel sure that no one in this House feels that everything that is possible has been done and that there is not any aspect which has not received attention. There is a great deal to be done, but I would say we have always to weigh the gains and losses in these matters, the embarrassments we invite with the possibilities of achievement. So far as we are concerned, we have stated the position of Goa is what may be called an unfinished chapter, that is to say, the unfinished part of the liberation of our country. We were occupied by the British, the Portuguese and the French. The Dutch were driveh out by other people. The British power terminated by agreement with us, after the achievement of our national movement, and contributed by progressive and liberal opinion of the metropolitan country itself. The French have done the same, or nearly done so. Portugal remains. The only aspect to which I have to refer is that which concerns the United Nations. We werb asked: Why is it that this matter is not brought before the United Nations? For one thing, I think we have been sufficiently involved with the United Nations on other questions, and it is far better to give a great

<Pg-70>

deal more of thought before we get involved in other questions. Secondly, in fact, this question of Goa has been raised before the United Nations by such procedures as are open to us. It is the practice of the United Nations under the commitments by the member-States under Article 73 of the Charter that they ought to send information on all non-political questions to the General Assembly, meaning educational, social and so on, and of course the Assembly stretches educational questions up to the political questions, up to the point they are ruled out of order. In this way, the United Kingdom France and all the other imperial or metropolitan countries do send information about their colonial territories which is the subject of discussion in the Committee on Non-Selfgoverning Territories. Portugal, for the first time--and the only country--has taken up the position that she has no colonial empire, that neither Angola nor Portuguese East Africa, nor Mozambique, Portuguese West

Africa, nor Macao nor Goa is colonial empire, they are Portugal itself. All one can say is that nations like individuals can suffer from hallucinations. This matter is before the Trusteeship Committee of the United Nations General Assembly and the bulk of opinion in the Assembly this year was that this matter must be considered next year and Portugal must fall in line with other people and submit information about colonial territories. In that way, the question of the colonial empire has come up. There are other aspects of it. As has been set out in the President's Address, it is our hope and our desire that the people of Goa will share the freedom of the rest of India. In this matter I may say we are often victims of the propaganda against us. It is common, for example, for us to speak about India and Kashmir, and not about Kashmir and the rest of India. So that is the position with regard to Goa.

In regard to Kashmir, in view of its international significance and certain other immediate circumstances, we cannot afford to let this matter and the various issues that have been raised to go unanswered. Acharya Kripalani told us that foreigners do not understand this issue, but we must take care that we understand it ourselves.

Before I go to Kashmir, I should deal with the Israel question. The Government was charged with some hostility with regard to Israel. I have stated on behalf of the Government in the United Nations that we have no hostility whatsoever so far as the State of Israel is concerned. We are one of the countries which recognise it. Something was said about the tardiness of our recognition. The facts are these. Israel was declared a separate State, by the United Nations on 29 November 1947. They proclaimed their own independence on 14 May 1948. They applied to the United Nations at the end of 1948 for membership. They were recommended by the United Nations Security Council for admission early in 1949 and they were admitted to the United Nations in the latter part of 1949 and in 1950 this country recognised Israel. It is not correct to say that there is no diplomatic engagement at all in this matter, because when we recognise some country, it means we declare its existence as a sovereign State and that we have no quarrels with it and so on.

With regard to the exchange of representatives, there are probably eighty-five nations, sovereign States, represented in this country, but we have not representatives in anything like half of them. These are decided by considerations, political, administrative, financial, and various other factors and it is untrue to give this impression abroad. Even in the Israel-Arab questions, or the issues in the Middle East, we have repeatedly stated that our position is not one of partisanship. We recognise the sovereignty of the Arab States; we recognise the territory of Israel that was granted by the United Nations. But what has happened in regard to the Middle East controversy is that we are accused of double standards. There are no double standards in this matter. Our position with regard to Middle East is exactly the same as in Kashmir--that is, you cannot establish rights by invasion, that conquest does not confer any legal rights.

Ours is one of the few countries in the world where people of Jewish religion and race have not suffered persecution. In so far as the Indian Jews are concerned, their ancestors came to this country in the fourth century before the Christian era. They are the descendants of twelve families which were ship-wrecked on our coast; other migrants have come afterwards. We are one of the few countries in the world with no

<Pg-71>

record of anti-Semitic feelings or racial persecution. I should say this because the statement would go round the world and not the answer. The relations of our delegations abroad with Israel have been cordial always. It is not only with Israel; we have very intimate relations with the United Kingdom, but we had to speak against their position in regard to the invasion of Egypt.

Now we come to Kashmir. In this matter we are asked as to why the Prime Minister ever agreed to a cease-fire. The territory is our sovereign territory. In agreeing to ceasefire, all we did was to agree that the problem be resolved in pacific conditions. It is not possible to negotiate with fighting going on, and what is more there were casualties, killings going on. Both in keeping with the traditions of this country and on general considerations of humanity, it is always necessary to make use of all attempts to stop a war. This is what the Prime Minister wrote to the Chairman of the Commission (the United Nations Commission for India and Pakistan) on 20 August 1948:

During the several conferences that we had with the Commission when it first came to Delhi, we placed before it we considered the basic fact of the situation which had led to the conflict in Kashmir. This fact was the unwarranted aggression, at first indirect at subsequently direct, of the Pakistan Government on Indian Dominion territory in Kashmir. The Pakistan Government denied this although it was common knowledge. In recent months, very large forces of the regular Pakistan Army have further entered Indian Union territory in Kashmir and opposed the Indian Army which was sent there for the defence of the State.

In accordance with the resolution of the Security Council, of the United Nations adopted on 17 January 1948, the Pakistan Government should have informed a Council immediately of any material change in the situation while the matter continued to be under the consideration of the Council.

Now we said all this to the Commission afterwards when they asked us to accept the resolution of cease-fire which has been the result of long negotiations.

The Prime Minister said:

Since our meeting of 18 August, we have given the Commission's

resolution our most earnest thought. There are many parts of it which we should have preferred to be otherwise and more in keeping with the fundamental facts of the situation, especially the flagrant aggression of the Pakistan Government on Indian Union territory. We recognise, however, that, if a successful effort is to be made to create satisfactory conditions for a solution of the Kashmir Problem without further bloodshed, we should concentrate on certain essentials only at present and seek safeguards in regard to them. It was in this spirit that I placed the following considerations before Your Excellency:

- (1) (a) To bring into question the sovereignty of the Jammu and Kashmir Government over the portion of their territory evacuated by Pakistan troops;
- (b) To afford any recognition of the so-called Azad Kashmir Government; or
- (c) To enable this territory to be consolidated in any way during the period of truce to the disadvantage of the State.
- (2) That from our point of view the effective insurance of the security of the State against external aggression, from which Kashmir has suffered so much during the last ten months, was of the most vital significance and no less important than the observance of internal law and order, and that, therefore, the withdrawal of Indian troops and the strength of Indian forces maintained in Kashmir should be conditioned by this overriding factor.
- (3) Thus at any time the strength of the

<Pg-72>

Indian forces maintained in Kashmir should be sufficient to ensure security against any form of external aggression as well as internal disorder.

Since this question was raised in connection with the overall authority of the Government of Jammu and Kashmir, it would be useful to read Also the Prime Minister's letter to Mr. Korbel, the Chairman of the Commission.

You will recall that in our interview with the Commission on 17 August, I dealt, at some length, with the position of the sparsely populated and mountainous region of the Jammu and Kashmir State in the north. The authority of the Government of Jammu and Kashmir over this region as a whole has not been challenged or disturbed, except by roving bands of hostiles, or in some places like Skardu which have been occupied by irregulars or Pakistan troops. The Commission's resolution, as you agreed in the course of our interview on the 18th, does not deal with the problem of administration or defence in this large area. We desire that, after Pakistani troops and irregulars have withdrawn from the territory, the responsibility for the

administration of the evacuated areas should revert to the Government of Jammu and Kashmir and that for defence to us. We must be free to maintain garrisons at selected points in this area for the dual purpose of preventing the incursion of tribesmen, who obey no authority, and to guard the main trade routes from the State into Central Asia.

That was the demand we made, which was in part accepted by the Commission itself. This was the reply of the Commission:

The Commission wishes me to confirm that, due to peculiar conditions of this area, it did not specifically deal with the military aspect of the problem in its resolution of 13 August 1948. It believes, however, that the question raised in your letter could be considered in the implementation of the resolution.

... When we agreed to a cease-fire, it was for humanitarian reasons, it was for reasons of resolving a situation. We did not go to the Security Council to decide a dispute over territory. In fact, the Security Council under the Article of the Charter has no right to decide the jurisdiction of a territory. We went their for a specific settlement under the Charter:

The next question that was asked was: Why did my predecessor, the late Shri Gopalaswami Ayyangar, send a telegram, and a categorical answer was requested. There is considerable misunderstanding even among some of our own people about what was said on this matter. What he said was that this accession is permanent; this accession is as good as the accession of any other five hundred odd States that acceded to India. The wordings are on the same form: "Whereas... we accept your accession". But the meaning of what he said was this. Though the accession is there, in view of the circumstances, in view of the situation that has arisen, we would, if certain conditions, if certain things happened, namely, if the plebiscite went against us, which plebiscite should again be taken under certain conditions, in the exercise of our sovereign rights concede that territory. Any country can give any part of its territory to anybody else. There is po such thing as conditional accession in our Constitution....

Various other matters have been raised and I do not think it is necessary, Mr. Speaker, for me to go into or to reopen the whole of the Kashmir debate. Two points, however, remain to be answered. Why is it that the Prime Minister, and we on his behalf, have just now trotted out the idea that Pakistan has legally annexed this territory. The reason is a very simple one, that we liked to adhere strictly to the facts, so that we may not be controverted. It was only when Pakistan passed the Constitution and Article 1, Clause (2) (b) and (c) became part of the law of Pakistan that it became incorporated. We could not just speak about her intentions. Now it is in black and white. Section 203 of their Constitution provides for the integration of the remaining part of Kashmir, but under this Article that I mentioned, all the territories they administer are part of Pakistan. And what is more, that these territories are so

administered has been spoken by no

$$<$$
Pg-73>

less a person than Sir Owen Dixon whose general findings have been against us.

The territory on the Pakistan side of the cease-fire line seemed to be administered through an Azad Kashmir 'Government' on the west but in north through political agents directly responsible to the Pakistan Government.

So, even from that time, there was direct administration. When the Constitution came in, they said that all administered areas were part of Pakistan. So, it becomes part of Pakistan. And we could not say it was legally part of Pakistan until that Constitution had received the assent of the Governor-General of Pakistan at that time. That was the reason why we did not say so.

In regard to Kashmir, therefore, the position that we have stated remains, that is to say, it is an integral part of India. And the problem before us today is the vacation of the aggression. It is not for me to argue this case in the Indian Parliament. But it is a part of the Union of India like any other part of the Union of India. Its defence is the concern of India. And our engagements are limited to two resolutions of the U.N. Commission and the assurances going therewith.

Now, those resolutions cannot be read in parts, nor can any part out of it be selected by anybody just as he likes. I have stated that this country will never go back at any time on its international obligations. Whatever commitments we have undertaken we will carry out. But we are not going into a position where if the Prime Minister opens his mouth or somebody explores something or says a hypothetical proposition or makes an offer, that is going to keep us down for ever. If an offer is made, it has to be accepted. If it is not accepted, it lapses.

So on behalf of the Government, it has been stated in the Security Council that whatever might have been said in the course of these exploratory discussions for the purposes of speeding, up the process of conciliation in good faith, we are bound to the extent we can be bound, and in the terms of those resolutions with all those qualifications, with all those assurances, to what we have subscribed to, which means that, in the first instance, the aggression must be vacated. Whatever may be the rights and wrongs of our position in Kashmir--and our position in Kashmir is legally, morally and politically entirely correct, but even if, it were not so for argument--Pakistan has no rights on that soil except the right of an invader. It is not noman's-land. And what is more, even before Pakistani troops invaded that territory, under any interpretation of international law or procedure, the permission for hostiles to traverse across the territory is an act of aggression. And,

therefore, the only title, the only locus standi they can have is what is based on invasion. If it is right for nations to gather together and say to these great countries, the U.K. and France, that they are wrong in invading the sovereign territory of Egypt, the same thing applies to us.

As for invasion, there is no such thing as the invasion of Kashmir. Since 27 October 1947, you could not speak legally or, in fact, in truth, of the invasion of Kashmir. It is an invasion of India. And we cannot submit ourselves to a position where a part of our territory is in this way invaded. Therefore, the position that has been taken up on behalf of the Government of India is that for nine years, we have tried, in spite of all our legal rights, to find ways of conciliation; we have made many concessions; we have explored many avenues, but we have never been able to find a position which is leading to a solution.

Criticism has beer made of the offer of a plebiscite. It is quite true that we have spoken about plebiscite. But just because we speak about a plebiscite, it does not mean that we undertake a plebiscite. What we said in this resolution that if the conditions in part (i) and part (ii) were accomplished, and when the Commission had reported that they have been accomplished, then the two Governments would enter into consultation as to finding the best way or fair means of ascertaining the wishes of the people, that is they would enter into conference.

But the Prime Minister, in his letter to Commission, distinctly stated that if parts (i) and (ii) are not performed, there is no commitment with regard to part (iii); and that has been acknowledged by the Commission equally in black and white. Now, these assurances are not secret assurances either

$$<$$
Pg-74>

to the Prime Minister or to the Government. They were published at that time. And what is more, Pakistan accepted these resolutions with the knowledge of those assurances.

While it is quite true that the world newspapers, including our own, may write columns and columns, about a plebiscite, the plebiscite cannot be triggered, cannot come into operation--whatever arrangements you may make, you may build election booths, and have ballots and commissioners and everything else, all arrangements you can make, but you cannot have the operation of it--until those two parts are performed.

Our position as stated in the Security Council is today not on the second part, that is, that the truce is not performed, but that Pakistan has violated the cease-fire agreement, by which I meant not the violation of the frontier here, there, or everywhere, not the probing of our territory, not the invading here, there or at any other place, but that it is part of the cease-fire agreement that she

cannot accumulate any more military personnel or military material since the time of the cease-fire. And since then, she has built up considerable forces in "Azad" area. She has built airfields in the territory, which have been incorporated as part of the Pakistan military mechanism. And what is more, she has refused to carry put a final provision, namely to appeal to its people to maintain a peaceful atmosphere. So, when the ceasefire agreement is itself violated, any negotiations on that basis would require the resurrection of those conditions. But nothing that I have said, so far as I know, reflects any intention on the part of the Government to shut itself against the processes of conciliation, should they arise. But they can only come in the context of the recognition of our sovereignty. They can only come in the context of the vacation of the aggression, because if we did not do this, what has begun in one place would begin in another. They can only come when this country realises, as it does today, that there is no such place as Kashmir separate from the Union of India; an aggression on Kashmir is the same as ah aggression on Bombay; it is part and parcel at the territory of this country.

Acharya Kripalani said yesterday, there are two Prime Ministers here, and, therefore, Kashmir is in a separate position. Now, there again, with great respect, I say, that is to forget the provisions of our Constitution. Our Constitution provides for a constituent State to have relation with the Federal Centre by agreement. In some cases, there were initial Constituent Assemblies in some of the other States. They found it a wasteful procedure, and they joined in the Constituent Assembly (Federal) instead. And, therefore, such establishment--

ACHARYA KRIPALANI: Mr. Speaker, may I correct this? What I said was that it was likely to give an impression to foreigners. That was what I said. I did not say that there need not be two Prime Ministers. But what I said was that it was likely to give an impression that we are putting Kashmir on a different footing.

SHRI KRISHNA MENON: That is the impression that we have been trying to correct.

My distinguished colleague perhaps thinks that I bored the audience for seven hours. The time when I bore people, I will stop talking. But it so happened they were not bored. If I may say so with respect, are speeches to be measured by the time they take or by what there is to be said? One does not speak for 45 minutes if one can say it in five minutes. And one does speak for 15 minutes, if it requires 1% hours.

But the whole of this case which has been laid over, as the Prime Minister said the other day, by years and years of negotiations involving discussions about the quantum of forces, the rifles they should carry, this, that and the other, which we have been talking about for years, has made us forget, or I should say, made the other people forget the main issues, and it took a very long time for it to

be brought back.

In the United Nations, you cannot judge public opinion merely by the vote on a proposition. We were put in the position of Pakistan having made a demand for the introduction of foreign troops on our soil, and this Government had the necessary courage to say to them that so long as this country was a free country, no foreigner could ever set his foot on its soil. We pointed out with great pains to the British delegation that it was a matter of regret to us that the United

<Pg-75>

Kingdom, which was a foreign occupier of this country, having relegated, having abdicted from that position and transferred its powers peacefully should again subscribe to a proposition where on this soil of India which we have liberated, and in the liberation of which they co-operated, there should once again be introduced, under whatever name, foreign troops, and what is more, under conditions which are not sanctioned by the Charter. The Charter does not provide, for the introduction of foreign troops in our territory, and our territory in this case includes the Pakistan-occupied area.

I have carefully refrained from introducing any beat into this Kashmir question because the Prime Minister is engaged in conversations with the former President of the Security Council and it is, therefore, not proper for me to go any further into these matters than has already been said, which are our unalterable positions. These positions are: That we would abide by the Charter of the United Nations, we would honour our obligations, big we just are not going to be either flattered or intimidated by other people, just because a number of them come and say that the prime minister of India stands on a high moral pedestal in regard to others, but when he comes to himself, he defends his territory--thank God he does. After all, if we are not convinced about the morality of our position, any prescription of morality by us to others would not in itself be moral. Therefore, we have replied to this--no double standards. All that we have said is: After nine years, we thought it was necessary to speak in plain terms and in as simple terms as possible even if it took some time.

USA GHANA SUDAN CHAD NIGER NIGERIA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC PORTUGAL SPAIN EGYPT KOREA CHINA CANADA AUSTRALIA INDIA ISRAEL MALI TURKEY UNITED KINGDOM INDONESIA PAKISTAN IRAQ CYPRUS GREECE SYRIA ICELAND FRANCE ANGOLA MOZAMBIQUE OMAN

Date: Mar 26, 1957

Volume No

IRAQ

Trade Agreement Extended

Letters were exchanged at Baghdad between Shri R. S. Mani, Ambassado of India to Iraq, and the Minister of Economies, Royal Iraqi Government, further extending the Trade Agreement between the Government of India and the Royal Iraqi Government. The agreement, which was due to expire on Dec 31, 1956, will now remain in force without any change for a further period of one year from 1 January 1957.

The agreement provides for the export and import of the following commodities in accordance with the import-export regulations in force from time to time:

EXPORTS FROM IRAQ: Animals; cotton; foodgrains; dates; gallnuts, and hides and skins (light weight).

EXPORTS FROM INDIA: Food and agriculture products; timber and related products; fibres and bristles; rubber products; hides and skins and related products; ceramics, pottery, glassware and allied industries; arts, handicrafts and jewellery; chemicals and related products; minerals and ores; machinery and mineral products; iron and steel and their products; abrasives; belting; birds; films, exposed; linoleum, and stones, precious and semi-precious.

IRAQ INDIA USA

Date: Dec 31, 1956

Volume No

1995

POLAND

Nehru-Cyrankiewicz Joint Statement

At the invitation of the Government of India, the Polish Prime

Minister, Mr. Josef Cyrankiewiez, paid a visit to India during March- April, 1957. In New Delhi, Mr. Cyrankiewiez held talks with Prime

Minister Nehru on International Affairs and the following joint statement was issued by the two Prime Ministers on Mar 28, 1957:

At the invitation of the Government of India, a Government Delegation of the Polish People's Republic is now on a visit to India. The

legation is headed by Mr. Josef Cyrankiewicz, Chairman of the Council of Ministers, and consists of: Mr. Karol Kuryluk, Minister of Culture and Art; Mr. Eugeniusz Stawinski, Minister of Light Industry; Mr.

<Pg-76>

Marian Naszkowaski, Deputy Minister of Foreign Affairs; Madam Eugenia Krassowska, Deputy Minister of High Education; Mr. Franciszek Modrzewski, Deputy Minister of Foreign Trade; Mr. Julisz Katz Suchy, Ambassador, Member of the Advisory Board of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs; Mr. Jerzy Grudzinski, Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to India.

The Government and the people of India are happy to have this opportunity of welcoming the representatives of a country and people who received the Prime Minister of India with great warmth and friendship in June, 195k. The Prime Minister of Poland and the Polish Delegation have been given a very friendly and cordial welcome in India. Their visit will further promote the close friendship and understanding between the two countries and peoples.

The Prime Minister of Poland, Mr. Josef Cyrankiewicz, on behalf of the Polish Government Delegation, discussed the international situation and other matters of mutual interest with the Prime Minister of India. Shri Jawaharlal Nehru. The Prime Ministers reaffirm their faith in the Five Principles which they accepted in June, 1955, at Warsaw as the basis of their mutual relations and in their dealings with other countries. They also reaffirm their belief that these principles, which are now widely, recognised to be the firm basis for co-operation among nations, should govern the relations between independent and sovereign countries. These principles will stand reiteration in this troubled world of ours. They are: (1) mutual respect of each other's territorial integrity and sovereignty, (2) non-aggression, (3) non-interference in each other's internal affairs for any reasons, either of an economic, political or ideological character, (4) equality and mutual benefit, and (5) peaceful co-existence. They believe that a solution of the many problems in the international sphere can be found by the application of these principles in the dealings of countries with one another.

The Prime Ministers of India and Poland express their concern about the deterioration which has taken place in the international situation during recent months. The Prime Ministers urge determined and continuous endeavours should be made to reverse this trend and to bring to this world greater hopes of peace and co-operation and to avoid conflict. In their opinion all constructive proposals should be given most careful consideration. The Prime Ministers while accepting the responsibilities of their own Governments and countries to the extent of their capacities and competence, wish to state that the relaxation of world tensions, the removal of threats of conflict and war, and any enduring solution of international problems can only ensue if the great powers of the world co-operate to this end.

Disarmament has made no progress despite prolonged discussions during the last ten years, while the invention, production and accummulation of weapons of mass destruction of over-increasing potency continues and threatens with disaster. The Prime Ministers earnestly hope that the Disarmament Commission and its Sub-Committee will seek to enlarge the area of agreement among the big powers on the limitation of armaments and the abandonment of the weapons of mass destruction. As a first step, there should be some reduction of armaments without delay, with agreed measures of inspection and control, as well as the prohibition of nuclear and thermo-nuclear weapons. The Prime Ministers also consider that as an immediate step nuclear and thermo-nuclear test explosions should be abandoned, as their very continuance involves ever-increasing danger to all forms of life with imponderable consequences to the future of mankind and civilisation.

The two Prime Ministers reiterate their view that world peace and international security cannot be ensured by military alliances or power blocs. They earnestly hope that the dangers to peace of the policy of military pacts and their proved ineffectiveness will be recognised and that this approach to international relations and security will be abandoned in favour of collective peace in accordance with the principles of the Charter of the United Nations. The two Prime Ministers express their full support for the aspiration and struggles of peoples seeking liberation from colonial rule.

The two Prime Ministers express their satisfaction at the withdrawal of invading forces from Egyptian territory. Recent events in the Middle East and the continuing tension in respect of this area amply demonstrate that the problems of this area demand urgent solution. The Prime Ministers consider that

$$<$$
Pg-77>

these problems should be approached with the recognition of the independence of the countries of the area and in co-operation with them as sovereign nations, and not in terms of power and power alignments.

The two Prime Ministers expressed their gratification that their association in the International Commissions in Indo-China, consisting of Poland, Canada and India, has helped in promoting the cause of peace and in an area which was so greatly disturbed until three years ago. They also express the hope that the problems with which the Commissions are concerned and are still outstanding will be solved by negotiation and co-operation in accordance with the Geneva Agreements of 1954, and that all parties concerned will co-operate with the Commissions and endeavour to overcome the existing difficulties.

The Prime Ministers deeply regret the continued exclusion of the representatives of the People's Republic of China from the United Nations and will continue their endeavour to remedy this situation.

The Prime Ministers express satisfaction at the development of cultural exchanges between their two countries during the last two years. In order to promote further mutual co-operation in the scientific, educational and cultural fields, their Governments have just concluded an agreement on cultural co-operation.

The development of economic relations between the two countries has been reviewed and the progress so far achieved in building up Indo-Polish trade has been noted with satisfaction. The two Prime Ministers, believing that there is considerable scope for the expansion of mutually beneficial commerce, are resolved to broaden and strengthen economic co-operation between the two countries.

The Prime Ministers express their gratification at the opportunity of personal discussion and exchange of views which the present visit of the Prime Minister of Poland has afforded. They feel assured that these exchanges of views between them and the personal contacts established will further strengthen the friendly relations between their two countries and that the co-operation of their two countries will assist them to serve the cause of world peace.

POLAND INDIA UNITED KINGDOM USA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC EGYPT CHINA CANADA SWITZERLAND

Date: Mar 28, 1957

Volume No

1995

POLAND

Cultural Agreement

India and Poland signed a Cultural Agreement in New Delhi on Mar 27, 1957. Mr. Josef Cyrankiewicz, Prime Minister of Poland, signed on behalf of the People's Republic of Poland and Prime Minister Nehru on behalf of India. The following is the text of the agreement:

The Council of State of the People's Republic of Poland and

The President of the Republic of India

Desirous of strengthening the bonds of friendship between the two nations, promoting cultural relations between Poland and India and

developing mutual co-operation in scientific, educational and cultural fields.

Have decided to conclude an agreement on cultural co-operation and to this end have appointed as their plenipotentiaries the following persons, namely:

The Council of State of the People's

Republic of Poland: Mr. J. Cyrankiewicz, Prime Minister of Poland

The President of India: Shri Jawaharlal Nehru, Prime Minister of India

who having exchanged each other's credentials and found them good and in due form have agreed as follows:

ARTICLE I:--The two high contracting parties shall promote:

- (a) Exchange of representatives of science, culture and arts of the two countries.
- (b) Receiving of employees from the other party or other delegated persons recommended by the other party for the purpose of their training in scientific, technical and industrial institutions of either country.
- (c) Grant of scholarships to enable students to pursue their studies in the country

<Pg-78>

of the other party in scientific and technical fields and other specialities. (d) Co-operation between scientific and research institutes and artistic and literary associations.

- (e) Co-operation between associations of journalists, press agencies and editor's offices.
- (f) Organisation of scientific and artistic exhibitions, theatrical performances and film shows, music concerts and broadcasts on the radio. To this end detailed arrangements will be made in each case.
- (g) Grant of prizes for writers and translators who will popularise in their countries the scientific and artistic achievements of the other party, and,
- (h) Distribution of books and periodicals of the other party.

ARTICLE II:--The two high contracting parties shall consider the question of establishing cultural institutes in their countries

according to the laws prevailing in each country.

ARTICLE III:--The two parties shall promote so far as possible exchange between the two countries in the field of sport.

ARTICLE IV:--The two parties shall endeavour to ensure that text books and official informative publications do not contain untrue information about each other's country.

ARTICLE V:--The two parties shall offer their good offices to facilitate the mutual recognition by universities and other educational authorities in the two countries of the degrees, diplomas and certificates awarded by them.

ARTICLE VI:--To achieve the purposes defined in the above Articles an Indo-Polish Commission may, if necessary, be set up. This commission shall be composed of two subcommissions: one with residence in Warsaw and the second with residence in New Delhi. Each sub-commission will be composed of persons designated by the Government of the country in which the sub-commission holds its sessions and of representatives of the embassy of the other party.

The task of the sub-commissions will be: (a) To watch the working of the agreement; (b) To inform the two parties about the detailed manner of working of the agreement; and, (c) To submit to the parties motions as to the manner in which the working of the agreement could be improved upon.

At intervals of not less than once in two years the Commission will hold joint consultations successively in New Delhi and in Warsaw in order to determine the measures to be taken for a proper fulfilment of the agreement.

ARTICLE VII:--The present agreement shall be ratified with the least possible delay.

The present agreement will come into force immediately after the exchange of the instruments of ratification which will take place in Warsaw.

ARTICLE VIII:--The present agreement is concluded for a period of five years from the date of its coming into force. The agreement can be terminated by either party giving minimum of six months' notice before the expiry of this period. The agreement shall remain in force until either party terminates it by giving six months' notice.

In witness thereof, the said plenipotentiaries have signed the present agreement in duplicate in Polish, Hindi and English languages, the texts being equally authentic except in the case of doubt when the English text shall prevail.

Signed at New Delhi this twenty-seventh day of March, 1957.

For the Council of State For the President of the People's Republic of the Republic of Poland. India.

(J. CYRANKIEWICZ) (JAWAHARLAL

NEHRU)

Prime Minister of Prime Minister of

Poland. India.

<Pg-79>

POLAND INDIA USA **Date**: Mar 27, 1957

Volume No

1995

POLAND

Trade Agreement Extended

The Schedules to the Indo-Polish Trade Agreement have been extended. A Press Note issued in New Delhi on Mar 01, 1957 said:

Letters were exchanged in New Delhi on 1 March 1957 between Shri S. Ranganathan, Secretary, Ministry of Commerce and Consumer Industries, and H.E. Mr. J. Grudzinski, Ambassador Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary of Poland in India, extending the Schedules to the Indo-Polish Trade Agreement, signed on 3 April 1956 up to 31 December 1957 with the following modifications:

SCHEDULE 'A' (Import from Poland to India). The following items have been omitted: Electric fans; sewing machines; rayon fabrics and bentwood furniture.

SCHEDULE 'B' (Exports from India to Poland). The following items have been added: Flax manufactures; paints and lacquers; bristles; plastic goods; electrical accessories; hardware; boots and shoes; linoleum; canned fruits and meat products; jams, chutneys, pickles, fruit squashes and sauces; soap and toilet products and cashew shell oil.

The trade between the two countries has been on the increase since the signing of the agreement. The exports during April-November, 1956, from India to Poland were valued at Rs. 7.622 million as compared to Rs. 3.26 million during 1955-56. Imports from Poland during April-November, 1956, were valued at Rs. 19.207 million as compared to Rs. 4.315 million during 1955-56.

The main items of Indian exports to Poland are: Mica; iron ore and hides and skins. The main items of Polish exports to India are: Metals; iron and steel goods and paper.

POLAND INDIA USA RUSSIA

Date: Mar 01, 1957

Volume No

1995

TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE

Agreement with Swiss Firm

The Government of India signed on Mar 02, 1957 a new agreement with Oerlikon Machine Tool Works Buehrle and Company, Zurich-Oerlikon, the Swiss firm of consultants for the Hindustan Machine Tools (Private) Ltd., Bangalore, the effect of which will be to terminate the financial partnership of the Swiss firm with the Government of India in the management of the company.

This agreement, which supersedes the agreement dated 28 March 1949, stipulates for the transfer by the firm of the shares, valued at Rs. 3 million, held by them in the Hindustan Machine Tools (Private) Ltd., under the original agreement, on payment to them by the Government of India on the value of the shares together with interest thereon from the date of investment, after deducting the interest already paid and subject to a maximum of the sum equal to the interest on the share capital for a period of five years at five per cent

Oerlikons will also surrender the right to have five per cent free shares, to which they were entitled under the 1949 agreement. In lieu thereof and also in consideration of the transfer of the licence which they hold for the manufacture of machine tools, to the Hindustan Machine Tools (Private) Ltd., and in further consideration of the assistance rendered by them in the setting up of the factory and supervision of the manufacturing processes, they would receive a net sum of Rs. 1.25 million before the end of June, 1957.

There is provision in the agreement for the appointment of arbitrators to resolve the difficulties touching or concerning the agreement, and for reference of such difficulties, where they cannot be resolved by the arbitrators, to an umpire whose decision would be final.

Simultaneously with the signing of the new agreement with the Government of India, Oerlikons were also signing two separate agreements with the Hindustan Machine Tools (Private) Ltd.

One of these provides for the technical

<Pg-80>

collaboration of the Swiss firm in the manufacture of or research into machine tools of the required specifications.

The second provides for the transfer to the company of the full licence, authority and manufacture of 8% inch highspeed centre lathes and the right to sell such machines throughout India, Burma, Ceylon and Pakistan.

In return for this, Oerlikons will receive from the Hindustan Machine Tools (Private) Ltd., apart from the Rs. 1.25 million, which would be paid by the Government of India, a royalty on actual sales, the percentage of which will become less in successive five year periods, beginning with 1 October 1954, when the first machine was sold.

There is provision in the agreement for technical collaboration and for its termination at six months notice on either side. The provision in the second agreement by which Hindustan Machine Tools (Private) Ltd., has secured the right to sell its products in Burma, Ceylon and Pakistan, enables the company to export Indian made lathes and machine tools outside the country.

INDIA SWITZERLAND USA RUSSIA BURMA PAKISTAN

Date: Mar 02, 1957

Volume No

1995

TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE

Indo-U.S. Agreement

An agreement between the Governments of India and the United States, providing a sum of 1 million dollars (about Rs. 5 million), out of the development assistance funds, for India's filaria control programme was signed in New Delhi on Mar 09, 1957 by Shri B. K. Nehru, Secretary, Ministry of Finance, Government of India and Mr. Howard E. Houston, Director of the Technical Co-operation Mission of the International Co-operation Administration of the U.S. Government.

The funds provided under the agreement will be utilised for the purchase of 470 long tons of dieldrin and water wettable powder required for the use of 54 units under the filaria control programme.

The Government of India will provide funds to meet the local costs of operation, including procurement of indigenous items of equipment and supplies.

USA INDIA

Date: Mar 09, 1957

Volume No

1995

TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE

W.H.O. Assistance

In a written reply to a question regarding the assistance received from the World Health Organisation for various schemes in India during the First Five-Year Plan, the Union Minister for Health, Rajkumari Amrit Kaur, stated in the Lok Sabha on Mar 25, 1957 that there were 17 schemes that had been helped by the W.H.O. during the First Five-Year Plan. She added:

W.H.O. assistance to health projects was usually provided by making available the services of technical personnel together with some equipment, where necessary, for demonstration purposes. Funds were not directly made available to Governments. The value of assistance received from the World Health Organisation during the First Five-Year Plan period amounted to 1,325,697 dollars (United States). This assistance was received for schemes such as malaria, maternal and child health, tuberculosis, venereal diseases, fellowships, environmental sanitation, endemo-epidemic diseases, mental health, nursing, B.C.G. campaign, etc.

The Minister stated that the annual contribution by India to the World Health Organisation during the period 1952 to 1956 amounted to 1,471,035 dollars (United States).

<Pg-81>

INDIA USA

Date: Mar 25, 1957

Volume No

1995

WEST GERMANY

Nehru-Brentano Joint Statement

Dr. Heinrich Von Brentano, Foreign Minister of the Federal Republic of Germany, visited India between 27 March and Mar 31, 1957. After talks in New Delhi, Prime Minister Nehru and Dr. Von Brentano issued a joint communique on 31 March. The following is the text of the communique:

At the invitation of the Government of India, the Minister of Foreign Affairs of the Federal Republic of Germany, Dr. Henrich Von Brentano, visited New Delhi from 27 March to 31 March 1957.

Dr. Von Brentano was received by the President and the Vice-President of India. He had several talks with the Prime Minister of India on a wide range of subjects. He also had discussions with some senior Ministers of the Government of India.

The visit offered a valuable opportunity for further exchange of views between the two Governments on the international situation and matters of special interest to India and the Federal Republic of Germany. The talks took place in an atmosphere of friendship, cordiality and mutual understanding and have enabled the two countries better to appreciate each other's points of view.

The Prime Minister and the Foreign Minister reiterated that the foreign policies of their respective Governments are guided by the principle of preservation and safeguarding of peace and the solution of all problems by peaceful agreement. The two Ministers agreed that effective disarmament would be of the greatest importance for the preservation of world peace.

The Prime Minister and the Foreign Minister discussed the recent proposals relating to the Euratom and the European Common Market. They also discussed the question of the re-unification of Germany. The Foreign Minister confirmed that the Federal Republic of Germany seeks a solution of this question only by peaceful agreement and that military means are ruled out. The Prime Minister expressed once more his sympathy with the desire of the German people for the peaceful achievement of their national unity and expressed the hope that conditions would be created in which the re-unification of Germany could take place in accordance with the wishes of the German people and with due regard to the security requirements of Germany and other countries in Europe.

The Foreign Minister assured the Prime Minister of the readiness of his Government to intensify co-operation between India and the Federal Republic in the spheres of trade, commerce and industry. Both the Ministers expressed the hope that the talks which would shortly start between the trade delegation from the Federal Republic of Germany and the Government of India would broaden and strengthen economic co-operation between the two countries. The Foreign Minister communicated to the Prime Minister an offer from his Government to assist in the establishment of a "Prototype Training Workshop" for the training of the technical staff necessary for small and medium scale industries in India. The details of this scheme will be discussed between the two Governments.

The Prime Minister and the Foreign Minister expressed their gratification at the opportunity of personal discussion and exchange of views which the Foreign Minister's visit gave them. They felt sure that this personal contact will further strengthen the friendly relations between their two countries.

<Pg-82>

GERMANY INDIA USA **Date**: Mar 31, 1957

April

Volume No 1995 CONTENTS

Foreign Affairs Record

1957 April

VOL. III No. 4

CONTENTS

CHILE Nehru-Sainte Marie Joint Statement 83
EGYPT Trade Facilities 83
HUNGARY Trade Agreement Extended 84
INDIA AND THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA Return of Lend-Lease Silver 84
INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS Prime Minister's Address to Asian Legal Committee 85
RUMANIA Cultural Agreement 89
TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE Agreement with U.S 91 Ford Foundation Grant 92
WEST GERMANY Trade Facilities 92
<pg-i></pg-i>

CHILE EGYPT HUNGARY INDIA USA GERMANY

Date: Apr 01, 1957

Volume No

1995

CHILE

Nehru-Sainte Marie Joint Statement

Sr. Osvaldo Sainte Marie, Foreign Minister of Chile, arrived in New Delhi on Apr 13, 1957 on a three-day official visit. After talks in Delhi, Prime Minister Nehru and Sr. Sainte Marie issued the following joint communique on 17 April:

At the invitation of the Prime Minister of India, Sr. Osvaldo Sainte Marie, Minister of Foreign Affairs of Chile, arrived in New Delhi on 13 April 1957.

During his stay in this country, Sr. Sainte Marie called on the President and the Vice-President.

The Foreign Minister had talks with the Prime Minister and the Minister Without Portfolio. The Chilean Delegation also discussed matters relating to trade and economic relations with the Ministry of Commerce.

These conversations have further promoted the friendship between the two countries and the development of Indo-Chilean relations. The talks also revealed a wide field of agreement and common approach in regard to basic issues and outlook in international affairs.

The Minister of Foreign Affairs of Chile and the Prime Minister of India more particularly agreed that their two countries found common ground in regard to the following:

- i. Equality of States and respect for their integrity and territorial sovereignty,
- ii. Non-intervention in the internal affairs of other States,
- iii. Aggression shall not be an instrument of national and international policy,
- iv. Necessity and the benefits of economic collaboration between the two countries, and
- v. International problems should be solved by peaceful means.

The Prime Minister of India desires to state on behalf of the Government and the people of India that the Foreign Minister and his delegation have been very welcome guests in India and that the visit has contributed to the further understanding between the two countries.

The Foreign Minister of Chile and the Prime Minister of India look forward to closer relations between their countries.

CHILE INDIA USA

Date: Apr 13, 1957

Volume No

1995

EGYPT

Trade Facilities

The following Press Note on matters relating to trade between India and Egypt was issued in New Delhi on Apr 24, 1957:

The course of trade between India and Egypt has been reviewed in friendly discussions which have taken place over the last week between officials of the Ministry of Commerce and Industry led by Shri K. B. Lall, Joint Secretary in the Ministry, and the Egyptian Delegation led by Dr. M. B. Chiati, Permanent Under Secretary of State, Ministry of Commerce, Egypt.

As a result of these discussions, certain matters have been agreed upon to facilitate the flow of trade between the two countries. These matters include a special rupee account to be operated by the State Trading Corporation (of India) to provide easy payment facilities to exporters and importers.

The special rupee account has been opened today. It will be used for purchasing

<Pg-83>

cotton and cement from Egypt and the sale proceeds will be used to promote the export of jute goods, tea, pepper, tobacco, electric fans, diesel engines, centrifugal pumps, dry batteries and other engineering, chemical and pharmaceutical products to Egypt.

The cotton imports will take place against contracts approved by the Textile Commissioner, whereas exports of Indian goods will be paid for through this special account against contracts registered with the State Trading Corporation.

EGYPT INDIA USA

Date : Apr 24, 1957

Volume No

1995

HUNGARY

Trade Agreement Extended

India and Hungary exchanged letters on Apr 11, 1957 extending the Trade Agreement between the countries. A Press Note issued in New Delhi on 11 April said:

Letters were exchanged in New Delhi today between Shri K. B. Lall, Joint Secretary, Ministry of Commerce and Consumer Industries and H.E. Mr. Aladar Tamas, Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary of Hungary in India, extending the Schedules to the Indo-Hungarian Trade Agreement, signed on 17 June 1954, up to 31 December 1957 with the following modifications:

SCHEDULE 'A' (Import from Hungary to India): The following items have been omitted: Canned tomato, and cast iron enamel bath tubs.

SCHEDULE 'B' (Exports from India to Hungary): The following items have been added: Coffee; jam, chutnies and pickles; cashew-nuts and cashew shell oil; tobacco manufactures, i.e., cigar and cigarettes; cordage and ropes; paints and lacquers bristles; tapioca and its products; fruits squashes and sauces; hardware; canned fruits and meat products; silk and rayon textiles and manufacture; light engineering goods; cotton seed oil; and pepper.

HUNGARY INDIA USA RUSSIA

Date: Apr 11, 1957

Volume No

1995

INDIA AND THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Return of Lend-Lease Silver

The following Press Note on the return by India to the United States Government of the lend-lease silver was issued in New Delhi on Apr 22, 1957:

During the war the United States Government lent-leased 226 million fine ounces of silver to the Government of India to be returned five years after the duration of the emergency. The liability for the return of this silver was divided between India and Pakistan, India's share being approximately 172 million ounces. For the return of this silver, the following arrangements have been agreed to between the Government of India and the U.S. Government.

The Government of India will make immediate arrangements for the shipment of approximately 50 million fine oz. of silver of the requisite fineness in the form of bars to the U.S. Government.

The balance of the silver amounting to approximately 122 million fine oz. will be made available in the form of quarternary alloy coins to the Government of the United States of America through the American

Embassy in New Delhi. The alloy silver will be taken over by the U.S. Government through their embassy in New Delhi and all costs of handling, transportation and refining will be on the account of the U.S. Government. The U.S. Government will retain all the metals recovered in the refining process.

<Pg-84>

INDIA USA PAKISTAN

Date: Apr 22, 1957

Volume No

1995

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

Prime Minister's Address to Asian Legal Committee

Prime Minister Nehru inaugurated the first meeting of the Asian Lega Consultative Committee at New Delhi on Apr 18, 1957. The Prime Minister, in his address, said:

Chief Justice, Attorney-General and distinguished delegates: I feel somewhat oppressed by the weight of learning represented here by the delegates to this conference. I do not know that in the particular domain that you have come here to represent, and to discuss, I can say anything of value. I am really here to welcome you and to express my happiness that this conference of the Asian Legal Consultative Committee has met here for the first time and to express the hope that this meeting will, as the Attorney-General has said, lead not only to the clarification of many problems which affect us but also to closer bonds between the nations of Asia and Africa. That of course does not mean that those bonds will be limited to them because I do not think the nations of Asia and Africa want in any sense to function separately from the rest of the world. Nevertheless, it is a fact that in many matters and in matters connected with international law, probably the opinions and views of Asian nations have been given little importance in the past. Mr. Attorney-General, you referred to the beginnings of international law, Hugo Grotius and all that happened afterwards, and pointed out that this international law was largely confined to a certain group of nations in Europe and represented their particular groupings and their views and their development. Asian and African countries did not come into the picture at all. Well, these Asian and African countries have now come into the picture in many ways, politically and otherwise, but still I believe that there is this tendency in considering these wider aspects of international law rather to adhere to the old concept of a

European family of nations, extending itself, if you like, to other countries. It extended itself in the last century or two in the form of dominating countries of Asia and Africa or many of them. Now, many of these countries are free but the old concept I think still governs the minds of many people, and it is desirable and indeed very necessary that lawyers and jurists of Asia and Africa should look at this problem from their own point of view.

I do not myself quite understand a phrase that the Attorney-General used or rather he quoted the distinguished judge, Alvarez I think was his name, about an Asian international law, some such phrase. I do not quite understand what an Asian international law or any other international law confined to a continent or a few countries might be. If it is international law, well it covers the world. But I can certainly understand that the concept of international law as it has grown up may have lost and never had, if I may say so, an international character, which was confined to a group of European nations. Because of all kinds of developments in the world and more especially the coming into independence of a number of Asian and African countries, this aspect, that is, the Asian and African aspect of it, does not form a separate part of international law but should vary or make broader the old concept of international law.

I suppose that applies to every aspect of international relations, certainly it applies to the political aspect. Politics in the old days, in the 19th century, in the early 20th century, were always governed by some countries of Europe; and Europe was a centre of political activity. It became the centre of economic activity and the politics or the economics of the countries of Asia and Africa were largely governed from that European concept of the metropolitan powers. Naturally, we do not accept that political concept now. Even in the economic domain, we do not accept it although we may be influenced by it because of various factors but gradually even in economic theory, our countries are beginning to think on their own lines because their problems are different; we cannot solve our problems on the basis of conditions which exist in countries differently situated. So, in this consideration of international law also it does seem to me important that we should bring our knowledge and experience to bear upon a wider interpretation of the concept of international law which will fit in with these

<Pg-85>

countries of Asia and Africa. I think therefore that it is of considerable importance that this gathering has met here and, what is more, that it will continue to meet and give consideration to these problems that arise.

I do not know very much about international law but every person who has to dabble in public affairs inevitably comes up against it and has to deal with these problems and has to take the advice of experts in regard to them and has to fit it in with his political activities in so far as that may be necessary. But I have a vague recollection

that connected with this idea of international law, various times in Europe, were concepts like the holy alliance in Europe, that is, a certain number of countries, for various reasons, binding themselves together against other countries or other forces which did not fit in with their thinking. That, of course, comes up against the very concept of internationalism. Today we see certain tendencies and something more than tendencies of the revival of holy alliances; they are not called by that name, that is, a certain group of nations or certain groups of nations functioning more or less on the basis of 19th century holy alliances, and consider themselves more or less the centre of the world in which other countries should fit in. That may have some justification from some point of view, but it does put other countries in an odd and embarrassing position. Either one joins the holy alliance or one is outside the pale of international law, in a sense. Therefore it has become very important, both in the context of devlopment of Asian and African countries as independent nations and in this return to the holy alliance idea, that this matter should be considered in this wider concept-really international concept.

Take again the United Nations. I think it was supposed to be an international organisation inclusive of all independent nations of the world. There is a tendency to consider it also as something less than that, a tendency, I suppose, emanating from the holy alliance idea which has not been put in practice completely, but it has affected other problems. Individuals, usually politicians, argue about them. What the politicians and the statesmen say is always coloured by their political approach to a problem and so we do not get what might be called a scholarly objective approach or we get one side of the picture, that is to say, a non-Asian or non-African side generally. Now, I respect that side, the scholars of that side, I am not criticising them, but it is possible and conceivable that their approach might not bear in mind some aspects which would be obvious to the Asian scholars and jurists. Therefore, again it becomes desirable and necessary that this aspect should be considered objectively and in a scholarly manner by eminent lawyers and jurists of Asia and Africa and the necessity for this gathering becomes obvious.

We hear now many words and phrases being used which have had a certain dictionary meaning and significance, but in the hands of politicians, that is the people of my tribe, they are used in all kinds of ways. We used to know what, let us say, 'belligerency' was. Belligerency, I believe, is defined as waging a regular and recognised war, it must be regular and it must be recognised, otherwise, I suppose, it is guerilla tactics which is not belligerency. I suppose everybody agrees with that and in so far as States or rulers are concerned, the opposite of belligerency was neutrality, that is, not doing that, or not siding with a power which is belligerent or which is waging an active and recognised war. Yet, delegates here must know how vaguely the word 'neutrality' or 'neutralism', as it is sometimes called, is used now--sometimes as a term of abuse, sometimes may be not that way, but as a description of something without exactly meaning what it is. I have tried to

understand this and have sometimes referred to this matter also without any person throwing light on this, because as I understood those terms, belligerency and neutrality, in relation to States, they referred to a state of war or to countries not joining a war which is taking place between other countries or States. But as everyone knows these words are now used without an active war. If a country is supposed to be neutral today, I do not like the word in that sense, but if it is, then presumably some other country which is not neutral should be described as belligerent. It seems to follow and yet that would be a wrong description of course, because the other country is not engaged in regular recognised warfare.

So, some kind of intermediate stage has developed. I do not quite know how international law or the jurists of repute would

<Pg-86>

consider it or define it, something that is called cold war which presumably is some kind of suspended belligerency. Now, all these developments create problems for politicians and statesmen. I do not suppose that juristic definitions will get rid of the problems. Nevertheless they might clear the air a little and I would hope that an eminent body of scholars and jurists would try to throw light on these terms so that at least our thinking, the politicians' thinking, may become straight. We find today a return, to some extent, to the idea of the old holy alliance backed by military pacts and alliances and economic measures also, and not one but more than one holy alliance, and behind which lies enormous danger to the world in case of war.

I take it that international law is meant, well, primarily to prevent war. War is absence of law, international or any other. Therefore, the purpose of international law is to settle problems and disputes by methods other than war. It is true that international law has not that strength behind it till now of domestic law. But the main purpose is the avoidance of war. Now, how can jurists and lawyers help? They cannot, I suppose, directly help in political developments but at least help in clear thinking because after all, everybody, almost everybody in the wide world, I take it, does not like the idea of war, today at any rate, when it is so dangerous. So, perhaps this concept of new holy alliances and this concept of cold war and this peculiar concept of neutrality, which is something apart from war, make us so confused in our thinking, and therefore in our actions, that we are unable to deal with these problems satisfactorily. I hope you will help us at least in thinking clearly so that we may not be led away by the slogans of politicians and statesmen. I am not going to decry my tribe of politicians and statesmen here. They have much virtue in them. And I am not going to say that jurists and lawyers are always very successful in dealing with public affairs. They may be successful, they are in dealing with matters in their courts, in giving opinions. I think, there was, some considerable time back, a French writer on statecraft. Discussing lawyers and in regard to statecraft, he said that, in general, the training of a lawyer breeds

habits and dispositions of mind which are not favourable to the practice of diplomacy.

Whether that is true or not I do not know, but there is something in it perhaps, so that the politicians obviously often go wrong. But the lawyers and the jurists in their ivory towers may be thinking correctly but may also get out of touch with what is happing around them. Therefore, some of the greatest judges have been those who have not only interpreted the law but who have adapted it to changing conditions without doing violence to it, because the world changes, the social structure changes, international relations change and it would be absurd for a problem of the middle of the 20th century being considered by some textbook maxim of the 18th century or the 19th century, when conditions were entirely different. And so great judges have adapted the law, the interpretation of the law, to changing social and political structures. Naturally they cannot change the basic law. That only a legislature can do. So these problems arise and more especially today when most thinking and sensitive persons are greatly troubled by the course of events in the world. I am not talking about political disputes but the course, the drift which leads towards conflict, major conflict and possibly great disaster. Everybody is interested in it.

There is another aspect to this, which troubles many of us. How far some recent developments can be fitted in with any conception of international law or moral law; developments which threaten the very existence of the human race in future, which tend to poison the atmosphere and thereby imperil all kinds of things not only in regard to mass killing, but, what is much more dreadful to contemplate, poisoning the atmosphere so that it may have terrible genetic and other results, and diseases which may gradually sweep through any country affecting vast masses of men. Is that justifiable by any conception of international law or moral law? Surely this is not a matter purely to be considered by statesmen and politicians.... It may be desirable to consider whether these developments, which are taking place from day to day and in connection with nuclear warfare or the preparation for it or the test explosions, are in keeping with any conception of international or moral law. These are some considerations which affect the politician, a man who has some responsibility in public affairs. But as I said, if he expresses

<Pg-87>

his opinion, it is usually considered a biased and coloured opinion, because by belonging to the political apparatus of a country he is biased by the policy of that country. It may be that if jurists and others, who are in the habit of considering these problems calmly and objectively, considered them and gave their opinion, that would have much greater weight, just as if scientists, who again are presumed to think of these matters objectively and in a scientific temper of mind, gave an opinion they can express that opinion perhaps with greater knowledge than others. That opinion has far greater value than the pure politicians' opinion. So, apart from dealing with the

broad development of international law and how it is affected by the world becoming something bigger than the old narrow European community, apart from considering how modern developments, as the Attorney-General said, in science and the application of science in communications and in social structures, all these things, affect our ways of life, our ways in international relationships as well as individual and group relations-all these must necessarily affect the concept of international law-apart from this there are these immediate problems which face every sensitive human being-the problem of this return to the concept of the old holy alliance, this use of the word and the practice of cold war and all that follows from it and this business of great nations and small nations drifting almost against their will by the force of circumstances in a direction which can only lead to terrible disaster and all that has flowed from this tremendous discovery of atomic energy which can be used for good purposes and bad.

You have referred Mr. Attorney-General, to Panch Sheela, the Five Principles which have been accepted by a number of countries of Asia and some countries outside Asia too. Now, I claim no special virtue for them. They are only some simple principles, I submit, which, if adopted by nations as regards international relationships, would not only lead us away from war but would establish healthy relationships. What are they? It is simple really and I do not know how anyone anywhere can object to any of them, the recognition of sovereignty, non-aggression, non-interference in internal affairs, because if you do not do any of these things you are interfering, you are misbehaving, a country is misbehaving. It is not acting according to, I think, what should be the real basis of international law, nonaggression, non-interference, recognition of sovereignty, mutual respect and all these leading up necessarily to peaceful coexistence. Either one accepts peaceful co-existence which means coexistence of countries, which differ in their policies, because there is no point in saying that two persons who agree or two countries who agree should exist peacefully. They do. There is no point in my saying that I should be tolerant to my neighbour if he and I have no reason to differ. The question of my tolerating my neighbour, his tolerating me comes in when we differ and yet we tolerate each other and the question of peaceful co-existence therefore comes in only when countries differ in their policies, provided always that they do not interfere with each other, provided always they do not interfere either internally or externally. If they do, then that is a breach. Therefore, I submit that these Five Principles, which are sometimes called Panch Sheela, are a healthy basis for international relations and I would further say in all humility, that there is no other basis, unless you accept the basis which leads to conflict which of course I presume is not our objective. If the attempt is to compel or coerce a country to do something against its will, to fall in line with something, well that is surely not something which international law should encourage. That brings conflicts.

We recognise that there is great variety in this world. Are we going to produce or try to produce by some measure of force, whether it is military or economic or some other, a uniformity? Perhaps it would be a good thing if there is uniformity about basic principles. But anyhow that can only develop by argument, by reason, by discussion, by conversion. Otherwise, if it develops by war, then we land ourselves in the dread state of war which I am convinced does not lead to the solution of any problems, more especially in any kind of war that might unfortunately take place in the future.

I have ventured, distinguished delegates, just to place some layman's ideas before you because these matters are not of an academic interest. They are of an urgency which compel the attention of every person who thinks.

<Pg-88>

And I am sure they occupy your minds too. I do not suggest, I cannot suggest, that you should find remedies for the world's ills but I do hope that you will show us some way of clear thinking which will lead to clear action.

INDIA USA

Date: Apr 18, 1957

Volume No

1995

RUMANIA

Cultural Agreement

A Cultural Agreement between Rumania and India was signed in New Delhi on Apr 30, 1957. The agreement aims at strengthening the ties of existing friendship and promoting further understanding and closer cooperation in the field of culture and science between the two countries.

His Excellency Mr. Mihai Magheru, Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary in India of the Government of the Rumanian People's Republic, signed the agreement on behalf of Rumania and Maulana Abul Kalam Azad, Union Minister for Education and Scientific Research, signed on behalf of India.

The agreement will remain in force for a period of five years and will come into force on the date of exchange of the instruments of ratification which will take place at Bucharest.

Speaking at the ceremony of the signing of the agreement, H.E. Mr.

Mihai Magheru said:

The Rumanian people are deeply convinced that by widening cultural and scientific exchanges with other countries, by acquainting themselves with the achievements of other nations and by making known to them their own culture, they bring an effective contribution to peaceful co-existence and better understanding between all countries helping thereby the maintenance of world peace.

The Cultural Agreement concluded today on behalf of our two Governments brings--I am sure--such a contribution and is also a landmark on the path of the friendly ties already existing between India and Rumania.

Important events have taken place in recent years, reflecting the growth of mutual friendly relations between our two countries.

In the presence in my country, last year, of the great scholar, Dr. Radhakrishnan, VicePresident of India, Rumanians have welcomed a remarkable representative of Indian culture, this rich and old culture which reverberated far and wide and which, in many instances, inspired works of some of our greatest poets.

At the same time, his visit to Rumania gave an opportunity to my people to express their high appreciation for the contribution brought to the cause of world peace by the Indian Government, under the leadership of the eminent world statesman, Mr. Nehru.

Recently, the Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the Rumanian People's Republic has expressed the satisfaction of the Rumanian Government at the strengthening of relations of co-operation with India, the great peace-loving power in Asia. A useful beginning, he said, in this co-operation has been made, in the sphere of the development of India's oil industry.

Indian artists have been welcomed in Rumania; various Rumanian scientists and specialists visited your country. The Rumanian people, who are legitimately proud of the contribution brought by their own culture to the treasury of world culture, were pleased to learn that their scholars and technicians were appreciated in India.

Many similarities between our two peoples in their folk art, in episodes of their troubled history, in the ideals which motivate their creative efforts today, as well as the diversity of talents and skills developed in an original way by each of them in various fields of arts, science and technique, bring us together.

Maulana Abul Kalam Azad, in his speech, expressed satisfaction at the conclusion of the agreement between the two countries, and

<Pg-89>

said it was an important landmark in the history of both Rumania and

India. It was a significant development, he added, which would strengthen the existing friendly relations between the two countries.

Although India, he said, had attained her independence a short while ago, she had been consistently trying to develop cultural relations with Rumania. Cultural relations were more significant than the political relations, since they had a deeper and lasting influence.

He expressed the hope that the step which they had taken now would contribute towards promotion of world peace and both the countries would continue to make efforts towards peace, goodwill and better understanding. The present agreement, he said, would open wider fields of mutual co-operation between the two countries.

The following is the text of the Cultural Agreement:

The Government of India and

The Government of the Rumanian People's Republic

Desiring to strengthen their existing friendship in every possible way and to promote further understanding and closer co-operation in the field of culture and science between the two countries,

Have decided to conclude a Cultural Agreement and have appointed for this purpose as their respective plenipotentiaries,

The Government of India: Maulana Abul Kalam Azad, Minister for Education and Scientific Research

The Government of the Rumanian People's Republic: His Excellency Mr. Mihai Magheru, Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary

who, having communicated to each other their full powers, found to be in good and due form, have agreed upon the following provisions:

ARTICLE I:-The high contracting parties declare their desire to encourage and facilitate co-operation in the fields of culture, science, education, literature and art.

ARTICLE II:-The high contracting parties will stimulate and support the development of relations between the academies, universities, scientific and research institutes of the two countries, especially by means of:

(a) Mutual visits and participation in the scientific congresses and conferences organised by the two parties;

- (b) Reciprocal visits of professors and research workers for giving lectures, special courses, etc., as well as exchange of students on scholarship basis; basis;
- (c) Reciprocal visits of educationists, exchange of educational material and equipment, publications, etc.;
- (d) Exchange of books, periodicals and other scientific and technical publications, and, as far as possible, exchange of archaeological specimens and copies of ancient manuscripts, etc.

ARTICLE III-Each high 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 scientific, technical and industrial institutions.

ARTICLE IV:-It is the desire of the high contracting parties to encourage and support the mutual knowledge of each other's cultures, by means of:

- (a) Translations and exchange of books, periodicals and other literary and cultural publications, etc.;
- (b) Lectures, concerts, theatrical and dance performances;
- (c) Art exhibitions and other cultural activities;
- (d) Radio, press and other similar means;
- (e) Scientific, educational, cultural and documentary films and newsreels.

ARTICLE V:-The high contracting parties will facilitate and encourage co-operation

<Pg-90>

between the literary, artistic, sports' and journalists' associations of the two countries by reciprocal visits, attendance in congresses and conferences, etc.

ARTICLE VI:--The two contracting parties will encourage the organisation of competitions in the field of sports between their two countries as well as of other activities in the field of physical culture.

ARTICLE VII:--In order to ensure the implementation of the present agreement, an Indo-Rumanian committee may, if necessary, be convened by rotation in New Delhi and Bucharest from time to time to review and suggest concrete programmes for the approval of the high contracting parties.

ARTICLE VIII:--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 at Bucharest.

The present agreement shall remain in force for a period of five years and thereafter until the expiration of six months from the day on which one of the contracting parties shall give notice of its intention to terminate the agreement.

In faith thereof, the said plenipotentiaries have signed the present agreement in duplicate in English, Hindi and Rumanian languages, all the three texts being equally authentic except in the case of doubt when the English text shall prevail.

Signed at New Delhi this thirtieth day of April, 1957.

For the Government For the Government of India of the Rumanian People's Republic

(A. K. AZAD) (MIHAI MAGHERU)

Minister for Education Envoy Extraordinary
and Scientific and Minister Plenipotentiary
Research. in India

INDIA ROMANIA USA **Date**: Apr 30, 1957

Volume No

1995

TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE

Agreement with U.S.

The Governments of India and the United States of America signed in New Delhi on Apr 27, 1957 two supplementary project agreements providing for 10.5 million dollars in development assistance funds for the Indian Railways and 2 million dollars for the Community Development Programme.

This total of 12.5 million dollars is part of the 55 million dollars in development funds available to India during the current fiscal year under the Indo-American programme and is in addition to Technical Assistance Funds.

The agreements were signed by Shri B. K. Nehru, Secretary, Ministry of Finance, Department of Economic Affairs, for the Government of

India, and Mr. Howard E. Houston, Director of the American Technical Cooperation Mission to India of the International Co-operation Administration of the United States of America.

The sum of 10.5 million dollars will be used by the Railway Board for purchasing approximately 56,400 tons of steel rails and 1,900 tons of fish plates while 2 million dollars is intended to continue assistance to the Community Development Programme by providing necessary funds for the purpose of procuring equipment required for opening 200 new community development blocks. This will increase the total number of blocks to 822 covering 13 million people in the rural areas of India.

The money will be used to acquire from outside India jeeps, cargo personnel carriers, station wagons, road rollers, audio-visual sets, hand-cameras and battery operated public address sets for use in the 200 new blocks.

The Government of India are providing the three-year rupee expenditure of the 200 blocks in the amount of Rs. 262,000,000 which includes the inland handling and transportation costs for the equipment to be imported under this agreement.

<Pg-91>

USA INDIA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC

Date: Apr 27, 1957

Volume No

1995

TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE

Ford Foundation Grant

The Ford Foundation (of the United States) announced on Apr 21, 1957 a grant of 1,500,000 dollars to the Government of India for the training of 200 engineers in production and management methods of the

training of 200 engineers in production and management methods of the United States Steel Industry.

A batch of 115 Indian steel engineers will begin a one-year course of training in steel works in the United States from 1 September 1957. The second batch of 85 will begin their training course on 1 December 1957.

On return, the engineers are expected to be absorbed in the steel projects at Rourkela, Bhilai, and Durgapur.

The training will be conducted by the eight largest steel companies in the United States. Related instruction will be provided by cooperating technological institutes in the vicinity of the plants to which the trainees will be assigned.

The Carnegie Institute of Technology will serve as an administrator of the programme in the United States and as liaison between the educational institutions and the steel companies. Besides the Carnegie Institute other co-operating educational institutions are the Case Institute of Technology, the Lehigh University, the Illinois Institute of Technology and the University of Cincinnati.

The steel companies participating in the training programme are the United States Steel Corporation, the Bethlehem Steel Company, the Republic Steel Corporation, Jones and Laughlin Steel Corporation, the Youngstown Sheet and Tube Company, the National Steel Corporation and the Inland Steel Corporation.

The Ford Foundation grant will help to meet the trainees' living expenses in the United States and their academic fees connected with institute studies. The co-operating steel companies will bear the cost of instruction and training in their plants. The Government of India will pay the trainees' international travel expenses and the cost of preliminary training in India.

Before their arrival in the United States, the trainees will receive a six-week orientation course at the Tata Iron and Steel Works at Jamshedpur. In the United States they will receive an additional twoweek orientation course at the Carnegie Institute before being assigned to the steel plants for specialised training.

This training programme for Indian engineers is part of the technical training scheme prepared by the Government of India to train engineers required to take charge of higher directional functions in the three steel plants, in the public sector, at Rourkela, Durgapur, and Bhilai. A number of Indian engineers are already being trained in West Germany and the Soviet Union and other engineers will be trained in Australia, Canada and the United Kingdom.

INDIA USA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC GERMANY AUSTRALIA CANADA

Date: Apr 21, 1957

Volume No

1995

WEST GERMANY

Trade Facilities

The following Press Note was issued in New Delhi on Apr 16, 1957 on the conclusion of the trade talks between India and the Federal Republic of Germany:

The talks between the Trade Delegation from the Federal Republic of Germany and representatives of the Government of India on the promotion of Indo-German trade, which began on 2 April 1957, ended in New Delhi on 16 April 1957. These negotiations, which followed closely in the wake of the visit to India of the Foreign Minister of the Federal Republic of Germany, His Excellency Dr. Von Brentano, were conducted in a spirit of friendliness and mutual goodwill.

As a result of these discussions, three sets of letters were exchanged on 16 April between Shri K. B. Lall, Joint Secretary,

<Pg-92>

Ministry of Commerce and Consumer Industries and Dr. Von Bargen, Leader of the Trade Delegation from the Federal Republic of Germany.

The two Governments have agreed to give all possible facilities, consistent with their respective import and export regulations, to enlarge the scope of trade and to promote commercial contacts between the two countries. It has been agreed to make every effort to place the trade between the two countries on a mutually satisfactory basis.

In the field of technical assistance the two Governments will strive to deepen their cooperation and the Federal Government will give, within the limits of its resources, the requisite assistance and advice for India's economic development.

Under the letters exchanged, quotas have been fixed for a number of items of Indian exports which are still subject to quantitative restrictions in the Federal Republic. These include twine, ropes, cordage and cables of jute and false jute, finished cotton fabrics and furnishings and towellings, silk and art silk fabrics, woollen fabrics, cotton blankets, knotted carpets of textiles other than silk and wool, fine animal hair and coir, carpets of jute or similar fibres other than knotted, tanned leather from hides and calf skins, finished leather from hides and calf skins, finished leather from sheep and goat skins, pineapple juice, canned tropical fruits, roasted and salted groundnuts, cashewnuts, almonds and mixtures.

Some of these quotas are valid until 30 September 1957 while some others up to the end of March, 1958, as the Federal Republic is progressively moving towards a multilateral trading pattern.

Both Governments hope that the understandings now reached will enlarge the scope of the Trade Agreement signed on 31 March 1955. The Federal Republic have, in order to strengthen commercial contacts

between the two countries, extended an invitation--which India has accepted--to send a group of Indian exporters and industrialists to Germany to study market conditions with a view to establishing close links with German importers.

Questions relating to imports of German industrial equipment into India within the scope of current import regulations regarding deferred payments have also been discussed in a spirit of mutual helpfulness. The German Trade Delegation were deeply impressed by the evidences they saw of India's enormous economic progress in the industrial plants, the dams and the community project areas visited by them.

It is hoped that as a result of these visits, the discussions in New Delhi and the measures that have now been agreed upon, the existing trade and economic relations between the two countries will be greatly strengthened.

<Pg-93>

GERMANY INDIA USA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC

Date: Apr 16, 1957

May

Volume No				
1995				
CONTENTS				

Foreign Affairs Record

1957 May

VOL. III No. 5

CONTENTS

CANADA Immigration Agreement
CEYLON Nehru-Bandaranaike Joint Statement
CHINA Trade Agreement Renewed
FOREIGN AND HOME AFFAIRS President's Address to Parliament 97
INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS Eisenhower Doctrine
IRAN Ratification of Treaty
(Continued overleaf) <pg-i></pg-i>
JAPAN Nehru-Kishi Joint Statement
NORTH VIETNAM Trade Contract
PAKISTAN Agreement on Educational Certificates
SOUTH AFRICA Eviction of Indians
TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE Exploration of Mineral Oil
UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS Supply of Oil Drilling Equipment
< <u>Pg-ij</u> >

Date: May 01, 1957

Volume No

1995

CANADA

Immigration Agreement

Prime Minister Nehru and Mr. Escott Reid, High Commissioner for Canada in India, signed an agreement on May 03, 1957 which modified the Indo-Canadian Agreement of 1951 on the immigration of Indian citizens to Canada.

Under the new agreement the number of Indian quota immigrants admissible to Canada every year will be doubled.

The agreement of 26 January 1951 provided for the admission to Canada of 150 Indian citizens a year in addition to the close relatives of Canadian citizens of Indian origin. Other relatives have been admissible as preference quota immigrants. Under the new agreement the Canadian Government intends to admit 150 such preference quota immigrants in addition to an equal number of other quota immigrants.

In a letter addressed to the Prime Minister on the occasion of the new agreement, Mr. Escott Reid stated that one result of the 1951 agreement had been that the number of persons in Canada of Indian origin was gradually becoming more representative of the whole of India with its rich variety of language, race and religion, while at the same time, the well-established Sikh community in Canada had added to its numbers

The Canadian High Commissioner added that any person admitted to Canada as an immigrant might become a citizen of Canada after five years' continuous residence in Canada. There is no legislation in Canada, federal or provincial, which discriminates against any group of citizens on grounds of national origin, race, language or religion.

CANADA INDIA USA

Date: May 03, 1957

Volume No

CEYLON

Nehru-Bandaranaike Joint Statement

Prime Minister Nehru paid a visit to Ceylon from May 17, 1957 to 5th May, 1957. After talks with Mr. S. W. R. D. Bandaranaike, Prime Minister of Ceylon, the two Prime Ministers issued the following joint statement on 19 May 1957:

On the invitation of the Prime Minister of Ceylon, the Prime Minister of India visited Ceylon from 17 to 20 May, to participate in the Buddha Jayanti celebrations in Ceylon.

The Prime Minister of India visited Anuradhapura on 18 May in the company of the Prime Minister of Ceylon and was privileged to participate in the Buddha Jayanti celebrations there. The Prime Minister of India desires to express on his behalf and that of his daughter his deep appreciation of the hospitality offered to them and of the kind and cordial welcome they have received in Ceylon.

The Prime Ministers availed themselves of the opportunity of their meeting together to exchange views on international issues and Indo-Ceylon relations. The Prime Ministers feel satisfied that their talks have resulted in further appreciation of each other's views of the problems of their respective countries and helped them in their appraisal of international issues generally and as they concern their two countries. Their talks have once again borne evidence of the great measure of agreement in their approach to the problems of peace and world co-operation and their relations within the Commonwealth. They have served to clarify further and strengthen their understanding of these problems and the determination of their two countries to continue to adhere to and pursue the principles on which their approach is based.

They reaffirm their faith in the five principles of international relations known as the Panch Sheela, which were embodied in and extended by the principles adopted by the Bandung Conference. It is their

<Pg-95>

conviction that the spirit of these principles, if acted upon, affords an opportunity for the establishment of co-operation, understanding and friendship amongst countries, many of which have ideological and other differences. This approach will also lessen the tensions of the world and help to avoid the grave conflicts which threaten the world today.

The Prime Ministers congratulate the people of Ghana on the attainment of independence and look forward to the people of Malaya

also achieving independence. They appreciate the action of the United Kingdom in acceding to the wishes of the peoples of these countries. They trust that the area of freedom will be enlarged and nations still under colonial domination will soon achieve their freedom. They disapprove strongly of every kind of aggression and attempt to reimpose colonialism or imperialism in any form.

The Prime Ministers express their relief and satisfaction at the opening of the Suez Canal for normal functioning. They view, however, with deep concern the developments in some parts of Western Asia. The problems of this region can only be solved by the peoples of the countries within that region being left free to work out their own destiny in accordance with their own wishes. Any imposition of an outside authority can only lead to continuing tension and an intensification of these problems.

The Prime Ministers recognise the importance of the United Nations as an instrument for securing world peace and, in particular, trust that the basic aims stated in the Charter of the United Nations for securing political freedom, social equality and racial harmony should be the guiding principles of that great organisation as well as of the member-nations. In order to function effectively, the United Nations must become fully representative of the world community. The failure by the United Nations to recognise the People's Republic of China is not only opposed to the basic principles of the Charter, but also impairs the utility of the United Nations.

The Prime Ministers gave their anxious and particular consideration to the present state of the development of nuclear and thermo-nuclear power for forging weapons of mass destruction, and to the ominous catastrophe that threatens humanity if their development and production continued and their use were not prohibited. While, in the event of their use in war, humanity would in all probability face well-nigh total extinction, the Prime Ministers were immediately concerned about the present and immediate consequences of the harmful and unpredictable effects of radiation on mankind caused by the continuing explosions of nuclear and thermonuclear weapons for test purposes carried out by the Soviet Union, the United States and the United Kingdom.

The Prime Ministers regret that, despite the declared intentions of all nations not to embark upon war, and the mounting opinion and anxiety in the world in regard to the grave and growing menace of these tests to the present and future of mankind, the great powers concerned have not yet decided to refrain from their hazardous ventures in this field which have already proved injurious to populations in lands near to the location of such tests, dangerously polluted the world's air and water and threatened the present and future generations with both known and unknown risks and consequences.

The Prime Ministers, therefore, make an earnest and urgent appeal for the immediate suspension of these nuclear and thermonuclear test explosions, pending their abandonment. Such suspension would not only limit the dangers that have already arisen and help in easing international tension, but would also lead to an effective consideration of the problem of disarmament.

There are certain outstanding problems between India and Ceylon that yet await satisfactory solution. The Prime Ministers feel confident, particularly in view of the cordial relations that exist between the two countries and their co-operation in so many spheres, that these problems can and should be solved satisfactorily to both countries.

The Prime Ministers are conscious of the great and wholesome interest aroused in both their countries by their present meeting, which is a token of their existing friendship and of the earnest and widespread desire to promote and strengthen the ties that bind them.

To this end, the Prime Ministers reaffirm their desire to devote their energies.

<Pg-96>

INDIA INDONESIA GHANA USA CHINA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC

Date: May 17, 1957

Volume No

1995

Indians in Ceylon

In reply to a question whether he had any discussions with the Prime Minister of Ceylon regarding the citizenship of Indians in Ceylon, and if so, whether any fresh assurance had been given to him regarding the settlement of the citizenship question by the Prime Minister of Ceylon, Prime Minister Nehru told the Lok Sabha on May 22, 1957:

In the course of talks with the Prime Minister of Ceylon, reference was made to this problem. No detailed consideration of it took place at that time and no fresh assurances were either asked for or given. It was, however, agreed that both in regard to this problem and others, further discussion should take place at a later stage and both the Prime Minister Ceylon and I expressed our confidence that outstanding problems between India and Ceylon can and should be solved satisfactorily.

INDIA USA

Date: May 22, 1957

Volume No

1995

CHINA

Trade Agreement Renewed

The Trade Agreement between India and the People's Republic of China has been renewed. A Press Note issued in New Delhi on May 25, 1957 said that letters to this effect were exchanged on 25 May between Shri S. Ranganathan, Secretary, Ministry of Commerce and Industry, Government of India, and His Excellency Mr. Pan Tzu-li, Ambassador of the People's Republic of China to India. The Press Note added:

The Trade Agreement, which was originally signed on 14 October 1954, was valid for a period of two years. Negotiations have been going on for some time past between representatives of the two Governments for the renewal of the agreement. It has now been decided that with certain modifications the trade relations between India and China should continue to be governed by the provisions of the original agreement.

These modifications mainly relate to payment procedures and arrangements for conversion of rupees into sterling being effected only through the account maintained by the People's Bank of China with the Reserve Bank of India. These new payment arrangements will come into force with effect from 1 July 1957. The renewed agreement will be valid up to 31 December 1958.

Letters were also exchanged between Shri K. B. Lail, Joint Secretary, Ministry of Commerce and Industry, Government of India and Mr. Tu Yuyuh, Counsellor for Commercial Affairs of the Embassy of the People's Republic of China in New Delhi, for encouraging closer contact and co-operation between Chinese and Indian trading organisations.

CHINA INDIA USA

Date: May 25, 1957

Volume No

FOREIGN AND HOME AFFAIRS

President's Address to Parliament

President Rajendra Prasad addressed a joint session of the Lok Sabha and the Rajya Sabha on May 13, 1957. The following is the text of the President's address:

You and the members of the legislatures of the States, chosen by an electorate of nearly two hundred million voters of our country, in accord with our Constitutional procedures, have called me once again to the high office of the President of the Republic. I am deeply conscious of the honour and I am grateful for the confidence which you have reposed in me. It shall be my endeavour to continue

$$<$$
Pg-97>

to deserve the trust and the affection of which I have been so long the happy recipient.

It gives me great pleasure to welcome you, as Members of the second Parliament in the history of our Republic. Some of you have been members of one or other of the Houses of Parliament, or come to Parliament with rich experience in your State legislatures. There are others among you who have been elected to Parliament for the first time. All of you will find, in your life and duties as Members of Parliament, both in the legislature and your constituencies, immense and varied opportunities and fields of constructive work in the service of our country and people. I wish you all good fortune and a very successful tenure of Parliamentary life.

We are in the second year of our Second Five-Year Plan. There has been some inevitable slowing down in the first year of the Plan, resulting partly from the reorganisation of the States. This imposes a greater strain and calls for added effort both by the Government and the people during the remaining period of that Plan. My Government are fully conscious of this.

The economic situation, more particularly in relation to the Plan, confronts us with factors which, while they do not warrant grave apprehensions, are matters of serious concern and they are engaging the attention of my Ministers. The deficit in the Central and State budgets and the strain on our foreign exchange resources occasioned by the requirements of the Plan and of industrial development generally, as well as by external factors, call for determined and planned efforts. They call for both conservation and expansion of our resources by effecting real economies, by planned restrictions of certain imports, by expansion of export trade and by increasing national self-sufficiency both in the fields of industry and

agriculture. They will call for savings to be utilised for production and the abandonment of unproductive and anti-social habits of hoarding and speculation. These can only be effectively achieved by efforts and vigilance not only on the part of Government but by the people as well.

It would be the easier, but not the gainful or constructive way, to bridge the gaps to which I have referred, by halting development. This will, however, provide no real or long term remedy. Our endeavour has to be to mobilise and conserve resources for greater productivity and for maintaining and improving development. My Government are fully aware of the problem and of the effort required. They are equally concerned that our temporary difficulties should not lead us in the direction of retarding progress and development, but that the difficulties should be overcome, where necessary, by reconsideration and revision of methods and by planned mobilisation of resources, and not by either the abandonment or slowing down of the progress towards our objectives.

Public opinion plays a large and wellnigh conclusive part in the success of such endeavour. The determination and fervour of our people, their readiness to accept discipline, to respond to the call for efforts and their resolve not to be led into anti-social behaviour, such as by hoarding or wasteful spending, alone will help the country to pass successfully through the present crucial period of our Second Five-Year Plan.

Members of Parliament, the country looks to you a great deal for that sustained and special effort in support of the policies and endeavours which my Government will initiate in this behalf, which will help us to surmount difficulties and to achieve success.

While food production has increased, and the increases have been maintained, except for the results of natural calamities, more especially in certain parts of Bihar and the eastern districts of Uttar Pradesh, we have a considerable way to go before our country becomes fully self-sufficient in food. There are signs of slight abatement in the rising trend of food prices and my Government have taken several measures to bring about this trend. Intensive efforts have increased food production and improved crop prospects. Except in the case of some of the coarse grains adversely affected by climatic conditions, the crop yields and estimates not only do not indicate a shortfall but have recorded appreciable increases.

My Government have also entered into arrangements for necessary imports of food grains and for building up reserves which will prevent price increases and bridge the gaps that still remain. A large storage

<Pg-98>

construction Programme has been undertaken. The behaviour of the public is a large and often determining factor in preventing rise in

food prices which is often caused by the apprehension of shortages resulting in the resort to hoarding as well as to the tendency to panic. The food situation, thanks to the increased production and the steps taken by my Government, does not warrant any lack of public confidence in regard to supplies. My Government propose to keep Parliament informed of the position in regard to food and the estimates of supply and requirements. It may be hoped that a knowledge of the true facts will help to allay needless apprehensions and prevent artificial shortages and higher prices.

My Government are happy to state that their decision to lay stress on food production and agriculture generally in the Community Project plans has yielded handsome results. The Community Development and the National Extension Service programmes have made great strides in achievement. Higher targets in agriculture, health and sanitation have been achieved. The National Sample Survey shows that, at the end of the First Five-Year Plan, the crop yields in the Community Development Project and National Extension Service Block areas were approximately 25 per cent higher than for the country as a whole. The Community Projects and National Extension Blocks now cover 222,000 villages.

State undertakings continue to make notable progress and new targets have been reached in almost every enterprise. There has also been expansion in the private sector. Khadi and village industries will receive a further impetus with the setting up of "The Khadi and Village Industries Commission" as a statutory body. Among the major new projects that will soon be inaugurated is the Neiveli Lignite Project where the first minecut will be made this month. My Government attach importance to the building up of a plant for the manufacture of heavy machinery and steps are being taken to this end.

To reduce the pressure on our resources of foreign exchange, my Government are making efforts to obtain deferred payment arrangements for major projects. Long term credits for certain projects are being negotiated.

Consequent on the reorganisation of the States, Advisory Committees have been set up for the Union Territories and Territorial Councils have been established in Himachal Pradesh, Manipur and Tripura. A Corporation for Delhi will be soon established. A new Union Territory of the Laccadives, Minicoy and Amindivi Islands has come into existence and the Five-Year Plan for the Andaman Islands at a total cost of Rs. 59.25 million will include the development of communication between the islands and the mainland.

Shipyard construction and the building of ships of modern design have made great progress at Vishakapatnam and plans for a second shipyard are now in hand.

My Government have initiated measures to relieve housing shortages and promote housing standards, slum clearances and plantation housing schemes and housing for low-income groups and subsidised industrial housing. An urgent requirement of Delhi and the other great cities of India is the clearance of slum areas, and this problem is receiving the consideration of the Central and State Governments and the Corporations concerned.

Two Ordinances have been promulgated since the last session of Parliament. Bills dealing with these Ordinances will be placed before Parliament. These are:

- (i) The Life Insurance Corporation (Amendment) Ordinance, 1957.
- (ii) The Industrial Disputes (Amendment) Ordinance, 1957.

My Government will also submit to Parliament a number of other Bills during the current session.

An interim statement of revenue and expenditure for 1957-58 was presented to Parliament during its last session and votes on account authorising expenditure for a part of the year were passed. That statement of revenue and expenditure will be presented again to Parliament in this session with such changes as are considered necessary, and

<Pg-99>

Parliament will be asked to approve funds for the whole year.

Our relations with foreign countries continue to be friendly. Since I addressed Parliament last, we have had the pleasure of receiving as the guests of the Republic, Mr. Josef Cyrankiewicz, Prime Minister of Poland, Dr. Heinrich Von Brentano, Foreign Minister of the Federal German Republic, and Mr. Osvaldo Sainte Marie, Foreign Minister of Chile.

My Prime Minister will attend the meeting of Commonwealth Prime Ministers in London at the end of June. During his absence abroad, he will take the opportunity of visiting Syria, Denmark, Finland, Norway, Sweden, the Netherlands, Egypt and the Sudan.

While the situation in the Middle East continues to be unsatisfactory and charged with tension, it is a matter of gratification that the Suez Canal has been re-opened for navigation. My Government welcome the declaration made by the Government of Egypt, prior to the opening of the canal, which re-affirms the Convention of 1888 and the determination of Egypt to continue to abide by the principles of the Charter of the United Nations and of International Law. The declaration provides for the reference of disputes arising from interpretations of the Convention and its application as well as certain other matters to the World Court and also to abide by its decisions. The main provisions in the declaration are, in the view of my Government, reasonable and adequate to safeguard the legitimate interests of the world community, if they are worked in a spirit of co-operation and mutual understanding by all concerned. A notable

feature of the declaration is that, while it is made by the Government of Egypt, that Government has declared that it has the status of an International Instrument and this has been registered with the United Nations. My Government feel that this declaration and its status as an International Instrument is a notable contribution to the lowering of tensions in that area and will provide a solution of the difficulties that followed the nationalisation of the Suez Canal.

Dr. Gunnar Jarring, a former President of the Security Council, visited Pakistan and India in pursuance of a resolution passed by the Security Council on 21 February this year at the end of the debate on Kashmir. Dr. Jarring visited India twice and conferred with my Prime Minister. He has submitted a report to the Security Council.

The Sub-Committee of the Disarmament Commission has been sitting in London for some time, but no agreement appears to have been reached on any aspect of disarmament, including the suspension of explosions of nuclear and thermo-nuclear weapons. The proposals of my Government in regard to disarmament were once again referred by the General Assembly of the United Nations at the last session, along with all other proposals, to the Disarmament Commission.

Meanwhile, the United States, the Soviet Union, and now the United Kingdom, continue their experiments to explode these weapons of mass destruction. World opinion is increasingly concerned about the harmful effects of radiation which has been increasingly and more frequently felt in various parts of the world. The demand for the suspension of these explosions is widespread and continues to be impressed upon the nuclear powers, but hitherto without success.

My Government do not consider that the compromise proposals suggested from diverse quarters for the so-called limitation of these explosions or for their registration will ever rid the world of their harmful effects, or open the way to the abandonment of these weapons of mass destruction. On the other hand, such regularisation of these tests tends to make thermo-nuclear war legitimate and as having the sanction of the world community. Reports of experiments with more and more deadly weapons of war continue to be received. It is however a matter of some gratification that the volume of world opinion against the continuance of experiments has reached a higher level than ever before. My Prime Minister in a statement before the Lok Sabha in April, 1954, put forward for consideration the proposal for a "Standstill Agreement" to suspend these explosions. These proposals have since gained much support and the movement of world opinion in favour of it has gathered momentum. My Government will continue to exert their influence with

<Pg-100>

other nations and in the counsels of the world to bring about the abandonment of these test explosions and the prohibition of nuclear and thermo-nuclear weapons.

We meet here today one hundred years after the great rising which began in Meerut and spread over considerable parts of India. That was the first major challenge to foreign rule and it threw up notable figures, famous in India's history. The uprising was cruelly suppressed, but the spirit of freedom and the desire to be free from foreign domination continued and found expression on many subsequent occasions. Ultimately it led to a great national movement which followed peaceful methods and succeeded in achieving the independence of India and the establishment of this Republic of ours. We pay tribute now to all those who gave their lives or otherwise suffered so that India may be free.

India has been independent for nearly ten years now and during this period Parliament has laboured for the well-being and advancement of this country and her people and for peace and co-operation in the world. These labours have produced substantial results which we see all round us in the country. The progress we have made during these years in our own land has produced in our people hope and self-reliance. This is a substantial foundation on which we can build for the future.

Abroad, my Government have striven strenuously to help to lower existing tensions in the world and to serve the cause of peace. The country has also accepted heavy responsibilities in the pursuit of this policy, in regard to maintaining the independence of its approach as well as in making contributions to the maintenance of peace, as in Korea, Indo-China and now in the Middle East.

The tasks that confront us both at home and abroad are not only considerable but at times appear overwhelming. But these tasks have to be faced, difficulties surmounted and objectives achieved if the fruits of independence are to be ensured to our people and if we are to help the world being spared the continual stress and horror of impending catastrophe.

My Government will continue their strenuous endeavours in all these directions, to the best of their capacity, conscious of the confidence reposed in them by the country, and fortified by the conviction that despite clouds of war, and even despair, the desire for survival and progress is inherent in humanity. Our capacities and resources are limited and our voice in the world may be but small. But neither our national interests nor our history and traditions, nor our convictions chart any other course for us. Happily for us, this is the common aim and the firm desire of all our people.

USA PERU RUSSIA INDIA POLAND CHILE UNITED KINGDOM DENMARK FINLAND SYRIA EGYPT THE NETHERLANDS NORWAY SUDAN SWEDEN PAKISTAN CHINA KOREA

Date: May 13, 1957

Volume No

1995

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

Eisenhower Doctrine

In reply to a question whether the Government of India were aware that Pakistan had been officially informed by the United States that the Eisenhower Plan covered that country, Shrimati Lakshmi N. Menon, Deputy Minister for External Affairs, said in the Lok Sabha on May 02, 1957:

The Government of India have no information whether Pakistan has been officially informed by the United States Government that the Eisenhower Plan for the Middle East covers that country. However, according to Press reports, the Pakistan Government have endorsed the plan. She added:

The Government of India have no information what assistance will be given to Pakistan under the Eisenhower Plan. But any assistance which increases Pakistan's military potential is bound to have repercussions on India's security arrangements.

<Pg-101>

INDIA PAKISTAN USA

Date: May 02, 1957

Volume No

1995

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

Purchase of Defence Equipment

In the course of his speech on the debate on the Finance Bill in the Lok Sabha on May 30, 1957, Prime Minister Nehru referred to India's policy on the purchase of defence equipment. The Prime Minister said:

The Hon. Member, Shri Dange, said something in connection with defence, about our purchasing expensive equipment and aircraft from the United Kingdom and not getting them from--not accepting, I think,

he said, the offer of--the Soviet Union for less expensive aircraft. Acharya Kripalani also referred to the question of defence and said that there was no point in keeping up any large armies or defence apparatus in these days of the atom, nuclear warfare. Well, Acharya Kripalani was undoubtedly partly right, partly I say, because, I do not think that it is quite correct or safe for anyone to say that a nation, today, can rely completely on the absence of defence apparatus. I agree with him that war today becomes more and more of an anachronism in this nuclear age. But, I do not think there are many Members of this House who probably agree with Acharya Kripalani in saying that we should practically do away with our defence apparatus. As a matter of fact, ever since independence, many of us connected with Government have constantly kept this in mind--how to reduce expenditure on defence, how to reduce the size of our army. I might tell this House that for several years we did reduce the size of our army gradually and tried our best to reduce expenditure. We did not succeed to any large extent to begin with, because the price of every kind of equipment goes up; because also there was certain capital expenditure and because we do not wish to buy things from abroad or build them up here. But in effect we did reduce the army till we arrived at a stage when our defence chiefs told us and strongly advised us against this continuing process. Theirs was the responsibility and so, we had to accept their advice.

The House knows the reasons for this and why this burden of defence has grown on us, and those reasons continue. It is a fact that there has been a great burden and it is a fact also that we are not going to take any risks about the defence of India, whatever the burden. And so, we have been forced by the circumstances to accept this burden within limits and spend fairly large sums upon it.

Now, as regards what Shri Dange said, let me make it perfectly clear that at no time--and I say so not only because Shri Dange has said it but it appears that a number of newspapers abroad have also referred to this matter a great deal--during the past few years or now has there been any offer from the Soviet Union or any request from us for the purchase of aircraft from the Soviet Union. What has happened and what normally happens is that our Defence Ministry keeps in touch with developments in various countries, whether it is America, England or the Soviet Union or France or any other country. We are supposed to keep in touch and we have kept in touch. We have sometimes enquired too about the type of some weapon or equipment or aircraft that is being produced to see how far it may be suitable for our purposes. That has happened. It is true that quite apart from defence, we received some Soviet leaders who came up here two or three years ago and they told us, not in connection with defence, but generally speaking, that they would like to co-operate with us and help us wherever they could. That broad assurance they gave, and the House perhaps knows that some months ago or a year back-I forgetthere was a further promise of credit for our Five-Year Plan, etc., a credit, I believe, of 500 million roubles; that is about Rs. 600 or 700 million. But this too will take effect about two years from now.

This has been happening. There is nothing, obviously, to prevent us from purchasing Soviet aircraft or any other type of machine from the Soviet Union. The difficulty we often have to face is that it is not easy to change over to a new type. Either one changes the whole basis of certain systems we have built up, whether it is army, navy or air system, or we have different types which produce confusion and which require entirely different servicing stations, different training and so on and so forth. This is the principal difficulty that we have had to face in this matter.

<Pg-102>

But, as I have said, it is open to us, when, considering things in a balance, we feel that it is desirable from the point of view of our defence, taking everything into consideration, to purchase, we can certainly purchase, Soviet or any other aircraft from any other country. At present there is no such proposal, and all this rather loud shouting in newspapers abroad has no foundation whatever.

INDIA USA FRANCE

Date: May 30, 1957

Volume No

1995

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

Resolution on Nuclear Test

The Lok Sabha on May 22, 1957 passed a resolution moved by the Defenc Minister, Shri V. K. Krishna Menon, urging immediate suspension of thermo-nuclear test explosions pending an agreement on complete prohibition of thermo-nuclear weapons. A similar resolution, moved by a Private Member, was passed by the Rajya Sabha on 24 May 1957. The following is the text of the resolution passed by the Lok Sabha.

This House views with anxiety and concern the continued development and production of nuclear and thermo-nuclear weapons of mass destruction which, if employed in any armed conflict, would spell the destruction of mankind and civilization.

This House expresses its more immediate and grave concern about the present menace arising from the harmful and unpredictable effects of radiation consequent on the continuing explosions of nuclear and thermo-nuclear weapons for test purposes which are carried out by the United States, the Soviet Union and the United Kingdom.

This House regrets and deplores that despite the declared intentions of all nations not to embark upon war and in the face of the mounting opinion and anxiety in the world in regard to the grave and growing menace of these tests of nuclear and thermo-nuclear weapons, to the present and the future of mankind, the great powers concerned have not abandoned their programmes of such test-explosions. These have already proved injurious to populations in lands both far and near to the location of such tests and dangerously pollute the world's air and water and threaten the present and future generations with known and unknown risks and consequences.

This House further expresses its considered opinion that the proposals at present canvassed for the so-called limitation and registration of these tests will not help to rid the world of the dreadful consequences of radiation to present and future generations, nor pave the way to the abandonment of these weapons of mass destruction. On the other hand, such regularisation would tend to make thermo-nuclear was seem more legitimate and to appear to have the sanction of the world community.

This House earnestly appeals to each and all of the three great powers concerned at least to suspend without further delay their programmes for the explosions for test purposes of nuclear and thermo-nuclear weapons pending agreement on their discontinuance and the abandonment of the production and stock-piling of such weapons.

This House considers that if any or all the powers concerned take the initiative or agree to the suspension of their test-explosions, a substantial contribution would be made to rid the world of the fear which has led to the present armaments race and open the way for the lowering of tensions, progress towards disarmement and international cooperation and peace.

USA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC

Date: May 22, 1957

Volume No

1995

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

Prime Minister's Speech in Lok Sabha

Speaking on the Defence Minister's resolution on nuclear explosions in the Lok Sabha on May 22, 1957, Prime Minister Nehru said:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, on many previous occasions, Hon. Members sitting

opposite have complained about our foreign policy and complained chiefly because they said that we acted as knight errants going out into the far corners of the world and taking upon ourselves the burdens of other countries. Today

<Pg-103>

I was happy to find that what we have done in the past on many occasions was referred to with some degree of appreciation. It took some time perhaps for the facts to sink into the minds of Hon. Members on the opposite side. Some of those who used to criticise us today spoke in appreciation of what we have been doing. At the same time we are called upon to do something which we were warned previously not to do.

Some Hon. Members have sent their amendments and have spoken on this motion. "What is this? Mere sentiments. Stand up and do the right; check others from doing evil; prevent others doing that. Be knight errants; hold the world by your broad shoulder." Now, I do not quite understand these two contradictory approaches to this problem.

Some Members have said that in this long resolution there is no condemnation, not a word of condemnation. Now, that gives me a clue as to what this wonderful action that was demanded was. The action presumably was strong language of condemnation. That in the mind of some Hon. Members has become the biggest action they can indulge instrong language.

This is too serious a matter to be dealt with in this way. It is true that this resolution expresses sentiments, in moderate, temperate language, nevertheless it expresses them powerfully and strongly. And it is no small matter for this Parliament of India to express its sentiments in a formal resolution.

An Hon. Member in an amendment says that this resolution be sent on by post or telegram, or whatever it be, to some other Parliaments, notably to the three great powers which possess these hydrogen and atomic bombs. Now, I submit, Sir, that the passage of this resolution in this House is something much more for the world, not only for our country, but the world, than sending it in an envelope to some other House. I know it has sometimes been the practice of some Parliaments to send resolutions like this to other Parliaments. If I may say so with all respect, Sir, I do not want this House. We pass resolutions and it is for the world to read them and they do read and take notice of them, because we do not pretend, we should not pretend, to do something that is beyond our capacity and power.

Hon. Members have said: You must go and check the cold war; you must do this; you must do that. I was a little surprised with all this, as if this House, or this country--let us be clear about it--has it in its power to go about managing the affairs of the world, to put an end to the cold war, of checking aggression in Egypt or somewhere else or interfering, or condemning or checking what has happened in

Hungary, as if we can do all this. Surely, the first thing for us to realise is how far we car go, and how far we cannot go and not to indulge in talk or in resolutions or in some kind of action which is utterly beyond our capacity. If we have attained some respect in the eyes of other countries of the world, it is because we have spoken with some sense of responsibility, with some sense of, not condemning but, trying to win over the other people, certainly expressing our opinion with firmness; but we have always tried not to condemn. And I want to tell the Hon. Member who accused us of not condemning that this is our deliberate, well thought out policy, not to condemn. Of course, the mere expression of an opinion is condemnation of a contrary opinion; that is another thing. We may express our opinion strongly, whether here or elsewhere in the United Nations. That is a different matter. But the whole point is this, that when you are dealing with a situation like this, cold war, etc., where parties to that cold war indulge in the strongest language against each other, the moment you enter that sphere of strong language and condemnation, you cease to have any real effect. Immediately, whether you wish it or not, you are parties to the cold war this way or that way. And the approach to reason, the calm approach to reason or to the emotions of the other party, is lost. Of course, if I may say so, not that I pretend to act up to it, but it may be said to be, to a small extent, the Gandhian approach. I do not presume to be capable or to be worthy of following Gandhiji in his policy entirely. But anyhow we have all learnt something from him.

But apart from the Gandhian or any approach, may I say this? And when I say Gandhian approach, the Hon. Member talked about satyagraha as if satyagraha was something, shall I say, some action devoid of

<Pg-104>

the motives behind it, devoid of the context of circumstances, devoid of the voice and temper of the persons indulging in it. I say if satyagraha is to be talked about, satyagraha should be understood. Satyagraha is not going to prison or breaking people's heads-certainly not--or indulging in strong language or condemnation. That is not satyagraha. It is entirely opposed to the spirit of satyagraha. Merely abstention from using weapons is neither satyagraha nor peace. Satyagraha ultimately is the approach of the mind, the friendly and peaceful approach, the approach to win over the other party. However, I cannot go into this question now.

But I do submit that in this particular matter if we go about saying things or doing things which we cannot give effect to, we do not do any credit to ourselves or to the cause we seek to serve. Hon.

Members often say, "Hold a conference". Am I to summon the leaders of the U.S.A., the U.S.S.R. and the U.K. and other countries to come to Delhi and tell them what to do? Surely, Mr. Speaker, to this House I should have thought that such a proposition would have appeared rather unreasonable--I use very, very mild language. that is not the way. If someone summoned me like that saying; "I will tell you what to do", he will get a curt answer from me, however big the country

may be. And for me to summon great leaders of great countries-whether I like them or not is another matter--would be presumptuous in the extreme. And nobody would come. Conferences are not held in this way--saying that the Prime Minister thinks it worth while to summon other leaders and Prime Ministers and Heads of States and tell them how they should behave! It is neither diplomacy nor politics. I cannot understand this--"summon a conference, whether anybody comes to it or not, you go on summoning". I suppose Hon. Members opposite have got some idea in their heads of some type of conference which they have got accustomed to attend. But this is a different matter. And even if a conference is held, it will be a different type of conference, and it will be of persons in conflict with each other. It is not asking a few friends to come and having a jamboree about it. Therefore, if we want to be effective, in so far as we can be effective--I do not claim to say that we can be ultimately effective; it is a very difficult thing to presume; one tries to do one's best-how are we to proceed? If we were in a measure effective, say, in the Korean affair or in the Indo-China affair--I think we were in a measure effective in helping to bring about peace-it was not through a conference, it was not through powerful speeches; it was through quiet, long continued hard work, conducted in all modesty, without any shouting, without any publicity. Therefore, we managed to achieve some result. Therefore, we cannot consider this matter which has raised, as the House knows well, strong feelings all over the world, lightly.

I think, as Hon. Members realise, the basis of it is fear. Fear, overwhelming fear of the other party, is some extraordinary thing; these countries which possess hydrogen bombs talk, they are prepared to give it up if the other party gives it up; and nobody gives it up. Proposals are put forward; a chain of test explosions is taking place while the proposal is being considered. I am not criticising or condemning even that, although I dislike it intensely. I am merely venturing to point out how unrealistic all this business is. The reality is the overwhelming fear that the other party might go ahead, that if we hold our hand even for one day or a month, the other party may go ahead, and so do not allow the other party to go ahead.

How to deal with the situation? By command issued from New Delhi? By passing resolutions of condemnation everywhere? I submit that is not the way. We have to proceed as strongly but as cautiously as possible in this matter. This is not the first time that we have taken up this. The mover of this resolution reminded this House how three years ago, I think, in 1954, I ventured to speak on this subject in this House and put forward a proposal in all humility, about the suspension of these tests. At that time, that proposal was rather treated with a certain measure of levity by other countries, by other people that we come into the field and make these proposals not understanding the great issues at stake. Later, this matter was discussed in the Disarmament Sub-Committee of the United Nations. A long statement was made by us about disarmament generally and more particularly about these matters. It is a big statement. That was referred to the Disarmament Commission. We have been pegging away at

this matter--pegging away not merely in the broad sense of talking

<Pg-105>

about peace and goodwill among men--that is good-or at public meetings--it does not help by itself--pegging away as precisely, as scientifically, with practical proposals; not vaguely, not by condemning--that is not good--not merely by talking about peace and goodwill, which are very desirable. That also does not help in solving the problem. We have put forward every time, whether it was Indo-China or elsewhere, practical suggestions and proposals; whether it was Egypt or any other place, we have always tried to avoid condemnation.

The Hon. Member has brought in the case of Hungary. The particular occasion to which he probably refers is when the matter came up before the United Nations. The Secretary-General had been asked to enquire and report. The Secretary-General came and said that he was not ready at that time to report. Thereupon some countries, more particularly our neighbour country, immediately brought up a resolution of condemnation. We said; "You must wait for the report of the Secretary-General and then we can deal with the matter". We said that at that stage when the Secretary-General said he could not report, we should wait for his report. As a matter of fact, if you wish to read what has been said there and in this House, we expressed, our strong disapproval at the things that occurred in Budapest and the rest of Hungary, at the killing and the use of tanks and the suppression of what I called in this House a strong national uprising. But again, in that matter too, we were up against a highly difficult and explosive situation which some of us thought might, in the course of days, perhaps blow up into a world war. It is easy enough to express one's opinion, but when one is confronted with such a situation, one has to think first of all of avoiding this huge bloup and then do anything else. However, that is not the point dealt with here.

My submission to the House is that in this resolution we should confine ourselves to what has been said. In a sense, of course, the resolution itself is disapproval, otherwise we would not ask for it, but if you condemn, you close the eyes of other people, and people immediately begin to think this person or this country is ganging up against us, and we enter, whether we wish it or not, into that thick atmosphere of cold war in the mind of the other, and reason does not count there.

The Hon. Member said something about a no-war declaration by us in regard to Pakistan, in regard to other countries, that we should make it unilaterally. I should like to inform the Hon. Member--he is new to the House, and that is why he does not know--that we have made it unilaterally, not once but many times, and in writing, in this House. We have stated it perfectly clearly that we will not go to war with Pakistan, we will not use our defence forces against Pakistan on any account unless we are attacked, when certainly we will have to defend

ourselves, and we will defend ourselves. I go a step further and say that that is our general policy, and it is on that we try to base our defence forces.

MEMBER: When I raised the question of a no-war declaration, I also meant that it carries with it the responsibility to condemn aggression elsewhere also. Mere passing of a no-war declaration without the duty of condemning aggression elsewhere would be totally negative, that is what I would say.

THE PRIME MINISTER: I do not understand the connection between the two. Whether condemnation is desirable or not may be considered on merits, but I venture to say that especially in the murky atmosphere of today, this kind of condemnation of other countries does not convince them of their wrong-doing. In fact, I may say we deal with Pakistan and we have disapproved a great many things that Pakistan has done, but so far as I am concerned, I have tried to restrain myself as much as I can in regard to condemnation etc., of Pakistan's activities.

There are just one or two other matters. I wish to make one thing clear with regard to the criticism which is made in these amendments: "What is this? This is only a pious sentiment. What are you going to do about it?" Well, what is suggested to be done, if I may say so, may also be termed a pious sentiment. What more is it? Shouting loudly does not help. It may be an impious sentiment, if you like. Ours is a pious sentiment; it may become an impious sentiment, but sentiment all the same. It is said that we should call a conference together; well, it may be some kind of action, but, as I have pointed out that conferences are not called

<Pg-106>

in this way, and if they are called, they are not likely to have any response. It is not done in this way.

Therefore, I do submit that we should pass this resolution as it is without bringing in other factors. For instance, I believe, in some amendments, something is said about the Commonwealth; it is said that we should break our contact with the Commonwealth. As to whether it is desirable or not--I do not think it is desirable for a variety of reasons--I have stated it in the House. It does not come in my way, or in the way of my policy or any policy; it helps me to further our policies in various ways. But whether it is desirable or not, it is certainly absolutely undesirable to tack it up with this thing. Immediately, you bring in other issues. You bring in another mentality here and elsewhere. And your appeal is lost, because this new mentality is created. So, I submit that all these other amendments, those attempts to tack on things, really take away from this resolution the dignity of this resolution which goes from this House to the world and undoubtedly to those great powers which are most concerned, as well as other powers.

Date: May 22, 1957

Volume No

1995

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

Prime Minister's Speech in Rajya Sabha

Speaking on the Private Member's resolution on nuclear explosions in the Rajya Sabha on May 24, 1957, Prime Minister Nehru said:

Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, much can be said on the subject of this resolution and much, indeed, has been said. And yet it seems to me that, in effect, very little is necessary in the sense that there is a very large measure of agreement about most things. We may repeat them--whether in this House or outside--and the real element of disagreement is becoming progressively more and more limited, although it is there.

The first thing I would like to say, Sir, is to endorse wholeheartedly what the Hon. Member, Dr. Kunzru, said that we do not come forward here in this resolution or at any other time, as presuming to tell others that we are better than they. There is no question of that. It is perfectly true that each country, naturally, has its policy influenced by a variety of factors, pressures, fears, apprehensions and not merely by some kind of ivory tower attitude. Each country, no doubt, has certain basic approaches to a question. If I may say in regard to India, and it is not from any idea of superiority over any body--because I do not believe we are superior-quite honestly we may have some virtues that others do not have. At the same time, we may have many faults which others do not have. It is mixture of virtue and fault. But I would say this that we have been conditioned to some extent through past periods in thinking in one way. More especially in the last 30 years or more, we have been conditioned in thinking a little more in terms of peaceful action than other countries have been. That does not mean that we are better than others. Thirdly, and that also is very important, situated as we are, relatively speaking, we can view these matters with greater dispassion than other countries who have greater fears to face. So, I agree with the Hon. Member opposite, when he said that it is not from any special virtue that we put this forward, but merely because of circumstances and ways of thinking and our present position in the world, that we can perhaps not get so excited over these matters as others might.

Everyone agrees about these atomic and hydrogen bombs, their danger, etc. Everyone agrees, I think, that they should be eliminated, stopped. Now, I do not for a moment say that by passing a resolution, or, indeed, even, if I may say so, by the United Nations unanimously agreeing to it or by the powers concerned agreeing to it all danger is past. I do not say that. After all danger is inherent in the situation and the danger grows because today three powers are supposed to have these hydrogen bombs. The general trend of progress, if it can be called progress, in this matter is for these bombs to become cheaper and cheaper, more easily made. It may be that in a few vears' time it will be relatively easy to make it. Any industrialised country may be able to make it. In other words, there is this danger of more and more countries being able to make these hydrogen bombs and the bombs being cheaper too, and at the same time, much more dangerous, the effectiveness grows. If this becomes wide-spread, it will be much more difficult to

<Pg-107>

control than perhaps it is today. In fact quite a new situation will arise then, which might threaten humanity, because it might even be that a group of misguided persons might try to terrorise the world. It is a possibility. Therefore, it is desirable to come to grips with this subject before it spreads too much. It is bad enough today that there are dangers but they may grow. That is one reason for urgent action.

The other approach, which is hardly a political approach, is that the general understanding of humanity should condemn this so much morally and otherwise, that practically no one would dare use it. I submit that when we say that this should be suspended and this should be ultimately banned and if the other countries agree to it and this is done, I do not mean that that puts an end to all dangers, but it stops this progressive rot in this matter that is going on, and it spreads a certain feeling all over the world which will at least check these weapons being produced or misused. There can be no absolute guarantee but we shall move in a right direction. Anyhow we have already gone far enough in the wrong direction and therefore it was time that this was done.

What this resolution says is--I forget the wording of it--suspension. May I say straightaway that I would support the amendment moved by my colleague, Shri Krishna Menon, to this resolution which said about suspension? Now, the mere fact of suspension with a view to future abandonment itself will create this atmosphere in the world. It will not put an end to the fears and apprehensions of the world, but it will set people thinking in a different direction. Fortunately there is a little more hope today than there was in the past about some step forward towards disarmament--not a very big step, some step, I would welcome any step, however small the step. That creates the atmosphere for the next step. This would be a very definite step, an agreement to suspend these explosions with a view to banning them

later. Now, some proposals have been made--I do not know whether they have been discussed in this House--about limiting them, that is the explosions I mean, about registering them, about informing the United Nations that "we are going to have a test explosion on such and such a day". On the face of it they appear to me at least a move in some kind of right direction, that is, restriction, limitation, information and all that. But we feel that it is not a right direction, it is not a practical direction. First of all, if the United Nations and the other powers all agree to this, what does it mean? It means that you make legitimate what is being done. You give a certain authority of the world community to its being done, although in a limited way, which is a bad thing, and the world may become complacent and say, "Oh yes, they are limiting it", while the danger continues. Secondly, of course, however limited these explosions may be, there is a strong body of scientific opinion that even the limited explosions are dangerous for the world. Thirdly, the most important fact is this: Why do people say you have a limit? They say, the argument is raised, that in the case of suspension or total abandonment nobody is quite sure that secretly this might not be done, that scientists have not yet found out effective means of checking it, that is, there is no effective control of it. That argument may or may not be true because some scientists say this can be done. Anyhow it cannot be done now, they have to investigate it. My point is that that argument applies completely to the limited thing also. If you cannot control the unlimited thing because you do not know it, you will also not be able to control the limited thing. You limit it and other things may happen. In fact it is far easier to say "suspend it", and by saying suspension, although it is a big thing, it is a relatively easy thing. What I mean is you are not finally deciding, you give time for considering, how to abandon it. You suspend it now and you have leisure and time. If you say limit it, then the immediate compulsion of the moment is gone. The thing goes on, and you are exactly in the same place in so far as knowledge goes, in so far as control goes, because a country or a group that wants to misbehave, may take the risk of misbehaviour either way, whether you ban it, suspend it or limit it. So that argument does not help at all. I would say that kind of thing which might appear to some people as a half-way house is no halfway house at all. It is really giving, as I said, certain legitimacy to these test explosions continuing. These are the two points which I particularly wish to submit to this House.

One other thing. In the original resolution there was talk of India taking a step towards summoning a world conference or

<Pg-108>

conference of leading nations. An amendment to it is "of neutral countries". Of course I think the way the word "neutral" is used is not very accurate or correct or desirable. We have got into the habit of using words at the wrong time in the wrong way. The word "neutral" is used in war time in regard to countries that are not at war. One might as well say now that if you call some countries neutral today,

the other countries by that analogy should be called belligerent, which they would object to, and rightly because they are not belligerent. So, this phraseology is a wrong phraseology. One may say that some countries are unaligned, are not lined up with various blocs, that is a more correct description. Anyhow I submit that this idea of our calling a conference is not feasible and is not desirable. I do not know, some time or other a conference may be called, and some countries may call it. If it is considered necessary, we can associate ourselves with it.

But our calling a conference and summoning the great powers to it smacks too much of presumption which, instead of soothing anybody. irritates everybody. And just the very point that Dr. Kunzru raised comes here. Here, we are presuming to be better than others and calling them to book and we call a conference. Well, calling a conference does not mean that the conference takes place. It is for others to agree to it. We are put in a false position and others are put in a false position. When the time comes, we may do so, but in all such matters, I submit, it is not the conference that produces any result. People may read about great speeches made at the conference. Conferences only take place for two reasons. One is, if I may say so, a propagate certain ideas in loud voice as opposed to somebody else who has different ideas. Or they take place to register some agreements, privately or like that. When the basic agreement has been arrived at by the countries concerned, a conference is held to hammer out the details and give a shape to it. That is the right time for it. These things have taken place previously. Let us take the conference which was held on the Indo-China agreement to stop the war in Indo-China. There was a great conference in Geneva. Everyone knows that the conference by itself did little, except listening to speeches. It was something done outside the scope of the conference, before the conference and even during that conference lasting many weeks which was behind it and it produced the results which were registered at the conference. So, I submit that, to call for a conference being held--and India to call it--would not be feasible or desirable, and would not really help this cause, as it would produce a feeling of irritation in other countries in regard to India and reduce our capacity really to work for the cause we have at heart. I would, therefore, submit, Sir, that the right resolution for this House to adopt is the amended one which Shri Krishna Menon proposed.

USA INDIA CHINA SWITZERLAND

Date: May 24, 1957

Volume No

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

Stoppage of Nuclear Tests

Prime Minister Nehru replied in the affirmative in the Rajya Sabha on May 28, 1957 to a question whether it was a fact that the Working Committee of the League of Red Cross Societies, which held its meeting at Geneva on 18 April 1957, adopted an Indian resolution in which the talks which were going on between the big powers to stop atomic bomb tests were welcomed.

The text of the resolution, the Prime Minister added, was as follows:

Whereas it is important from the point of view of saving humanity from the fear and dangers of war, the Executive Committee of the League of Red Cross Societies welcomes the fact that the powers concerned are meeting to discuss the problems of disarmament and the cessation of experiments with atomic and other weapons. The Red Cross Societies here represented would like to reiterate the Oslo Resolution and hope sincerely that the efforts of the powers concerned will meet with the success they deserve and for which the peoples of the world long.

Asked as to how many countries supported the resolution, the Prime Minister said:

The resolution was supported by the representatives of all the 18 National Red Cross Societies who attended the meeting. The

<Pg-109>

committee is composed of representatives from Australia, Belgium, Brazil, Canada, China (People's Republic), France, Great Britain, Greece, India, Iran, Mexico, Norway, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Turkey, the U.S.A., the U.S.S.R. and Yugoslavia.

INDIA SWITZERLAND USA NORWAY AUSTRALIA BELGIUM BRAZIL CANADA CHINA FRANCE GREECE IRAN MEXICO SPAIN SWEDEN TURKEY YUGOSLAVIA

Date: May 28, 1957

volume no	

1995

IRAN

The Instruments of Ratification of the Indo-Iranian Treaty of Commerce and Navigation of 1954 were exchanged in New Delhi on May 10, 1957. The Secretary-General of the Ministry of External Affairs, Shri N.R. Pillai, exchanged the Instruments on behalf of the Government of India with Dr. A.A. Hekmat, Ambassador of Iran in India, who did so on behalf of his Government.

A Treaty of Commerce and Navigation between the Governments of India and Iran was signed at Teheran in December, 1954. In accordance with Article XV of the treaty, it has come into force from 10 May 1957.

The treaty regulates on a reciprocal basis the rights and obligations of nationals of either country in the territory of the other, in such matters as carrying on of lawful avocations, the acquisition and disposal of property, laws of taxation, succession, commercial enterprises and facilities regarding shipping and remittances to home countries.

IRAN INDIA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC

Date: May 10, 1957

Volume No

1995

JAPAN

Nehru-Kishi Joint Statement

At the invitation of the Govenment of India, Mr. Nobusuke Kishi, Prime Minister of Japan, visited India between 23 and May 25, 1957. In New Delhi, Mr. Kishi held talks with Prime Minister Nehru and other members of the Indian Government. The two Prime Ministers issued a joint communique in New Delhi on 25 May 1957. The following is the text of the communique:

The Prime Minister of Japan, Mr. Nobusuke Kishi, visited New Delhi from 23 May to 25 May. He called on the President and the Vice-President and had discussions with the Prime Minister of India. He also had discussions with the Ministers of Finance and Commerce and Industry.

The discussions between the two Prime Ministers took place in a cordial and friendly atmosphere. They covered a wide range of international issues and questions of special interest to India and Japan. The Prime Ministers feel satisfied that their talks have resulted in a better appreciation of each other's views and further

strengthened the close and friendly relations which exist between their two countries. The discussions also showed that the two countries shared a common faith in the democratic way of life.

The Prime Minister of India once more expressed the gratification of the Government of India at Japan's entry into the United Nations. He had no doubt that Japan's membership has added to the effectiveness of the United Nations and its constituent organs.

The two Prime Ministers were convinced that, given goodwill and sincerity, there were no international disputes which could not be settled in a peaceful manner in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations and the ten principles of the Bandung Resolution. They reaffirmed the dedication of their two countries to the cause of peace both in the interest of the two countries and in that of the world.

The Prime Ministers gave their anxious and particular consideration to one of the gravest and most urgent of problems which face the world today. This is the threat to the whole future of mankind posed by the

<Pg-110>

application of nuclear and thermo-nuclear power to the production of weapons of mass destruction. While they agreed that, in the event of the use of such weapons in war, humanity would in all probability face the risk of total extinction, they were immediately concerned about the harmful and unpredictable effects on mankind of the radiation caused by the continuing explosions of nuclear and thermonuclear weapons for test purposes by some countries of the world today.

The Prime Ministers make an earnest and urgent appeal for the immediate suspension of these nuclear and thermo-nuclear test explosions. They express the hope that the big powers concerned will reach an agreement on the eventual abandonment of these tests and the prohibition of all kinds of nuclear and thermo-nuclear weapons.

The Prime Minister of Japan expressed satisfaction at the successful completion of India's First Five-Year Plan and evinced keen interest in the Second Five-Year Plan. He promised the full co-operation of his country in the implementation of this Plan. The two Prime Ministers had a general discussion on economic collaboration and development of trade between their two countries.

In view of the long and close cultural relationship between their two countries, the two Prime Ministers were happy that the Instruments of Ratification of the Cultural Agreement between Japan and India which was signed in Tokyo in October last year were exchanged in Delhi during the present visit of the Prime Minister of Japan.

The Prime Minister of Japan extended an invitation to the Prime

Minister of India to visit Japan. This invitation was accepted by the Prime Minister of India with great pleasure.

JAPAN INDIA UNITED KINGDOM USA INDONESIA

Date: May 25, 1957

Volume No

1995

JAPAN

Ratification of Cultural Agreement

The Instruments of Ratification of the Cultural Agreement between India and Japan, which was signed at Tokyo on Oct 29, 1956, were exchanged in New Delhi on 24 May 1957 between Shri K. G. Saiyidain, Secretary, Department of Education, Ministry of Education and Scientific Research, as representative on behalf of the Government of India, and His Excellency Mr. Seijiro Yoshizawa, Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of Japan in India, as representative on behalf of the Government of Japan. In accordance with Article VIII of the agreement, it came into force from 24 May.

The agreement, which consists of eight Articles, aims at promoting closer cultural relations and understanding between the two countries. It provides for the encouragement of cultural exchanges like those of professors, scholars, students and members of scientific and cultural institutions.

Each country will accord every possible facility for the training of employees and any other persons deputed by the other country's Government in the scientific, technical and industrial institutions in its own country.

The agreement will remain in force for a period of 10 years and is expected to strengthen the existing friendly relations and cultural ties between the two countries.

JAPAN INDIA USA

Date: Oct 29, 1956

Volume No

1995

NORTH VIET NAM

Trade Contract

Following discussions between the Trade Delegation from the Democratic Republic of Viet Nam and the State Trading Corporation of India (Private) Limited, a contract was signed in New Delhi on May 01, 1957 between Shri K. B. Lall Chairman of the State Trading Corporation, and the leader of the Viet Nam delegation, Mr. Ngo Thanh Giang.

Under the contract, the Corporation has agreed, with a view to developing trade

<Pg-111>

between the two countries, to purchase 7,000 metric tons of rice from the 1956-57 crop.

The rice will be shipped at the end of May, 1957. The Viet Nam Trade Delegation has agreed to use the sale proceeds of this contract for the purchase of Indian goods. These goods include jute manufactures, raw hemp, textile piece-goods, machines, engineering goods and hides and skins.

USA INDIA RUSSIA

Date: May 01, 1957

Volume No

1995

PAKISTAN

Agreement on Educational Certificates

A Press Note issued in New Delhi on May 09, 1957 said that the Governments of India and Pakistan have agreed to implement, with immediate effect, the decisions of the Indo-Pakistan Agreement of May, 1955, in regard to the issue of original duplicate copies of certificates/diplomas/degrees by the universities and other authorities to persons who lost their original certificates etc. during or after partition, or who did not receive them earlier.

Both the Governments have agreed that no fresh fees shall be charged for issue of duplicate certificates for which applications with fees had already been submitted by the persons concerned which had not been disposed of by the issuing authority, and the fees lapsed after the period stipulated under rules of the issuing authority.

No fees shall also be charged for a period of one year (July, 1957 to June, 1958) in the first instance for the supply of information and verification regarding educational qualifications, dates of birth and other educational particulars to Public Service Commissions, Government departments or universities and other institutions, on official request made by these authorities.

It has been agreed that the supply of certificates and duplicates will be the direct responsibility of the two Ministries of Education who will obtain them through the Education Ministry of the country from where the certificates are required.

It is the earnest desire of the Governments of India and Pakistan that the implementation of this agreement should start immediately and that utmost efforts should be made by the issuing authorities to avoid delay in the issue of certificates.

PAKISTAN INDIA

Date: May 09, 1957

Volume No

1995

PAKISTAN

Arrest of Indian Diplomats at Lahore

Asked in the Lok Sabha on May 14, 1957 whether the Press Trust of India report from Karachi appearing in the "Hindustan Times" dated 10 May 1957, to the effect that two senior officials attached to the Indian Deputy High Commission at Lahore were insulted, handcuffed and kept in police custody is correct, Prime Minister Nehru said: The Press report is in the main correct. The Prime Minister added:

The facts, as ascertained by us, are as follows: On the night of 7 May, five Indian nationals were arrested at 11 p.m. in Lahore by the local police on a baseless charge of creating nuisance in a public place. They were abused, handcuffed and manhandled, kept under police custody for a period of about six hours and subjected to needless medical examination on a baseless charge of being under the influence of alcohol. Of the five innocent victims, three were Indian Railway

officials undergoing training at the United Nations Training Centre at Walton; the other two were diplomatic officers serving as Attaches in the Deputy High Commission for India.

Two other officers of the Deputy High Commission who came to know of the incident contacted them in the Mavo Hospital at 3 a.m. on the morning of 8 May. They informed the Sub-Inspector that two of the persons arrested had diplomatic status. The Sub-Inspector professed ignorance about their status and identity and gave an assurance that after consulting his superior he would immediately release them from

<Pg-112>

custody. The Sub-Inspector, however, did not release these officers till ten minutes past five on the morning of 8 May, and even then the car and the personal belongings attached from them were retained by the police.

Our High Commissioner in Karachi saw the Pakistan Foreign Minister on the evening of 9 May, and, lodged a strong protest, both orally and in writing, asking, amongst other things, for exmplary punishment of the police officers involved. The Pakistan Foreign Minister replied that he would immediately look into the matter and get into touch with the West Pakistan Government. Our Deputy High Commissioner at Lahore also lodged a strong protest orally and in writing to the Governor of West Pakistan on the afternoon of 10 May. The Governor expressed regret at the incident and the embarrassment it had caused and promised a high level enquiry and severe punishment of the guilty persons in the complaint made is established. The Commonwealth Secretary also brought the full details of the incident to the notice of the Pakistan High Commission on 11th morning and lodged an emphatic protest against the barbaric behaviour of the police and asked for severe punishment of the offenders.

PAKISTAN INDIA USA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC

Date: May 14, 1957

Volume No

1995

PAKISTAN

Migration of Hindus

In reply to a question about the number of Hindus who migrated from Pakistan after the Dacca Conference where Pakistan's representatives had reiterated their determination to safeguard the rights of minorities fully and effectively, Shrimati Lakshmi N. Menon, Deputy Minister for External Affairs, said in the Rajya Sabha on May 28, 1957 that 162,202 Hindus migrated to India from East Pakistan since 16 May 1956 till 30 April 1957.

PAKISTAN USA INDIA

Date: May 28, 1957

Volume No

1995

SOUTH AFRICA

Eviction of Indians

Shrimati Lakshmi N. Menon, Deputy Minister for External Affairs, tol the Rajya Sabha during question-time on May 15, 1957 that, according to an estimate, ultimately more than 22,000 Indians owning property in Johannesburg worth about \$10,000,000 will be uprooted under the Group Areas Act. The Deputy Minister added:

The Group Areas Act, 1950, has been proclaimed in Johannesburg only. In terms of this proclamation, gazetted in August 1956, more than 9,000 Indian have been served with notices to vacate western areas of Johannesburg within two years. Some have been directed to vacate within one year; others within two years. Out of 9,000 Indians, 750 are traders.

Evicted Indians in Johannesburg will have to move to Lenasia, 22 miles from Johannesburg. The Government of India are not aware of the arrangements, if any, made by the South African Government to facilitate their move.

SOUTH AFRICA INDIA USA

Date: May 15, 1957

Volume No

1995

TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE

Exploration of Mineral Oil

Shri K. D. Malaviya, Union Minister for Mines and Oil, in a statemen in the Lok Sabha on May 16, 1957 gave the names of the countries that have promised assistance to the Government of India for the exploration of mineral oil. The Minister also indicated the nature of the assistance promised and the manner in which it would be received. The following is the text of the statement:

Assistance for the exploration of mineral oil has been received from several countries.

<Pg-113>

Brief particulars of the assistance received or promised are given below:

CANADA: An aeromagnetic survey of the Jaisalmer area and the Gangetic plains was carried out by a Canadian firm under the Colombo Plan.

FRANCE: The French Institute if Petroleum provided an expert for the Refinery Location Committee. They also sent an expert to study the organisation and working of the oil prospecting in the public sector. The French Government have further offered some scholarships for training of our geologists etc.

RUMANIA: A Rumanian deep drilling rig has been obtained on payment. The suppliers have also provided the services of technical personnel for its erection and operation as well as training of Indian personnel, on payment.

U.K.: The U.K. Government have offered to make available the services of an oil expert under the Colombo Plan.

U.S.S.R.: Eight officers of the Oil and Natural Gas Commission have been sent to the U.S.S.R. for training in oil well drilling under U.N.T.A.A. Programme. Another eight officers will be sent to the U.S.S.R. in 1957 for training under the same programme. The services of some specialists and experts were obtained on payment. Three deep drilling rigs and some other equipment for oil exploration has been ordered on payment basis. The suppliers will provide the services of technical personnel on payment, along with the drills.

U.S.A.: The services of an oil expert were obtained under the T.C.M. Programme.

WEST GERMANY: The services of an expert were made available for carrying out an assessment of the oil potentialities of various areas in India. Three more oil experts visited India recently to advise the Oil and Natural Gas Commission, on payment of travelling expenses in India.

INDIA CANADA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC SRI LANKA FRANCE UNITED KINGDOM USA GERMANY

Date: May 16, 1957

Volume No

1995

UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS

Supply of Oil Drilling Equipment

A Press Note issued in New Delhi on May 03, 1957 announced that an agreement for the purchase of some accessory oil drilling equipment has been signed between the Governments of India and the U.S.S.R.

Under the agreement, equipment worth Rs. 3.724 million will be supplied by the Russian Government within six months. A part of the equipment, however, is likely to arrive in India sooner.

The agreement was signed by Shri A. C. Bose, Member (Finance), Oil and Natural Gas Commission, on behalf of the Government of India and by Mr. Segeev, Commercial Counsellor, U.S.S.R. Embassy, on behalf of the Government of his country.

India has already obtained equipment for oil drilling operations along with services of drilling engineers, geophysists, oil advisers, laboratory specialists and geologists.

INDIA USA RUSSIA

Date: May 03, 1957

Volume No

1995

UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS

Supplementary Agreement

A supplementary agreement for the supply of turbo drilling equipment from the U.S.S.R. was signed at New Delhi on May 11, 1957.

The agreement modified an earlier agreement executed in May, 1956,

for the supply of conventional rotary type drills along with geophysical and seismic equipment at a cost of Rs. 13.4 million.

Under the present agreement, the U.S.S.R. will supply drilling rigs designed for forced turbine and rotary drilling of oil

<Pg-114>

and gas prospecting up to a depth of nearly 16,000 feet.

The modification involves an additional expenditure of Rs. 2 million and covers the supply of cementing and additional workshop units also.

Shri A. C. Bose, Member (Finance), Oil and Natural Gas Commission, signed the agreement on behalf of the Government of India, which was signed by Messrs. E. Olienik and V. G. Sizonenko on behalf of the Machinoexport, a foreign trade organisation of the U.S.S.R.

<Pg-115>

INDIA USA

Date: May 11, 1957

June

Volume No 1995 CONTENTS

Foreign Affairs Record

VOL. III No. 6

1957 June

CONTENTS

AFGHANISTAN Trade Arrangements 117
BULGARIA Trade Agreement Extended 117
CZECHOSLOVAKIA Trade Agreement Extended 118
FINLAND Technical Assistance Agreement 118
INDIA AND THE UNITED NATIONS Speech on Trust Terriotory of Marshall Islands 119
INTERNATIONAL TRADE India's Exports 129 India's Imports
SWEDEN Trade Arrangement Revised 132
SYRIA Prime Minister's Speech at Damascus 133
TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE Agreement with U.S. Extended 135 Aid for Thermal Power Plant 135
YUGOSLAVIA Trade Agreement Extended 136
MINISTRY OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS: EXTERNAL PUBLICITY DIVISION GOVERNMENT OF INDIA

AFGHANISTAN BULGARIA NORWAY SLOVAKIA FINLAND INDIA MARSHALL ISLANDS USA SWEDEN SYRIA YUGOSLAVIA

Date: Jun 01, 1957

Volume No

1995

<Pg-i>

AFGHANISTAN

Trade Arrangements

India and Afghanistan exchanged letters on Jun 14, 1957 setting out arrangements for the development of trade between the two countries. A Press Note issued in New Delhi on 14 June said:

The negotiations between representatives of the Government of India and the Trade Delegation from Afghanistan concluded in New Delhi on 14 June 1957. Letters were exchanged between Shri K. B. Lall, Joint Secretary, Ministry of Commerce and Industry, and the leader of the Afghan Delegation, Mr. Mohammad Rasul Khan Younossi, setting out the arrangements agreed upon between the two countries for the development of Indo-Afghan trade.

The discussions have been conducted in a spirit of friendship and mutual co-operation and have been animated by the desire to resolve the difficulties with which the two countries are currently faced.

Under the arrangements which have been agreed upon, the two Governments have reaffirmed their desire to promote the trade between their respective countries on the basis of mutual advantage and in a manner so as to achieve a balance in their trade.

Further, transit facilities have been provided for Indo-Afghan trade in terms of Article XV of the Treaty of Friendship and Commerce concluded between the two countries in 1952. It has been agreed that subject to a ceiling of Rs. 33.5 million for the first year, facilities will be afforded to the registered traders in Afghanistan and approved parties in India, who have participated in Indo-Afghan trade during the four years ending 30 June 1956, to supply fruits, both dry and fresh, and asafoetida to India. These supplies will be paid for in Indian rupees.

The Government of Afghanistan will on their part afford facilities for the import from India of goods such as: Cotton textiles; green and black tea; bidi and tobacco manufactures; spices; jute manufactures; art silk piece goods and woollen manufactures; leather and leather goods, including footwear; films; machinery and building materials; chemicals; rubber goods; bicycles and motor cycles; paper and stationery; aluminium goods; iron and steel products; and sugar.

The two Governments will consult each other periodically to review arrangements with a view to improving upon them to their mutual advantage.

AFGHANISTAN INDIA USA RUSSIA

Date: Jun 14, 1957

Volume No

BULGARIA

Trade Agreement Extended

The Trade Agreement between India and Bulgaria has been extended. Announcing this, a Press Note issued in New Delhi on Jun 20, 1957 said:

Letters were exchanged in New Delhi on 20 June 1957 between Shri K. B. Lall, Joint Secretary, Ministry of Commerce and Industry, and H.E. Mr. Ivan Petrov Daskalov, Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary of the People's Republic of Bulgaria in India, extending up to 31 December 1957, the Schedules of the Indo-Bulgarian Trade Agreement, signed on 18 April 1956, with certain modifications.

The volume of trade between India and Bulgaria, though not very large, has been steadily growing since the Trade Agreement between the two countries was signed. The balance of trade is unfavourable to India. The imports from Bulgaria rose from Rs. 81,000 in 1954-55 to Rs. 350,000 in 1955-56 and to Rs. 2,224,000 in 1956 (April to December).

Exports from India to Bulgaria have also gone up, but the increase has been comparatively smaller. The corresponding figures for exports stood at Rs. 79,000; Rs. 205,000 and Rs. 477,000 in the three years.

<Pg-117>

The principal items of import from Bulgaria to India have been metals and ores, chemicals and electrical goods. India, on the other hand, has been exporting to Bulgaria mostly spices and shellac.

A review of the trade between the two countries has revealed the possibility of exporting to Bulgaria certain new items which have been included in Schedule B, which names the items Tobacco manufactures; cigars and cigarettes; cashew-nuts, cashew kernels and cashew shell oil; tapioca and its products; manila and sisal ropes; silk and rayon textiles and manufactures; flax manufactures, cordage and ropes; linoleum; plastic goods; paints and lacquers; hardware; and myrobalan extracts.

Similarly certain new items have been included in Schedule A, which lists the items of exports from Bulgaria to India. These are: Ferrous metals and products thereof, alloy ribbons and complete plants.

BULGARIA INDIA USA RUSSIA PHILIPPINES

Date: Jun 20, 1957

Volume No

1995

CZECHOSLOVAKIA

Trade Agreement Extended

A Press Note was issued in New Delhi on Jun 03, 1957 announcing the exchange of letters in New Delhi on 3 June between Shri K. B. Lall, Joint Secretary, Ministry of Commerce and Industry, and H.E. Mr. Jiri Nosek, Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of Czechoslovakia in India, extending the Trade Agreement concluded between the two countries on 17 November 1953, up to 30 September 1957, pending negotiations for modification of the agreement. The Press Note added:

The trade between the two countries has been on the increase since the signing of the agreement. Exports during the period, April to December, 1956, from India to Czechoslovakia were valued at Rs. 20.9 million as compared to Rs. 13.3 million during the whole of 1955-56. Imports from Czechoslovakia during April-December, 1956, amounted to Rs. 51.7 million against Rs. 28.9 million during 1955-56.

The main items of Indian exports to Czechoslovakia are iron ore, mica and skins. The main items of import from that country are chemicals, machinery and mill work, iron and steel and paper.

NORWAY SLOVAKIA INDIA USA

Date: Jun 03, 1957

Volume No

1995

FINLAND

Technical Assistance Agreement

A Technical Assistance Agreement between India and Finland was signe in New Delhi on Jun 14, 1957.

Under the agreement, two Finnish experts will be sent to India to survey the area of the Beas in the Punjab, and, if possible, the

conifer forests of the surrounding regions. They will study the possibilities of setting up forest industries there and the supply of raw material.

Further, the Government of Finland will place at the disposal of the Government of India four fellowships, each of the value of 400,000 marks, for Indians to study forestry in Finland for a period of one year.

The agreement was signed by Shri H. M. Patel, Principal Secretary, Ministry of Finance, Government of India, and H.E. Mr. Aaro Pakaslahti, Finnish Envoy to India.

<Pg-118>

FINLAND INDIA USA

Date: Jun 14, 1957

Volume No

1995

INDIA AND THE UNITED NATIONS

Speech on Trust Territory of Marshall Islands

Shri V. K. Krishna Menon, Union Minister for Defence, addressed the U.N. Trusteeship Council at New York on Jun 05, 1957 on the conditions in the Trust Territory of Marshall Islands. The Council was considering the annual report on the administration of the Trust Territory. Shri Krishna Menon said:

We are now considering the Administering Authority's report and the probems of what are popularly called the Marshall Islands, the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands under the United States administration.

I think the first reaction of anyone with any sense of responsibility who looks at this Territory is the immense task of the Administering Authority. The area is not extensive in land but is spread over some three million square miles of sea and consists of 2,000 islands. There is only 697 square miles of land, half of which is available for general occupation. Whatever may be the form of government, the administration must be one of considerable difficulty and, while we do not subscribe to the view that there are any difficulties arising from the racial composition of that population in bringing it up to modern standards, there are, no doubt, difficulties of an economic and social character and in the nature of mechanics which make the

administration extremely difficult. Therefore the achievements in this place in so far as the dividends of administration are concerned--which are substantial--are a great credit to the administration.

But when all that is said and done, the whole of this is still a paternal administration. The population of this area increases and it does sound somewhat of a contradiction in terms to say that here are territories spread over three million square miles and over 2,000 islands and yet 65,000 people are too many. Of course, whether people are too many or too few depends upon what there is with which to feed them. We are concerned to see, as a land-hungry people, that there is still 60,000 acres of uncultivated land and I join with my colleague from Syria in saying that, as agricultural peoples, we find it difficult to understand why this land should remain uncultivated, especially when it has at hand the enormous technique and resources of the United States of America.

But the developments that have already taken place are considerable and we have to note that the food shortages and famine which characterized this Territory in the previous mandatory regime have disappeared. There is little or no industrial development, which is perhaps as well in view of the comparatively unprotected nature of populations of this character in the present context of the world. Perhaps if they had considerable industrial development, their islands would become more a target of international rivalry than otherwise. This is no argument for keeping territories in a rudimentary state of civilization, but the 60,000 acres of productive but uncultivated land must cause concern to the administration as it does to us. We are all in a sense, by proxy, part of the administration as members of the Trusteeship Council.

The United States provides a considerable part of the money for the territorial expenditure in this Territory and one must note that out of 6.5 million dollars of expenditure, 5 million dollars were contributed by the United States Treasury. On the other hand, it has also to be remembered that from all the reports that we read, from the nature of this administration and the interests of the United States Navy in this area, 5 million dollars is not a very great strain upon a very wealthy country; in fact, very much more than that is given as aids and unrequited gifts to other countries, including my own, and there is therefore nothing unusual in this matter; and I do not agree with the observations that are usually made that it is not in the interests of these people to have a greater amount of subsidy put into the administration of this Territory.

So far as its economic conditions are concerned, compared to what they were in the pre-Trusteeship period, they certainly show

<Pg-119>

a great deal of improvement and there is no doubt that the attempt of the administration to advance economic conditions is to be seen in the co-operative administration where profits are kept in trust almost for the population and there is also the development of various other economic factors in the Territory.

Reference has been made to education. Here it will be noticed that there is a vast amount of literacy, far greater than in my country, for example. Among the young, it amounts to 88 per cent in the local languages, 52 per cent in English and 20 per cent in Japanese. Girls are also enrolled in schools.

Looking at the tabular statement with regard to the progress of education, we find that during the last five or six years the number of schools remained stationary, but the number of teachers and pupils has risen. This, we submit, is a development in the right direction. But there is a disparity between the large volume of elementary education and the shrinkage when it comes to higher education. No one suggests that in these far-off islands with a population of 65,000 it is possible to make the educational system self-sufficient. The problem of over-coming the difficulty which we all experience in our countries of what may be called the lapse into illiteracy when children leave school, I hope, will receive the attention of the Administering Authority and the advisory assistance, if need be, of UNESCO and other organisations interested in this matter. It is only if there is a greater volume of higher education that there is any possibility of this Territory moving towards whatever form it might be of independence or self-government. That is not to suggest that it is not possible to apply to this Territory the same kind of polity which we hope will emerge in Tanganyika in a few years. If it were not possible to take these people to self-government or independence, then I think placing them under Trusteeship would be ultra vires of the Charter because the object of Trusteeship is to prepare people for self-government or independence.

It is not my intention this afternoon to go a great deal into the various aspects of administration on the economic and social side. In general, we have nothing but praise for the Administering Authority in this respect. But it will be to the greater credit of the Administering Authority, to the greater fulfilment of the purposes of the Charter and, what is more, to the greater encouragement of other areas--it is not for me to specify where--if in these islands with all these difficulties there was a movement towards greater selfsufficiency both in the economic and in the political sense. No one argues that it is possible to leave these areas without any protection either from collective or single authorities from outside in view of the international situation in our time. It is, however, to be noted that looking, for example, at the working paper of the Secretariat, there is nothing new to record in regard to the political advance in this area. The advance that exists is considerable and, what is more, has a quality about it which is acceptable--that is to say, the franchise is practically universal, the ballot is secret and the number of representative bodies is considerable, which means that representation does not remain merely as a paper device. But when all that is said and done, it is at that

level where these bodies cannot make a real impact upon administration.

The report furnishes a chart which is very telling. It is interesting to note at what layer these representative bodies are and what is their relationship to the High Commissioner and the United States Administration. There is a direct link, but the source of power is still there

There are 102 municipalities in this area, which would do credit to any advanced country. There has been a successful attempt, I would say, to blend the old customary institutions with the conceptions of modern electoral devices.

When we come to the civil service, which is the essential feature of any stable community, we find that the Micronesians are numerically larger, as is the case in any colonial country because they are the hewers of wood and the drawers of water. When we sample them and put weights upon them, then we find that the whole of the 1,539 probably would not weigh as much as the last 277. Therefore it is not sufficient in our opinion--and we speak from experience in this matter--merely to look at the number of people who are employed and to observe that of that number the Micronesians are about seven times more than the United States citizens.

<Pg-120>

We do not for a moment suggest that there should be any discrimination against the nationals of the Administering Authority. That would be a very bad precedent to set --to create in peoples who have no racial feelings of that character. But at the same time it would be in keeping with the Trusteeship Agreement and reflect high credit on the Administering Authority if, in this higher strata of the 277, there were a much larger number of indigenous population.

The Administering Authority told us that it may take seven or eight years before there can be an organ of the Territory as a whole. With regard to that, my delegation, this year, last year and the previous year, has expressed its views very strongly in the contrary direction.

We think that, in view of the considerable amount of literacy, in view of the large number of educational institutions, in view of the practice of universal franchise and of the secret ballot, in view of the responsibilities that have been evinced by these local bodies, the time has come to take the first step towards the establishment of some territorial organ. It is not for us to prescribe how that should be done. It may be possible perhaps to obtain representatives from these bodies in the first instance as a preparation for whatever may come thereafter.

We think that the headquarters of the administration being placed in an area far away from this Territory, and one which has nothing to do with the Trusteeship responsibilities, is a serious drawback. In old imperial history there is a phrase, "government from a distance", which has its own psychological and political background. We hope that the United States Administration will find it possible to shift the headquarters of the administration of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands to the Territory itself.

One of the two other matters that remain to be said is one to which my colleague from Burma has already made reference. My delegation brought up the question of the explosion of nuclear and thermonuclear weapons in this Territory some three or four years ago. I think you will agree that more people in the world today think more in that direction than they did three years ago, but it is perhaps useful for us as civilized people not to learn all these lessons in the hardest way possible.

The Marshall Islands, as they are popularly called, in this Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, are even now not immune from the possibility of further test explosions. According to the information that is available to me, the last of these--I think it was the sixth series--took place in 1956, and, from what I am going to say hereafter, it appears that this area is still within the political radius of availability for these purposes. These islands, although they may be inhabited by Micronesians or by Americans or by some other people, are the homelands of the people who are there. To regard them as proving grounds, in our opinion, is contrary to the world concept of sacred trust.

We have said from 1954 onwards that the Trusteeship Council is not competent and that it is not its function to discuss the rights and wrongs of nuclear explosions. The representative of the United States would say that it was performing a duty towards civilization, and at one time I think he said that he was protecting my country by doing so, but it is not our purpose to discuss this. All that we may discuss is whether this particular operation can be carried on in a Trust Territory--not whether the operation is right or wrong in a general context but whether it is right to carry it on in that Territory. There are no explosions we have to discuss as regards this area just now, but since my last speaking on this subject there have been the 1956 explosions, and now there is the problem of the return of the people to the atolls from which they had been vacated.

I heard the High Commissioner (for the Trust Territory) say the other day, in answer to questions, I believe, and I also read his report, that these places are now considered safe for the return of these people. We all have great respect for United States scientific authority, but the character of the United States scientific authority, as indeed in any country where science is taught and is free, is that there are contradictory views about it. Taking into account the circumstances of Hiroshima or other places, we should like to know in course of time whether this prognostication is correct and whether this place is now safe, after the vast quantity of radiation which was subsisting in the waters even fifteen months

after the test

<Pg-121>

explosion--whether it is now really safe for human habitation.

If that is not so, then I think it is a matter which is of importance to the world as a whole. That the effects of ionizing radiation wash away after two or three years, as the case may be, or that the United States has used any particular device for doing that, also should be within the knowledge of mankind as a whole.

There is also a statement which was made by Mr. Nucker (High Commissioner for the Trust Territory) that these people are healthier after the explosions. We are all aware of the therapeutic effects of isotopes, and so on, but there is no evidence that people who have been subjected to this kind of radiation would be healthier as a result of it.

Therefore, my delegation would like to know in the next report how these people are faring after their rehabilitation in the old areas.

That takes me to the main problem. I should like to make a prefatory observation. My Government does not consider that any particular member of the Trusteeship Council has a specific function in relation to the Trust Territories. We do not regard the non-administering countries as having any special functions different from those of the administering countries. We regard the Trusteeship Council in the terms of the Charter and in the terms of the Trusteeship Agreements as a corporate whole. Its responsibility, including that of the particular Administering Authority, is that of supervision and review of affairs. It is therefore not as though there are some people who should be more vigilant and others who should be less vigilant. It is quite true that our opinions may some times vary and our approach may vary from our experience.

I say all this because by what may be said hereafter the impression should not be conveyed that this is by way of an indictment or by way of a destructive or non-constructive approach to the problem. It applies to the whole conception of trust in relation to the transactions that are reported to have been taken place. We do not write them down as illegal. We do not for the moment pronounce any opinion about them, but we would like to state what kind of transactions are possible within the Trusteeship Agreement.

This trust idea is now about a couple of hundred years old in modern times. In our more ancient societies, the conception of trust was very well known. Surpisingly enough, it is in Anglo-American jurisprudence, and it is more in connection with my country and with what is now the United States of America, that the whole conception of a sacred trust has arisen. This conception of trust, therefore, which exists in our ordinary private law, is now translated in international affairs and receives a kind of organic shape with the

mandates and now under the Trusteeship System itself.

We do not think that anything can or should be done which would shake the foundations of this. The issue is not whether its actual effects in these islands and in relation to the United States administration would be of a harmful character, but whether a new principle is introduced which may be used somewhere else. This is our concern.

The questioning on this matter has not taken us very far. The words used were "use rights"; that is, the payment of nearly half a million dollars to this population, who were affected by nuclear explosions, and the grant of some rights over other islands, were supposed to confer upon the Administering Authority some special use rights.

I submit that the Administering Authority under the Trusteeship Agreement has got the right to use facilities. It does not have to buy it. It is there already under the Charter and under the Trusteeship Agreement. Therefore, we can only regard these payments in connection with this transaction as something which the Administering Authority considered necessary as compensation to these people for their sufferings or for whatever may have followed from the explosions. We cannot regard that as in any way a transaction which alters the status of this Territory. That is very important, and I am happy to say that Mr. Nucker has said that there is no question of absolute ownership. May I amend that slightly and say that there is no question of any rights of ownership whatsoever. Ownership in this, the sovereignty of this Territory, rests in its people. It is latent sovereignty, latent because

<Pg-122>

they do hot have the capacity to govern themselves. But in my country it would require a great deal of convincing to be able to tell our Parliament, for example, when these things are discussed, how a people who are not regarded as competent to govern themselves and who are not advanced to the stage of having a Territorial Assembly, could exercise their will to give something away. That is a very difficult proposition. If these people are not fit to govern themselves, how can they be fit to dispose of their rights themselves?

My delegation, therefore, would like to place it on record that our view in regard to this particular transaction is that nothing new has happened, there is no change in the status of the Territory. It does not set up a precedent for any other Administering Authority to attempt purchases of territory for themselves. There is in fact no purchase of territory. There is only an ad hoc payment, for whatever may be the reasons, which does not touch the relationship between the United Nations and the Trust Territory, the rights of the people in the Trust Territory, and their capacity to decide for themselves. In fact, every transaction must be bounded by the outer limits of the Trusteeship Agreement.

I read the report of the United States Congress on this Territory and

I think it sets out that there are six sources of authority in regard to this Trust Territory. The first is the Trusteeship Agreement and the others are Presidential orders and Congressional orders. So far as we are concerned, there is only one authority and that is the Trusteeship Agreement. The others flow from that and are derived from that. The same applies to this particular thing.

There are certain other aspects of the problem.

The Administering Authorities and the United Nations have certain obligations in respect of the Trust Territories. It was in the light of these obligations that, at a previous session, we asked the Trusteeship Council to request an advisory opinion from the International Court on the Administering Authority's right to use high-powered explosives in an area which would destroy the terrain itself. Unfortunately, the Council did not accept that position. The principle, however, that the destruction of an area is not permissible under the Trust is still, in our opinion, unchallenged.

Looking through the law on this subject, I think that the best statement was made in the International Court by Sir Arnold McNair, when he was considering the problem of South-West Africa. The South African Government had put forward certain ideas to the effect that the mandate had terminated and that that Government was therefore in possession of the territory of South-West Africa. Part of this is, of course, obiter dicta, but this late Judge and scholar laid down three principles.

The first principle is that the control of the trustee over the property is limited in one way or another. He is not in the position of the complete owner who can do what he likes with his own, because he is precluded from administering the property for his own personal benefit. Part of this principle is admitted by the High Commissioner, when he says that there is no ownership; he is still somewhat in doubt about the other part.

The second principle laid down by Sir Arnold McNair is that the trustee is under some kind of legal obligation, based on confidence and conscience, to carry out the trust or mission confided to him for the benefit of some other person or for some public purpose. Here again there are some difficulties. So far as I can see from the answers given by Mr. Mason Sears, the United States representative, the words "for some public purpose" are in some way or other equated with the purposes for which the present trust is now being used. That is not a position which my Government accepts.

The third principle laid down by Sir Arnold McNair is that any attempt by the trustee to absorb the property entrusted to him into his own patrimony would be illegal and would be prevented by law. This, of course, is the same position as that of ownership.

In the light of these three basic principles, the Territory of the Pacific Islands, having been placed under the International

Trusteeship System, would attract to itself all these attributes.

The argument has been presented that

<Pg-123>

this area has been designated as a strategic area. Now, the designation of a Trust Territory as a strategic area does not take away from it what a lawyer would call the mischief, but what are really the benefits, of the Trusteeship System. It is quite true that strategic areas have certain special characteristics and certain relationships to the Security Council. With very great respect, I should like to express the view that what the United States representative, Mr. Mason Sears, has tried to submit in this regard is not warranted either by the Trusteeship Agreement or by the Charter. There is no special, sanctified relationship in regard to strategic areas. It is quite true that they can be used for certain purposes, for the maintenance of international peace and security. The other obligations arising from the Trusteeship Agreements, are, however, equal to all Trust Territories. The Security Council has the right to say whether or not we should look into the matter.

In an answer given to Mr. Jaipal (Indian delegate) the other day, Mr. Sears said that:

.... under the Trusteeship Agreement and the Charter of the United Nations, these areas are closed areas and we can cease debate on them instantly. However, I do not propose to invoke them.

But that does not appear to be the case if one looks at the resolution adopted by the Security Council on 7 March 1949, in which the Council resolved:

That the Trusteeship Council be requested, subject to the provisions of the Trusteeship Agreements or parts thereof in respect of strategic areas, and subject to the decisions of the Security Council made having regard to security considerations from time to time, to perform in accordance with its own procedures--

that is, the procedures of the Trusteeship Council--

on behalf of the Security Council the functions specified in Articles 87 and 88 of the Charter relating to the political, economic, social and educational advancement of the inhabitants of such strategic areas....

In the first place, the whole of the present Territory is not a closed area. In the second place, the Trusteeship Council is not discussing this matter because it has been granted permission to do so, but because it has the right to do so. Its rights in that respect were delegated to it by the Security Council--I presume that the Security Council would have the right to withdraw that delegation, but it has not done so. Hence, any suggestion that we are discussing

this matter on sufferance is neither in accordance with the facts nor in accordance with the dignity and functions of the Trusteeship Council. What we are doing here is considering the position of the United Nations in terms of Articles 87 and 88 of the Charter.

Now, Mr. Mason Sears asks us to refer to Article 87. I can only think that there must have been some error in that reference. For what does Article 87 say? It says:

The General Assembly and, under its authority, the Trusteeship Council, in carrying out their functions, may:

a. consider reports submitted by the Administering Authority;

b. accept petitions and examine them in consultation with the Administering Authority;

c. provide for periodic visits to the respective Trust Territories at times agreed upon with the Administering Authority; and

d. take these and other actions in conformity with the terms of the Trusteeship Agreements.

There is nothing in this Trusteeship Agreement which debars our discussion of these matters, our criticisms of these matters or our suggestions on these matters.

Let us now turn to the Trusteeship Agreement. I invite members to refer to Article 3 of that agreement, which states:

The Administering Authority shall have full powers of administration, legislation, and jurisdiction over the Territory subject to the provisions of this Agreement, and may apply to the Trust Territory, subject to any modifications which the Administering Authority may consider desirable, such of the laws of

<Pg-124>

the United States as it may deem appropriate to local conditions and requirements.

What is the Administering Authority supposed to do under the terms of that Article? It has full powers of administration. I submit that transferring the Territory or establishing any servitude over the Territory is outside of the Administering Authority's powers. It has powers of legislation and jurisdiction. But those three powers do not cover a transaction which establishes any rights other than those conferred by the Trusteeship Agreement or any rights contrary to the conception of a sacred trust.

The United States, however, in this particular instance, can rely on the last part of this Article, if it has any relevance. So far as my limited knowledge of United States law goes, I do not think that it is part of United States law for any particular population of a territory to be in a position to barter away its rights. It is quite true that United States law allows purchases of territories from other people, but not from their own populations.

Then we come to Article 4 of the Trusteeship Agreement, which states:

The Administering Authority, in discharging the obligations of Trusteeship in the, Trust Territory, shall act in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations, and the provisions of this Agreement, and shall, as specified in Article 83 (2) of the Charter, apply the objectives of the International Trusteeship System, as set forth in Article 76 of the Charter, to the people of the Trust Territory.

With regard to this particular Territory, Article 76 of the Charter is specially set out. That dismisses any idea that this is a sacrosanct territory, a strategic area, which is in a category different from anything else, because when the United States concluded this agreement with the United Nations, there were certain modifications as compared to other agreements and it accepted these particular Articles--Article 76, dealing with the purposes, and Article 83 (2), dealing with similar matters. That is, it agreed that the objectives of Article 76 should be applicable.

Article 4 of the Trusteeship Agreement is particularly significant because it refers to Article 83 (2). Article 83 (2) states:

The basic objective set forth in Article 76 shall be applicable to the people of each strategic area.

In fact, not only is there no exemption by implication, but, an exemption is prohibited by the Charter. The fact that the Territory is strategic does not take away the competence of Article 76 of the Charter.

Now we come to Article 5 of the Trusteeship Agreement, and this is probably what is most important. I think it is a common principle of law that when the specific things which one may do have been enunciated, then one cannot go beyond that. One cannot say that one has some reserves unless it is stated "and other things". Under Article 5, the Administering Authority's entitlement is given. What can the Administering Authority do? This was discussed at length in 1946 when the present Secretary of State was the representative in the Fourth Committee. I was there at the time; and the henchman of greater rights at that time was the United Kingdom in regard to the fortification of Tanganyika. The following three things are set out in Article 5:

1. To establish naval, military and air bases and to erect fortifications in the Trust Territory;

Nobody challenges the right of the Administering Authority to do that

under this agreement.

2. To station and employ armed forces in the Territory;

That, I submit, does not require a new agreement of any kind.

3. To make use of volunteer forces, facilities and assistance from the Trust Territory....

That is to say, making use of facilities already provided for. Therefore, I submit that these three clauses of Article 5 exhaust the competence in the entitlement of the Administering Authority.

But if that stood alone, it would not complete the story I invite the attention of those concerned to Article 6 of the Trusteeship

<Pg-125>

Agreement, paragraph 2 of which contains an obligation placed upon the Administering Authority which is the other way round--that is to say, it prevents it from taking away any lands. The paragraph reads:

Promote the economic advancement and self-sufficiency of the inhabitants, and to this end shall regulate the use of natural resources; encourage the development of fisheries, agriculture, and industries; protect the inhabitants against the loss of their lands and resources....

That is enjoined upon the Administering Authority under the agreement to which it is a signatory. Therefore, the only helpful construction which one can put upon the present development is that it does not take away their lands, it does not create new rights; it is purely a payment of money made to people for what the Administering Authority may think is some damage which they have suffered.

What my Government is concerned to establish is that no new rights can be created. There can be no disposal of properties, no change of status. I want to say frankly that it is not these island, that worry us; but the precedent which it might establish in relation to other territories and other Administering Authorities. The Article which I have just read definitely goes against the idea of any changes in this way. Therefore, as regards any suggestion that the present transaction is of a character that has changed anything, so far as my Government is concerned, we want to go on record that we do not accept that position. We are happy to feel that the United States has considered the sufferings of these people; and there may be many who think that the payment of half a million dollars to these people is probably not adequate, but, on the other hand, we have to take into account the fact that the Administering Authority is still there and that if there are any other requirements, those things will be looked after.

Is there anything in the Code of the Territory that permits this? The

Code of the Territory does not authorise transfer of land for indefinite use. That is why we tried to obtain at questioning time--I am sorry to say, not successfully--what was actually meant. Unfortunately, we have not the advantage of having a copy of this agreement. In our view, that agreement should have been registered with the United Nations and we think that the Secretariat is remiss in not obtaining a copy of it.

The Permanent Representative of India asked the Secretary-General a few days ago:

It will be noticed from the abovementioned references--

It refers here to the working paper of the Secretariat--

that the former inhabitants of Bikini and Eniwetok have been credited in all sums of 325,000 dollars and 175,000 dollars respectively in return for which the Trust Territory Government has assumed `the indefinite use rights'--

here are the words that confuse us: "the indefinite use rights". It is a particularly American expression.

.... of these two of attols. The delegation of India appreciates the fact that the Administering Authority has thus sought to give a measure of relief to the former inhabitants of these atolls and that in so doing it has been motivated by humanitarian considerations. It will be appreciated, however, that in view of the Trusteeship status of these territories it is necessary to examine the full implications of these measures both in respect of this Trust Territory and having regard to possible repercussions on other such areas. It would appear to the delegation of India, therefore, that the following points arise for further consideration: (a) whether the instrument concerning the transaction referred to above has been deposited with the United Nations Secretariat and whether a copy could be made available; (b) whether it affects the provisions of the Trusteeship Agreement and its principles and purposes; (c) whether it entails any rights for the user beyond the period of Trusteeship; and (d) considering that the inhabitants of these two atolls have not yet obtained self-government, how the right of disposal of a part of the Trust Territory can be reconciled with their present political advancement.

<Pg-126>

Now, the Secretariat answer to this letter states:

The Secretary-General of the United Nations presents his compliments. . . . and has the honour to inform him (the representative of India) that no instrument concerning the transaction mentioned in the second paragraph of the note has been deposited with the United Nations Secretariat.

I think that that is a totally correct answer and, what,is more, it is so correct that it is totally uninformative, apart from the fact that no document is here. We are always in for this, and therefore, I repeat that we think that the Secretariat has not discharged its responsibility in not obtaining a copy of this agreement. It is their duty, when putting up the working paper, to have pointed out that this agreement ought to be furnished. It is entirely up to the Administering Authority to say that they would furnish it or they would not furnish it. That is a different matter because none of the member-States can be expected to look into these matters or to carry out the responsibilities which must rest with the Secretariat.

Section 925 of the Code of the Trust Territory authorised the acquisition of land by the Government of the Trust Territory for public purposes. Now here is where I join issues with my colleague, Mr. Mason Sears, the implication of whose statement is that these are public purposes. A public purpose in terms of administered territory is a service or public utility, and that is to say, for building a transport or a fish market or whatever it may be. But what is argued here is that it is necessary for international peace and security, and the High Commissioner quite rightly takes the view that it is not his business to discuss these matters. I turned this over to the representative of the United States, and he told us--last year and, I believe, this year-that this is a matter of international peace and security.

We recognise that the Trusteeship Agreement--not only the Trusteeship Agreement but the Trusteeship System--recognises and, what is more, lays down that Trust Territories must be available and must come into the system of international peace and security. But the submission of my delegation is that a decision on what is international peace and security, or where this comes in, is a matter in this regard for the Security Council.

If you look at the Charter, the Charter being a brief document for world administration, you will see that it does not go into great detail. The only reference in this regard is in Article 24. Paragraph 1 of Article 24 says:

In order to ensure prompt and effective action by the United Nations, its members confer on the Security Council primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security.

If these places are necessary for international peace and security, if a particular "use right" is necessary and flows from the reasons of international peace and security, it is our submission that that ought to be done in terms of Article 24. It is only when it has been referred to the Security Council and if it fails to discharge its primary responsibilities that some other things may arise. What is more, Article 24, to elaborate this, says how the Security Council should act. It says that it "shall act in accordance with the purposes and principles of the United Nations". It further says that:

The specific powers granted to the Security Council for the discharge of these duties are laid down in Chapters VI, VII, VIII and XII.

If it does anything of that kind, it has to report to the General Assembly. Therefore, all that is provided for in the Charter, and we cannot therefore subscribe to the view that section 925 of the Code of the Islands of the Trust Territory can be enlisted in support of any transaction which is more than what we have said. We prefer to believe that that is how it is: This is not a public purpose as understood in terms of administration.

The present transfer, if the words are to be taken at their face value, which involved the indefinite use of rights to the islands, may suggest a possible period beyond Trusteeship. What I should like to say is that when the High Commissioner says "Indefinite use of rights", he probably refers to the character of the use rather than to the period; that is to say, the character is not defined, whether he is going to use these areas for

<Pg-127>

grazing grounds or for manufacturing purposes or for burning incense or for exploding bombs: that is indefinite. That is all it means and it cannot mean anything else because how can we as a member-State think that the Administering Authority would go beyond the Trusteeship Agreement? That is by definition impossible. Therefore, the indefinite use referred to by the High Commissioner, or implied in his statement--"the indefinite use rights"--can only refer to the character of the use and not to the period of use. The character of the use in our opinion is limited by what is called public purpose in terms of domestic law and also by the Trusteeship Agreement for the welfare of the inhabitants. 1 Whose, are the only two uses they can make.

The third use of international peace and security has to be so denoted by the Security Council. In this matter we have good authority from the United States itself. Some years ago the Government of the Union of South Africa decided to annex South-West Africa which was held by it under a C Mandate of the League of Nations, and which by all rights and by all good practice ought to be under Trusteeship. Anyway, they decided to annex it, and in order to make the annexation legal they took a referendum of the peoples of South-West Africa, the very people who are not competent to be self-governing. They said at the end of the referendum that the people had decided to join the Union of South Africa.

What is the United States view about it? It comes from a gentleman called Mr. John Foster Dulles who at that time was a member of the Fourth Committee. Mr. Dulles, speaking for the United States, said:

that the United States of America wished to associate itself with the views expressed by certain other delegations to the effect that the data before the General Assembly did not justify the approval of the incorporation of South-West Africa into the Union.

Then the General Assembly adopted the resolution which considered:

that the African inhabitants of South-West Africa have not yet secured political autonomy or reached a stage of political development enabling them to express a considered opinion which the Assembly could recognise on such an important question as incorporation of their territory.

We have spoken at length on this, as I said several times, not because we question the bona fides of this transaction, not because we are sad that these people have received this amount of money, not because it will make any real difference in substance, but because we are very apprehensive of doing things in this way because there may be situations where this may be used as a precedent. Therefore, we want to state not that this is wrong but that, in our opinion, having regard to the Trusteeship Agreement, having regard to Anglo-American jurisprudence by which the United States is bound in this question and having regard to the Trusteeship Agreement and to the Charter, this transaction can only go so far and therefore no violation will have taken place.

We submit therefore, for the purposes of record, that this should be so conceived, and we hope that the United States Government in the exercise of its wisdom will enable member-States to have copies of this instrument.

All that my delegation has submitted is merely with a view to ensuring that, exercise of the responsibilities arising from a trust, the conception of a trust does not suffer any infringement, because that have serious implications. That is our reason for this rather long statement question. It is not that we think that this is an example of annexation or expansionism of any kind and I feel quite sure that if these possibilities of criticism or of apprehension had been in the mind of the Administering Authority, the latter would probably dealt with it in another way.

<Pg-128>

INDIA MARSHALL ISLANDS USA SYRIA JAPAN BURMA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC RUSSIA SOUTH AFRICA

Date: Jun 05, 1957

Volume No

INTERNATIONAL TRADE

India's Exports

Addressing a meeting of the Export Advisory Council in New Delhi on June 1957, Shri Morarji Desai, Minister for Commerce and Industry, reviewed the position of India's export trade. Shri Desai said:

This is the first meeting of the reconstituted Export Advisory Council. All of you, I hope, are conscious of the fact that the task that faces this council is much more difficult and much more urgent than has been the case over the last few years.

I need not waste your time by explaining to you our difficult foreign exchange position. The plain fact is that we have to find the resources that are needed to pay for the imports essential to the success of our Second Plan. Over the last year and a half, we have relied unduly on our reserves to sustain our imports programme. In 1956 alone, imports exceeded exports by as many as Rs. 2,100 million; in other words, on an average, we were running up a monthly deficit of as much as Rs. 175 million. In the first two months of the current year, the average has mounted to Rs. 200 million despite a higher level of exports.

How is this gap to be narrowed and then closed? This is the problem we have to face squarely. It might help us to consider the problem in its proper perspective if I recount briefly our experience in 1956. The total of our exports in that year, I regret to say, has fallen short of the total in 1955.

It is true that the shortfall is only of the order of Rs. 40 million. Nevertheless, if this shortfall is viewed in the context of the substantial expansion that has taken place in international trade, you will agree with me that there is much cause for concern and very considerable scope for serious heartsearching.

Some of our agricultural commodities have proved most disappointing. The yield from cotton, both raw and waste, has fallen as compared with 1955 by Rs. 95 million. Against an export of the value of Rs. 90 million in 1955, pulses and grain earned for India's Exports us only Rs. 31 Million in the year under review. In the case of groundnut oil and groundnuts, the net loss has been of the order of Rs. 185 million. The earnings from oilcakes have declined by Rs. 40 million and from pepper by more than Rs. 10 million. The exports of such small items as chillies and potatoes have also suffered a set-back.

The reason for these disappointing setbacks is not far to seek. It is obvious that the increase in the production of commercial crops has not kept pace with the rise in domestic demand, with the result that we have had much less to spare for export and on occasions our prices have beep, on the high side for our foreign buyers. We cannot afford this story to be repeated from year to year. We have been used to

relying on these agricultural commodities to yield a substantial proportion of our foreign exchange requirements. Now that our need for cash resources is much greater, it is only natural if we expect these traditional foreign exchange earners to make a higher contribution.

At the same time, we are bound to take good care of our minimum internal requirements and worry about rise in prices. I am myself convinced that if we go about our business in a businesslike manner we will not find the problem to be insoluble. It is possible that the difficulties will need to be resolved at each stage--in the farm, at the market-place and at the point of export. It is also possible that the solutions to which we have been used in the past will be found to be wanting in the present circumstances. I have no doubt that you must have given your deep consideration to these difficulties and that during the course of today's discussions you will have many helpful suggestions to make.

Before I invite your attention to certain pleasing aspects of our performance in 1956, I would like to say a few words in regard to the direction of our exports. I am happy to tell you that our exports to the United Kingdom have shown a substantial increase, as much as Rs. 190 million over 1955. There has been an equally significant increase in

<Pg-129>

our exports to the Soviet Union, the improvement being of the order of Rs. 100 million. Small increases have been recorded in our exports to Japan, Italy, Egypt and Czechoslovakia.

For the rest, I fear the picture is not particularly pleasing. There has been a disconcerting decline in our exports to some European countries. Our, exports to the United States have also suffered a slight set-back. Our to build up our trade with our neighbours in East and West Asia has yielded no significant result. You will no doubt go into the reasons for these set-backs.

But, I would like to say that the predominant impression left on my mind by a number of visiting delegations, whom we had the pleasure to welcome during 1956-57, is that our trade contacts need to be strengthened and our businessmen need to show much greater enterprise.

I now turn to the commodities where our performance in 1956 has not been too discouraging. Over a large field which includes hides and skins, certain essential oils, mica, coal, certain spices and provisions, our export has been more or less static. Tea, however, has been a bright spot, although we should not ignore the fact that a large part of the improvement is accounted for by a substantial carry-over from 1955.

Fruits and vegetables have yielded an increase of Rs. 40 million over

the 1955 figure, while cashew accounts for another gain of Rs. 35 million. The export of coffee has gone up and we have been able to earn an additional Rs. 15 million from caster oil.

There has been some controversy about ores, but I am able to assure this council that we have earned more from ores in 1956 than we did in 1955, the net improvement being of the order of Rs. 120 million. There has been a welcome increase in the earnings from manufactured items; some improvement has been recorded in the export of steel manufactures, tobacco manufactures, coir and leather manufactures, particularly boots and shoes, pharmaceuticals and such products of our new industries as diesel engines, pumps, fans, telephone instruments and electrical equipment and appliances.

I do not propose to spend much time on analysing the export figures for cotton piece-goods and jute manufactures. But you will be heartened to hear that our handloom fabrics are capturing the imagination of fashion experts in Europe and in the States and in the first quarter of the current year record quantities of mill-made cotton piece-goods have been paled fox shipment. On the whole, if we exclude from our calculations the losses on account of some of the agricultural commodities I have mentioned earlier, such as edible oils, oilcakes and pulses, we will be found to have improved upon the 1955 performance by about say Rs. 250 million.

We need not therefore lose heart. As I said earlier, international trade is expanding and we have reason to expect an increase in the world demand for the kind of goods we can produce on a competitive basis. The opportunities are undoubtedly there; but we have to organise ourselves to utilise them to our country's advantage.

You know that we on our part have attempted to do our little bit. You are aware of the Export Promotion Councils that have been set up; a report on the work done by them has been circulated. Two councils, one on leather and the other on shellac, came into being only a couple of days ago. A fresh Trade Agreement has been entered into with Chile and agreements with 13 other countries have been renewed or re-negotiated. Showrooms have been re-organised and two new trade centres are being set up; facilities have been extended for the trade to participate in eleven exhibitions in different parts of the globe.

Substantial improvements have been effected in the working of our commercial publicity organisation, and the Trade Commissioners' service has been extended and strengthened. We would like our enterprising, businessmen to make more and more use of the facilities offered by the Director-General of Commercial Intelligence.

I have been gratified to see that the effort put in by the State Trading Corporation to build up a mutually invigorating partnership with the trading community is slowly bearing fruit. The corporation has in the first year of its existence succeeded, with the cooperation of the business community in helping to diversify the country's foreign trade, to maximise the export of some difficult

items

<Pg-130>

and to enlarge the scope for bulk deals in mineral ores.

We are about to set up another Government-owned corporation; it will be the object of this corporation to insure exporters against the risks of export business. Fiscal measures have not been ignored and efforts are being made to simplify procedures for the disbursement of refunds of excise duties and for the grant of drawback on the import duties paid on the imported component of the manufactured goods sought to be exported.

You will agree with me that we have brought into being a number of institutions and organisations to serve the business community in their effort to promote the country's exports. We will try to effect whatever improvements that are necessary in the working of these organisations in the light of the report which is now being compiled by the Export Promotion Committee. But, meanwhile, I have thought it necessary to endeavour to bring about better co-ordination in their working and to give direction to their efforts. For this purpose, a Foreign Trade Board is being set up and the post of Director of Export Promotion is being created so that a senior officer may pursue the decisions of the board and assist the trade in utilising the different service organisations to the best advantage of the country.

INDIA USA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC EGYPT GERMANY INDONESIA PAKISTAN ITALY JAPAN NORWAY SLOVAKIA RUSSIA CHILE

Date: Jun 05, 1957

Volume No

1995

INTERNATIONAL TRADE

India's Imports

Addressing a meeting of the Import Advisory Council in New Delhi on June 1957, Shri Morarji Desai, Minister for Commerce and Industry, reviewed the import trade position of India with particular reference to India's foreign exchange resources. Shri Desai said:

We are meeting today at a very crucial period in the economic history of our country. Government have recently reiterated their resolve to implement and carry through the core of the Second Five-Year Plan, and I will be deeply interested in your suggestions on how our

resources in foreign exchange should be managed so as to achieve our main objective.

We have not made a secret of our current difficulties and it is not necessary for me to recite them at length. Suffice it to say that we have made heavy inroads into our sterling reserves. On 1 January 1956, the total of our sterling balances stood at Rs. 7,386 million; by 24 May 1957 this figure had fallen to Rs. 4,690 million, a fall of almost Rs. 2,690 million over a period of 17 months. It is true that all this money has been put to good use. In the 12 months of 1956 alone we paid over Rs. 1,500 million for the import of machinery, Rs. 1,230 million for the import of steel and Rs. 350 million for the import of non-ferrous metals. I need not weary you with details for it is well known that our huge trade deficit is mainly due to increased imports of essential items.

I fear the pressure on our meagre resources is not likely to ease off in the immediate future. Large licences for plant, machinery and metals are outstanding and imports against them will need to be paid for. It is true that in consultation with the previous council we cut down on licensing during the current half-year. But we did not make any drastic reduction in the import of raw materials and intermediates required by industries, and while we had rigorously excluded non-essential imports we still issued licences for items which on a strict view of priorities would be considered as less essential than others. While considering the import policy for the rest of 1957, we will, therefore, have to take a very careful account of the outstanding licences that are likely to mature in the ensuing months. I would like you to keep this prominently in view while making your recommendations during the course of our discussions today.

The shortage of foreign exchange has compelled us to adopt a very strict policy in granting import licences for the procurement of capital goods from abroad. We have laid down certain terms of deferred payments to which intending importers must conform. It has been said that these terms are too strict for business on a large scale to take place. The basic point, however, is that we do not want to incure liabilities without the fullest regard to our ability to repay the loans when the payments fall due. Therefore, we have given a somewhat shorter period of repayment in respect of projects which will start saving foreign exchange or earning it for us

< Pg-131 >

and thus generate their own resources for the repayment of the loan. I am afraid no general relaxation of these terms is possible. We have, however, been prepared to consider somewhat more favourably the requirements of those industries which have already installed a good proportion of the plant and machinery that they need and whose product is considered to be of special importance to the economy.

We recognise that one of the chief difficulties has been the absence

of institutional arrangements to provide certain guarantees in support of deferred payment schemes. This matter is under active consideration and we have also been holding discussions with financial, banking and other authorities in a number of countries. It is hoped that as soon as these discussions are finalised, it may be possible to issue licences for capital goods on a more liberal basis.

For the rest, I fear we must tighten our belt and we must improvise. I have no doubt in my mind that we can do without a number of items we have hitherto been regarding as essential. There may be some other items where imports in the immediate past will be sufficient to carry us through over the next six months or so. I am also relying on the ingenuity of our engineers and craftsmen to manufacture locally indigenous substitutes so as to make it possible for our industry to maintain production without having to depend too much on imports from abroad.

I have shared with you the broad framework within which the question of imports for the rest of 1957 has to be considered. Before I invite you to make your observations and give your suggestions, I will say one word about the progress of licensing and our licensing procedures. You will be glad to learn that at the end of July-December 1956 only 200 out of 183,822 applications remained pending. During the current licensing period up to 24 May 1957, 126,097 applications out of 128,768 applications received have been disposed of. Nevertheless, I am aware that some of you have had to put up with some delays in the grant of licences. You will appreciate the adjustment to the revised foreign exchange budgeting procedures has taken some time to be put into effect. Further, if maximum economy is to be achieved, it will be necessary to give reasonable time to all the authorities concerned to examine and scrutinise the applications.

INDIA USA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC RUSSIA

Date: Jul 01, 1957

Volume No

1995

SWEDEN

Trade Agreement Revised

A Press Note issued in New Delhi on Jun 01, 1957 said that letters were exchanged in New Delhi on 1 June between Shri K. B. Lall, Joint Secretary, Ministry of Commerce and Industry, and Mr. B. J. Jarnstedt, Charge d'Affaires, Swedish Embassy, revising with minor modifications the Schedules attached to the Indo-Swedish Trade

Arrangement for the current year. The Press Note added:

The Trade Arrangement which was concluded in May, 1955, provides for the revision of the Schedules every year.

During the preceding year, a Trade and Goodwill Mission from Sweden visited India at the invitation of the Government of India and had talks with the Government representatives and chambers of commerce and other business associations. It is hoped that the contacts which have been established as a result of the delegation's visit would lead to considerable increase in the trade between the two countries.

Some of the important commodities mentioned in the list of exports from India to Sweden are: Cotton textiles, silk and rayon fabrics; jute and plastic goods; raw wool and woollen manufactures; coir and coir products; cotton waste; leather goods including footwear; myrobalan and extracts; sports goods; castor oil; linseed oil; mustard oil; hydrogenated oil; spices; tea; coffee; tapioca and tapioca products; tobacco; shellac; manganese ore and magnesite; kyanite; chrome and iron ores; paraffin wax; linoleum; bristles; cottage industry products; cashew kernels; cashew shell oil; and coal.

<Pg-132>

There is no quantitative restriction on the import of these commodities into Sweden.

Some of the important commodities for import into India from Sweden are: Building materials; chemicals and pharmaceuticals; forestry products; chemical and mechanical pulp; newsprint; paper and board; textiles; iron and steel, including ferro alloys and stainless steel; metal manufactures and semi-manufactures; builders hardware; various machinery and industrial equipment, e.g., diesel engines, metal and woodworking machinery, ball and roller bearings, match making machinery, printing machinery, domestic and office equipment and machinery; electrical equipment, e.g., generators, transformers; railway rolling stock and locomotives.

SWEDEN INDIA USA RUSSIA ITALY

Date: Jun 01, 1957

Volume No

1995

SYRIA

Prime Minister's Speech At Damascus

Prime Minister Nehru visited Damascus, capital of Syria, on Jun 14, 1957 1957, on his way to London to attend the Commonwealth Prime Ministers' Conference. The following is the text of the Prime Minister's speech delivered at a banquet given in his honour by the Syrian President on 14 June:

Your Excellency, Mr. President, Excellencies and Gentlemen:

You have referred, Sir, to your visit to India some months ago. May I tell you that we cherish very vivid memories of that visit when you honoured us by coming to our country, and the many cities and other areas in India which you visited remember that occasion and often talk of it. I am happy that so soon after that I have been given the opportunity of meeting you, Sir, again here. I do believe that such meetings, even though unfortunately brief, are good and bring us nearer to each other and make us understand each other's minds a little more, because it is important that apart from the natural drawing together of peoples there should be understanding between them of their problems, and, where opportunity offers itself, talks about them, because we live in a changing world when from day to day new problems confront us.

I am particularly grateful, Sir, for your references to me which are so full of affection. Your referring to me as a citizen of Damascus moves me because I consider this a very great privilege and honour, not only because you have associated me with this city of history but because you have done me the honour of making me one of your own large family.

You referred in your remarks to foreign policy. The foreign policy which you and your country pursue and the one which my country pursues is sometimes called that of positive neutrality. That may be a way of describing it. I would prefer to call it one of nonalignment. It may be the same thing. This may be said to be in conformity with what we decided at the Bandung Conference. But if I may say so with all respect this is nothing new for us--this broad approach to problems and to problems where there are differences, acute differences. So far as we are concerned in India we have been conditioned during the past 40 years or so by our own struggle for freedom and by our leader, Mahatma Gandhi, into thinking in particular ways. But going further back into history-very far back--I may mention what a great ruler in India said and inscribed on rock and stones more than 2,000 years ago--2,300 years ago. This ruler of India--his name was Asoka--put up huge pillars, all over India right from the northern border, what is now Pakistan, and rest of India, inscribing various messages for his people. Those huge pillars still remain with his message and it comes back to us after these 2,000 years and more--many such messages, dozens of them. But one particularly relevant is this. He told his people then to hold to their opinions and their faith; but if they wished to honour their faith they must honour the faiths of others. Those who honoured the

faiths of others got honour in return for their own faith. It was no great thing merely to honour themselves

<Pg-133>

and their faith, but the cultured person had an open mind, was tolerant of others and honoured others also. That was said and inscribed on rocks and on huge pillars 2,300 years ago. I do not say that we in India have always acted up to that. But at any rate that message has always been before us reminding us of what we should do, even though we might not always succeed. Applying that message to the present day world, it means, I suppose, that while adhering to our faith and our beliefs and our point of view in any sphere of activity we should honour others too. We should keep open minds.

You quoted, Sir, a saying of Mahatma Gandhi that he said we should keep all our doors and windows open, we should allow the winds from all the world to come into us to refresh us and for us to profit by them but we should not allow ourselves to be uprooted by those winds. We should hold fast to our soil. So in a sense what is called the foreign policy of India is not some sudden development but something in keeping with, and in tune with, our thought for long ages past, and more particularly during the last 40 years or more of the period in India's history which is often referred to as the Gandhi Era. We of this generation have been conditioned and moulded by that and inevitably therefore we react to present conditions in terms of that moulding. Apart from that, I would venture to say that even recent history of great wars and the like has shown that the approach of war does not solve problems, it only makes them more difficult.

Now that we have arrived at the last extremity of perhaps warlike weapons, that approach becomes still more illogical, and we have to seek some other approach and that other approach can only be one of tolerance of each other, of peaceful co-existence, of methods of peace, methods of avoidance of hatred and violence.

My country, India, is in extent a big country--one of the biggest in the world. Your country, Sir, in extent is a small country. But all history tells us that greatness does not go by bigness. Big countries have been small in the real qualities of the world and small countries have been very great in history, whether in Asia or in Europe. If I am proud of my country and have great love for it, it is not because it is 2,000 miles long and 1,800 miles broad, but because I do hope that that country will serve others in the cause of peace, of friendship and co-operation; because in spite of its numerous failings it has had some good message for the world also, in the past and perhaps for the present. And your country, Sir, which is small in extent, has been a country which has long ages of history behind it, a history which has made it notable among nations.

A country after all grows in greatness not because of its extent, but because of its cultural and other accomplishments, its industry, its economy, and above all because of the spirit of its people. If the spirit is there then it is well with that country, whether it is big or small. If it is not there then the bigness of it is a hindrance and a burden

I am very happy, Sir, that relations between India and Syria, which have always been good, have grown something more than good now because they are charged with a degree of affection, to which you were pleased to give utterance. That is a closer bond than even any reasons of opportunism which normally bind nations. The bond of affection, the power of affection is infinitely greater than the power of hatred, which unfortunately comes in the way of nations. Let us hope that this bond will grow between nations.

You referred, Sir, to imperialism and the like. There can be no doubt that any domination of one country by another in the present day world certainly is an anachronism, is a cause of continuous trouble, difficulty, and turbulence and conflict. It does not fit in with modern conceptions, I do not presume to talk about past history. Therefore if we seek to lay the foundations of peace it must be based on freedom, the freedom of the nation, the freedom of the individual; because I do attach great importance to the freedom of the individual also. My country stands for democracy in its fullest sense; political democracy and, I hope, that that political democracy will grow more and more into economic welfare and economic democracy. It is a hard struggle we have as with every country that wants to pull itself out of the ruts and make progress. We are having and we will certainly have great difficulties. But we are determined to go ahead along that path and realising that only by overcoming great difficulties does a nation or an individual grow. No country or an individual

<Pg-134>

grows by spoon-feeding. It is by one's own strength of will and activity that one grows. Such growth as we in India have had in the past generation has been because of our struggle for freedom, because of our sacrifices, and because of the methods we adopted which were devoid, as far as we could make them, of hatred. And so we were happy that when our conflict ended and we were free no trace of past animosity continued. We are friends even with those against whom we have quarrelled, and that, I think, is a good example for us to remember and for others to see. There is no hope for this world, great world with all its scientific achievements and other growing accomplishments on so many fronts, except in the approach of mutual tolerance, peaceful co-existence and goodwill.

I thank you, Sir, again for your exceedingly friendly and affectionate welcome and may I also, Sir, speaking here venture to thank the people of this great city too who have shown such friendship and cordiality.

SYRIA USA UNITED KINGDOM INDIA INDONESIA PAKISTAN TUNISIA

Date: Jun 14, 1957

Volume No

1995

TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE

Agreement with U.S. Extended

Letters were exchanged in New Delhi on Jun 29, 1957 between the Unio Finance Minister, Shri T. T. Krishnamachari, and the United States Ambassador to India, Mr. Ellsworth Bunker, extending the Technical Cooperation Programme Agreement.

The agreement, which was signed on 5 January 1952, was for a period of five years ending 30 June 1957.

The T.C.P. Agreement between the two countries will now be in force until it is terminated by either Government upon three months written notice to the other Government or replaced by a new agreement.

On 28 June 1957, two loan agreements were signed in Washington by Shri G. L. Mehta, Indian Ambassador to the United States, with the U.S. Export-Import Bank. One was for a loan of 47.5 million dollars under the T.C.P. for the year ending 30 June 1957; and the other for 234.1 million dollars relating to the rupee loan to be advanced by the United States to India under the Agricultural Commodities Agreement signed on 29 August 1956.

USA INDIA

Date: Jun 29, 1957

Volume No

1995

TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE

Aid for Thermal Power Plant

An agreement between India and the United States was signed in New Delhi on Jun 29, 1957 for the provision of four million dollars as developmental assistance for the design, construction and equipment of a 30 mega watt thermal power plant for Delhi. The total cost of

the project is estimated at 6,625,000 dollars and the American assistance is intended to meet its foreign exchange costs.

The agreement was signed for the Government of India by Shri N. C. Sen Gupta, Joint Secretary, Ministry of Finance, and for the United States by Mr. Harry A. Hinderer, Acting Director of the Technical Cooperation Mission in India.

The project which is expected to be completed by 1960 will increase the present availability of electric power in Delhi and New Delhi by about 40 per cent.

<Pg-135>

INDIA

Date: Jun 29, 1957

Volume No

1995

YUGOSLAVIA

Trade Agreement Extended

The Trade Agreement between India and Yugoslavia has been extended. Press Note issued in New Delhi on Jun 19, 1957 said:

Letters were exchanged in New Delhi on 19 June 1957 between Shri K. B. Lall, Joint Secretary, Ministry of Commerce and Industry, and H.E. Mr. Bogdan Crnobrnja, Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of Yugoslavia in India, extending the Schedules to the Indo-Yugoslav Trade Agreement, signed on 31 March 1956, up to 31 December 1957, with some modifications.

From the Schedule A, which lists the items of import from Yugoslavia into India, haberdashery and drapery, cigarettes paper in booklet form, and marble and stone and manufactures thereof have been omitted.

To the Schedule B, that names the items of export from India to Yugoslavia, flax manufactures, paints and lacquers, bristles, electrical accessories and appliances, hardware and cashew shell oil have been added.

<Pg-136>

YUGOSLAVIA INDIA USA RUSSIA

Date: Jun 19, 1957

July

	Volume No
1995	_
1993	
CONTENTS	
Foreign Affairs Record	
	1957
-	July
VOL. III	No. 7
CONTENTS	
ATOMIC ENERGY	
ATOMIC ENERGY Prime Minister's Statement in Lok	Cobbo 127
Finne Minister's Statement in Lok	Sabha 137
CEYLON	
Repatriation of Indians	139
-	
COMMONWEALTH	
Prime Ministers' Conference	140
EAST GERMANY	
C '1D / D 1	142
Special Payments Procedure	142
INDONESIA	
Trade Agreement Extended .	142
INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS	
Prime Minister's Statement in Lok	
Prime Minister's Reply to Debate	ın Lok Sabha 147
PAKISTAN	
	149
Border Incidents	
Indian Nationals in East Pakistan	152
"Liberation of Kashmir Party"	152
Pakistani Nationals in India	152

Date: Jul 01, 1957

Volume No

1995

ATOMIC ENERGY

Prime Minister's Statement in Lok Sabha

Replying to the debate in the Lok Sabha on Jul 23, 1957 on the Demands for Grants for the Department of Atomic Energy, Prime Minister Nehru said:

Mr. Speaker, Sir, in the course of this discussion, almost everyone has emphasised the necessity for us to go ahead as far as we can in the development of atomic energy in this country. The subject is naturally one which rather excites the imagination of everyone, and there is a feeling, as someone has said, that in this matter at least we should not lag behind, as we did, when the industrial revolution took place. I can say nothing more about it except that we have no intention of lagging behind, in so far as resources etc. permit.

Apart from the theoretical as well as practical necessity of keeping abreast of this new realm of knowledge and discovery, there is this aspect that from the power point of view, it is likely to be of the utmost importance for us in India to utilise the atomic power for peaceful purposes. We hear a lot about the use of iron and coal and oil for purposes of power. But it is rather a sobering thought that if by any chance, we used our power supplies at the rate, let us say, that the United States is using them at--which is a tremendous rate-they disappear in a very short time, and we finish them up in the course of a generation or more--I forget exactly how long. It may be twenty-five or thirty-five years. It does not matter.

So far as we know about the coal we have, and the oil we have--we now hope to have more oil than we thought first, and I believe that we are likely to discover oil in several parts of India--the fact remains, however, that our power resources potential, considering our population, is not great, for we cannot merely deal with the present generation, but we have to build for the future.

Now, therefore, as far as one can see, the main source of power, apart from the conventional sources has to be atomic energy. So, it becomes a question of extreme practical importance for us to develop power from atomic sources.

It is curious that only about, perhaps, three or four years ago, people talked rather vaguely about using atomic energy for power purposes, and there were hardly any definite plans in almost any country, although, no doubt, in the United States and England and the Soviet Union, there were some efforts being made to that end. But the progress since then has been so rapid in some of these countries, that now, it is taken for granted, which it was not then. Then, it was a kind of adventure in the sense that it could be used for civil purposes. But it was not an economic proposition. Today, it is recognised that it is an economic proposition, and it is likely to become more and more so.

Of course, at the present moment, at any rate, no one would think of our going to a coal-field, let us say, and putting up an atomic energy plant there. That is, if you are near the source of power, that is, coal or some hydroelectric concern, you would not put an atomic energy plant right there. That will be wasteful. But where you go away from the source, go away some distance from the coal-fields or from hydroelectric power, where, in fact, you may have to take vast quantities of coal to create power, there, even today, it might well be cheaper to have an atomic energy plant.

Take Delhi. We have to put up something here. We have to bring coal from 800, 900 or 1,000 miles away. There is the question of transport and so much of cost.

I would make two points. The first is that India must have some additional sources of power, apart from conventional sources, if it is to go ahead, and give higher standards to our people. Secondly, it is possible to do it through proper development of atomic energy now. Therefore the third point comes out and you must try to do it. Indeed, we are trying to do so.

Many honourable Members who have spoken have congratulated the Atomic

<Pg-137>

Energy Department on the work they have done. Some have criticised them or said that they ought to do much more than what they have done. It is not very easy to have a correct measurement of what one can do and one could have done if we had proceeded differently. But the fact remains that the development of atomic energy work in India has been remarkably rapid and, if I may say so, remarkably good. Both facts have to be borne in mind. As to whether it could not be better or whether we could not be more rapid, it is open to one to have an opinion. But the Atomic Energy Department as such was started three years ago, in 1954. Of course, before that there was the Atomic Energy Commission, which also did that work.

In August 1954, I think we spent about Rs. 11 million on atomic energy work here. Money is not much of a test, but still it helps us to understand what we are doing. Two years after that, that is, in

the current year, we are spending twelve times that amount. It has increased twelve-fold, and we are spending about Rs. 125 million.

I may inform the House that nobody in the Government of Indianeither the Finance Ministry nor any other Ministry--anxious as we are to have economy to save money, has ever refused any urgent demand of the department. Sometimes, it may be that we may suggest to them that a particular item may be spread out. I saw the other day a very big figure for a huge wall round the whole area, mile upon mile of it, which, I suppose, is necessary because one has to protect these things; but it may be that the wall might be postponed for a little while. But we have not come in the way of the development of this department and of the work it does from the financial point of view. We do not propose to do so.

Naturally, there are certain limits beyond which we cannot go. Anyway, we realise completely the importance of this work both in the present and even more so for the future.

In doing atomic energy work, there is of course the side of research and there is the practical side of the application of that research. So far as research work is concerned, the Tata Institute is the principal institute. Of course, research work is done in Universities and Colleges etc....

Apart from that, we have increased the number of people being trained by the Atomic Energy Department. I believe the present number is about 260; it will go up to about 1,000 very soon.

I think that the work we have done, both in the realm of theory and research and in practice, has not only been appreciated in various centres of atomic energy work in the world--important centres--but there have been many references to it elsewhere.

Whenever I travel abroad, I am particularly asked often enough by scientists of the countries I visit about our work. I am told by them how much they appreciate the rapid progress that we have made. Only about a month or six weeks ago, I happened to meet more than once a person who is almost the father of all this business, Prof. Neils Bohr, in Norway. He has spoken in the highest terms about our work. He has not been in India; naturally he keeps himself informed. In the field of atomic physics, he is a kind of semi-god or big guru. He is an old man who has done so much and is highly respected. He spoke in the highest terms to me about what we were doing. He was very pleased and he sought to make out that they in Norway were trying to do something which we had already done. That may be just pure compliment, but I do not think it was. It is a fact that we have done rather well. That does not mean that we should not do better....

The putting up of the Swimming Pool Reactor, which was opened by me last August--to which we gave, I think, a very proper name Apsara--was built entirely by Indian scientists and Indian engineers and that was a good piece of work. Now, two other reactors are being built,

the Canada-India reactor and the other one.

I believe, in our research work at the Tata Institute, among other things, at least one new elementary particle has been discovered. At the Institute, at least one new decay process for an elementary particle has been discovered, apart from helping in establishing a number of other processes. The Tata Research Institute, the Institute of

<Pg-138>

Fundamental Research is recognised the world over as one of the leading research institutes in mathematics and physics.

The Atomic Energy Department is planning for the next 15 years looking ahead. We have Uranium here, though not at present in very large quantities. But, we have vast quantities of Thorium. Thorium is of big importance and can be used for working reactors, but only in the second stage. In order to reach the second stage, you have to go through the first stage with Uranium reactors. And, it has become necessary, therefore, to start with these natural Uranium reactors so that later you may get to the next stage of Thorium which you have fairly in abundance, not only in Kerala, as we all know, but, even more so than there, in Bihar now.

There is one aspect which I should like to mention, which has some kind of political bearing. That is, how necessary it is for us not to depend too much on outside sources. If we depend too much for fissionable material or the rest, then, inevitably, that dependence may affect us; or other people may try to affect our foreign policy or any other policy through that dependence. It is not good, in a sense, to depend on others. That is why, when discussions took place about the formation of what is called the International Agency for the development of atomic energy for peaceful purposes, we had this specially in mind. If we have to depend too much on some central pool which contains these very special fissionable materials like Uranium 235, Plutonium 233, to be used for future atom bomb programmes, then, we have to submit to all kinds of safeguards. These very things are necessary to make the atom bombs. We do not make atom bombs or anything like that. In fact, we have declared quite clearly that we are not interested in and we will not make these bombs, even if we have the capacity to do so and that in no event will we use atomic energy for those most destructive purposes. I declared that and I was quite sure in doing that that I represented every Member of this House. And, I hope that will be the policy of all future Governments whoever is in charge. But, anyhow, the fact remains that if you develop adequately and get these fissionable materials and if you have got the resources, then you can make a bomb too, unless the world has been wise enough to come to some decision previously to stop this kind of production of bombs.

Therefore, there is a grave danger that if this fissionable material is kept in the hands of a particular agency which is more or less

controlled by a particular group of powers--all other countries to that extent are dependent--what might be called atomic colonialism might grow up. Something of that type. One wants to avoid it. Of course, one can never wholly avoid the fact that a strong country is strong and a weak country is weak and a country financially or militarily strong throws its weight about. But, nevertheless, we do not want that, as far as possible, to come into this.

I am sorry if I have forgotten to reply to any particular point. Much has been said about the use of atomic energy, isotopes, etc. being used for medical, agricultural and other purposes. Naturally, they are being used and we help in every way; they will be used. There is no difference on that. I believe considerable progress is being made in that respect and I can assure the House that the Atomic Energy Department is fully alive to its responsibilities and the Government also realises the importance of the Atomic Energy Department and the work it is doing.

USA INDIA NORWAY CANADA

Date: Jul 23, 1957

Volume No

1995

CEYLON

Repatriation of Indians

In reply to a question in the Lok Sabha on Jul 23, 1957 regarding th number of families repatriated from Ceylon to India since the agreement of 1954 and the places where they had been settled, Shri Sadath Ali Khan, Parliamentary Secretary to the

<Pg-139>

External Affairs Minister, said:

According to figures available, 23,285 Indians who were served with quit notices by the Ceylon Government, returned to India up to the end of June, 1957. Besides this, 26,198 Indians returned to India voluntarily during the same period. As most of them returned to India with their earnings and have resettled themselves in districts to which they originally belonged, it has not been found necessary to take any special steps for their rehabilitation.

Asked whether the Ceylon Government had evolved a scheme which would allow the persons of Indian origin to remain in Ceylon without

acquiring citizenship rights, Shri Sadath Ali Khan said:

According to press reports, the Government of Ceylon are working out a formula by which stateless persons would be naturalised without the right to vote. The Government of India have, however, received no such scheme from the Government of Ceylon.

INDIA

Date: Jul 23, 1957

Volume No

1995

COMMONWEALTH

Prime Ministers' Conference

The annual Conference of the Commonwealth Prime Ministers was held i London from 26 June to Jul 05, 1957. A communique was issued on 5 July. The following is the text of the communique:

The meeting of Commonwealth Prime Ministers was concluded today. This was the first Commonwealth meeting at which Ghana was represented, following her attainment of independence in March, 1957. Other Commonwealth Ministers welcomed Ghana's participation in the meeting as a full member of the Commonwealth, and took note of this occasion as a further practical evidence of the progress made by the United Kingdom Government in the pursuit of their policy of fostering constitutional development in their dependent territories.

In the course of their discussions the Commonwealth Ministers have reviewed all the major international questions of the day which are of common concern to their countries. In this association of free and independent nations it is inevitable that there should be some differences of viewpoint and opinion. But these meetings reveal a broad similarity of approach and purpose. It is not their function, nor is it the object of this communique, to record agreed decisions or formal resolutions. Their value lies in the opportunity which they afford for a full and candid exchange of views in the light of which each Commonwealth Government can formulate and pursue its separate policies with deeper knowledge and understanding of the views and interests of its fellow-members.

The primary objective of all the Commonwealth Governments is world peace and security. They believe that this objective can only be assured by increased co-operation between nations. They themselves accept the principle and practice of co-operation: it is the

foundation of their own association: they will continue to work for its wider adoption.

The United Nations was designed to provide one of the main opportunities for the practical exercise of the principle of cooperation between nations. Experience has, however, revealed certain deficiencies and weaknesses in the functioning of the organisation. The Commonwealth Ministers agreed that constructive action is needed to strengthen and improve the United Nations as an instrument for preserving peace, justice and co-operation throughout the world in accordance with the principles of the Charter.

In the discussion of developments since their last meeting, the Commonwealth Ministers expressed their grave concern at the tragic events in Hungary. They took note that the forthcoming consideration by the General Assembly of the report presented by its Special Committee will provide the occasion for the United Nations to record its views.

<Pg-140>

The Commonwealth Ministers reviewed the course of developments in the current discussions on disarmament. They noted that proposals relating to a first stage of disarmament were put forward on 2 July in the Disarmament Sub-Committee on behalf of the Governments of the United States, the United Kingdom, Canada and France. They recognised that even a limited agreement, by reducing the suspicions and tensions throughout the world, would help to create conditions in which a more comprehensive scheme of disarmament could be developed.

The Commonwealth Ministers discussed the international problems of the Middle East. They agreed that, in the long term, economic and social progress must be the foundation for stability in the Middle East. They agreed, however, that in the short term the need is to work towards a relaxation of the tension arising from the dispute between the Arab States and Israel, the plight of the Arab refugees and the unresolved problems in connection with the Suez Canal. They considered that solutions of all these urgent questions should continue to be pursued by all practicable means. Consideration was also given to the contribution which might be made by the Commonwealth Governments concerned towards the easing of tension and the maintenance of peace, stability and political freedom in the Far East and South-East Asia. The Commonwealth Ministers welcomed the important contribution already made by mutual assistance under the Colombo Plan towards raising the standards of living and promoting economic development in the under-developed countries of this area.

In their general review of economic questions the Commonwealth Ministers gave special attention to the impact of the major programmes of development on which many of their countries are now engaged. These programmes call for high levels of domestic saving which can only be secured by sound internal policies. But they also call for conditions favourable to investment from other countries.

The United Kingdom will continue to play its leading role in furthering economic development in the countries of the Commonwealth, and important contributions are also being made by other Commonwealth members. But, in view of the continued need for capital investment, it is also important to encourage investment from other sources on suitable conditions.

The Commonwealth Ministers noted the progress made since their last meeting towards the freeing of trade and payments. In this context they discussed the proposals for the creation of an industrial free trade area in Europe as a complement to the European Economic Community to be set up under the Treaty of Rome. They agreed that, as a part of the continuous exchange of views between Commonwealth Governments on these matters, particular aspects of the proposals which might specially affect certain countries of the Commonwealth should be examined in London next week by officials of all Commonwealth countries in the light of the Ministers' discussions.

The Commonwealth Ministers noted that the Annual Meeting of the International Monetary Fund and the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development will be held in Washington in September. The normal practice is for this Meeting to be followed by a meeting of Commonwealth Finance Ministers. The Prime Minister of Canada extended an invitation that this meeting of Finance Ministers should be held this year in Ottawa.

The Commonwealth Ministers recognised the value of the work carried out over the past thirty years by the Commonwealth Economic Committee. They agreed that the Committee should be invited to examine and suggest to Governments what expansion of its scope and functions might usefully be undertaken for the particular purpose of drawing attention to the economic resources of Commonwealth countries.

The Commonwealth Ministers reviewed the progress of co-operation within the Commonwealth in the use of nuclear energy for civil purposes. They recognised the growing importance of the contribution which nuclear energy can make to the peaceful development of their countries and of the rest of the world and the value of close collaboration between members of the Commonwealth in this field. For this purpose nuclear scientists from Commonwealth countries will be invited to an informal meeting in the United Kingdom, in 1958.

The Commonwealth Ministers noted that the Federation of Malaya was on the eve of attaining independence. They extended to

<Pg-141>

the Federation their warm good wishes for its future, and they looked forward to being able to welcome an independent Malaya as a member of the Commonwealth on the completion of the necessary constitutional processes.

Date: Jul 05, 1957

Volume No

1995

EAST GERMANY

Special Payments Procedure

A Press Note was issued in New Delhi on Jul 16, 1957 announcing the exchange of letters in New Delhi on 16 July between Shri K. B. Lall, Joint Secretary, Ministry of Commerce & Industry and Mr. H. Meyer of the Ministry of Foreign Trade and Inner German Trade of the German Democratic Republic setting out a special payments procedure.

The German Democratic Republic is in a position to supply essential machinery, particularly textile machinery, industrial raw materials, chemicals, etc. while India has a large variety of consumer goods to offer to the German Democratic Republic. The payments procedure now agreed upon aims at promoting the trade between the two countries in these items.

The Deutsche Notenbank of the German Democratic Republic will open a Special Account with the State Bank of India to be known as the Special Trade Development Account of the German Democratic Republic. The rupee proceeds of contracts for the import of essential machinery and industrial raw materials from the German Democratic Republic concluded with or through the State Trading Corporation of India (Private) Ltd. will be credited to this account.

The contracts for the purchase of machinery are expected to be concluded on deferred payment terms and the rupee balances in the Special Account are proposed to be utilised only for the payment of exports from India of a number of commodities. These include jute goods, tea, coffee, mica, chemicals, wool, hides and skins, handloom cloth, leather goods, machine tools, tobacco, handicrafts, fans, sewing machines and other electrical appliances.

This arrangement does not affect the operation of other Accounts stipulated in the Trade Agreement of 8 October 1956. In fact, all the transactions under this arrangement will be governed by the Trade Agreement except for the procedure for payments.

The new arrangement is expected to result in a substantial development of trade between two countries on a mutually advantageous

basis.

GERMANY INDIA USA

Date: Jul 16, 1957

Volume No

1995

INDONESIA

Trade Agreement Extended

A Press Note was issued in New Delhi on Jul 01, 1957 announcing the exchange of letters in Djakarta, on 1 July, between the Indian Ambassador, Shri G. Parthasarthy, on behalf of the Government of India, and the Secretary-General of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, on behalf of the Government of the Republic of Indonesia extending the validity of the Trade Agreement between the two countries until 31 December 1957.

The principal commodities listed for export from India to Indonesia under the agreement are: Cotton textile and yarn, jute goods, Jtobacco, linseed oil, hardware, pharmaceuticals and chemicals, teachests, shellac, sports goods, rubber tyres and tubes, porcelainware, paper and boards, machinery including agricultural implements, diesel engines, sugarcane crushers, textile machinery, electrical equipment including motors and

<Pg-142>

batteries, sewing machines, hurricane lanterns and other household utensils.

The major items listed for exports from Indonesia to India are: Copra and cocoanut oils, palm kernels and essential oil, spices including betelnuts, timber, tin, rubber, hides and skins, canes and rattans, gums and resins, tanning materials, sisal fibre, and tobacco wrappers.

INDONESIA INDIA USA

Date: Jul 01, 1957

Volume No

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

Prime Minister's Statement in Lok Sabha

Initiating debate on the Demands for Grants of the Ministry of External Affairs in the Lok Sabha on Jul 23, 1957, Prime Minister Nehru said:

In considering the foreign policy and the work of our foreign missions, we cannot isolate them from conditions that prevail in the world today; nor, indeed, may we be able to isolate them from the past. They are governed by those conditions and to some extent, we have to do many things that normally we would not do, or we would not like to do. We had to go and accept the challenge of the establishment of a Commission in Indo-China, which is not normally within the scope of our work, but for the sake of conditions there, we could not escape from that responsibility. We went to Korea; we have got a detachment on the Israeli-Egyptian border today. All these are really outside the normal scope of our work. Occupying the position that We do, that is to say, the position in which sometimes other countries like to put faith in our impartiality, we are called upon to undertake certain tasks and we cannot escape that burden.

The world today, as everyone knows has been for some time past pursued by this conflict between major Power Blocs, sometimes this is called cold war, sometimes by some other name. This is the dominant feature of the political landscape in the world. Whether you consider disarmament on the one hand or any other major question, whether you consider the question of Kashmir or any other, somehow it gets entangled so far as other countries are concerned in this cold war approach and cold war technique. A distinguished statesman who was here only two or three days ago and who was here from abroad, said in answer to a question about some of these problems including Kashmir, that it is entangled in the cold war. Otherwise, they might have been much easier to handle. I am merely mentioning this so that people may realise how much we are conditioned by these major factors and every problem today, whether it is discussed in the United Nations or elsewhere, is conditioned, is affected, by this approach. We have tried and tried with success to keep outside these military groupings and we have tried to judge every problem on the merits so far as we can, even though, of course, we do not live in some ivory tower cut off from the rest of the world, we are affected by the world's happenings. We have often adopted policies and programmes which have to take into consideration the facts of life, if I may say so. I am not just ideological.

If I may give an instance, there is the instance of Algeria. All of us here, I take it, feel very strongly about the tragedy of Algeria.

We want Algerian freedom. We have functioned in regard to Algeria in the United Nations, however, not merely proclaiming loudly that we are in favour of Algerian freedom, but also always trying to find some way to approach it, some way to bring people together, some way even to influence, in so far as we can, the Republic of France in a friendly way, because our object has been to get something done, to get peace established, so that freedom may advance and not merely to shout out at everything that we dislike.

There are so many things in this world that we dislike. There are so many things in our own country that we dislike. If we merely shout out at them all the time peacefully, it would yield no result. Sometimes we are criticised because we do not go out as champions proclaiming our faith in the various things that ought to be done in the

<Pg-143>

world. I suppose that would be a noble attitude, but apart from not yielding any results always, it actually may put back the clock, because if one has to solve the world's problems by peaceful methods, one has always to try, while adhering to a principle, to win over the other side, to influence the other side by various methods such as might lead to a peaceful approach, whatever the problem may be. I ask this House to bear this in mind whether the problem is that of, let us say, Indians in South Africa on which every single person here and in the country and many people outside this country have the strongest feelings, about the policy of the Government of the Union of South Africa. We are limited in what we can do. We cannot declare war on South Africa. We go to the United Nations; we take other steps. Unfortunately those steps have not yielded any great results, although I believe world opinion has very largely accepted, I will not say our view-point, but at any rate accepted the view-point that the South African Government's policy is completely wrong, not only wrong, but highly objectionable. That has happened. But even that question is tied up with this cold war. Even the question of Goa about which we feel so much is tied up with the cold war. So every subject that you touch gets tied up with these major conflicts. That does not mean that we should give up that particular subject; we should go on dealing with it, but we must realise that that particular subject or conflict, simple as it may appear to be, is not simple because it is tied up with the major conflicts in the world today, and all kinds of pressures are brought upon us in regard to the major conflicts in this way. The House knows how the question of Kashmir has been dragged into this in many ways. Other countries, regardless of the merits of the case, judge it from the point of view of the cold war.

The cold war technique, we feel, is a very wrong technique because ultimately the cold war technique is a technique, if not of actual violence, always thinking in terms of violence and hatred thereby increasing the conflicts, not really solving the problem, but keeping it on the brink of major conflicts. It is in this context that we

have to function in the world and deal with every single problem of foreign affairs today. We have tried, and again in a large measure succeeded, to keep friendly relations with all countries, even those countries that are opposed to us in many ways and with whose policies we do not agree

I am trying to put before this House that whatever subject there may be in the context of foreign affairs, we try to approach it from this broad standpoint, in order to try to solve it peacefully without giving up any single principle of ours, because there is no other way. The other way is one of war. If we want to avoid war, we should not all the time talk in terms of war or in terms of threats and counter-threats. We have to express ourselves strongly occasionally because we feel strongly, but we try to avoid condemning any country as far as possible. Sometimes one has to do it in discussing a policy because condemnation does not take us anywhere, more especially when the condemnation is not of a particular country, but inevitably is seen in the context of these groups against each other and, instead of throwing any light on the situation, it merely aggravates it and angers the party condemned.

I do not think I need say much about the present situation in the world except that in the course of the last few months what is called the Middle-East, that is, Western Asia, has been the centre of a great deal of tension. In fact, it was a centre of military operation, last year and the tension continues. There again, there are many problems of that region, but every single problem has been made more difficult by the military approach, by the cold war approach, by the military alliance approach, by the Baghdad Pact approach. I confess I have tried hard to understand how these military approaches have in practice, apart from theory, helped in easing the situation there. It is my belief that, but for these military approaches, but for the Baghdad Pact, the situation would never have deteriorated as it did last year in Western Asia. In my belief, it is only by giving up these military approaches, the situation there and elsewhere will gradually stabilise itself. I do not say that the problems will be solved by that. I do not say, that any country can forget the problems of its own security. We have to talk of our security from danger. We are, I believe, more peacefully inclined than any other country in the world; I believe, at least as much. Yet, we have to talk of our own security. We have to take measures for it. I

<Pg-144>

cannot ask any country not to take measures for its security. It is one thing to take measures for security and quite another thing to talk in terms of war, to have threats and counter-threats and live in this atmosphere of cold war.

The world today is living under the shadow of the hydrogen bomb and atomic war. This House and the other too declared themselves quite clearly on this subject. I believe in the world today there is a very strong opinion among the people and even among many Governments against nuclear warfare and against nuclear test explosions. There is, perhaps, a little better atmosphere for disarmament too. Yet, fears and apprehensions prevent nations from coming to agreement. All I can say is, I hope they will come to some kind of agreement however partial it may be. We cannot hope for full and complete agreement suddenly. Even if small agreements are made, they create a better atmosphere for the next advance. But, in particular, this business of test explosions of atomic and hydrogen bombs seems to us completely immoral from any point of view, completely injurious and to consider that they are advancing the cause of peace in the world, seems to me rather an extraordinary way of looking at things.

In regard to some of our major problems with our neighbouring, country Pakistan, problems of Kashmir, canal waters, etc., I will not say much except, again, to say that one of the chief difficulties about these problems is this cold war which has been brought to India's borders by these pacts like the Baghdad Pact or the SEATO by the military assistance given to Pakistan and thereby these problems have been made much more intricate and more difficult.

Take the canal waters problem. We handed it over to the World Bank for their help. For five years, they dealt with it. After two or three years, they made a proposal which, broadly, we accepted. Pakistan did not accept it. Again, for two or three years, they had been going on discussing this matter. Some of our best engineers, for five years, had been sitting in Washington, going backwards and forwards. We lose their services here. We spent large sums of money in keeping a huge delegation discussing it there. We have pursued this policy because we wanted to solve the canal water problem peacefully to the advantage of both the countries. It is not a political problem at all. It is a technical problem which technicians should have solved, sitting together. It is well known that there is quite enough water in the various rivers of the Punjab to go round and much more left over for the sea. It is only a question of arrangement with some expenditure involved. Yet, this has been made into a purely political problem. Year after year has passed and Pakistan has taken up an attitude which becomes more and more intransigent.

I am amazed, if I may say so, at the kind of speeches recently delivered by the Prime Minister of Pakistan in the U.S.A. and to some extent, even in the United Kingdom:

Pakistan is suffering from hunger and thirst because of canal water disputes; what will not a hungry and thirsty man or a country do; it will not die of hunger and thirst.

This is an extraordinary approach to these problems. At any time that would have been bad. At a time when the World Bank has, again, put forward some proposals which cast a heavy burden on India, a very heavy burden and yet, for the sake of peace we have again accepted, subject to certain minor matters to be discussed,--we have not yet

got Pakistan's reply--for the Prime Minister of Pakistan to go about in the United States and say that we are bent on reducing Pakistan to a desert by cutting off water and placing the population of Pakistan in such agonies, does seem to me to be a thing very far from the truth. It is a realm of fancy which should not normally be brought into play in dealing with solid matters of fact. I regret this tendency on the part of the Pakistan Prime Minister. It is not a question of difference of opinion. We differ in many ways. We differ in our outlook on life, way of life, way of thinking. That may be there. But, there are certain standards, I think, which should normally be kept up by people who occupy responsible positions. I regret that these standards are being repeatedly ignored.

About this canal water question, I may remind this House, because there is so much

<Pg-145>

talk about it, that here in Delhi, in May, 1948, we actually came to a friendly understanding, agreement, a kind of treaty which we signed, Pakistan and India. It was on 4 May, if I remember rightly, in 1948. In spite of that, after two years, it was denounced by Pakistan. Since then, all these arguments have taken place.

In all these matters, we live under the shadow of cold war. Unfortunately, Pakistan, through these military alliances, and the rest, is encouraged to pursue wrong paths which prevent the settlement of so many problems that we have with Pakistan. It is obvious that two countries like India and Pakistan, which are neighbours, which will continue to be neighbours and which have so much in common, must be friends, should be co-operative and help each other. Any kind of injury to Pakistan ultimately is bound to be an injury to India just as an injury to India is bound to injure Pakistan. But, it has been our misfortune during the past many years to live in this state of conflict with Pakistan. In spite of our efforts to normalise our relations, they have not improved to any considerable extent.

Then, I will not say much about Pondicherry. We have been waiting for long, long time for the French Government, to pass their law so that the transfer of the French territories here might become legal, de jure--up till now it is de facto. The House knows that French Governments have been changed frequently and all kinds of difficulties have been faced by them, and this thing which should have been a formal affair has not yet been done. We are now assured that in the course of the next month or two it will be done. I hope so.

Then there is this old question of our continuing in the Commonwealth. I do not know if I can add anything to what I have previously said on this issue. It seems to me that the difference in opinion on this issue arises really from a different conception of what we are there for and what we do there. If it is a conception

that by being in the Commonwealth we are in any sense subordinate to anybody, in any sense tied up to something that might come in our way, then I would be completely at one with those who object to our being in the Commonwealth. If, on the other hand, it does not come in our way in the slightest degree, and in fact gives us certain opportunities, helpful opportunities, to serve the larger causes that we have at heart, then it is worth while being there.

I have asked in this House previously and I would like to ask that question again now. I can understand somebody feeling sentimental; well, he does not like it. To that, of course, there is no logical reply. But I should like to know practically how our being in the Commonwealth has injured our policies or our advocacy of any cause that we hold dear. It has helped us, I say, in influencing others. It has helped us in regard to other matters too. And broadly speaking, I am against breaking any kind of associations, with any nation which I have. I want more associations, not less.

Our association with our neighbour country like Burma is a very close one, with other countries, also it is often very close. It may not be signified by a special name, but it is very much closer in many ways than our association with many of the Commonwealth countries. So, I just do not understand this except that I can understand it on the ground of sentiment. In the Commonwealth there is the Union of South Africa with which we have nothing to do.

Now, certain changes are coming over the Commonwealth which I think are good in the wider scheme of things. That is the coming into the Commonwealth of independent Ghana, a new nation, an African nation, to be followed a little later by Malaya, to be followed presumably a little later by Nigeria. All these things really have a great deal of historical significance, and we can help or hinder in these processes which are not only of importance to those countries concerned but in the wider context of Africa and Asia and world peace.

<Pg-146>

CHINA KOREA EGYPT ISRAEL USA ALGERIA FRANCE INDIA SOUTH AFRICA IRAQ PAKISTAN MALI BURMA GHANA NIGER NIGERIA

Date: Jul 23, 1957

Volume No

1995

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

Prime Minister's Reply to Debate in Lok Sabha

In course of his reply to the debate in the Lok Sabha on Jul 23, 1957 on the Demands for Grants of the External Affairs Ministry, Prime Minister Nehru said:

The Hon. Member Shri V. Raju referred to Bhutan and Sikkim and to our having put down, crushed popular movements there. That was news to me.

SHRI V. RAJU: I did not say you put it down. I said you made a treaty with the Rulers there and in the case of Sikkim there was a popular Government before the treaty was made which is no longer there at the moment

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: Who exactly we should make a treaty with there or in any country except with the Government of the country is not clear to me. Normally we deal with Governments, whether it was the Government of Bhutan or Sikkim. As a matter of fact, we had treaties with them. We have inherited treaties. Since then we have had new treaties made, or amendments to the old treaties. There was a special relationship between India and Sikkim and Bhutan. It is not the same relationship.

There is some difference between the two. We inherited it, and having inherited it, interpreted that relationship in as free a way as possible, to encourage these Governments to have their own free life without interference. We are not interested in them except, naturally, that we would like them to progress. We are interested in them certainly because they are frontier Governments and what happens in them is of deep interest to us. For the rest we are only interested in their development according to their lines and wishes.

So far as Bhutan is concerned, we have not even got a representative sitting in Bhutan. From what Shri V. Raju has said, one might imagine that we have got armies stationed there. We have not even got a mission or a representative or an agent in the whole of Bhutan, so far as I can remember, unless something has taken place very recently, that I do not know.

Occasionally, our representative who sits in Gangtok has been to Bhutan. It is about seven or eight days' journey to reach from the border of Bhutan to the capital. The capital itself is a moving capital. It is a cutoff place, certainly much more cut off than Egypt or Tibet is nowadays. Probably, there is hardly a place in the world which is quite so cut off.

There is no question of interference by us. There are many things that happened there, which we may like or dislike. We cannot interfere with a country like that. We are friendly with them. We have given them some help. They wanted some engineers. We gave them some engineers. They want some teachers. And there has been some little surveying by our engineers about roads. That is all. So, I think, for anyone to say that we are carrying on some kind of an

imperialist tradition in Sikkim and Bhutan is very very far from reality or the facts.

There are a number of small matters to which I shall make a reference. Shri H. N. Mukerjee had referred to the Gurkha recruitment centres of the U.K. I had previously also referred to these centres, and I bad expressed my regret that they continue. But I should like to make it perfectly clear that they do not recruit in India. It has nothing to do with recruitment. We stopped that long ago. We certainly have allowed them to continue as transit centres; they bring these Gurkhas from Nepal, and they stay in these transit centres, are given clothing etc. and then passed on, and I believe, they are also examined medically there. I am not justifying that, because we do not want these things to continue there. I only wish to say, however, that nobody is allowed to be recruited here. This facility that was given was a transit facility. I am told that other depots in Nepal territory are being built now by the British.

SHRI JAIPAL SINGH: Does that mean that no training is given in these transit centres as used to be the case previously?

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: To my knowledge, no training is given. If the Hon. Member wants, I can find out. What I have

<Pg-147>

been told is that these transit centres are places for storage and clothing; they are also used for X-ray screening, payment of pensions, collection and staging of parties to Calcutta, and handling of leave and discharge parties. That is the definition. These depots would be closed as soon as the British depot under construction in Dharan Bazar (on Nepalese territory) is completed.

About India's publicity in foreign countries, the Prime Minister observed:

I would like to point out that the reaction to publicity in many countries depends so much on the policy that that country pursues. That is, if our policy is contrary to that country's policy, we do not get much publicity there, and it does not affect people--I am talking about the governmental circles or the Press. The Press may be very free, and the Press is supposed to he free and is, in a sense, free, and yet in another sense, not legal, I mean, it is as regimented as anything can be, not forcibly regimented, but simply ideologically regimented. I am not merely talking about countries which are supposed to be totalitarian but other countries too where the Press--no all the Press--follows one line, because they are used to that line. They do not like anything said in contradiction of it.

So that publicity, properly carried out, should be helpful, and probably the best kind of publicity ultimately is the personal approach and the personal explanation.

But the real thing is that when policies conflict, in these days of rather passionate attachment to one programme or policy, anyone not agreeing with it is prima facie supposed to be a person in the wrong and all eyes and ears are closed to him.

I would like to say, however, that whatever Governments and others or even the Press may say or may not say about India,— I say so with all respect and with some hesitation—the fact is that to the common people in every country, in their minds, India is popular. I have no doubt about it. They are increasingly interested in India, her work and difficulties, in India's philosophy, if you like, but I am not talking about our civilisation, but about what we are doing today. It is extraordinary. Interest in our Five Year Plans, and in our efforts has grown in a great part of the world, I do not say all over the world—I cannot speak for all the world—but certainly for a very large part of the world. This interest has grown very greatly. There is appreciation that even though we might make many mistakes, we try to live up to certain standards in our public life and in our foreign policy.

There was some reference to our opening a mission in Madrid. We have resisted opening an office there for many years and for various reasons. Ultimately, we felt that this was not in conformity with the general policy we had laid down. What is this policy? We have said that China, for instance, should be recognised--we have recognised her; I am talking about other countries--regardless of the fact whether we agree with China's policy or not. It is a fact and it should be recognised and dealt with as a great nation. Now, if that is so, if we say that we do not agree with the policy of another country and we won't have dealings with her, that argument was put before us repeatedly. We had no real answer. For other reasons too, we made this decision. After all, many of us for long years had certain sympathies in regard to Spain. Even the United Nations, at one time, expressed an opinion which was not favourable to the present regime in Spain and asked countries not to have Missions there. That was years ago and years have passed; and we have felt that it would not be right in the present circumstances for us not to have recognised the Government of Spain and to have our Mission there and to exchange Missions from there.

Coming to Hungary. It is rather difficult to deal with this matter in all its aspects. But, I should like to point out two or three aspects of it. There has never been any doubt in any person's mind--any person acquainted with the facts--about certain major developments there. First, and undoubtedly it was or it developed into a national uprising. I do not think, to begin with, it was organised as such. Obviously, there was the feeling there. It began in a small way, but because of certain circumstances, it spread and became undoubtedly a national uprising. Undoubtedly also, various elements took advantage of that national uprising which are normally called fascist and the like. Various people from outside also

came into the picture. Even before that there had been continuous efforts to create trouble. All this was there and, nevertheless, it is true that it was a national uprising. It is also true that this national uprising was forcibly crushed by the military, chiefly the Soviet forces that came in. Some emphasise one aspect more than the other; but these facts are clear. The point is to look at them in a certain context of events. In one sense, the context goes far back. Of course development has been there. I am not referring to that, but to the fact that all this coincided with what happened in Egypt at the time and Suez Canal. It was a great misfortune for Hungary that this coincided with the Anglo-French intervention in Egypt because both these things coming together raised the tempo of the World situation and the temperature was high no doubt. There was grave danger in the minds of many people and many Governments, that war was coming. Because of that, many things were done which, perhaps, normally would not have been done. A situation had arisen in Poland which, as, the House knows, was settled peacefully, and to the satisfaction more or less of all the parties concerned. It is quite conceivable that the same thing would have happened in Hungary but for what took place immediately in Egypt, the invasion of Egypt and the Suez Canal. That is, a situation arose when every country began to think in terms of war coming, in terms of security, in terms of seeing that it does not lose its strategic point, in terms of seeing that the hostile frontier did not come nearer to then. All kinds of tactics came in. These are not excuses. I am only trying to understand the situation that had arisen.

So far as we are concerned, although all these factors were before us, nevertheless we, right from the beginning--some people think that I stated in Scandinavia something which I had not stated before--but from the beginning we had said that we do not like to go about merely condemning. We stated from the beginning that the people of Hungary should be given freedom to decide their own way whatever they wish. And, secondly that foreign forces should be withdrawn from there as from everywhere.

This was our attitude throughout, in the United Nations as well as everywhere. The only thing we were anxious to avoid was to take a step at that very critical moment which might have plunged, we thought at that time, Europe and the world into war; not by our action, but every small thing counted at that time. So, it is in this perspective that I would like the House to consider this matter.

Of course, even that is a smaller perspective. One should go back to the last war decisions. After all, we are in a happy position; but, nonetheless, the decisions at Yalta and other places we have to consider, and the fates and consequences of some of those decisions taken there. Anyhow, I believe that for a variety of reasons, the developments that are now taking place are in the right direction and it should be our endeavour to encourage them instead of discouraging and not doing something which comes in the way of action.

Date: Jul 23, 1957

Volume No

1995

PAKISTAN

Canal Waters Issue

Shri S. K. Patil, Minister for Irrigation and Power, made a statemen in the Lok Sabha, on Jul 25, 1957 on the question of sharing the waters of the Indus Basin between India and Pakistan. The following is the text of Shri Patil's statement:

The House is aware that on 4 May 1943 the Governments of India and Pakistan entered into an agreement on the canal waters. The two Governments then agreed to approach the problem in a practical spirit on the basis of India progressively diminishing supply to Pakistan canals in order to give reasonable time to enable Pakistan to tap alternative sources. The question, however, still remains unsettled due to the unwillingness of Pakistan to settle it in the only manner possible, namely, by developing supplies through alternative sources to

<Pg-149>

replace the pre-partition historic withdrawals of the Pakistan canals from the three eastern rivers.

In 1952, a working party comprising an engineer each from India and Pakistan and a representative of the World Bank, was set up, at the instance of Mr. Eugene R. Black, President of the Bank, to work out a plan of "specific engineering measures, by which the supplies effectively available to each country will be increased substantially beyond what they have ever been". Intensive engineering studies were undertaken but all efforts to find an agreed basis for a settlement ended in failure. It was, however, clear that there was enough water in the Indus Basin rivers to meet the requirements of both India and Pakistan.

The Bank representative, thereupon, put forward, on 5 February 1954, a proposal for the consideration of both sides to serve as a basis of agreement. This proposal, as is well known to the House, envisaged that the three western rivers (Indus, Jhelum and Chenab) except for minor uses in the State of Jammu and Kashmir, would be available for

the use and benefit of Pakistan, and the three eastern rivers (Ravi, Beas and Sutlej) for the use and benefit of India. It also envisaged a transition period of roughly five years, during which Pakistan was to build link canals to replace the waters received by some of its canals rom the eastern rivers. India was to contribute towards the cost of the link canals.

In the interest of a speedy settlement, we accepted the proposal notwithstanding the fact that its acceptance involved extremely heavy sacrifices by us. Pakistan, however, did not accept the Bank proposal. Later, it was agreed at the instance of the Bank that both sides would co-operate in working out a plan, taking as a starting point the division of waters envisaged in the Bank proposal. Although a considerable amount of useful work was done, the Bank found itself unable to bring about a settlement between the two parties.

In May, 1956, the Bank handed over to both sides an aide memoire in which it reiterated its conviction that the division of waters proposed by the Bank in 1954 afforded the best prospects of a settlement. The Bank also felt, on the basis of a study carried out by its consultants, that it might be necessary to provide some storage as a part of the replacement plan to meet the uses that the Bank had adopted for this study.

Though the talks were extended to 31 March 1957, the Bank again found it difficult to make much progress because of the attitude of the Pakistan representative who would not cooperate in working out a plan on the basis of the Bank proposal and the aide memoire. In April, 1957, the Bank suggested that the co-operative work should be extended up to 30 September 1957, to give the Bank and the Governments of India and Pakistan an opportunity to review the situation.

In June last, a Bank team, headed by Mr. W. A. B. Iliff, Vice-President of the Bank, visited India and Pakistan and held consultations with the Prime Ministers and Ministers concerned in both countries. Before leaving for Washington, Mr. Iliff handed over to both sides a letter in which he has asked for the views of the two Governments, in writing, on certain heads of agreement which should form the basis of an approach to an international water treaty. These heads of agreement follow generally the Bank proposal of 1954 but seek to provide some machinery for resolving points on which the Bank may be unable to secure an agreement. After receiving the views of the two Governments, the Bank would obtain the comments of each Government on the views of the other. The Bank would then decide whether the employment of its good offices could make any further contribution and, if so, along what lines the work should proceed.

During the recent months, there has been a good deal of propaganda by and on behalf of Pakistan, aimed at misleading world opinion by suppression and distortion of facts. Among other things, it has been alleged that India has cut off, or is threatening to cut off, canal supplies to Pakistan; that India is constructing a dam on the river

Sutlej which would convert the whole of West Pakistan into a 'dusty bowl'; and that Pakistan's economy is in danger unless it continues to receive supplies from the three eastern rivers.

The statements made against India have not only no basis in fact, but are completely

$$<$$
Pg-150>

misleading. Ever since the agreement of May 1948, to which I have already referred, there has not been a single occasion when supplies were cut off from Pakistan. For the two years ending 31 March 1957, three agreements were executed through the good offices of the Bank and formed the basis of regulation of canal waters between the two countries. Under these ad hoc transitional agreements, India agreed to restrict her additional withdrawals for the Bhakra canals in accordance with Pakistan's ability to replace supplies. There is no such agreement, however, from April, 1957, as no request was made for one. It is understood that the three link canals already constructed in Pakistan are capable of replacing all the waters that the new Indian canals would withdraw during the current kharif season.

The Bhakra Dam which has been under construction since 1945 will go into operation with partial reservoir capacity in 1958. By 1960, it would operate with full capacity. This will not have any effect on the Pakistan canals as the dam would store supplies only during the flood season when ample supplies are available. On the other hand, such storage would reduce flood hazards and damage by floods in Pakistan.

A dam on the Sutlej cannot in any event hold up waters flowing into the Indus, the Jhelum and the Chenab which carry 80 percent of the waters of the Indus system. At present only about 10 per cent of the irrigation in West Pakistan depends on the waters from the eastern rivers. The fact is--and this has been generally recognised by those who have studied the problem--that the three western rivers (Indus, Jhelum and Chenab) have such a large irrigation potential that Pakistan would be able to undertake, in addition to replacing supplies hitherto received from the eastern rivers, extensive new developments for many years to come. To say, in these circumstances, that the whole of the irrigated area in West Pakistan will revert to desert by the withholding of waters from the eastern rivers is a grave distortion of facts.

It was in a spirit of good neighbourliness that we accepted the Bank proposal although it meant giving up our rights on certain vital supplies flowing through our territory. In the same spirit we voluntarily imposed on ourselves restrictions on the utilisation of the waters flowing through our rivers although in the context of the tremendous problems of rehabilitation following partition, we would have been fully justified in rapidly extending irrigation to areas which depend for their development on the waters of the eastern rivers. And, in our anxiety to see that the Pakistan cultivators were

not penalised for the faults of their Government, we have continued to supply water from the three eastern rivers although the Government of Pakistan, contrary to the agreement of May, 1948, have defaulted in the payment of canal water charges, the arrears of which have steadily mounted up to over Rs. 10 million. There is, however, a limit to our patience. India will not wait indefinitely for a settlement, ignoring the needs of her own people.

PAKISTAN LATVIA INDIA USA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC

Date: Jul 25, 1957

Volume No

1995

PAKISTAN

Border Incidents

In reply to a question in the Lok Sabha on Jul 31, 1957 on border incidents Shrimati Lakshmi N. Menon, Deputy Minister of External Affairs, said:

In 1956 there were 80 incidents of various kinds on the Indo-Pakistan border of West Bengal. In 1957, up to 30 June, there have been 49 incidents. There was no loss of life but 12 Indian nationals were injured and 22 kidnapped. 697 heads of cattle were also lifted. These incidents have been taken up by the Government of West Bengal with the Government of East Pakistan. A few serious cases have also been taken up by the Indian High Commission, Karachi, with the Government of Pakistan. The State Governments have taken steps, for example, intensifying border patrols to tighten up security arrangements.

<Pg-151>

PAKISTAN USA INDIA

Date: Jul 31, 1957

Volume No

1995

PAKISTAN

Indian Nationals in East Pakistan

Shrimati Lakshmi N. Menon, Deputy Minister of External Affairs, replied in the affirmative, in the Lok Sabha on Jul 18, 1957, to a question whether Indian nationals in East Pakistan were being subjected to discrimination in appointment in private firms. She said:

Some instances of such discrimination have been brought to the notice of the Government of India. In all these cases the firms in Pakistan have been obliged to dispense with the services of Indian nationals because the Pakistan authorities refused to renew the `F' category visas of the employees who are Indian nationals.

PAKISTAN INDIA USA

Date: Jul 18, 1957

Volume No

1995

PAKISTAN

"Liberation of Kashmir Party"

In reply to a question in the Lok Sabha on Jul 23, 1957 whether it was a fact that a "Liberation of Kashmir Party" had been formed in Pakistan under the leadership of ex-Major General Akbar Khan with the object of 'liberating' Kashmir through agitation from within, the Prime Minister, Shri Jawaharlal Nehru, said:

According to information, a new Party or movement has been formed under the leadership of ex-Major General Akbar Khan. One of the declared objectives of the Party is to create a so-called "internal freedom movement" for what they choose the term "liberation" of the State. This so-called "liberation movement" aims at sabotage, violence and subversion within the Part of the territory of the Indian Union in Jammu and Kashmir that is not under Pakistan occupation, with assistance or direction from Pakistan.

PAKISTAN INDIA

Date: Jul 23, 1957

Volume No

1995

PAKISTAN

Pakistan Nationals in India

In reply to a question in the Lok Sabha on Jul 26, 1957 about the reasons for extending the time-limit for Pakistan Nationals working in India to acquire "T" Visas to enable them to stay in the country, Shri Sadath Ali Khan, Parliamentary Secretary to the External Affairs Minister, said:

The time-limit has been extended on humanitarian grounds to give a further opportunity to those who had not been able to acquire the visas by the earlier date.

<Pg-152>

PAKISTAN INDIA **Date**: Jul 26, 1957

August

Volume No

1995

CONTENTS

Foreign Affairs Record

1957 August No. 8

VOL. III

CONTENTS

FOREIGN ASSISTANCE Development of Railways 153
GOA Border Smuggling
INDIA AND THE UNITED NATIONS People of Indian Origin in South Africa 154
INTERNATIONAL TRADE European Common Market Scheme 155
MALAYA India's Greetings 156
OMAN Reference in Parliament 156
PAKISTAN Residence Law in Jammu and Kashmir 157 Indian Representative's Letter to U.N
SOUTH KOREA Introduction of Modern Weapons 163
UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS Negotiations on Rouble Credit 163
MINISTRY OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS: EXTERNAL PUBLICITY DIVISION GOVERNMENT OF INDIA
<Ρσ-i>

INDIA SOUTH AFRICA OMAN PAKISTAN USA KOREA

Date: Aug 01, 1957

Volume No

FOREIGN ASSISTANCE

Development Of Railways

In reply to a question in the Lok Sabha on Aug 01, 1957, Shri Shah Nawaz Khan, Deputy Minister for Railways, placed a statement on the table of the House giving details of the foreign assistance received for the development of the Indian Railways.

According to the statement, the Indian Railways have received in all \$40,164,282 under the Technical Co-operation Aid Programme (U.S.A.) and under the Colombo Plan Aid Programme from Australia aid equivalent to \$8,064,000.

The World Bank loan of 90 million dollars recently secured for the Railways' second Five Year Plan is not part of this "foreign assistance".

USA INDIA AUSTRALIA SRI LANKA

Date: Aug 01, 1957

Volume No

1995

GOA

Border Smuggling

In reply to a question in the Lok Sabha on Aug 08, 1957, Shri T. T. Krishnamachari, Finance Minister, said:

Contraband goods valued at Rs. 374,692 had been seized on the Goa border during the period 1 December 1956 to 30 June 1957. The goods seized included foreign silk, georgette cloth, stationery, shaving blades, torches, manufactured tobacco, apparel, chewing gum, foreign liquor, betelnuts, country liquor, toilet requisites, foodstuffs, Indian handloom and powerloom cloth, livestock, Indian currency and other miscellaneous articles.

The Finance Minister added that the value of such goods still lying in the godowns was Rs. 281,251. The value of goods since disposed of was Rs. 93,441. The number of persons found involved in smuggling during the above period was 781.

RUSSIA INDIA USA

Date: Aug 08, 1957

Volume No

1995

GOA

Kidnapping Of Indians

In reply to a question in the Lok Sabha on Aug 05, 1957, Prime Minister Nehru said:

Four civilians and others were kidnapped from within Indian territory by the Portuguese police or military in Goa during the last three years. One was still under detention or in the custody of the Portuguese authorities.

Asked about the steps Government had taken or proposed to take to ensure checking this highhandedness of the Portuguese authorities, the Prime Minister added:

The Government of India have strengthened the security arrangements on Indo-Goa border and have given instructions to the border police to prevent recurrence of such incidents. In their protest notes, the Government of India have also warned the Portuguese authorities that the responsibility for the consequences resulting from such violations will be that of the Portuguese Government at Lisbon.

<Pg-153>

INDIA USA PORTUGAL

Date: Aug 05, 1957

Volume No

1995

INDIA AND THE UNITED NATIONS

People Of Indian Origin In South Africa

Shri Arthur S. Lall, India's Permanent Representative to the United Nations, addressed a letter on Aug 16, 1957 to the Secretary-

General of the U.N.O. on the question of treatment of the people of Indian origin in the Union of South Africa. The following is the text of the letter:

I have the honour to invite your attention to paragraph 5 of resolution 1015 (XI) adopted by the General Assembly at its 648th plenary meeting on 30 January 1957, which reads as follows:

The General Assembly,

- 1. Invites the parties to report as appropriate, jointly or separately, to the General Assembly.
- 2. As the Government of India desires to submit its report to the General Assembly at its twelfth session, I have been instructed to request you to include the following item in the supplementary list of items for the agenda for that session:

Treatment of people of Indian origin in the Union of South Africa: report of the Government of India (resolution 1015(XI) of 30 January 1957).

3. An, explanatory memorandum relating to the above item in terms of rule 20 of the rules of procedure is attached.

(Sd.) ARTHUR S. LALL
Permanent Representative of India
to the United Nations

The following is the text of the explanatory memorandum enclosed along with the letter:

At its eleventh session, the General Assembly gave consideration, for the tenth time, to the item entitled, "Treatment of people of Indian origin in the Union of South Africa." Once again the Assembly adopted a resolution on the item, and on this last occasion it urged the parties concerned to enter into negotiations with a view to bringing about a settlement of the question.

With a view to implementing the express wishes of the General Assembly, as recorded in its resolution 1015 (XI), the Government of India, through its Permanent Representative to the United Nations, addressed the Government of the Union of South Africa through its Permanent Representative (vide text attached). This communication stated explicitly that the Government of India were desirous of and were prepared to enter into and pursue negotiations with the Government of the Union of South Africa in accordance with the above cited resolution of the Assembly. Furthermore, the Government of India stated their view that such negotiations would, in no way, prejudice the position adopted by any of the parties concerned in respect of the issue of "domestic jurisdiction" in terms of Article 2, paragraph 7, of the Charter of the United Nations. While the Government of India suggested that such negotiations could

conveniently be held between the representatives of the Governments concerned at New York, they expressed their willingness to consider any alternative venue that the Government of the Union of South Africa might desire to suggest. Finally, in a continuing spirit of accommodation and conciliation, the Government of India sought the views of the Government of the Union of South Africa in regard to a suitable time for the commencement of negotiations.

Up to the date of the submission of this explanatory memorandum, no acknowledgement or reply has been received from the Government of the Union of South Africa to the letter addressed to their Permanent Representative to the United Nations by the Permanent Representative of India. Thus, the explicit wish of the General Assembly that negotiations be conducted to facilitate a settlement of the problem of the treatment of people of Indian origin in the Union of South Africa has been frustrated by the absence of a response from the Government of the Union of South Africa. The Government of the Union of South Africa has

<Pg-154>

apparently thought fit to disregard the appeal of the General Assembly addressed to that Government in resolution 1015(XI), seeking irs co-operation to bring about negotiations.

Meanwhile, the position of persons of Indian origin in South Africa compared with that of settlers of European origin, has continued to deteriorate. Persons of Indian origin continue to be uprooted from their homes and are forbidden to reside in those areas where they have been living and earning their livelihood for many decades. These persons also continue to be denied elementary political and social rights.

In compliance with paragraph 5 of resolution 1015 (XI), the Government of India propose to report to the General Assembly at its twelfth session and have accordingly asked for the inscription of this item. The Government of India feel certain that it will be the wish of the General Assembly to take further steps to implement its resolutions on this subject and to promote a peaceful and just solution of this problem.

ANNEXURE

Letter dated 8 July 1957 from the Permanent Representative of India, addressed to the Acting Permanent Representative of the Union of South Africa.

I have the honour to invite reference to paragraph 3 of the resolution entitled "Treatment of people of Indian origin in the Union of South Africa" adopted by the General Assembly of the United Nations at its 648th plenary meeting on 30 January 1957.

The Government of India desire to inform the Government of the Union

of South Africa that they desire to act in accordance with paragraph 3 of the aforesaid resolution and in conformity with the statement made by the Indian delegation in the Special Political Committee in respect of it. They therefore desire and are prepared to enter into and pursue negotiations with the Government of the Union of South Africa in accordance with the aforesaid resolution. The Government of India further desire to state their view that such negotiations will, in no way, prejudice the position adopted by any of the parties concerned in respect of the issue of "domestic jurisdiction" under Article 2, paragraph 7, of the Charter of the United Nations.

The Government of India suggest that such negotiations may conveniently be held between the representatives of the Governments of the parties concerned at New York. They would, however, be willing to consider any alternative venue that the Government of the Union of South Africa would desire to suggest. They also seek the views of the Government of the Union of South Africa in regard to a suitable time for such negotiations to begin.

The Government of India earnestly trust that the Government of the Union of South Africa will welcome the initiative now taken and accede to the request made in pursuance of the decision of the General Assembly of the United Nations.

Please accept, Sir, the renewed assurances of my highest consideration.

(Sd.) ARTHUR S. LALL
Permanent Representative of India
to the United Nations

INDIA SOUTH AFRICA USA

Date: Aug 16, 1957

Volume No

1995

INTERNATIONAL TRADE

European Common Market Scheme

In reply to a question in the Lok Sabha on Aug 02, 1957, on India's attitude towards the European Common Market Scheme, Shri T. T. Krishnamachari, Finance Minister stated:

The formation of common markets had been tentatively accepted in principle by the contracting parties to the GATT. Whether the

provisions of the Treaty establishing the European Common Market were consistent with the specific provisions laid down by the GATT was a matter for further examination. The Treaty was to come up for consideration

<Pg-155>

in the GATT at its, session beginning in October.

The Finance Minister added that it was only after consideration of the Treaty in the GATT that the exact scope of the European Common Market Scheme and its conformity with the principles of the GATT would be clear. It was too early, therefore, for the Government of India to have any definite attitude towards the European Common Market Scheme.

INDIA

Date: Aug 02, 1957

Volume No

1995

MALAYA

India's Greetings

President Rajendra Prasad and Prime Minister Nehru sent messages of greetings to His Majesty the Yang Di Pertuan Agong and His Excellency the Prime Minister of the Federation of Malaya, respectively, on the occasion of the attainment of independence by the Federation of Malaya. The following is the text of the President's message:

On the occasion of the attainment of independence by the Federation of Malaya, the Government and people of India join me in extending cordial congratulations and sincere wishes for Your Majesty's personal happiness and for the well-being of the people of the Federation of Malaya. We are confident that the bonds of friendship already existing between India and the Federation of Malaya will be further strengthened in the coming years and that Malaya will be able to contribute appreciably towards the promotion of world peace.

The following is the text of the Prime Minister's message:

On behalf of my colleagues in the Government and on my own behalf, I have great pleasure in offering to Your Excellency and through you to the Government and the people of the Federation of Malaya our most cordial congratulations and good wishes on the attainment of

independence.

Malaya attains independence at a period in world history when it is imperative for all people of goodwill to work together in harmony. We look forward to increasing friendship and understanding between our two countries and to close co-operation in the cause of freedom and the promotion of world peace.

INDIA USA

Date: Aug 02, 1957

Volume No

1995

OMAN

Reference In Parliament

In reply to a question in the Rajya Sabha on Aug 23, 1957 about th developments in Oman, Prime Minister Nehru said:

Government have followed the developments in Oman chiefly from newspaper reports. There is an Indian Consul at Muscat whose chief function is to look after the Indian population there. He has not been in a position to supply us with any detailed information about the developments in Oman. We received, some time ago, indirectly a message purporting to come from some representatives of the Imam of Oman drawing our attention to British action in the territory of Oman.

The Government of India have viewed with concern the news of the military action which has taken place in Oman. They have expressed to the United Kingdom Government their concern in regard to this action.

<Pg-156>

OMAN INDIA USA

Date: Aug 23, 1957

Volume No

1995

PAKISTAN

Residence Laws in Jammu and Kashmir

In reply to a question in the Lok Sabha on Aug 13, 1957 about the letter of Pakistan Permanent Representative at U.N. Headquarters to the President of the Security Council dated 5 August 1957 making certain allegations against India regarding the Kashmir issue, Prime Minister Nehru said:

The Pakistan Permanent Representative's letter states that the Government of India have recently settled a large number of non-Muslims, who are not residents of the State of Jammu and Kashmir, in certain districts of the Jammu Province. Further, that evacuee properties have been allotted to non-Muslim settlers of non-Kashmiri origin. Copy of Pakistan Permanent Representative's letter to the President, Security Council, was received by our Permanent Representative in New York as U.N. document in general circulation.

About the Government of India's reaction, the Prime Minister said:

The allegations contained in the Pakistani note are untrue and without any basis. According to the laws in force in the Jammu and Kashmir State no non-resident of Jammu and Kashmir can become a resident of that State and have the privileges appertaining to such residents. No evacuee property has been allotted to non-residents of Jammu and Kashmir. Evacuee properties have been allotted to refugees from the Pakistan-occupied areas of Jammu and Kashmir State who came over in large number and had to be resettled by the Jammu and Kashmir Government. These refugees were old residents of the State and were thus qualified as such.

Our Permanent Representative in New York has taken action to point out the false and baseless nature of these allegations to the President of the Security Council, and copy of his letter has been circulated as a U.N. document.

PAKISTAN USA INDIA

Date: Aug 13, 1957

Volume No

1995

PAKISTAN

Indian Representative's Letter To U.N.

The following is the text of the letter dated Aug 09, 1957 from Shri Arthur S. Lall, India's Permanent Representative to the United Nations, to the President of the U.N. Security Council, which refers to Pakistan Representative's letter of 5 August 1957:

I have the honour to refer to the letter dated 5 August 1957 from the Permanent Representative of Pakistan inviting the attention of the members of the Security Council to certain alleged "recent developments" in Jammu and Kashmir, a constituent State of the Union of India.

I have been instructed by the Government of India to inform you that the allegations contained in the Pakistan Permanent Representative's letter are false and baseless. He has not adduced any facts in support of the allegations; he could not do so because there are none. The letter itself begins by stating that "it appears...", and on that tenuous basis it proceeds to develop baseless allegations and falsely attributes non-existent motives to the Government of India.

The position under the law, which is scrupulously observed, is that no non-resident person is permitted to become a resident of Jammu and Kashmir. Also, no evacuee property has been allotted to any nonresident of Jammu and Kashmir. Evacuee properties in Jammu and Kashmir are allotted to Jammu and Kashmir refugees driven from their homes in Pakistan-occupied areas of Jammu and Kashmir. Such persons have already crossed over in thousands and have had to be resettled by the Jammu and Kashmir Government. In sum, it is not possible, either legally or in terms of administrative regulations, to import outsiders into Jammu and Kashmir and there is thus no truth whatsoever in the allegations made by the Permanent Representative of Pakistan in paragraph 2 of his letter. Consequently, the surprising allegation that India has acted in contravention of the Security Council resolution of 17 January 1948 is without foundation, and the argument sought to be advanced in the succeeding paragraph of his letter is equally false and irrelevant.

<Pg-157>

The apprehension expressed in paragraph 4 of the letter of the Permanent Representative of Pakistan can be allayed immediately. The increased movement of persons over the cease-fire line has been into Jammu and Kashmir and not in the opposite direction into Pakistan-occupied areas.

That the term "India-held zone" occuring in paragraph 4 of the letter of the Permanent Representative of Pakistan has no sanction whatsoever in the resolutions of the UNCIP and of the Security Council, speaks for itself. Thus, this phrase is a patent misrepresentation of the facts. The relevant facts are that Pakistan occupied part of the territory of the Union of India by aggression and continues to be in occupation of that territory in violation of the resolution of the Security Council of 17 January 1948 and of the

UNCIP resolutions of 13 August 1948 and 5 January 1949.

This communication of mine points out and establishes that both in detail and in totality the picture drawn by the Permanent Representative of Pakistan in paragraphs 2 to 4 of his letter of 5 August 1957 is devoid of factual basis and consequently in no sense corresponds with the truth. This being so, the conclusion reached in paragraph 5 of the letter of the Permanent Representative of Pakistan is a falsification which is entirely rejected by the Government of India. It is evident that this part of the letter of the Permanent Representative of Pakistan is an attempt, on baseless premises, to sidetrack the fact that those resolutions of the Security Council and of the UNCIP which have been accepted by both India and Pakistan have remained unimplemented entirely because of Pakistan's non-compliance.

I request that this communication may kindly be circulated as a Security Council document and be brought to the notice of the members of the Security Council.

(Sd.) ARTHUR S. LALL
Ambassador Extraordinary and
Plenipotentiary,
Permanent Representative of India to the
United Nations.

PAKISTAN INDIA USA

Date: Aug 09, 1957

Volume No

1995

PAKISTAN

Alleged Landing of Soviet Planes in Kashmir

In reply to a question in the Lok Sabha on Aug 26, 1957 on Pakista Foreign Minister's statement in the Pakistan National Assembly that "Soviet planes were known to have been landing in Kashmir", Prime Minister Nehru said:

There is no truth whatever in the allegations made. They are flights of fancy and imagination. There are no foreign air bases in Kashmir. No Russian or other foreign planes have landed there except when the Soviet leaders, Mr. Khrushchev and Mr. Bulganin, and their party visited Srinagar during their visit to India in 1955. They went there on their own aircraft, Ilyushin 14. This aircraft only went to Srinagar and did not touch any other place in Jammu and Kashmir

State. No Russian plane has ever landed at Leh. There is no new aerodrome at Leh. There is only an improvised landing ground where thus far only dakotas have landed. No military or other stores have been transported to the Jammu and Kashmir State in Russian aircraft. There is no secret agreement in regard to the use of air bases there.

Thus the allegations made in the reply of the Foreign Minister of Pakistan in the Pakistan National Assembly are completely without foundation.

PAKISTAN RUSSIA USA INDIA ITALY

Date: Aug 26, 1957

Volume No

1995

PAKISTAN

Canal Waters Issue

Shri S. K. Patil, Minister for Irrigation and Power, made a statement in the Rajya Sabha on Aug 21, 1957 on the Indo-Pakistan dispute over the waters of the Indus Basin. The following is the text of Shri Patil's statement:

The House is aware, that the Governments of India and Pakistan entered into an agreement on the Canal Waters as far back as May 1948 on the basis of India progressively diminishing supply to Pakistan canals in order to give reasonable time to Pakistan to tap alternative sources. Although over nine years have elapsed since the signing of the agreement, the Indus Water dispute still

<Pg-158>

remains unsettled owing to the unwillingness of Pakistan to settle it in the only manner possible namely, by developing supplies from the western rivers to replace the prepartition withdrawals from the eastern rivers. The House is also aware that in 1952, at the instance of Mr. Eugene R. Black, President of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, negotiations were started on an engineering basis to work out a comprehensive plan for the cooperative development of the waters of the Indus system of rivers. After a careful study of the problem, the Bank put forward in February 1954, a proposal which envisaged the division of waters on the basis that the three western rivers (Indus, Jhelum and Chenab), except for minor uses in the State of Jammu and Kashmir, would be available for the use and benefit of Pakistan and the three eastern

rivers (Ravi, Beas and Sutlej) for the use and benefit of India. That proposal also provided for a transition period of about five years during which Pakistan was to construct link canals from the western rivers. India was also required to pay for the cost of these link canals. Notwithstanding the fact that its acceptance involved great sacrifices, financial and other, on our part, we accepted the Bank proposal in principle but Pakistan did not. The negotiations thereupon broke down but were resumed again at the instance of the Bank in December 1954. When these talks also failed to bring about an agreement the Bank put forward an aide memoire in which, while reiterating its conviction that the division of waters envisaged in its proposal of 1951 afforded the best prospects of a settlement, the Bank indicated that it might be necessary to provide for some storage as a part of the replacement plan. Though the talks were extended up to 31 March 1957, no significant progress could be made because of Pakistan's unwillingness to co-operate in working out a plan on the basis of the Bank proposal and the aide memoire.

In April 1957, the Bank suggested that the co-operative work should be extended up to 30 September 1957 to give the Bank and the Governments of India and Pakistan an opportunity to review the situation. This was agreed to by the two Governments.

In June last, a Bank Team headed by Mr. W. A. B. Iliff, Vice-President of the Bank, visited India and Pakistan and held consultations with the Prime Minister and Ministers concerned in both the countries. Before leaving for Washington, Mr. Iliff handed over to both sides a letter in which he asked for the views of the two Governments, in writing, on some General Heads of Agreement which should form the basis of an approach to an international water treaty. These Heads of Agreement follow generally the Bank proposal of 1954, but seek to provide some machinery for resolving points on which the Bank may be unable to secure an agreement. The two Governments have since communicated their views to the Bank who have in turn forwarded the views of each Government to the other for comments. Pakistan Government's reply to the Bank is under examination.

The Government of India have scrupulously refrained from making any statements on the canal water dispute which might even remotely have the effect of embarrassing the Bank in its difficult and delicate task of bringing about a settlement between the parties.

But in the recent months statements have been made by persons in authority in Pakistan which are so palpably false and mischievous that they cannot be allowed to go unchallenged. Among other things it has been alleged that India has cut off or is threatening to cut off canal supplies to Pakistan and that Pakistan's economy is in grave jeopardy as Pakistan would revert to desert if India stops the supply of water from the eastern rivers.

The statements made against India have not only no basis in fact, but are completely misleading. Ever since the Agreement of May 1948 to

which I have already referred, there has not been a single occasion when supplies were cut off from Pakistan. For the two years ending 31 March 1957, three agreements were executed through the good offices of the Bank and formed the basis of regulation of canal waters between the two countries. Under these ad hoc transitional agreements, India agreed to restrict her additional withdrawals for the Bhakra canals in accordance with Pakistan's ability to replace supplies. There is no such agreement, however, from April 1957 as no request was made for one. It is understood that the three link canals already constructed in Pakistan are

<Pg-159>

capable of replacing all the waters that the new Indian canals would withdraw during the current kharif season.

The three western rivers allocated to Pakistan under the Bank proposal carry 80 per cent. of the waters of the Indus system. At present Pakistan depends upon the eastern rivers only for about five per cent. of the total supplies used by her for irrigation in the Indus basin in Pakistan, if she makes full use of the link canals already constructed by her. There is, therefore, no question of the whole of the irrigated area in West Pakistan turning into a desert, or of Pakistan's economy being endangered.

Had the World Bank proposal been accepted by Pakistan in 1954, the transition period would have expired some time in 1959. Unfortunately, Pakistan has imparted a political bias to what is essentially an economic and engineering problem and while going ahead with her development plans on the western rivers has sought to hold up development on the eastern rivers in India by placing difficulties in the way of a quick settlement. We have shown great restraint by imposing on ourselves restrictions on the utilisation of the waters flowing through the eastern rivers during the last nine years. To avoid suffering to the cultivator in Pakistan we have continued to supply water in spite of the fact that Pakistan, contrary to the obligations under the Agreement of May 1948, has defaulted in the payment, of canal water charges.

We owe a duty to our own people and cannot wait indefinitely for a settlement. Despite our pressing needs, we have, with a view to promoting a settlement, informed the Bank that we would be prepared to extend the transition period up to 1962, that is, five years from now, although under the Bank proposal this period would have terminated in 1959. We cannot go any further without jeopardising the vital interests of millions of our people.

PAKISTAN LATVIA USA INDIA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC

Date: Aug 21, 1957

Volume No

1995

PAKISTAN

Letter to U.N. on Mangla Dam Project

Shri Arthur S. Lall, India's Permanent Representative to the United Nations, addressed a letter on Aug 21, 1957 to the President of the Security Council oil the subject of execution of the Mangla Dam Project by the Government of Pakistan. The following is the text of the letter:

Excellency,

Under instructions from my Government, I have the honour to bring to Your Excellency's notice and through you to the notice of the members of the Security Council the following report regarding the commencement of execution of the Mangla Dam Project by the Government of Pakistan which appeared in the Dawn newspaper of Karachi on 26 June 1957.

Rawalpindi: June 25: The Azad Kashmir Government have issue, necessary notification to acquire land in Mirpur District for the Mangla Dam Project.

The Project, which will involve an expenditure of 1,000 million rupees, will cover an area of a hundred square miles.

About 122 villages, in Azad Kashmir territory will be affected with a total area of about 42,000 acres.

Out of this nearly 22,000 acres are at present under cultivation. The rest is barren and those who will be affected by the construction of the dam will be adequately compensated with cash payment or canal irrigated land-Radio Pakistan.

The details of the project are given in the attached note.

The execution of this Dam Project is a further instance of consolidation by the Government of Pakistan of their authority over the Indian territory of Jammu and Kashmir which they continue to occupy by force and of the exploitation of the resources of the territory to the disadvantage of the people of Jammu and Kashmir and for the benefit of the people of Pakistan.

My Government have asked me to invite your attention and through you the attention of the members of the Council to this further instance of violation by the Government of Pakistan of the Security Council Resolution of 17 January 1948 which calls upon both the

<Pg-160>

Governments of India and Pakistan "to refrain from making any statements and from doing or causing to be done or permitting any acts which might aggravate the situation."

The members of the Security Council are aware of the categorical assurances given to the Prime Minister of India by the Chairman of the U.N. Commission that Pakistan Government will not be allowed to consolidate their position. in the territory they had unlawfully occupied, of clause A 1 of Part, II of the UNCIP Resolution of 13 August 1948 under which Pakistan troops are required to vacate the territory unlawfully occupied by them and of the recognition of the Government of the State of Jammu and Kashmir as the only lawful Government of the State underlying the Resolutions of 13 August 1948 and 5 August 1949. The commencement of the execution of the Mangla Dam project by the Government of Pakistan violates not only the provisions of the Security Council Resolution of 17 January 1948 but also the assurances given to the Prime Minister of India by the Chairman of the UNCIP and the provisions of the two UNCIP Resolutions.

I request that this communication may kindly be circulated as a Security Council document and be brought to the notice of the Members of the Security Council.

Accept, Excellency, the assurances of my highest consideration.

(Sd.) ARTHUR S. LALL
Ambassador Extraordinary and
Plenipotentiary,
Permanent Representative of India to the
United Nations.

DETAILS OF PROJECT: The Upper Jhelum Canal takes off from the river Jhelum at Mangla and irrigates areas in the West Punjab. The Mangla Headworks and the first 19 miles of the Upper Jhelum Canal lie in the territory of Jammu and Kashmir. The land required for the Upper Jhelum Canal and the Headworks was given by the Government of Jammu and Kashmir to the Punjab Government in 1904, free of cost, but on condition "that it shall always remain the property of the Darbar."

The details of the Mangla Dam Project given by Chaudhury Abdul Hamid, Superintending Engineer, Mangla Dam Circle, in September last were published in the Pakistan Times, Lahore, on September 17, 1956, and according to these "the dam will be located across the Jhelum river, about 2 miles upstream of the Upper Jhelum Canal regulator." The location of the dam is thus in the Indian territory of Jammu and Kashmir.

The report gave the following further particulars of the project:

The main structure will be an earth embankment almost two miles long at the crest the elevation of which is 1,200 feet above the sea level. Its height at, the deepest section from, rock to crest will be about 360 feet. The reservoir so created will have an effective capacity of 3.5 million acre feet.

The dam will be flanked by a power plant on the left and a spillway structure on the right. The power house will have an installed capacity of 300,000 k.w. (four sets of 75,000 k.w. each), the power head varying between 180 to 315 feet. The tail race will outfall into the Upper Jhelum Canal.

The spillway for flood water, will be of one million cusees capacity. It will be fitted with automatic gates. The water will shoot from the end of the structure and after falling in the trajectory about 200 feet vertically will flow back into the river Jhelum.

The Jhelum drains an area of about 13,000 square miles above the Dam site.

It has been found, that the use of water originating in the Jhelum River is now about ten million acre feet per year and that the remainder of the river flow, approximating 13 million acre feet in an average year, is wasted during the floods, which usually coincide with floods in other provincial rivers.

A reservoir of 3.5 million acre feet effective storage capacity would control a release aggregating 16 million acre feet in every year. The initial gain in the supply of water from Jhelum River will thus be six million acre feet per year even in a period of drought.

<Pg-161>

Practically all this supply of water, available for expanded irrigation use will be transferred to Chenab River through the Upper Jhelum Canal after its enlargement and would mingle with the Chenab water.

The total indirect supply of the Mangla Dam will be nine million acre feet which will bring an additional area of 3,000,000 acres under irrigation.

The benefits accruing from the dam after completion are stated to be: (i) Supply of six million acre feet water from the Jhelum River and an additional three million acre feet from the flood flows of the Chenab River; (ii) The installed capacity of 300,000 k.w. (all firm); and (iii) Improvement in communications.

"The construction of the dam," the report says, "will...have a healthy effect on the Pakistan economy." "The distance between Mirpur and Muzzaffarabad will be cut down by 25 miles" by a new road which will be constructed. This road will also "shorten the distance

between Jhelum and Mangla by five miles." With the help of cheap power Pakistan hopes to exploit bauxite deposits from which aluminium is extracted.

Last year, when there were protests against this Project from the people of the area, Chaudhri Ghulam Abbas, once President of the so-called Azad Kashmir Government, made the following significant statement in which he tried to persuade them to accept the project:

I, therefore, feel it is my duty to exhort the people to be realistic and to accept gracefully and patriotically this position which no doubt will seek a great amount of sacrifice on their part. But it must be realised that the larger interests of Pakistan have in any case to be kept in view and that the entire economy as well as the stability of Pakistan...now depends mainly on the Mangla Dam Project."

(Pakistan Times, Lahore, 31 March, 1956)

That the construction of this Project in Indian territory is intended to help Pakistan in a big way is clear from an editorial which was published in Dawn, Karachi, of 22 September, 1956. The editorial states:

For a country, which is under a severe pressure to develop its land, water and power resources to cope with its growing population and economy, it is a welcome relief to know that the detailed investigations and designs of its largest multipurpose project, Mangla Dam, are nearing completion and that construction work may start early next year.... The huge cost of the project which will be spread over five years, is well worth the far-reaching benefits that are expected to accrue to the economy of West Pakistan. The additional acreage which, for want of ample water, produces little or nothing, promises an impressive step-up in agricultural produce, more particularly foodgrains which a combination of natural and man made causes compels the Government to import at a disconcerting loss of foreign exchange urgently needed for development programmes. No less welcome will be the substantial accretion to West Pakistan's power potential which, despite the commendable advance in recent years, is still so far behind the consumption needs of the Province that a not inconsiderable amount of electric energy is purchased every year from East Punjab.

A report published earlier this year stated that the Government of Pakistan had already sanctioned Rs. 58 million for preliminary work, including construction of roads and quarters for the Staff.

(Pakistan Times, Lahore, 7 January, 1957)

PAKISTAN INDIA LATVIA USA

Date: Aug 21, 1957

Volume No

1995

PAKISTAN

Military Base Near Jammu Border

In reply to a question in the Lok Sabha on Aug 09, 1957 on the establishment of military base by the Pakistan Government near the Jammu border, Shrimati Lakshmi N. Menon, Deputy Minister of External Affairs, said:

According to information, Pakistan is setting up a military base near Kharian in the district of Gujrat, adjoining the western border of Jammu.

<Pg-162>

PAKISTAN

Date: Aug 09, 1957

Volume No

1995

PAKISTAN

Mr. Suhrawardy's Speeches in U.S.A.

In reply to a question in the Lok Sabha on Aug 09, 1957 about the references made to the questions of Kashmir and canal waters in the speeches delivered by the Pakistan Prime Minister during his recent visit to the U.S.A., Shrimati Lakshmi N. Menon, Deputy Minister of External Affairs, said:

Many of the statements made by the Prime Minister of Pakistan have no relation to fact or reality.

As for the specific steps taken to counter act the wrong impressions created by such references in the minds of American people, the Deputy Minister said:

The Indian standpoint on various Indo-Pakistan issues is being continuously presented with the customary dignity and decorum. We do not think that there is any need for us to depart from our normal standards of behaviour in this matter. Our Ambassador in the United States saw the Secretary of State and clarified various matters.

PAKISTAN USA INDIA

Date: Aug 09, 1957

Volume No

1995

SOUTH KOREA

Introduction of Modern Weapons

In reply to a question in the Rajya Sabha on Aug 12, 1957 whether it was a fact that the Defence Minister had in a statement made in Bombay on 22 June last expressed concern over the reported decision of the United Nations Command to introduce modern weapons in South Korea, Shrimati Lakshmi N. Menon, Dy. Minister of External Affairs, said:

The press reports relating to the Defence Minister's comments are substantially correct. These comments were made on press reports from Washington and Pan Mun Jon regarding the announcement of the United Nations Command to supply modern weapons to South Korea with a view to replacing outmoded weapons. The Government of India have no information in respect of supply of modern weapons to South Korea. They have only seen press reports on this.

In reply to a further question on the same subject, Prime Minister Nehru said:

It is difficult for me to give precise answers as to what is being supplied and to whom, but it is obvious that according to our thinking the supply of anything like atomic weapons to South Korea must necessarily have an upsetting influence not only there but in the whole region.

KOREA INDIA USA

Date: Aug 12, 1957

Volume No

1995

UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS

Negotiations on Rouble Credit

In reply to a question in the Lok Sabha on Aug 02, 1957, Sardar Swaran Singh, Union Minister of Steel, Mines and Fuel said:

The U.S.S.R. had agreed to negotiated with the Government of India on 5 schemes, to be financed out of the 500 million roubles credit in 1959-61. The schemes were: (i) Heavy Machine Building Works; (ii) Mining Machinery Plant; (iii) Power Station at Neyveli; (iv) Optical Glass Factory; and (v) Development of Korba Coalfields--Coal Mines, Quarry, Coal Beneficiation Plant, Repairing Shops.

<Pg-163>

INDIA USA

Date: Aug 02, 1957

September

Volume No

1995

CONTENTS

Foreign Affairs Record

VOL. III

No. 9 1957 September

CONTENTS

AUSTRIA Trade Agreement Extended 165
CZECHOSLOVAKIA Trade Agreement Signed 165
GOA Portuguese Violation of Indian Territory 166
INDIA AND THE UNITED NATIONS Inclusion of Hungary Question on U.N. Agenda 167
INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS Prime Minister's Speech in Lok Sabha 167 Prime Minister's Speech in Rajya Sabha 175
IRAQ Air Transport Agreement Ratified 181
JAPAN Extension of Trade Privileges 181 NEPAL Aid from India 182
NORTH KOREA Trade Arrangements 182
PAKISTAN Statement on Financial Issues 183 Canal Water Dispute 184 Air Space Violation 184
MINISTRY OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS: EXTERNAL PUBLICI

MINISTRY OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS: EXTERNAL PUBLICITY DIVISION GOVERNMENT OF INDIA

<Pg-i>

AUSTRIA USA NORWAY SLOVAKIA INDIA HUNGARY IRAQ JAPAN NEPAL KOREA NORTH KOREA PAKISTAN

Date : Sep 01, 1957

Volume No

1995

AUSTRIA

Trade Agreement Extended

The Government of India issued a Press Note in New Delhi on Sep 04, 1957 announcing the exchange of letters extending the Trade Agreement with Austria. The Press Note said:

Letters have been exchanged at Vienna between the representatives of India and the Austrian Federal Republic extending the validity of the Indo-Austrian Trade Agreement up to June 1958.

The Trade Agreement, which was signed on 9, December 1952, was initially valid for two years ending June 1954 and was extended from time to time. It was last extended in September 1956 and was valid up to June 1957.

In terms of the latest-exchange of letters, the Austrian Federal Government have agreed to license freely for importation into Austria from India of walnuts, kapok, raw wool, pig bristles, cotton seed oil for industrial purposes, crushed bones for use as fertilizers and bladders and guts.

Other commodities that are permitted to be imported freely into Austria from India are castor oil, coir, coir yarns, fibre for brushes and brooms, handicraft manufactures of ivory, brass, horn and brocade, iron ore, maganese ore, mica, shellac, linseed oil, myrobolans, spices, cashewnuts, tanned leather, tea, carpets, sports goods, hydrogenated oil for industrial purposes and raw cotton.

AUSTRIA USA INDIA RUSSIA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC

Date : Sep 04, 1957

Volume No

1995

CZECHOSLOVAKIA

Trade Agreement Signed

The Government of India issued a Press Note in New Delhi on Sep 30, 1957 announcing the conclusion of a Trade Agreement with the Czechoslovak Republic. The Press Note said:

Following the discussions between representatives of the Government of India and the Government Trade Delegation from the Czechoslovak Republic, a Trade Agreement between the two countries was signed in New Delhi on 30, September 1957. Shri K. B. Lall, Joint Secretary,

Ministry of Commerce and Industry, signed on behalf of the Government, of India and Mr. J. Kohout, Deputy Minister for Foreign Trade, Government of Czechoslovakia and leader of the Czechoslovak Government Trade Delegation, signed on behalf of the Czechoslovak Government.

Since the last Trade Agreement was concluded in November 1953 trade between the two countries has been steadily increasing and valuable contacts have been established between trading organizations. The total trade between the two countries is now of the order of about Rs. 80 to 90 million, the value of Indian exports being nearly Rs. 30 million in 1956-57. The present agreement is expected to promote and expand the trade between the two countries further and to strengthen the trade and economic cooperation between them.

Under it the two Governments have undertaken to provide facilities for export and import of commodities listed in two schedules attached to the agreement. The exchange of goods and services between the two countries will be effected by means of contracts between Foreign Trade Corporations or other such bodies in Czechoslovakia on the one hand and the State Trading Corporation and other commercial organizations in India on the other.

Payments for commercial and non-commercial transactions between the two countries will henceforward be made in Indian Rupees. For this purpose the State Bank of Czechoslovakia will maintain one or more accounts with Indian Commercial Banks

<Pg-165>

dealing in foreign exchange. Any balance in the Rupee account maintained by the State Bank of Czechoslovakia with the Reserve Bank of India will be convertible on demand into pounds sterling.

The two Governments, under the agreement, have also decided to encourage triangular trade agreements as a means for widening and developing international trade. It has also been agreed that reasonable facilities will be made available to enable Indian ships to carry as large a proportion as possible of the goods to be exchanged under this agreement.

The agreement will come into force on 1 October 1957 and will be valid until the end of 1960 and can be extended if required.

The Schedule of goods available for export from India includes apart from traditional items of exports like ores, spices, skins, vegetable oils, cashew-nuts, tea and coffee--manufactured products like cotton, rayon and woollen textiles, plastic goods, sports goods, coir products. jute, manufactures, linoleum, leather goods, cigars and cigarettes, handloom fabrics, handicrafts and Indian films.

The schedule of goods available for export from Czechoslovakia includes machinery of various kinds, machine tools, diesel generating

sets, marine type diesel engines, agricultural tractors, textile machinery, paper and newsprint, dye stuffs, cameras and appliances, domestic hardware, abrasive materials, narrow gauge diesel locomotives and Czechoslovak films.

NORWAY SLOVAKIA INDIA USA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC RUSSIA

Date: Sep 30, 1957

Volume No

1995

GOA

Portuguese Violation of Indian Territory

In reply to a question in the Lok Sabha on Sep 05, 1957 about th violation of Indian territory by Portuguese troops, Prime Minister Nehru made the following statement:

In so far as information is available to us about certain occurrences in the Portuguese territory of Daman, the facts appear to be as follows:

On 26 August at about midnight, a Portuguese military patrol jeep was blown up in an explosion by a land mine about three quarters of a mile from the Daman Fort. The jeep was blown to pieces and the occupants numbering six were all killed. Portuguese soldiers following in another jeep searched the vicinity and arrested an innocent villager of village Dhandas inside Daman. This villager, whose name is reported to be Kanji Homi Bari, was thrown on the road and a jeep ran over him, crushing him. Curfew was imposed in the locality.

Between midnight and 3:30 a.m. on 28 August Portuguese border patrol fired continuously for over three hours in the direction of Tarak Pardi post which is inside Indian territory. Several bullets entered Indian territory. The fire was not returned and there were no casualties. Again at 1:40 a.m. on 29 August Portuguese troops fired several rounds at Premavadi road post off Kunta in Indian territory. Some more rounds were fired at 4:40 a.m. from Vad Chowkey which is in Portuguese territory. On all these occasions, bullets entered Indian territory. The fire was not returned and there were no casualties.

On 28 August at about 1:30 a.m. Portuguese troops fired about ten to twelve rounds at our border patrol near Satosa post on the Savantvadi border. There were no casualties and the fire was not returned.

While we are determined to prevent the violation of our borders by foreign elements, no effective action is possible against incidents of this kind. We have found from experience that notes of protest to the Portuguese Government are quite useless.

<Pg-166>

INDIA USA

Date: Sep 05, 1957

Volume No

1995

INDIA AND THE UNITED NATIONS

Inclusion of Hungary Question on U.N. Agenda

In reply to a question whether the Government were aware that in some of the newspapers of Hungary it had been published that the Prime Minister of India was opposed to the Hungary question being included in the agenda of the United Nations General Assembly and if so, whether the Government had issued any clarification in this respect, Shrimati Lakshmi N. Menon, Deputy Minister of External Affairs, said in the Rajya Sabha on Sep 09, 1957:

We understand that some such announcement was made by the Budapest Radio. It was not a correct announcement and it was denied by us here and our important missions were also informed.

What we had informally stated was that the report had to be discussed but that it might be better to discuss it at the next session of the Assembly rather than at a continuation of the old session. Further, we had said that the discussion should be aimed at lessening tensions and not aggravating them.

INDIA HUNGARY USA

Date: Sep 09, 1957

Volume No

1995

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

Prime Minister's Speech in Lok Sabha

Replying to the debate on foreign affairs in the Lok Sabha on Sep 02, 1957, Prime Minister Nehru said:

Mr. Speaker, I have had the advantage of listening to various viewpoints and comments in regard to our foreign policy. I have been told on the one hand that we should cease to be crusaders or messiahs of peace, and the Same Hon. Member two or three minutes later said that India should play her role in bringing about peace in the Middle East. It seems to me that there is some slight contradiction between these two statements. Another Hon. Member went a little further and said India's role should not only be to support national interests but to support peoples' demands in other countries.

These statements require little consideration. So far as we are concerned, it is entirely wrong, if I may say so with all respect, to say that we go out anywhere as crusaders of peace or with any such idea. It is true that when we go out or when we remain in our country, we talk about peace, because that is dear to us, because we consider that of vital importance in the world and to our country.

It so happens that in many parts of the world, indeed I would say, in every part of the world, the idea of peace appeals to people and, therefore, there is talk of it. It is not that we go out to convert people or to carry on any kind of a campaign in regard to it. Because I do not think that that is the right approach to this question, for a Government--I am not talking about people--to adopt, if I may use the word, an agitational role in other countries.

If that is so, even in regard to what I might call the propaganda for peace, to which we are so intimately attached, the second idea that we should, support peoples' demands in other countries, simply means that we should support, encourage and help agitational demands. I am not using the word 'agitational' in a bad sense at all. Of course, obviously it has a good sense too, but such demands in other countries are presumably made against their governments; obviously, peoples' demands are made against their governments. Now we are asked by at least one Member here to support peoples' demands in other countries. How would that Hon. Member like some other government supporting somebody's demands in India?

If that kind of policy is adopted by governments, that is a policy of continuous and persistent interference, to which we certainly, our Government, would take the strongest exception; and I am quite sure this House

<Pg-167>

would object. And if that is so, surely that we cannot play that part in other countries apart from the fact that we are not made that way.

We have not the resources which other countries may have, but it is not a question of resources; it is a question of doing something which we do not want others to do. It is a bad example to set.

We talk about Panchsheel. In Panchsheel, there is a very definite clause to the effect that there should be no interference--apart from external interference--in the internal affairs of a country. I forget the exact language, but even ideological interference is mentioned there--any kind of interference, including ideological interference.

So that I just do not understand how we are asked to go and support peoples' demands. Let us admit that we, in our hearts and minds, sympathise with those demands; they fit in with our policy and ideals. I can understand that.

And, it is not for me to say what individuals may do or private groups may do, but for Government to go about supporting peoples' demands against their Governments in other countries, would be really an extra-ordinary proposition which, would land us into great difficulties and land other countries too in difficulties, if they do so.

I know and I regret that some countries do this kind of thing, sometimes overtly and sometimes otherwise, and our voice is raised here and elsewhere against this kind of thing, and we say that it is far better for the peace of the world that every question of interference is put an end to, interference of one country in another.

There are world forces at play and today they cannot be kept away by any kind of barriers even if Governments want to put up barriers. Thoughts flow, ideals flow and all kinds of things flow; and there are economic forces at play and political forces at play, and all kinds of forces. Well and good. If we agree with some force we encourage it in our own way but not, I submit, by interfering in the slightest degree in the country's affairs.

If we look at the countries of the world, there are 70 or 80 countries--I forget how many there are--which are supposed to be independent, of all kinds. Some are more powerful. others are, well, more or less strong but middling; many are weak and they have all kinds of Government. Many or some are communist governments which are supposed to be authoritarian. Other are what are called parliamentary, democracies, a very few of them. Some are called democracies which, on closer analysis, have not much of democracy about them in their country; yet they are called democracies. Some, I need not mention names, call themselves democracies with no elections and nothing. They simply carry on.

We do not go about criticising them. There are monarchies which may be called free monarchies so far as the people are concerned. There are authoritarian monarchies; all kinds of countries and States in the world. Are we to set about telling them which of them is good and which bad and criticising everybody? That would be extraordinary presumption, apart from its being extraordinary folly. So, we really do not try to criticise other countries. As a Government I am talking about it. If I am Prime Minister, unfortunately I cannot wholly disentangle myself from my position in Government. Even in private, I cannot go about criticising other countries because immediately it will be difficult for me to say," I did so in my private capacity and not as Prime Minister." So that point should be borne in mind.

Our policy has been to express our viewpoint. When we have to do so, whether in the United Nations or here in Parliament or elsewhere, we are trying, as far as possible, not to criticise other countries. It is true that sometimes we have to do it, inferentially, indirectly, or sometimes even directly. But, broadly speaking, we do not want to do so because there is today far too much not of criticism only but something much worse as between countries and that has spoiled the atmosphere of any problem being considered objectively.

The first thing, therefore, is to remove this tension, this new type of diplomatic and public language which is coming into play and we try to avoid it. I do not say that we are virtuous or that we always succeed or that we are better than others. I certainly do not say this. But, we have had, first of all, a

< Pg-168 >

certain kind of training in restraint of expression under our leader Mahatmaji. We tried to avoid it in the days of our struggle, tried it against our opponents, the British, against whom we felt so strongly.

So, now, as a Government surely it is not merely Gandhi's teachings but the normal practice of Government which, I am afraid, is not normally followed now, but still it has been the practice of Government. But, apart from that, looking-at it purely from a narrow, our own country's point of view, there is no reason why we should allow ourselves to get entangled in the conflicts and troubles of the world. To some extent we cannot help it, because the world is becoming more and more inter-related, and we have to deal with problems in the United Nations or elsewhere, our chanceries have to deal with them. Nevertheless, we do not wish to get entangled in these problems as far as we can help it. Sometimes it is not possible to keep away from them. We express an opinion. Even then we express it in a more or less restrained language.

The Hon Member who spoke just before me referred to what I sometimes said about me personally--I am sorry to refer to a personal matter-that I am so involved in world issues that I forget my own country. Well, it is not for me to talk about myself or to judge myself. But, my own feeling about this is that I rather not have anything to do with world issues; we have enough problems in our country to solve. And, also, I know very well, and this House knows that, if we want to play any part in world affairs that part is completely dependent not on our loud voices but on the internal strength, unity and conditions

in the country.

By purely just criticising others we,may for a moment create some impression here and there but, ultimately, the country finds its own level and other people know exactly in what depth of water it is and what strength it has, and only attach that much important to its voice. Therefore, from the point of view of our primary needs and primary concern being our country and, secondly, from the point of view that if we wish to play any part in world affairs it can only be by developing the strength and unity of our own country, we have to pay the first attention to our own country's affairs.

Having said that, I should also like to say that apart from our general Inheritance, in the past it is our inheritance, let us say, against colonialism, in favour of freedom--that is there--we feel that still; we have not forgotten that and our sympathies go out. Apart from that, it has become obvious that if certain things happen in the world, more especially, of course, if the war occurs, then it does not matter what our internal problems may be; everything is subordinated to this great disaster. All our problems, all our planning etc., go to pieces because the whole world goes to pieces, and we are part of that world. Therefore, it has become necessary and incumbent on us to see what is happening in the world. The world and world affairs impinge upon us all the time. It has become impossible for us to take, if I may use the word, a parochial outlook. We cannot understand our own problems if we look at them that way. Therefore, we are interested.

Take for instance, the situation in, what is called, the Middle East, and which really is for us the West, Western Asia. At the present moment, probably, that is the most difficult and explosive part of the world surface. Now, it will be untrue if I said that I am not very much interested in what happens there. I am not only interested as I was interested, as this House was interested, in what happened last year in those very middle-eastern regions, in Egypt etc., In connection with Suez Canal or intervention of other powers, in which we were interested, if you like, emotionally interested, psychologically interested but, ultimately, politically interested, but what happened there affected us.

Whatever consequences they had, they were far-reaching. So, we tried to help there in so far as we could. Although we took up a fairly clear and unequivocal line, we tried to avoid just condemnation of any kind even though we felt strongly about matters. I believe we were of some little help in finding some solution, whether it was about the Suez Canal or other matters. What happened then affected us. It affected our Five Year Plan and our economy and all that. Something happens, let us say, in the Middle East, in Syria. Even if they are small beginnings of a conflict, it will affect us. But there is hardly such a thing now that we can think of, that is, a small conflict. However, a small conflict has the shadow of a big conflict behind

it and the big conflict has a shadow of a world war behind it. and if there is that danger there, we are interested, every Member of this House is interested, this country is interested, because it will affect us and and affect the world.

We are concerned about it, and therefore we venture to say, and in this matter it is no good my criticising any country or condemning any country's action. I may have some views but even so, although perhaps I have more information at my disposal than most Members of this House, obviously I do not know what is happening behind the scene, or what has happened. Some bits come to us and we have to pick and choose what is true and what is not, and we form some kind of notion which is checked as we have further knowledge.

But the main thing is that here is a dangerous and explosive situation in Syria. We have seen previously how things happen in the middle-eastern countries and we should be warned by what has happened and what has been happening in the past, and other countries should also be warned and should not make any country in the Middle East a plaything of their policy. It is a dangerous thing, dangerous from the larger viewpoint of even major wars developing.

There is no immediate crisis in the sense of war. That is true, but, nevertheless, there is plenty of crisis: brewing all round which may suddenly burst out. And therefore I should like to repeat my appeal about conditions in the Middle East, that it is unsafe, it is dangerous, for policies to be pursued in which those particular countries become merely playthings, chequer-boards, for other major conflicts to be played out. It is a dangerous policy as things are today. The major power groups are each too powerful to be sat upon by the other. That is a practical fact which you may like or dislike.

If that is so, if something is done by one, the other responds to it by doing something to counter that; and so, step by step, one may be drawn into the conflict. If you look back at the history of these middle-eastern countries including Egypt and Western Asia and the roundabout countries, if you look at their history for the last three or four years,--not very long,--you will find how one step has led to another and how one step which was meant to protect, presumably, the interests of one group of powers, has actually led to an injury of that interest, because somebody else is taking some other step and then they are worried and then they take a third step and so it has gone on, step by step, whether it is the Baghdad Pact or something else. It has not brought peace or security or any measure of freedom from conflict.

Conditions in the Middle-East countries three or four years ago may not have been what might be called ideal. They were not ideal. They were not ideal anywhere. But will not everybody admit that conditions today and the last year or two have been worse than before? They have been. There has been progressive deterioration.

All these things, the Baghdad Pact and various other pacts, intrusions, etc. have worsened the affairs. That is obvious. One might say. "Oh! Yes, it is true, but other facts have occurred too." I admit it. One fact has led to another. One, interference has led to another. Here we are, therefore, instead of learning from this and keeping out, leaving these countries to work out their own destiny, with our goodwill, with our help, if you like, but not this military help, not this military intervention, not military threats, not all kinds of pressure tactics being exercised. I do earnestly hope that these words, which I say with all humility and respect, will have some effect on those who may hear them.

We do not wish to interfere in international affairs, except where we feel that we might be able to be of some help, or except where we cannot help it. But where something affects us directly, then naturally, we have to say something. For instance what has happened in regard to Pakistan, the military help given to it, is not an international matter about which we may have some views. We have views, of course, but that is a matter that has an immediate direct effect, and adverse affect, on us. Then we have to express our views clearly, strongly and unequivocally. Or, when something is said about Goa--Goa affects us. Goa may be a small thing in the world context, but Goa affects us and if something is said in regard to Goa which we think is not only wrong, but offensive to us, well, we have to reply to it.

<Pg-170>

You have to test our policy from that point of view, not a crusading policy or a seer-like policy; we are too humble for that. We know our limitations. We do believe in something stoutly and we express our opinions in a friendly way, but I hope, clearly when occasion arises. Where world peace is concerned, naturally we want to have our say, as a member of the world community. Where India's interests are directly threatened, whether in Goa or in Pakistan, we must have our say, a loud say, a positive say. There we cannot remain quiet. You have to balance all these things.

One Hon. Member said, it has been suggested, "Withdraw your complaint from the U.N." I do not understand this. I should like Hon. Members to realise that there is no such thing done. It simply cannot be done. Also, somebody said, "Withdraw your plebiscite offer." I do not know where the question of withdrawal comes in, continuing the offer or withdrawing it. Originally the plebiscite offer was made to the people of Kashmir by us, if I may say so; I do not call it a plebiscite. I am not trying to juggle with words; but in the course of the last few years, we have had two general elections in Jammu and Kashmir State, except that part which is under the illegal and unlawful occupation of Pakistan. I do not call them a plebiscite. But anyhow, the people of those territories have been given a chance to elect their representatives. Some people say that these elections were bogus. Well, I think that charge is wrong. I do not say, and I

cannot say naturally, that all those elections were perfect elections; that there were no mistakes or no errors committed. But I do say that by and large, those elections were good elections in the circumstances and even now an Election Commission, consisting of some Judge, I believe, is there. I speak from memory--a retired Judge from India has been asked to look into this matter; a High Court Judge, I think. Now election petitions go before them and they will be decided. There can be no doubt at all-barring some irregularities or mistakes--that in the main, those elections represent the viewpoint of the people of Jammu and Kashmir. If many of them were uncontested elections, well, I would submit, Sir, that the persons who did not wish to contest had no chance and therefore they did not contest them. May be, some people had a chance, but they did not.

What I wish to point out here is that in the course of the last five years or so, there have been two general elections. On the other side, there have been no elections, no attempt at elections. In fact, conditions in the Pakistan-occupied part of Kashmir have been very extraordinary. News does not come very frequently; sometimes it does come and in today's papers there is something.

Then again it was said by an Hon. Member that the accession of Kashmir was not only accession of the ruler of the State, but accession of the people. Well, I agree. Further it was said that it was accession to the Constitution of India. That is a wide statement, which is not quite clear to me.

When the accessions took place, not of Kashmir only, but of the other States of India in those days in 1947, the accessions were on three subjects only at that time: defence, foreign affairs and communications. The accession documents of all the major States of India contained only these three subjects. It was then thought certain States, at any rate the big ones, will have their own Constituent Assemblies to frame their Constitution, naturally in line with our Constitution, but not necessarily adopting it completely. That was the original idea. Some months later Sardar Patel discussed this matter and, in fact, some Constituent Assemblies were formed in some of the States. I am told that seven Constituent Assemblies were formed in the other States. Meanwhile, of course, our Constituent Assembly for the whole of India was functioning here. Later Sardar Patel and many of us discussed this matter with the then representatives of the States as they were, and it was felt unnecessary, and perhaps, if you like, undesirable, for all these Constituent Assemblies to function, because their representatives had been imported to our Constituent Assembly. So, the idea of these separate Constituent Assemblies was given up. Their representatives functioned in our Constituent Assembly and helped us in making our Constitution.

While all this was happening, something else had happened in Kashmir. First of all Kashmir did not come in before independence or even at the time of independence. Then came the Pakistan invasion and aggression, and war. It was a completely new situation. Kashmir

acceded to us on those three subjects.

<Pg-171>

And in fact, it was made clear even then--I forget now, I am speaking from memory, I hope I do not make a wrong statement--certain provisional matters were even then incorporated in the Constitution in regard to Kashmir.

From the very beginning it was clear that the accession of Kashmir, complete as it was, as the other States' accession was, did not mean that everything in our Constitution automatically applied to it. In the course of the next year or two further amendments and changes were made in consultation with the then Kashmir Government and their representatives. So that, to say that Kashmir acceded to the Constitution of India is an incorrect statement. The House may remember that subsequently there was a Constituent Assembly in the Jammu and Kashmir State. It really would have functioned long before it did, but, because of military operations and other difficulties, it was postponed. Ultimately, when nothing came of these talks in the United Nations, we could not leave Kashmir in mid-air and, therefore, with our willing approval, they elected their Constituent Assembly.

The first thing that that Constituent Assembly did was to change the nature of the Head of the State. The ruling family there of the State was removed--although the son of the Maharaja was chosen as the Head of the State, the Sadr-i-Riyasat. And this was reported to the Parliament and to the President, because the President came in to the picture; and we made necessary amendments to fit in with that in our own Constitution. Later, other changes came in. As their Constituent Assembly went on making changes, they were reported to us, and we accepted those changes after discussion etc., and they were grafted on to our Constitution.

Their Constituent Assembly finished their Constitution-making about a year ago. Meanwhile, of course, that Constituent Assembly had also functioned as a Legislative Assembly and carried out very farreaching land reforms and other reforms. So that, this Constitution-making has legitimately gone on there in conformity with our Constitution, and we have frequently adapted, made some changes, to fit in with that in our own Constitution.

At the present moment it has come very near to our Constitution in many matters. Only in a few matters they have kept apart. One matter to which they attach great importance and which has come up in the shape of questions here is about their ownership of land. It is an odd thing against our Constitution. I cannot go and buy land or possess land in Kashmir. It is restricted to, if I may use the word, genuine Kashmiris.

They have got, I believe, certain definitions--people, that is generations, who have been there, who have been born there, and all kinds of things. There are two or three groups or classifications of

them. I can very well understand this. It is an old rule, from the old Maharajas' time--not this Maharaja, but from his father's or grandfather's time. And the rule was framed, I am told, firstly, because of their fear that, Kashmir being such an agreeable place for foreigners, for English people specially, English people will come and practically physically take possession of it, start living there and take property. No Englishman, not even the biggest English-man-they could go there of course as tourists--could get any property there. A great favour was shown to them about thirty, forty or fifty years ago when they were allowed at Gulmarg, which was a very favourite place, to build a cottage there for ten years after which it lapsed to the State. Because, I remember one of the Maharajas 30 or 40 years ago telling us that he had failed in many ways but at least he had kept out the British people from settling down in Kashmir, because it was such an attractive place climatically. The rule applied, of course, apart from the British, to people from other parts of India, moneyed people who could go and buy up property there, because Kashmir is a poor place with poor people, and they were afraid these people would buy all the delectable spots in Kashmir. So, they made this rule, and when this matter was put to us about their desire to continue it, we agreed. We said: "We do not wish to come in your way, certainly continue it"--as indeed in quite another place we ourselves in our Constitution have made a rule, if you remember it. In some of the hill districts of Assam there is a definite rule that land cannot be transferred to outsiders etc., because we wanted to protect that land so that it may remain with the tribal people there.

Therefore, in regard to Kashmir I would beg of this House to remember always that

<Pg-172>

all these nine, ten years there have been two armies facing each other on the cease-fire line. There have been frequent attempts by Pakistan to create trouble inside Kashmir. Recently, there have been almost deliberately organised attempts to do so. As the House knows, in answer to some questions I have said so. Because of all this you cannot treat Kashmir as a place which can be completely normal. As a matter of fact, as far as the common man is concerned, normalcy has returned. He does business; he has much more business than he has ever had; he has more food but nevertheless, there is this danger hovering over it of espionage, sabotage and all that, and if the Kashmir Government takes some special measures to meet the situation, I do not quite see how we can blame them or ask them to remove some of the special powers that they have taken.

There was a reference to Sheikh Abdullah. I have often said in this House that few things have disturbed and pained me so much as the arrest and detention of Sheikh Abdullah. I would not go into the past history. Sometimes we have to take steps which are exceedingly distasteful. This is one of them. I did not take the step, but certainly indirectly we were approving or consenting parties. I shall

be very happy indeed when this state of affairs is ended.

I was referring to Pakistan. Now, there are two or three matters which I should like to mention. It is really quite extraordinary, the kind of false statements that are made now with greater frequency than before from Pakistan. The other day a statement was made with a great air of secrecy by the Foreign Minister of Pakistan that Russian planes were landing in Kashmir, and that Kashmir or India, I think-had become a Russian base. Now, one would expect of a Foreign Minister some slight adherence to truth. It is really quite extraordinary. India is not a closed land, nor is Kashmir. It is not particularly easy for people to go to Leh. It is physically difficult, and even otherwise we do not encourage people going there either, but there are thousands and thousands of tourists in Kashmir and in India, of course. I gave a very specific denial to each single fact. I invite Pakistan, and I am prepared to do the same, to give the names of every foreign person employed directly or indirectly in our defence services or in the construction of anything connected with defence like airfields, or barracks. I am prepared to give every name, to publish them. Let them publish the names of all the foreigners they are employing in their defence services, not only actively in the defence services, but--of course, what happens is they do not have an exact position in the defence--of the advisers, the builders, the trainers, the vast crowds that function there.

One thing we can never forget, and that is the exodus from East Pakistan into India, this tremendous exodus which shows the state of affairs in East Pakistan, and in Pakistan generally, a fact which we know very well, but which few foreign countries realise; that mere fact brings out the picture of our relations with Pakistan and the conditions in Pakistan much more vividly than almost any argument that we could put forward.

The Defence Minister had made some kind of an appeal to the United Kingdom and the United States of America about Goa said some Hon. Members. I understand from him that he made no appeal. What he had said was that the case of Goa was such that countries like the U.K. and U.S. should express themselves clearly as to where they stand. Did they support colonialism there or not? It was a kind of an enquiry. I have said previously in this House that the case of Goa is incontestably a colonial domain of Portugal; it does not matter how long they have been there. It is colonialism functioning, and functioning very badly.

Now, when people in other countries talk about colonialism vanishing and their being opposed to colonialism, we are justified in asking them, in all politeness: how does this fit in with your anti-colonial declarations, this continuation of Portugal in Goa? We are entitled to ask them this question. Apart from the major questions with regard to Goa, one continuing pain and torment for all of us is the continuation of hundreds and hundreds of Goans in prison there. There are a few Indian nationals too, still there, whose nationality is challenged by the Portuguese. I think, there are about 5 or 6. But

there are hundreds of Goans suffering long terms of imprisonment, quite apart from those who have been put to death or who have had to submit to all kinds of torture in the past. It is a horrible thing and it surprises me that

<Pg-173>

this is ignored by those great powers and small powers.

It does not surprise me that in the context of world events Pakistan and Portugal in Goa are closely knit together and are close friends. And yet, it is rather extraordinary. There was the Bandung Conference which talked about colonialism. And partly Pakistan had actually supported it. We did not expect Pakistan to stand out as a crusader of anti-colonialism. They could well have remained silent over the issue. But they have gone out of their way to support Portuguese dominion in Goa. Their newspapers supported it. The present Prime Minister, before he become Prime Minister, was I believe the legal adviser and advocate for Portugal. It is an extraordinary thing that simply because of their hatred of India they should descend to such levels.

An Hon. Member referred to Indians abroad, in Burma, East Africa and Mauritius. In some places Indians have to suffer some disabilities. I think, in Burma, there is no special disability except the one common factor in many places about facilities for sending money which are not easily granted. Now, we do not grant them easily to others. So, we cannot very well complain. Most of these countries are in difficulties about foreign exchange and we can hardly call upon them to adopt a policy in regard to Indians which they are not adopting for their own people.

But the major fact is that Indians abroad spread out in the past because they were to some extent more adventurous people, whether they were business people or other or they went in search of employment. And, wherever large numbers of people go to another country, a certain problem arises subsequently. Everywhere there is this question of unemployment and the tendency of that country is to reserve its employment for its own nationals. It is difficult to criticise that tendency. And, Indians get into some difficulties. The way we look upon it is this. Where the country has to face difficulties we advise our countrymen to put up with those difficulties, the other country's difficulties. We cannot ask for special privileges. But where any unfair treatment is given to our countrymen, then, of course, we protest. But even there we have to protest in a friendly way; we cannot issue any threats. We refuse to do that. That is not the way to deal with such matters just because there is a case. And again where there are Indians abroad, we have left it to them entirely whether to continue to remain Indian nationals or to adopt the nationality of that country.

If they remain Indian nationals, then all that they can claim there is favoured alien treatment. They are aliens and they should get as

good treatment as any other alien gets. They cannot vote there. Obviously, the aliens have no right of vote. But they have all the civic privileges; they have the privileges as friendly aliens.

If they adopted the nationality of that country, then, they should be treated as citizens with all the rights of citizenship. But, then, we have no concern with them. Sentimental concern, of course, there is, but politically they cease to be Indian nationals.

There is the problem of Indian nationals. Admittedly, Indian nationals who have gone there with visas, many of them have come back. If Indian nationals who went there for a period are asked to go back we cannot object. We can say, do this in a phased way. Do not push too many people back. But they are people with visas and the Government concerned has the right not to renew the visa. But we ask them to exercise that right in a way so as to cause the least inconvenience and injury to the people concerned.

Then, there are the other people; that is, those whom we do not consider our nationals, who have been there 50, 60, 30 or 40 years, whatever the period may be and they have settled down and many of them have been born there. Their problem is there. So far as we are concerned, strictly, legally and constitutionally, it is none of our problem. They are not our nationals. It is a problem of Ceylon. But we do not take up that particular attitude although it is the correct attitude because we are interested in their welfare and we are interested in finding a solution because there is a history behind this.

For the last 30 or 40 years, before we became independent and before Ceylon became independent, all kinds of agreements and other things were being made. We are independent. But fundamentally it is a problem of Ceylon dealing with its own people.

<Pg-174>

Finally, Sir, a Member again appealed to us to break the old moorings of thought and action which tie us to the Commonwealth. I do not think it is necessary for me to repeat what I have previously said. It is perfectly true that there are certain old moorings of thought which necessarily affect our action sometimes, not in regard to England only but in regard to so many things. Those old moorings have carried us to this Parliament, which is largely modelled after the British parliamentary system. There are so many other things. That is true, but so far as the Commonwealth is concerned, I think that it should be considered entirely apart from any sentimental point of view but purely from the point of view of whether it is good for us and for world peace or not, whether we can balance the advantages or not. I feel I have been convinced, and I am still convinced that our association with that serves some useful purpose for ourselves and for the larger causes that we support in the world. The fact of new countries coming in like Ghana, like Malaya, possibly a little later Nigeria brings about continuous changes in the complexion of the

Commonwealth and makes it, I think, even more desirable and necessary for us to remain associated with it.

USA INDIA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC EGYPT SYRIA IRAQ PAKISTAN PERU RUSSIA UNITED KINGDOM PORTUGAL INDONESIA BURMA MAURITIUS GHANA NIGER NIGERIA

Date : Sep 02, 1957

Volume No

1995

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

Prime Minister's Speech in Rajya Sabha

Initiating the debate on India's foreign policy in the Rajya Sabha on Sep 09, 1957 Prime Minister Nehru said:

Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, I beg to move--

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

I have spoken on this subject, Sir, on many occasions in this House and elsewhere, and I feel a little unhappy to relate the same story again and again, to go through more or less the same ground and to confess that all the major problems of the world still remain unsolved problems. It is possible that progress is being made behind the scenes or in the hearts and minds of men, which will give results in future. But for the present, the outlook is very far from bright.

I suppose that the basic issue which perhaps governs other matters is that of disarmament. During the last 18 months or perhaps a little more, an impression has been created, I think with some justification, that we were getting somewhere near to some form of disarmament. I have no doubt that all the great countries concerned—the United States, the Soviet Union, the United Kingdom, France and Canada—have all worked hard towards the same goal and wanted to have some measure of disarmament. All kinds of proposals have been made, but the fact is that, at the present moment, again the Disarmament Commission faces a dead-lock. It may well be that they will come out of that deadlock and start discussing again. But it is a somewhat frustrating experience to expect something to happen—something that you are eagerly and anxiously looking forward to—and be repeatedly disappointed.

Meanwhile, while these great powers discuss questions of limiting atomic, nuclear tests or limiting the use of these bombs or of the manufacture of them, the fact is that both the tests and the

manufacture go on and in some measure vitiate the world's atmosphere and make it more and more dangerous for human beings. The measure may be small at the present moment, that is, it does not actually affect people, but nobody quite knows how it is affecting gradually not only children, but still unborn children, all kinds of genetic aspects.

I do not know what part we in India can play in this matter. We have in the past made certain proposals in all humility for the consideration of the Big Powers and I believe, some consideration has been given to them by the Committee. But we seem to be where we were. It is obvious that this question cannot be solved by some majority voting. It has to be solved ultimately by the Big Powers that possess these weapons, more particularly, the United States and the Soviet Union, and secondarily, by the other Powers that possess these weapons, like the United Kingdom, and some others who may possess them soon.

Occasionally, it has been stated that India might play a greater part in the Disarmament

Sub-Committee or elsewhere. Last year or earlier this year, we offered to appear before the Disarmament Sub-Committee in support of a memorandum that we had given. The Committee thanked us for that memorandum and said they would consider it carefully, but pointed out that it would be difficult for them to make an exception in favour of one country, as requests might be made from many other countries too. Well, there was some justification for that statement. Anyhow, it is not our decision or our desire to push ourselves in these Committees or Commissions, but naturally, we would like to help, we are prepared to do so.

The House knows that recently we had some of the latest developments in these weapons. On the one hand, there is the development of the nuclear bomb or the hydrogen bomb; on the other, of the ballistic weapon which carries it to some other place--there are two different types of developments--and thirdly, some method of guiding that weapon and by some other means making it hit the target. Every day, we hear of more and more progress being made and I should imagine that perhaps this might shake up a little more than before the conscience and the mind of mankind. I suppose it does do so because, I believe, the people of every country are very much exercised over this possibility and in effect, all our problems--every problem in the world and every problem that we face in this country--become very secondary in the face of this major world problem.

There has been an instance--there have been many instances, of course, but there has been one particular instance--which has given us much trouble and much thought, and which is still troubling us greatly. This has been the case of Hungary. Now the House knows that a Committee was appointed by the United Nations, and that Committee presented a report. The Committee consisted of able men, and I am

quite sure that they tried their utmost with the material before them, to arrive at some conclusion as to what had happened. Their material was not complete for no fault of theirs, but nevertheless, it was incomplete. Now this matter is coming up before the United Nations. Naturally, when a Committee has been appointed by the U.N., its Report has to be considered by the U.N. What we were concerned with was that it should be considered, as far as possible, in an atmosphere which would help the people of Hungary, and which would help in lessening tensions and fears in Hungary, and not merely to add to them. We were of opinion then--it is of no consequence now-that it might have been better for it to be considered in the regular way by the new session of the United Nations and not by reconvening the old session. It makes no great difference but the old session has been reconvened. And if so, there is no particular difficulty about it, but the main thing is how this matter is to be dealt with. There is this great difficulty, because many things have happened in Hungary which most of us have disapproved very strongly.

It has been one of the biggest tragedies that have occurred in recent years, and yet the question is how we can help, not how we can condemn. I believe that India has played some effective part in helping the people of Hungary. During the past few months we tried to continue to play that part. Now if in the United Nations we join, let us say, in some kind of repudiation of the Hungarian representation in the U.N.--I mention this because sometimes it has been suggested, although I do not know whether anybody is going to do it--and deny the right of the Hungarian representatives to come to the United Nations, what would be the result? How exactly do we help the Hungarian people by not recognising the present Government functioning there? I do not quite know by what standards we judge, because there are many Governments, at any rate, some Governments in the world which probably would not come up to any standard of judgment. We acknowledge them as a fact, and there the matter ends. And sometimes, some Governments which from every standard are justified are not acknowledged, like the Government of the People's Republic of China.

But whatever measure you may employ, if a proposal is made, as I said, to deny the present Government of Hungary from being represented or from their representatives being accepted, what is the significance of that? How does that help in dealing with the problem of Hungary? The Government of Hungary does not disappear by that act. It functions and it functions possibly with greater rigidity than it otherwise would. If we take some such step, is to be followed

< Pg-176 >

by many other steps. Yet nobody is prepared to follow the step which leads to war, and rightly so. Therefore this kind of a step or any similar step of condemnation which cannot be followed by outright war, because nobody wants that, does not help in these circumstances. I am troubled not only about the past happenings, but also about the present happenings, and I want to help in these present happenings.

I believe that in Eastern Europe all kinds of forces have been at play, liberalising forces and democratising forces, and that some progress has been made, and indeed a great deal of progress has been made in some countries. Left to themselves and helped a little, they would go further, but if they are restricted and hindered and are upbraided and condemned, than you stop those forces from functioning properly and yielding results. That is our broad attitude in regard to Hungary. But I must confess that in a matter of this kind, whatever attitude one may take, it is not wholly satisfactory. It can be criticised. Every middle attitude of trying to seek peace when people are excited is not welcomed. Take the case of one of the most explosive parts of the world today, Western Asia or the Middle East, or whatever it is called, and more particularly Syria.

Now the story of these Middle East countries during the past year or a little more, has been quite extraordinarily interesting, fascinating, and to some extent, tragic, how step by step conditions there have become worse, not better. We are told from time to time that the situation has improved there because of this military pact or that military alliance. But the fact is that the situation has become progressively worse. If the Western Powers have disliked any interference by the Soviet Union in the Middle Eastern countries, and if they have made these alliances to prevent that happening, well, the very thing they disliked and the very thing they wanted to avoid by those alliances has taken place, and because of those alliances and because of that policy. It is an obvious thing. Apart from the fact, of course, that the Soviet Union is a great country, if a country is sitting there geographically, you cannot wash it away, and it cannot be ignored in any settlement about the Middle East, just as you cannot ignore China in any settlement about the Far East, because geographically it is there, and it cannot be pushed out of its place on the surface of the earth.

But as I said, it is interesting to see that during the course of the past two or three years, the situation in the Mid-Eastern Region has progressively become worse. There was a measure of Arab unity. That has been broken up and split and then some of these Arab countries look at each other with extreme dislike, and possibly they even arm against each other. We read that Syria has been armed by the Soviet Union. We read further that Syria's neighbours all around are being supplied with arms by air-lift from the United States. Tanks are going by air from all over the place, from some European places where they are stocked and from America itself. It is an extraordinary world where each country has to take steps to prevent the other country outstepping it in arms aid. How one wishes that this competition was in economic aid and not in arms aid. But it is an extraordinary thing that these countries, not big in size, not big in population, occupying a famous part of Asia where Asia joins Europe, with a tremendous history behind them, with great cities, with a common culture so far as Arab countries are concerned, with a common language and living in a state of high tension, spending all their substance on arming themselves and thereby, I have no doubt,

restricting and limiting the freedom they possess.

We cannot put ourselves under another country for the arms they supply, for the free arms they supply, without somehow affecting our own freedom. It is a grave situation in the Mid-East, and especially in Syria. If a wrong step is taken, even if a small conflict somehow unfortunately begins there, the consequences may well be for a bigger conflict to occur and the bigger conflict may lead to a still bigger one. Therefore it is a dangerous situation. These things affect us because they affect the world. We are not intimately connected with what happens in West Asia or let us say, in Germany. That is one of the bigger questions of the world in Europe.

The two Germanys, whether they unite or don't unite, is a very big question and, if not at present, an explosive question. It is not our lookout, but, inevitably we are interested

<Pg-177>

in it because it affects the world. In that sense we are interested in every major question, more especially disarmament which I mentioned. But really the issues of immediate importance to us are those which directly affect us. Our relations with Pakistan and more especially involving Kashmir issue and Goa--these two are the questions which affect us directly and intimately. They affect the integrity of India and they affect the security of India. As I have said often, so far as Kashmir is concerned, a part of Kashmir territory has been invaded, aggression has been committed and is still in hostile possession.

So far as Goa is concerned, it is true that Goa has been under Portuguese possession for a considerable time, for hundreds of years but the freedom of India and the political revolution of India will not be complete however long it may take, till Goa is part of India. That is patent to anyone who sees it. If we disapprove, as we do, of colonialism in North Africa, in Algeria or in South East Asia or somewhere else in the wide world, would anyone expect us to permit colonialism in our very lap, sitting here in India, our own territory? It is an astounding idea and presumption that people seem to have. Nobody in India, I say, no party, no group, no individual in India can ever accept a foreign power sitting in any corner of India; because we have deliberately and with painful effort arrived at a conclusion that we must restrain ourselves and not allow any military effort in regard to Goa, perhaps some people imagine, perhaps the Portuguese Government imagine that they have settled this problem or dealt with it to their own advantage. I think they are very much mistaken because a problem of this kind, as I said, can never be settled till it is settled in one way and that is, till Portuguese domination ends there completely.

There is one small matter, not small but small only in the sense that it is whispered now, but very important and vital. I would like to mention this. It is sometimes said that Goa might be made some kind

of a base for other Powers. Portugal is a Member of the NATO alliance and it seeks to preserve its colonies under cover of that NATO alliance. A year or two ago there was some reference to NATO in connection with Goa and we referred to the NATO countries. The replies we got were more or less satisfactory. I would not say, they were 100 per cent satisfactory but they were more or less satisfactory. The replies broadly were that according to the NATO treaty, the Portuguese colonies did not come into it directly but under the Treaty they could discuss them. What they did afterwards, was another matter. So I said, they were not completely satisfactory, though that question and answer did serve as a warning to all these countries as to what we feel about Goa and what we feel about the application of any alliance to Goa.

If Goa is made any kind of a base for larger purposes of any alliance, that would be a move of the most serious character. It would be an unfriendly act to India and every country that helps or supports that move would thereby be committing this unfriendly act towards India and India will not tolerate it, whatever the consequences. We have shown enough patience in regard to Goa by tolerating, in the sense of not taking any aggressive steps, so far as Portuguese are concerned, but if that concept is widened so as to make Goa the base of other Powers or alliances or make Goa as the agent of other Powers functioning in that way, then the situation is much worse and we cannot possibly admit that and accept it.

I referred to the Kashmir issue which unfortunately has long been with us and is still with us, for no fault of ours. Sometimes you will find that the outside world and even Pakistan rather forgets Kashmir. Sometimes you find all the newspapers and many leading personalities in Pakistan having Kashmir on their lips, morning, noon and night, and shouting at the top of their voice. It is a kind of cyclical movement. Whenever anything happens, if the Security Council is meeting, then this propaganda goes up tremendously. During the past year or so, this propaganda has been at its highest pitch and I feel and I confess it with regret that it produced last year some considerable effect in the minds of other countries. Why it did so is another matter. There are many reasons, may be the effectiveness of repeating falsehoods with great force again and again, may be because the minds of some other countries were conditioned that way to begin with for various reasons. However, it did produce a certain effect and Hon. Members will remember, when this matter came up before the

<Pg-178>

Security Council last year, we had to face a very considerable opposition. It was an astonishing opposition, because it seemed to ignore some obvious, basic and patent facts. I hope I am not so blind to any viewpoint that I cannot even understand an opposition viewpoint or an opposing viewpoint. I may not agree with it. But the kind of arguments that were raised then, the kind of speeches that were delivered by the representatives of great powers who are supposed to know about this matter, by the representative of England,

by the representative of the United States of America and by other countries, were so far from facts, from truth, and from even a fair appraisal of the situation that we were astonished.

My colleague, Shri Krishna Menon, dealt with the situation there at very considerable length. Then the argument was raised that India's case is weak and so it has to be argued at length, the idea being that if we admitted the weakness of the case then they would be generous with us and just pat us on the back. I confess that during a long period of dealing with these matters, I have seldom come across something so astounding as the attitude last year in the Security Council of some of these great powers and other powers. They never dealt with this question. I don't mind their having other opinions, but I do expect and I think it is reasonable to expect, that a question should be faced and all the basic factors considered and answers framed and enquiries made. But not a word of it. And they passed a resolution then about the accession of Kashmir not taking place and nothing being done with regard to it on 26 January 1957. They were told repeatedly that the accession of the State of Jammu and Kashmir to India had taken place in October, 1947, and nothing was happening in January, 1957, except the winding up of the Constituent Assembly of Kashmir. They were told further that even though the Constituent Assembly of Kashmir drafted the Constitution, it had been finalised months before in the previous year. Nevertheless, they passed that resolution with all pomp and circumstance.

Nothing happened on 26 January. We did nothing then. Parliament did nothing. After all, if there are any steps to be taken constitutionally, Parliament will take the step. A public parade was held there. We normally have it on January 26. In Kashmir all that happened was that on the 25th mid-night, their Constituent Assembly met and they delivered some valedictory speeches and stopped functioning indefinitely. Then these representatives of countries, their chanceries and newspapers started writing articles that India had disobeyed, had flouted the Security Council and Kashmir had acceded to India on 26 January 1957. It is perfectly extraordinary how if a lie is embedded in a person's mind, how difficult it is to uproot it and take it out.

They talk about a plebiscite. Again and again we have pointed out that in terms of the Resolution passed by the United Nations Commission in the Security Council, the first thing to be done was for Pakistan to get out, that Pakistan was there by virtue of invasion, of aggression, and it has been practically admitted, and until it goes out nothing else is going to be done. Instead of going out, it has entrenched itself. Instead of going out, in the name of may be, fighting Communism or whatever it may be, it has got enormous aid from the United States of America; it may be getting it from the Baghdad Pact or the SEATO, I do not know. But what they get from the United States of America is very considerable. I make no vague or general statement, and I say so, because we have enough information in our possession to show that the military aid, the air aid and the

other aid that is coming from the United States to Pakistan is very considerable, and is a menace to India unless we deal with it. And here, because of this menace we have had to do something which has hurt us and given us a tremendous deal of pain, that is, to spend more and more on armaments.

The House knows that on the economic plane, especially on the foreign exchange plane, especially on the foreign exchange at this moment, we have had to add to our burden of foreign exchange. It was a difficult decision but in the final analysis where the security of India is concerned, there can be no two decisions on the matter. We took it. And I should like other countries, our friendly countries concerned, to realise how by some of their policies of military alliances, military aid, they have added to the burdens of India, a feeling of insecurity and thereby coming in the way of some other thing, of our working out our Five Year Plan and our developmental schemes.

<Pg-179>

We are very grateful for the help, financial, loans or credits or otherwise, that we have received from other countries and--I speak in all honesty--I am grateful to them but it is an odd thing that while we are helped, other conditions are produced which wash out that help. We have to carry greater burdens.

Therefore, so far as Kashmir is concerned, let there be no doubt in peoples' minds as to what our position is. We have not repudiated any direction or decision of the Security Council to which we agreed. We went to the Security Council ourselves complaining of a certain aggression by Pakistan. We went there under an article of the Character which is a kind of mediatory article. The Security Council passed two main resolutions to which references are made, one in 1948 and the other in January, 1949. We accepted them; we stood by them and we stand by them but they have to be interpreted in terms of today. Apart from that, the question remains that the two things those resolutions laid down were that Pakistan had brought its Army into Kashmir and that it must withdraw, it must go out of that territory. That should be the first thing but they have never done that. Their aggression, indeed their occupation of Jammu and Kashmir territory, continues still. While that continues, we are asked repeatedly by some of the Western Powers to make it up with Pakistan, to agree to what Pakistan says or for a plebiscite or for other things.

Whatever may be the rights and wrongs in regard to some steps that we may have taken, I fail to understand how anybody in the wide world, including Pakistan, can justify the presence of Pakistani armies, troops, civil personnel, in Jammu and Kashmir territory. There is no explanation, no justification, no pretext except that of armed invasion and aggression. Nothing more and, if they say, "Oh, we came here because Muslims are in a majority in Kashmir. The hearts of Muslims in Pakistan bled because they were suffering under foreign yoke and we came over to free them," then, let that be put forward

and no other argument. We shall answer that. The more I think of it, the more surprising it becomes as to how these statesmen of the Western World cannot see the facts as they are and go on repeating something which has no basis and will have no basis. We do not propose to forget facts as they are. Facts remain facts whether a person forgets them or not and the Kashmir issue is going to be treated on the basis of those facts and on none other.

The House knows, how constantly attempts are being made in Kashmir, attempts at sabotage. Members may have read this morning about bombs bursting and little children being killed. Of course, these bursting of bombs and crackers do not solve the question of Kashmir. It is absurd but this is the extent to which people in Pakistan are going. Having failed in their major efforts, now they are sending their emissaries with all kinds of bombs, etc., with money and so on. We have got the money and we have often got the material which was sent by Pakistan, the pamphlets that they have sent. After all, it is not easy to guard a huge frontier to see that nobody comes in. This kind of very unseemly activity is going on, of trying just to frighten and unnerving the people of Kashmir and, in fact, training people to do this.

A MEMBER: This aggression is open and is increasing day by day. Could you do nothing about it?

PRIME MINISTER: I do not know what the Hon. Member means. We certainly deal with them. We have captured many people who came and some people, I believe, are going to be tried in open court. It is being done but it is not exactly easy to guarantee that nobody will throw a cracker or a bomb especially when this apparatus is helped by a neighbouring Government which has great resources at its command.

I mentioned casually about Algeria. I do not think I need say much about it except that it is today one of the major colonial issues in the world. It is a difficult issue. We have always recognised that there is difficulty for France because of the presence of a million and a half or a million and a quarter Frenchmen there. Because of this it does become a little difficult issue but the fact of the presence of the Frenchmen there cannot possibly be made an excuse for continuation of this colonial regime as a colony. They have suffered very greatly and I do earnestly hope that they will gain their freedom with the co-operation of the French because this injury is harming both terribly.

I do not wish to say anything more at

<Pg-180>

this stage because, I would like Hon. Members here to help us in considering this problem in all its aspects. After all, this question of international affairs become more and more difficult and intricate because we cannot control the world. We cannot control our own country as we would like to, much less the world and we cannot

presume to control the world.

We can only influence world events a little by our weight and by our influence do what we can. Ultimately, one comes to the conclusion that the only way wherein one can influence any event in the world is to increase one's own strength, the country's strength and unity and purpose. Then only it is that its voice counts; otherwise, it is just shouting in the wilderness. So, we try to do our best in our humble way in world affairs. It is really in our own country that we have to build up our position in the world.

INDIA USA FRANCE CANADA RUSSIA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC HUNGARY CHINA SYRIA GERMANY PAKISTAN ALGERIA PORTUGAL IRAQ

Date: Sep 09, 1957

Volume No

1995

IRAQ

Air Transport Agreement Ratified

The Government of India issued a Press Note on Sep 05, 1957 in New Delhi on the ratification of India-Iraq Air Transport Agreement. The Press Note said:

The India-Iraq Air Transport Agreement, which was signed on 27 July 1955 at Baghdad, came into force from 3 September 1957 when the Instruments of Ratification were exchanged between the Indian Embassy, Baghdad, and the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Government of Iraq.

A bilateral air transport agreement between the Government of India and the Government of Iraq was signed on 27 July 1955 at Baghdad.

The agreement lays down the conditions that will govern the operation of air services between the two countries by airlines designated by either of the two Governments. The agreement specifies that air services may be operated on the following routes:

For an airline designated by the Govern-of India: India, points in Pakistan, points in Afghanistan, points in Iran, to Basra and, if desired, beyond, or Baghdad, points in Europe (including Turkey) and, if desired, beyond.

India, a point in Pakistan, Jedda, Dhahran or Bahrein, Points in Iran, to Basra and, if desired, beyond, or Baghdad, points in Europe

(including Turkey) and, if desired, beyond.

For an airlines designated by the Government of Iraq: Iraq, points in Iran, points in Afghanistan, points in Persian Gulf, Jedda, Karachi, Delhi or Calcutta and, if desired, beyond.

Iraq, points in Iran, points in Afghanistan, points in Persian Gulf, Jedda, Karachi, Bombay and, if desired, beyond.

The agreement also provides the machinery for the determination of the capacity and the frequencies of the services that might be operated on the above routes.

IRAQ INDIA AFGHANISTAN IRAN PAKISTAN TURKEY

Date: Sep 05, 1957

Volume No

1995

JAPAN

Extension of Trade Privileges

The Government, of India issued a Press Note in New Delhi on Sep 28, 1957 announcing the exchange of letters regarding the extension of Indo-Japanese Trade Privileges. The Press Note said:

The Indo-Japanese Peace Treaty, which was concluded in 1952, provided that pending the conclusion or treaties or agreements to place their trading and other commercial relations on stable and friendly basis, the two

<Pg-181>

countries would accord, on a reciprocal basis, for a period of four years, certain privileges to their nationals, trade, shipping, navigation, air traffic, etc. This provisional period ended on 27 April 1956 and was last extended up to 30 September 1957, by exchange of letters.

As a result of the discussions held in New Delhi between the representatives of the two Governments, letters have been exchanged on 28 September 1957 between Shri K. B. Lall, Joint Secretary, Ministry of Commerce and Industry, on behalf of the Government of India and His Excellency Mr. Seijiro Yoshizawa, Ambassador of Japan, on behalf of the Japanese Governments, by which the two Governments have agreed to continue to accord the same privileges upto 31

December 1957.

During this extended period, the two Governments hope to complete discussions for the conclusion of a Trade Agreement.

JAPAN INDIA GERMANY USA

Date: Sep 01, 1957

Volume No

1995

NEPAL

Aid from India

Replying to a question in the Rajya Sabha on Sep 03, 1957 on the amount of financial aid so far given to the Government of Nepal for the implementation of their Five-Year Plan, the Deputy Minister of Finance, Shri B. R. Bhagat, stated that the approximate amount spent on aid from 1 April 1956 till todate was Rs. 14 million.

The main works undertaken by the Government of India in Nepal were, (i) construction, repairs and maintenance of roads, (ii) construction of permanent runway, terminal buildings, fencing and sealing coat at the Gaucher Airfield, (iii) minor irrigation and water supply schemes, and (iv) surveys (aerial and triangulation railway projects, power projects and landing grounds).

NEPAL INDIA LATVIA **Date**: Sep 03, 1957

Volume No

1995

NORTH KOREA

Trade Arrangements

The Minister for Commerce, Shri Nityanand Kanungo, stated in the Rajya Sabha during question-time on Sep 12, 1957 that letters had been exchanged between the leader of the Trade Delegation from

the Democratic People's Republic of Korea and the Managing Director of the State Trading Corporation of India outlining the arrangements for trade between India and the Democratic People's Republic of Korea.

Shri Kanungo placed on the table of the House a list of the goods proposed to be exchanged. He said quantities would be determined in due course as a result of negotiations between the trading organisations on both sides.

The list of goods to be exported from India to the Democratic People's Republic of Korea include jute goods, tea, shellac, coffee, ores, vegetable oils, cotton and woollen textiles, coir and coir manufactures, soaps, machine tools, sewing machines and linoleum.

The list of goods to be exported from the Democratic People's Republic of Korea to India include cement, glass sheets and plates, electrolytic zinc, steels, caustic soda and other chemicals.

<Pg-182>

KOREA NORTH KOREA INDIA USA RUSSIA

Date: Sep 12, 1957

Volume No

1995

PAKISTAN

Statement on Financial Issues

The Finance Minister, Shri T. T. Krishnamachari, made the following statement in the Lok Sabha on Sep 05, 1957 in reply to a question calling attention to the statement made by the Finance Minister of Pakistan regarding amounts payable by India to Pakistan:

Sir, With your permission I propose to make a short statement on the outstanding financial issues between India and Pakistan in regard to which I answered a question on the floor of this House on the 8th of last month. Since then, certain statements have been made in the Pakistan National Assembly which may convey a wrong impression.

The House will remember that in August last year a statement was laid on the table of the House listing the more important of the outstanding financial issues. These were last discussed in May 1951 between the Finance Ministers of the two countries. They have been the subject matter of a number of subsequent discussions at

Secretariat level, but for a variety of reasons into which I do not think it necessary to enter, it has not been possible to arrange a meeting at Ministerial level.

In March 1955 my predecessor invited the then Pakistan Finance Minister for a discussion but owing to his other preoccupations he was unable to come. About a fortnight back I received a suggestion from the Pakistan Finance Minister that we should meet and discuss the outstanding issues. I have accepted his suggestion and I hope that the meeting will take place as soon as possible after I return from my impending visit to the United States and Europe.

The outstanding issues between the two countries fall into three broad categories. The first relates to the determination of partition debt. Our estimate of this debt, so far as it concerned the two Central Governments, is that it will be of the order of Rs. 3000 million. If the debt arising out of partition of the provinces is also taken into account it may be higher.

The figure I mentioned gives only the order of the sum involved. The partition debt at the Centre is repayable in 50 equated instalments, the first of which fell due on the 15 August 1952. Six instalments are today overdue. In the Budget for 1952-53, we took credit for a payment of Rs. 90 million on this account. Even on this very rough and clearly low figure, the amount overdue is over Rs. 500 million.

The second category deals with matters arising out of the separation of the currencies of the two countries. The most important item is the assets remaining to be transferred out of the assets of the Issue Department of the Reserve Bank of India. The value is about Rs. 490 million. Then other items are relatively small and do not involve any substantial amount.

The third category relates to what may be broadly called post-partition transactions. A large volume of payments have been made in each country on behalf of the other which will have to be cleared up. On our side the sum is of the order of Rs. 230 million. I do not know what the sum on the Pakistan side is. All this will have to be gone into with the assistance of the Auditors General on both sides.

Then we have a sum of Rs. 165 million due to us on account of Defence stores supplied after partition to Pakistan for which under an agreement entered into in May 1948 they are due to pay us. There are also some rupee balances held by Pakistan in India about which there has been some argument. The sum thus held is Rs. 130 million.

I do not wish to weary the House with a recital of the less important items. It is our intention to discuss all the items, both major and minor, in a frank and friendly way and strive to reach an overall settlement. I do not, therefore, wish to say anything or take up any position in regard to any individual matter falling to be discussed, whatever the temptation or the provocation for it, which might in any way affect the discussion which we propose to have with the Pakistan

Government. I only wish to emphasise that on the major outstanding issues we should reach an overall settlement fair to both the countries. This will be our approach at the ensuing meeting.

<Pg-183>

PAKISTAN INDIA USA

Date: Sep 05, 1957

Volume No

1995

PAKISTAN

Canal Water Dispute

Replying to a question in the Rajya Sabha on Sep 10, 1957, Shri S. K. Patil, Minister of Irrigation and Power, said that the attention of the Government of India had been drawn to a statement made by the Pakistan Finance Minister in the Pakistan National Assembly to the effect that India's attitude to the canal water dispute was against the spirit of the co-operative effort under the good offices of the World Bank and that India had gone back on her commitments. The Minister added:

The Pakistan Finance Minister's statement in the National Assembly on 31 August 1957, as reported in the Pakistan Press is misleading. The correct position is: The Bank Proposal of February, 1954, stipulated a transition period of about 5 years during which Pakistan was expected to complete the necessary link canals for replacing supplies from India.

It may be recalled that in the statement made by me to the House on 21 August 1957, it was indicated that although the transition period according to the Bank Proposal would have terminated in 1959, we would be prepared to extend it up to 1962, but could go no further without jeopardising the vital interests of millions of our people. Curiously, our readiness to extend the period of transition up to 1962, has been interpreted as a threat of unilateral stoppage of canal waters.

We have not gone back upon any of our commitments. In February, 1954, the World Bank put forward a proposal to the Governments of India and Pakistan for acceptance as the basis of agreement. India accepted the principles of the Bank Proposal but Pakistan did not.

In May, 1956, the Bank, in its aide memoire to both Governments,

stated that it might be necessary to provide some storage in addition to the link canals on which the 1954 proposal was based and that the Bank would proceed to use its good offices to bring about acceptance of an appropriate adjustment of the Bank Proposal of February, 1954, when the co-operative work was resumed.

The Government of India informed the World Bank that our point of view would be explained in the course of further discussions and that we would be prepared to consider at an appropriate stage, any adjustment, which, on examination might appear necessary.

During further discussions, under the aegis of the World Bank, till March 31, 1957, this matter was not considered, as the stage for it was not reached. The Government of India have, therefore, had no opportunity so far to consider what, if any, adjustments to the Bank Proposal of 1954 are necessary.

The latest position is that Mr. Iliff made suggestions regarding certain heads of agreement to both Pakistan and India in his letter of 24 June 1957, and we have replied to this letter. The replies sent by Pakistan to Mr. Iliff, copy of which has been supplied to us by the World Bank, is being studied for sending our comments to the World Bank.

PAKISTAN LATVIA INDIA USA

Date : Sep 10, 1957

Volume No

1995

PAKISTAN

Air Violation

In reply to a question in the Rajya Sabha on Sep 04, 1957, Prime Minister said that Dakota and Jet aircraft, believed to belong to Pakistan, violated Indian air space in Jammu and Kashmir, on five different days in August.

Asked about the action taken in the matter he said:

Complaints were lodged by the Indian Army authorities with the U.N. Chief Military Observer.

<Pg-184>

Date: Sep 04, 1957

October

Volume No		
1995		
CONTENTS		
Foreign Affairs Record		
	1957	
VOL. III.	October No. 10	
VOL. III.	No. 10	
CONTEN	ΓS	
JAPAN		
Nehru-Kishi Joint Commur		
Supply of Textile Machiner	ry 186	
INDIA IN THE UNITED NA	ATIONS	
Shri Krishna Menon's State	ment on Disarmament 187	
WEST GERMANY		
Communique on Shri Krish	namachari's Visit 204	
MINISTRY OF EXTERN	NAL AFFAIRS: EXTERNAL PUBLICITY DIVI	SION
	ENT OF INDIA	SIOIV
<pg-i></pg-i>		
TIDITIDI GEDICI		

JAPAN INDIA GERMANY USA

Date: Oct 01, 1957

Volume No

1995

Nehru-Kishi Joint Communique

Prime Minister Nehru paid an official visit to Japan between 4 and Oct 13, 1957 issued in Tokyo on 13 October after the conclusion of talks between

Prime Minister Nehru and the Japanese Prime Minister, Mr. Nobusuke Kishi, and the Foreign Minister, Mr. Aiichiro Fujiyama.

At the invitation of the Prime Minister of Japan, Mr. Nobusuke Kishi, the Prime Minister of India, Mr. Jawaharlal Nehru, visited Japan from 4 to 13 October 1957. He was received in audience by His Majesty the Emperor and had talks with the Prime Minister of Japan. He had also talks with the Minister of Foreign Affairs, Mr. Aiichiro Fujiyama.

The two Prime Ministers were happy to continue the friendly discussions which they had at New Delhi in May this year. These talks covered a wide range of international problems, including particularly problems of Asia, as well as matters of special interest to Japan and India, and there was agreement of views in many respects. As on the previous occasion, the present talks were held in an atmosphere of frankness and cordiality and with a friendly understanding of each other's point of view, which characterises the relations between the two countries. The Prime Ministers agreed that there were no difficult problems between the two countries and reaffirmed their desire for increasing understanding and co-operation between Japan and India, which will not only be to their mutual benefit but will contribute to the peace and prosperity of Asia and the world.

Referring to Japan's recent election to a non-permanent seat on the Security Council of the United Nations, Prime Minister Kishi stated that this brought her new and heavy international responsibilities, and expressed Japan's determination in that capacity to work ceaselessly for world peace and realisation of the principles and purposes of the United Nations Charter. The Prime Minister of India expressed satisfaction at these sentiments and offered his felicitations.

The Prime Ministers discussed the question of nuclear weapons and disarmament. They are convinced that the piling up of arms, especially weapons of mass destruction by the major powers, spells a grave danger to the peace of the world. In the recent invention of space missiles lie further dangers, the nature and extent of which cannot yet be fully assessed. While a comprehensive all-round disarmament is essential, the prohibition of the manufacture and use of nuclear and other weapons of mass destruction is urgent and imperative if the peoples of the world are to live in freedom from fear and enjoy the abundant life that modern science and technology offers. The Prime Ministers are aware of the difficulties, arising mainly from lack of understanding and mutual confidence among the big powers, which have stood in the way of a comprehensive agreement on

disarmament. It is incumbent on the United Nations as a whole and on the big powers in particular to continue and redouble their efforts to that end.

Meanwhile, the Prime Ministers consider that suspension of nuclear tests, the frequency of which has greatly increased during the past two or three years, must be the first step towards the creating of conditions in which prohibition of the manufacture and use of nuclear weapons and disarmament in other fields may become possible.

They recall in this connection the unanimous appeal of the Afro-Asian nations in Bandung in April, 1955, to the powers concerned to reach agreement to suspend experiments with nuclear weapons as well as to realise disarmament. They decided to instruct their delegations at the United Nations to co-operate with a view to bringing about the suspension of nuclear tests as well as an agreement on disarmament among the powers concerned.

The Prime Ministers consider that the economic development of Asian countries, which had been neglected during past centuries, is essential for the peace and stability not only of Asia but of the whole world. They discussed ways and means of promoting economic cooperation as well as trade and commerce

<Pg-185>

between the two countries. They expressed their desire and hope that a trade agreement, now under negotiation between Japan and India, would be concluded as early as possible and also that settlement of other pending problems would be expedited. They also recognised that there were many further fields of economic co-operation between Japan and India, such as long-term arrangements for stabilised supply of iron ore from India to Japan and financing of India's imports of capital goods from Japan, and they agreed that discussions should be held at the expert level between the two Governments.

The Prime Minister of Japan offered Japan's help in establishing technical training centres in India for the purpose of contribution to the development of medium and small-scale industries in India. The Prime Minister of India welcomed the offer and it was agreed that details of the proposal should be discussed between the two Governments at an early date.

Prime Minister Kishi expressed his sincere hope that the Second Five-Year Plan of India would be successfully carried out. In connection with the implementation of the plan the two Prime Ministers agreed in principle on Japan's co-operation with India in the way of yen credit to finance the supply of capital goods from Japan.

The Prime Ministers expressed their determination to take all possible steps under the recently concluded cultural agreement between Japan and India to promote and further strengthen the cultural relations between the two countries. They discussed in

particular the possibility of exchanging professors and students, of encouraging mutual visits by scientists, artists and others eminent in the cultural life of each country, as well as exchanging films.

Prime Minister Kishi mentioned that he wished to present to the Prime Minister of India a number of books and other publications on science and technology and on economic and cultural subjects to serve as works of reference in connection with economic development and cultural understanding. Prime Minister Nehru accepted this gift with pleasure.

The Prime Minister of India expressed his deep appreciation and sincere thanks for the very warm reception accorded to him in Japan. Both the Prime Ministers are convinced that this visit, following on the earlier visit of Prime Minister Kishi to Delhi, the personal contacts they have established and the fruitful exchange of views which has taken place, will lead to greatly increased co-operation and understanding between the two countries.

JAPAN USA UNITED KINGDOM INDIA RUSSIA INDONESIA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC

Date: Oct 01, 1957

Volume No

1995

JAPAN

Supply of Textile Machinery

An agreement was signed in New Delhi on Oct 19, 1957 between the State Trading Corporation of India and the Japan Textile Machinery Manufacturers' Association providing for the supply of textile machinery from Japan on deferred payment basis. The agreement was signed by Shri K. B. Lall, Chairman, State Trading Corporation, on the Corporation's behalf and by Mr. T. Ishida, President of the Japan Textile Machinery Manufacturers' Association, on behalf of the Association.

Under the agreement, different items of textile machinery will be supplied by Japanese manufacturers to Indian mills, with the cooperation of the S.T.C. on the one hand and the Japanese Association on the other. Contracts will be entered into, on the basis of deferred payments agreed upon between the two organisation, by the purchasers and suppliers directly. Such contracts will be registered with the S.T.C. who will ensure their implementation. The Japanese Association on its part will assist the suppliers in the export of machinery and try to keep prices at a reasonable level.

Ten per cent of the value of each contract will be paid immediately on the placing of the contract and another 10 per cent will be payable on presentation of shipping documents. The balance of 80 per cent of the value will be paid in ten equal half-yearly instalments. The rate of interest will be 6 per cent.

The items of textile machinery will include carding engines, speed and ring frames, blow room machinery, automatic looms, high speed winding and warping machines, sizing machines, drawing frames, combing sets, cotton waste spinning plant, and spinning and weaving machinary for silk, art silk and spun silk.

<Pg-186>

JAPAN INDIA RUSSIA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC CHINA

Date: Oct 19, 1957

Volume No

1995

INDIA IN THE UNITED NATIONS

Shri Krishna Menon's Statement on Disarmament

Shri V. K. Krishna Menon, Leader of the Indian Delegation, made the following statement on Oct 30, 1957 in the general debate in the U.N. Political Committee on regulation, limitation and balanced reduction of all armed forces and all armaments; conclusion of an International Convention (treaty) on the reduction of armaments and the prohibition of atomic, hydrogen and other weapons of mass destruction:

When I made my first and preliminary intervention in this debate on disarmament, I felt it my duty to mention that it is to this Assembly that the world looks for some progress in the direction of disarmament. There were many speakers during the general debate in the General Assembly, notably the Prime Minister of Canada, who expressed the hope that this Assembly might be known in future years as the "Disarmament Assembly." In my first intervention I also said that my delegation would have preferred to intervene in the debate after it had heard all the representatives on the Sub-Committee of the Disarmament Commission, particularly the representative of France, I wish to express my regret that I was not present in the Committee when Mr. Jules Moch made his statement. This was not due to any lack of courtesy, but because I was engaged in another place. However, I studied his speech very fully.

A great part of the statement from the French delegation was addressed to the arguments which I presented to the Assembly, and it also went to the root of the problem of disarmament and discussed how we should tackle it at the present time and also the role of the General Assembly, which is a significant one. Therefore, I hope the representative of France will forgive me if I make very full use of his statement. Much of that statement was in favour of what has been presented by my delegation; at least, the arguments were but the conclusions were not always so. Mr. Moch said:

The need for a disarmed peace has never been as deeply felt as at this time when, in the case of a conflict, the advanced lines of former times would stretch across the whole world. Disarmament was never so meticulously studied as it was during the last six-month session of the Sub-Committee in London, nor has there ever been as much hope as there was then to turn into reality the spirit of Geneva. Therefore, never was the disillusionment as great as it was on the morning after our recent adjournment.

I ask with very great respect, if the need for disarmed peace has never been as deeply felt and if in the case of a conflict the advanced lines of former times would stretch across the world, is the disillusionment the answer or the contention that should be put before this Assembly? The two parts of his argument somehow do not seem to fit in together. My delegation in its initial statement said that what we were really discussing under the item of disarmament was really the survival of civilization, as we know it. That is putting the same statement in another way.

From there the statement went on to refer to our debates here, and this is a matter of very great importance because in the submission we originally made we stated, with respect to all members of this Assembly, that here was an issue in which we must if necessary think in fresh terms, not merely in terms of party or political alignment. The issues were so vital for the survival of the human race that even at the risk of changing our original view, it was necessary for us to make a fresh approach.

In all that, my delegation took the view that the Disarmament Commission itself had ceased to function and had become merely a post office. The Sub-Committee on Disarmament had laboured long and zealously, and it had not produced agreement. But, at the same time, as Mr. Lodge pointed out, areas of agreement had been reached at various times. It was as though they met on a level plateau near each other and that drifts of suspicion came between them and separated them again. But the main point which we made was that this is one of those occasions when world public opinion, Governments

<Pg-187>

large and small, irrespective of their economic or political power, had the same responsibility, not to find a solution, not in order to produce the knowledge that the great powers have, but the same responsibility towards pressing forward and not sharing in the disillusionment.

But what are we told? We are told that because of the work in London, according to Mr. Moch, "all this necessarily limits the role of our Assembly." The role of this Assembly cannot be limited by anybody except the Assembly itself. "We must examine the situation objectively, and not as we would have it," said Mr. Moch. That is what the Assembly is supposed to do. Mr. Moch continued:

One fact is immediately apparent: seventy-one official meetings of the Sub-Committee and many private meetings between heads of delegations have been unable to bring about the draft of any agreement ... even after the different points of view had been brought considerably closer, as Mr. Cabot Lodge correctly stressed. Among the five members of the Sub-Committee are the four powers which alone must bear the responsibility for taking the first disarmament measures

My delegation has time after time, year after year, stated that unless these great powers agreed, there could be no disarmament in the world. Therefore, we do not disagree with it. It may be true that they should take the first disarmament measures, but at the same time, is it not the Assembly's responsibility to have a policy and the necessary expression of opinion and the influence which it might exert in that way? Mr. Moch went on to say:

... none of us can reasonably expect an agreement, provisionally deferred after lengthy negotiations between five States, suddenly to emerge after a brief discussion between eighty-two States ...

If this is the case, then what was the purpose of submitting the report of the Disarmament Commission, because what is said here is that for three months, at seventy-one meetings, the matter was discussed in great detail; they are the people who know all about it and they could not reach agreement, and therefore we cannot reach agreement. Therefore, the representative of France, with all his experience, and in his wisdom advises us:

- ... let us regretfully discard the idea of unanimity on the substance of the problem And that is the most damaging statement that could be made to a person like myself.
- ... This year, the Assembly will have to decide by a majority vote despite the serious difficulties inherent in the absence of unanimity that Mr. Krishna Menon so appropriately brought out.

If we are told that on the four powers alone rests the responsibility of disarmament, and if, at the same time, we are told that the four powers do not agree and, therefore, we must depend upon the three of them in order to bring about a decision, how do we square these two

things? On the one hand, we are told that there must be agreement among the four. We have not got that agreement and, therefore, instead of putting any barrier to further measures towards reaching agreement, the Assembly is asked to take the view that there cannot be unanimity; we must discard this idea in regard to the substance of the problem:

No one has a higher respect than I have for the representative of France, for his very steadfast and devoted work in this cause and the great knowledge and experience which he brings to bear upon it. He tells us that in this matter, inspite of the political vicissitudes that may happen in a system of democratic government, he has conducted these negotiations for years and his own person lives, therefore, in the continuity of French policy in regard to that. I do not question all this. But let us be clear about this one thing, that it is not possible for the Assembly at any time to consider that there are not occasions when deadlocks can be reached which may be resolved one way or another. The General Assembly has many experiences where this has happened. To this I shall refer later, with concrete instances. This is the approach that is made.

Then in the next part of his speech, the representative of France prescribes to the General Assembly what is its role. What is

<Pg-188>

the role of the General Assembly? There are three roles as prescribed to us by Mr. Moch:

First of all, each of its members individually can submit his own suggestions

That, I think, is the right that rests in us as sovereign States. In any case, any communications will be received by the International Postal System. The paragraph continues;

... We shall receive these with rejoining because we are aware that, despite our seventy-one working meetings, undoubtedly we may have overlooked certain aspects of the problem.

That, Mr. Moch, does not square again with the idea that no other influence should be brought to bear upon the considerations between Assemblies in regard to this problem. Mr. Moch continued:

Secondly, the Assembly collectively must soothe human fear with a note of hope, of confidence in the wisdom of men ...

How would the General Assembly "soothe human fear with a note of hope, of confidence" when we are told that there can be no unanimity and no agreement and that, therefore, one must vote with the majority? On the one hand, we are asked to endorse the non-agreed findings of the Sub-Committee, and then we are to go to the world and "soothe human fear with a note of hope, of confidence in the wisdom

of man." Mr. Moch went on to say:

Finally, this year the Assembly must make a choice: at least two roads are open to us ...

I submit that there is only one road with regard to this, and that is to disarm. And then comes the most tragic sentence of all:

... For the moment, a synthesis seems to be impossible ... The representative of France was the author of this idea of synthesis two or three years ago. The sentence goes on:

... and I say this sadly since in the course of our long years of work I have always done everything in my power to bring about the necessary conciliation. I am not giving up. Still, to continue with it, a better time must be awaited than that which follows the long London session. Our first task is to make known the feelings of the United Nations, that is to say, to choose between the two main concepts, to take a majority stand...

With very great respect for the 24 countries that have sponsored the draft resolution and for Mr. Jules Moch himself, I submit the view of my Government that it would not be a contribution to negotiation to get the endorsement of this Assembly to a non-agreed view of the Commission. This has nothing to do with whether one proposal is more meritorious than the other. The essence of success in disarmament work is agreement. Therefore if the power of the Assembly is rallied behind one view--whether it be the view of the majority or the minority makes no difference ... the next stage of negotiation becomes more difficult. The representative of France questions this and thinks that if the Assembly endorsed a non-agreed view view then that non-agreed view might become an agreed view later on. We feel, on our part, that it would be unwise to tighten this deadlock and put the weight of the Assembly behind disagreements. This is a centre for harmonising interests and not for disharmonising them.

This is not meant in disrespect of the labours of the Commission. This is no final disagreement with regard to the proposals put forward, but simply to point out that the work we have to do here is not in any way to put the Disarmament Commission in cold storage or to make its further meeting more difficult by being met with an initial objection ... that is, an Assembly mandate to proceed in a particular way.

In the statements we made, I submitted to you, Mr. Chairman, and under your guidance that this was not the time to deal with resolutions, but generally with the main subheadings so that the general debate will cover the whole issue. The first of these items to which we address ourselves is the draft resolution of Belgium. My delegation is in sympathy with this draft resolution, but we should like to say this: that while we are in sympathy with this draft resolution, if the dissemination of knowledge simply means another period of delay and, what is more,

from all the discussions and the contradictions made by the representative of France himself with regard to the scientific data that is put forward, if the dissemination of knowledge becomes only another instrument for saying that armaments are no danger and that disarmament is not necessary, then the dissemination of information will serve little purpose. With that reservation we should like to express our support for the view that is put forward by the Belgian delegation because in the last analysis it is the public opinion of the world that will bring pressure upon all of us. The next item I would like to deal with is the question of these explosions. We are told that we have now "come to the crucial point." The representative of France states:

... the isolated suspension of nuclear tests, the supreme hope of the Soviet delegation ... a battlefield wisely chosen where the passionate and the rational meet He has received the support of Mr. Krishna Menon who, I hasten to add, has not taken upon himself to repeat all those imputations and whose ardent address calls for the most careful reflection.

I am most grateful for the kind references to me by the representative of France. But I think it is my duty to state the position of my Government. As early as 1954, this proposal for a moratorium on tests was made, long before the Soviet Union had agreed or had agreed tentatively or had expressed its view on a suspension of tests. What is more, by itself, one country supporting or opposing a proposition is not a measure of its merit. If support of the suspension of explosions is regarded as a political move then I think we shall stand in this Assembly with the great majority of opinion in the world. We shall take first of all the United States of America where recently,

in a nation-wide survey just completed by the American Institute of Public Opinion, a dramatic change in the public's thinking on calling a halt to further hydrogen bomb tests is noted. Sixty-three per cent of those questioned believe that this country should agree to stop making any more tests of nuclear weapons ... if all nations, including Russia, agree to do so.

When the issue was first raised in April, 1954 only 20 per cent were in favour of calling off tests.

We read the following in The New York Times of 19 May 1957:

Throughout Scandinavia just about everybody wants to see an end of nuclear explosion tests. In Norway's larger cities such as Oslo, Bergen and Stavanger, people have been standing by hundreds in queues awaiting a chance to sign a public round robin saying simply, 'We think Albert Schweitzer is right.'

Norwegian newspaper editorials have been saving for weeks now, as did Oslo's Arbeiderbladet--a Government mouthpiece--recently that the increasing rate of nuclear explosions is proof enough that they must be stopped--now and while there is yet time.

There are similar opinions expressed in Sweden and other Scandinavian countries.

Then we come to what may be called a totally non-political opinion in a statement made by the Central Committee of the World Council of Churches on 5 August 1957. I am not saying that the World Council of Churches is an expert on atomic science, but we are now talking about public opinion. This Statement reads:

We are bound to ask whether any nation is justified in continuing the testing of nuclear weapons while the magnitude of the dangers is so little known and while effective means of protection against these dangers are lacking. We must ask further whether any nation is justified in deciding on its own responsibility to conduct such tests when the people of other nations in all parts of the world who have not agreed may have to bear the consequences.

But we urge that as a first step Governments conducting tests should forego them, at least for a trial period, either together, or individually in the hope that the others will do the same, a new confidence be born, and foundations be laid for reliable agreements.

I read these out because it is always possible to draw across any argument of a political red herring in this way.

<Pg-190>

The position of the Government of India in regard to suspension of tests is something which is fundamental, which India regards as necessary in view of the danger, as I shall show very soon, and in view of its importance in relation to the whole of the disarmament problem on which we, hold views diametrically opposed to those expressed by the Secretary of States of the United Kingdom and because we think that any step in this direction will be a contribution towards disarmament itself further, we do not think that any of the objections raised in this regard are any longer true. Nor does the suspension of tests--I would like to make this new point-handicap one groups of countries as against the other. The handicaps are even. In regard to all this, I propose to place before the Committee such evidence as we have. The representative of New Zealand, speaking in the debate, said:

We need no reminding that many earnest people throughout the world feel that the possible hazards from test explosions should override all other considerations in determining the attitude of Governments and of this Assembly towards the testing of nuclear weapons. Their genuine apprehensions arise from uncertainty about the long-term effects of radiation if tests are not brought to an end. We have

heard an eloquent exposition of this point of view from the distinguished representative of India. On the other hand, Mr. Moch, with all his experience, reassured us yesterday as to the effects of radiation, and I must say that I found his statement very convincing.

This reaction that has been created in the Assembly either in full or in part has imposed upon me a responsibility, in spite of all the respect I have for the representative of France, to answer each of the points that have been raised. The representative of France says:

Let us dwell no longer on the possibility of chain reactions destroying the planet as the result of peace-time test explosions. All this has been scientifically proved and I shall not harp upon it again. At any rate, the most powerful nuclear explosions release a thousand times less energy than the most powerful earthquakes, and only just about as much as the tropical cyclones, with which I am sure members are acquainted. Therefore, their danger need not be taken into account at all.

Here is a member of the Disarmament Commission saying that the danger need not be taken into account at all and that therefore it is not a question that tests should be suspended now or later. I should like to say that I have read through what I have said and I do not recollect my saying that explosions are likely to create a chain reaction and destroy the world. I said that it is possible to conceive of a situation in which the advance of knowledge and the success of further experiments might mean the finding of methods whereby whatever they do with the atom can create chain reactions, as was said at the scientific conference in Geneva that was convened by the United Nations itself.

Be that as it may, we are told that an atomic explosion is much less powerful than a powerful earthquake. But we do not make the earthquakes; we have no control over them; they are natural calamities. However, we make the explosions. That is the difference. The same thing applies to cyclones. Earthquakes and cyclones are not man-made affairs. On the other hand, it should be borne in mind that the advice given me by our scientific advisers is that one of these big bombs that is exploded either by the Soviet Union or by the United States has as much explosive power as all the explosives used by his humanity during all time. Therefore, to suggest that a powerful earthquake is more powerful than danger need not be taken into account at all comes to me as a great surprise.

If we are to apply this argument logically, this could equally apply to war. All the explosions in war, whether atomic or otherwise, would be less powerful than the powerful earthquakes, if the statement is true, and therefore we could equally apply this argument in this way. It does not matter very much that if we have a earthquake there is much more trouble in the world. Each of the test explosions conducted by the United States in March 1954 and 1956 and by the Soviet Union in November 1955 produced far more explosive energy than the total explosive energy released by mankind in all its history.

Because one reads out this kind of evidence one is charged with what has been called science fiction stories. I shall come to these science fiction stories, but let me quote again responsible opinion.

The Chairman of the Special Sub-Committee on Radiation of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy of the United States Congress says the following:

My Sub-Committee heard a great deal of testimony from eminent scientists on the probable biological damage to be expected from various amounts of internally deposited radioactive substances.... As a layman I was somewhat shocked to find out how much the experts admitted they did not know. In fact, when I thought over how little is known for sure, I wondered how some Government officials could be so positive that bomb tests were so safe....

The Atomic Energy Commission has continually given out assurances that we had nothing to worry about and yet we find, from testimony of their own experts, that there is reason to worry.

Now we come to what I am sure the representative of France will consider it my duty to deal with. Because he regards the presentation of the effects of radiation and the effects of these explosions, apart from all the political consequences, as not being as calamitous, as I might have presented them, he suggests that we have not got to the scientific reality. I am not trying to contradict him because we have been criticised. We have to get down to the root of this matter. The representative of France says: "I am not awed by science fiction stories." I shall not read the rest of it. What are these science fiction stories? Who are the fiction writers? I shall not name all the authorities I have quoted before this Committee, but the following are some: the Committee on Radiation of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States, a committee of eighteen members including one Nobel Prize winner in genetics; the Radiation Hazards Committee of the United Kingdom Atomic Scientists Association, including one Nobel Prize winner in physics; Professor Price of the University, of Pennsylvania; Professor Miyake, Director of the Geochemical Laboratory of Tokyo; Professor Parisot of France, President of the ninth World Health Assembly; Professor Sievert of the Karolinska Hospital, Sweden, whose evidence I read here the other day; Professor Compton of Chicago, a Nobel Prize winner; Professor Haddow of the Cancer Research Institute of London; Professor Crow of the University of Wisconsin; Dr. Lapp of the University of Chicago; and, finally, Dr. Libby, of the United States Atomic Energy Commission, on Strontium-90.

I read out Dr. Libby's name because I had to place before the Committee a contradiction of the contradictions submitted by the French representative.

So these are the fiction writers. I say this because my delegation has not sought to trade on fear or on the passions and emotions that have been aroused in this matter. We have, as far as we could, used the approach of a layman to this problem, and I think that in this particular matter a layman's approach is more important, because the majority of the people in the world are laymen, and we have tried to present to the Assembly what are the known and the unknown hazards arising from radiation, either biological or otherwise. We never suggested that there should be any panicking in this matter. Panic is no answer, we entirely agree.

These are the main contradictions. I hope the Committee will bear with me for going into this in detail because the details have been dealt with in both these speeches.

The main substance of an injurious nature that has been referred to year after year is Strontium-90. The representative of France has done me the honour of reading quotations from what I said in regard to this. He said:

Mr. Menon is dismayed by the fact that by 1970, radioactive fall-out resulting from nuclear explosions will have raised the amount of radiation in human bones from 9 per cent to 45 per cent higher than is normally present owing to natural background radiation. But to this we must add--and Mr. Menon did not do so--that in the view of the experts the amount of Strontium present in the bones is at present so far below the margin of safety that, even in 1970, after the

<Pg-192>

addition which will have occurred by that time, it would still be forty times less than that limit. He also stated:

I want to say that Dr. Libby, the American scientist quoted by Mr. Menon, ends a lengthy study on Strontium-90 by indicating that the entire increase in the absorption of this element by man, following all the explosions already carried out, is equal to the natural radiation increase resulting from an insignificant elevation in altitude of a few hundred metres.

I should like to submit that it is not the whole of the story. First of all, these are no established safety margins in regard to this. if I may, I would submit with great respect that there is some confusion here with regard to the radiation effects of Strontium and the effects of Strontium on bones and blood, and we were referring to that at that time.

With regard to Dr. Libby's own opinion, that seems to have changed a little. Dr. Harrison Brown, Professor of Geo-Chemistry at the California Institute of Technology, who was associated with the Manhattan Project during the war, has the following to say about the so-called small risk:

The Atomic Energy Commission is convinced that continued testing of H-Bombs is necessary for the defence of the United States. Upon Dr. Willard Libby's, shoulders has fallen the task of assuring the world that continued testing is safe. It has been next to impossible for anyone of any consequence to voice doubts or fears concerning radiation hazards and H-Bomb testing without a new letter or article from Dr. Libby quickly appearing, assuring the reader in carefullyworded sentences that everything will be alright. Dr. Schweitzer is the latest addition to a long list of distinguished individuals who have received such reassurance.

For a long time Dr. Libby contended that there were no dangers of any consequence involved in H-bomb fall-out, if we continued testing at the present rate. Recently, however, there has been a change of tone. In his letter to Dr. Schweitzer he admits that there is some risk, although he hastily adds that the risk is `extremely small compared with other risks which persons everywhere take as a normal part of their lives.

Dr. Libby's letter to Dr. Schweitzer begs at least two major questions. Do we really know what the risks are in sufficient detail so that we can be as confident as Dr. Libby appears to be? And what does we mean when he says that the risk is `extremely small'?

Dr. Libby has stated that the present concentration of Strontium-90 in children in the United States is somewhat less than 1 per cent of the maximum permissible concentration for the population. The latter in turn is one-tenth the permissible amount of Strontium-90 for atomic energy workers in the United States. If we assume that 20 per cent of all existing leukemia has been induced by radiation, then it can be shown that in the absence of further explosions, the leukemia rate will go up about 0.1 per cent.

If testing continues at the present, rate for the next few decades, the leukemia rate may increase by about 0.5 per cent. If we are to permit tests at a rate such that doses of strontium-90 were received equal to that which have been declared `safe' for the population as a whole by a committee of the National Academy of Sciences, leukemia incidence might increase 1041 per cent.

When we say that the leukemia rate is increasing by only 0.5 per cent, the number appears small. But when we say that 19,000 individuals are killed each year--individuals of all nationalities who work, love and laugh and who want to live as much as do you and I--the number suddenly seems very large.

We would not dream of lining thousands of people against a well and shooting them down to order to test a new machine-gun. But this, in effect, is what the United States, the Soviet Union and the United Kingdom do when they test these fantastic new weapons. We do not know who the people are who are afflicted, but we know that with little question many people are killed as a result of these actions.

I believe that in this area we must be guided as much by our ignorance as by our knowledge. That is to say, when we do not know what harm we are doing, we have no right to inflict that harm.

There is as much yet to be learned concerning both the immediate and long-range effects of radiation fall-out. And I cannot help feeling that as the testing nations follow their present path, as their actions result indiscriminately in the deaths of persons all over the world, and as they continue to pursue an elusive security, they lose what is perhaps the most important element of true security—their human dignity.

There is another bit of confusion which is cleared up by the evidence given in the summary of the hearings of the Joint Committee of Atomic Energy of the United States, from 27--29 May and from 3--7 June of this year, on the nature of radioactive fall-out and its effect on man. In this official record there will be found another version of Dr. Libby's views. It is not as though the increase in Strontium-90 deposits is one-fortieth of the permissible margin, but according to him it varies from 3.5 to 9 if stratospheric fall-out is uniform; 5 to 12 if existing fall-out pattern is maintained, and 10 to 25 it predicted increase in banding of stratospheric fall-out in latitudes of Northeastern United States occurs. Therefore, it is not one-fortieth, as suggested, but one--fourth the increase; and that is considerably more. The rest of the information points to the fact that if this increase is one-tenth, and not one-fourth, that will be dangerous.

In this document which is submitted by the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, there is a summary of the key points made. In, that summary there was general agreement that any amount of radiation no matter how small the dose, increases the rate of genetic mutation population. There was, on the other hand, a difference of opinion as to whether a small dose of radiation would produce similar increased incidences of such somatic conditions as leukemia, bone cancer, or a decrease of life expectancy.

We have to make a difference between somatic effects and biological effects in regard to this. I would submit to the Committee that there is no such thing as a safe level as far as genetic effects are concerned. What the Committee has to take into account is that any dose, any increase of radiation, however slight, has some effect. Therefore, it is quite true, as Mr. Lodge pointed out, that there is radiation out of radium dial watches and what not. That is true, but there is no reason to add to it; where consequences are not known, and therefore we cannot accept the fact that there is nothing to worry about. There were differences of opinion on how to forecast the consequence of further testing effects of radiation. Then this document goes on to say that pending a resolution of the differences, it would appear from the information presented that the consequence

of further testing over the next several generations at the level of testing of the past five years could constitute a hazard to the world's population. It is very difficult, if not impossible, to forecast the real position of the number of people that will be so affected. No one has suggested that we could forecast the position.

Another aspect of this which has to be thought of is that especially in view of the emergence of what are called "clean bombs," which are exploded from great heights, the fall-out of this particular substance will take many years to come down. Therefore, to speak about its somatic effects, as we know it in a month or two afterwards, does not appear from the scientific evidence to be warranted.

Twenty of the world's famous scientists, including Professor Lacassagne of the Radium Institute of Paris, three Nobel Prize winners--Professor Muller of Indiana, Professor Yukawa of Japan, and Professor Powell of England--as well as other scientists, including Dr. Chisholm of Canada, former Director-General of the World Health Organisation, after a meeting in Committee, came to the same conclusions:

A principal effect is due to Strontium-90.... We estimate that tests conducted over the past six years will be responsible for an increase of about one per cent over the natural incidence of leukemia and bone cancer during the next few decades. Over the next thirty years, this increase would amount to about 100,000 additional cases of leukemia and bone cancer. The correct numbers may be

<Pg-194>

several times larger or smaller. These additional cases could, however, not be identified among the 10 million or so normal cases of the same diseases.

It is true that when you take ten million cases in the world, 100,000 cases would appear small. But then, if you are continuing these tests in this way, to what extent they can increase no one can forecast. Their report continues:

A second principal effect of global fall-out consists of genetic mutations. We estimate that these cause serious injury to about as many individuals as those in whom leukemia or bone cancer will be produced....

With regard to fall-out effects from tests, it should be recognised that the effects are global, and exerted upon citizens of all countries; regardless of whether they or their Governments have approved the holding of tests. In these circumstances, the usual criteria as to whether a given hazard is justifiable cannot be applied.

It should also be realised that appreciable areas of the world will

experience higher, than average effects from fall-out.

In this age of atomic weapons, the objective of all nations must be the abolition of war and even the threat of war from the life of mankind. War must be eliminated, not merely regulated by limiting the weapons to be used.

Of course, that is not a scientific conclusion, but there it is.

Therefore, when my delegation is regarded as having submitted material that relies more on passion than on rational elements, it is only right to point out that as regards the scientific evidence that we have submitted, as the representative of Mexico said, there is only one test to apply to it: how many people say it is so and how many not? As Professor Charles Price of the University of Pennsylvania said: When the difference of opinion is one-hundred to one then it should be declared no contest. It is mostly the scientists that belong to these atomic energy organisations, from whom official opinions come, he says, that give these contradictions.

The Radiation Hazards Committee of the Federation of American Scientists has published a document entitled, The Biological Hazards of Nuclear Weapon Testing. The Committee has as its Chairman, Professor Selove of the University of Pennsylvania, and has a very distinguished membership. Its report says:

The quantity of strontium-90 in human bones has been measured both by the United States Atomic Energy Commission and the British Atomic Energy Authority Observers...the largest value observed was .2 times background.

This is one-fifth of the background and not one-fortieth.

It has been estimated that if no further explosion take place, the average radiation concentration of strontium-90 in human bones will rise, by about 1970, to a maximum which will give a dose of about one-tenth of background.

This does not conform to what came from the representative of France.

If nuclear explosions continue at the rate of about ten megatons a year, the strontium-90 concentration will gradually rise to an average, by the year 2,000, of about six times the level predicted for 1970.... The radiation level reached by 1970, if there are no further tests, will cause about 1,000 deaths per year throughout the world (estimates based on United States statistics and on Lewis' work); the level estimated for the year 2000, if the present rate of testing continues, will cause about 5,000 deaths per year...... If the cancer-producing effect is proportional to, the dose, as it may be, the average exposure of about one-tenth of background that will result from all tests conducted up through 1956 may be expected to result in leukemia or bone cancer in 60,000 persons.

Therefore, from what I have read out it is quite clear that whatever Dr. Libby might have said somewhere about one fortieth, it is not borne out either by the

<Pg-195>

evidence presented to, Congress or by these other British, American and Scandinavian scientists. The increase is much greater than it was supposed. I would submit that we should not mix up the somatic effects of this question with the radiation effects. It is quite true that the increase in the radiation effects are small, but since the substance has a half-life of many years and it comes down little by little, since it is eaten by cattle or goes into vegetables and enters into the human body, it becomes a menace to humanity as a whole.

We have said so much about the actual effects of radiation because, apart from all other considerations, there is the one of what it does immediately to people who are in no way responsible for the explosions--indeed, their countries might be against it--and they are the sufferers in this way.

What are the other reasons why there should be a suspension or a moratorium on these tests? At the present time, only the United States, the Soviet Union and the United Kingdom are conducting these explosions. We were told the other day: "Who can deny to other countries the sovereign right to explode bombs?" Our answer is, theoretically no one, but I suppose there are other ways of exercising one's sovereignty. In this connection, it should be remembered that these three countries are well advanced in these experimentations and that they are continually adding to their, knowledge and, thereby, according to their own statements--according to the United States statement bringing down the effects of radiation. Although, the effect is being brought down it is, as I pointed out the other day, still considerable. If there is no suspension of tests and other countries come into the picture, they come in without that experience and they would therefore experiment with more crude bombs. If there is to be any use of them, there would be greater harm caused by the fusion effects and by the larger quantity of fall-out.

Dr. Selove, Chairman of the Radiation Hazards Committee of the American Federation of Scientists, and Associate Professor of Physics of the University of Pennsylvania, said to the Joint Congressional Committee on 5 June this year:

As new nations enter the nuclear testing programme, it can be expected that they will be interested in testing bomb types which produce a great deal of fall-out. There are two dominant reasons for this: First, about the most economical way possible to increase the yield of a large bomb is to use an outer shell of natural uranium. This leads to an inexpensive large energy release, but also to a large release of fission products—the worst kind of fall-out.

Second, a large amount of fall-out increases the devastating power of a nuclear bomb. The addition of a shell of natural uranium to a large thermonuclear bomb can increase the devastating fall-out to a very much greater degree, for example, than the addition of cobalt to make a 'cobalt bomb', and, moreover, can at the same time increase the energy release by a large amount, which a cobalt shell will not do.

If there is no suspension of explosions, experimentation by other countries can increase, and that experimentation will lead not only to an increase of radiation of the same rate as that produced by the advanced countries, but, according to the evidence which I read out to the Committee, it is possible and highly probable that they would experiment with bombs of a different character which will add disproportionately in terms of the improved bombs to the amount of radiation.

That takes us to the next issue, which is partly political but which certainly must be judged from a scientific basis as well, namely, whether it is advisable to pursue our desire for the suspension of thermonuclear and nuclear bomb testing except in the context of an entire disarmament programme.

I submit with great respect that I have not been able to understand why, if we get disarmament and the abandonment of the atomic weapon, then why bother about these explosions because nobody will test the bombs if they cannot make them. The idea is neither logical nor does it make sense. When it was first put forward it was first the idea that it could be done quickly with the amount of control that is easily possible so that some beginning could be made in the field of disarmament. Now, for the first time this year, thanks to the initiative of the United

<Pg-196>

Kingdom we were told before the Assembly, that the abandonment of nuclear testing is not disarmament and, what is more, that it should not be done. The speeches made from that quarter were not only that they should not be discontinued, but that they should be continued in the interests of policies. But on this matter there is a considerable body of scientific evidence which deals with the problem which must be in the minds of the politicians who have to deal with this question.

It is natural and legitimate to expect that any country would take into consideration the fact, whether the suspension of bomb testing and the evasion of it by anybody else, or the suspension of bomb testing at any particular time, would prove a handicap to itself and not to others. Here I wish to cite the evidence of the Council of the Federation of American Scientists, given in February this year:

The Council of the Federation of American Scientists urges the Administration to seek worldwide cessation of nuclear weapon tests without making this contingent on achieving more far-reaching goals in arms limitation. Because stopping these tests would slow down the development of even swifter and more easily hidden weapons for devastating surprise attack....

We have never presented this argument. One of the legitimate fears that a country would have is that other atomic countries may launch a surprise attack. But here we have the scientists saying that the more you allow them to test these weapons the more you will enable them to produce weapons of surprise attack.

And because it would further contribute to world stability by helping to confine the production of nuclear weapons to three nations (Britain, the United States, the USSR), this alone would be a substantial step towards a rational solution of the world crisis brought about by nuclear armaments! All available evidence assures us that this constructive step would handicap the military preparations of our competitors at least as much as our own, and that a test ban could be adequately monitored by a United Nations monitoring agency without requiring free access for inspectors within national boundaries.

I shall deal more with this when we come to the question of detection.

Therefore, the Federation of American scientists and another body of 2,000 scientists who have also pronounced on this all point out that it does not impose a handicap on the side which is discriminatory as against the other. Secondly, it has the merit that it prevents further development and production of bombs which will be potent for surprise attack. This second body of 2,000 scientists from California says:

An international agreement to stop the testing of nuclear bombs could serve as a first step towards a more general disarmament and ultimate effective abolition of nuclear weapons, averting the possibility of nuclear war which would be a catastrophe for all humanity.

We have, in common with our fellow men, a deep concern for the welfare of all human beings. As scientists, we have knowledge of the dangers involved and, therefore, a special responsibility to make these dangers known. We deem it imperative that immediate action be taken to effect the international agreement to stop the testing of weapons.

Then we come to the question of detection. When the Government of India first submitted these proposals in the Disarmament Commission-not this year after the Soviet resolution, but in 1954--there was, as I said on the last occasion, as we understood it, a fair degree of sympathy and support for them as a possible idea. But a few months later we informed that it was possible to have secret explosions of these bombs. In fact, one could explode them in one's pocket and they could not be detected. This did create problems because if the bombs could be so secretly exploded then each country would suspect the

other of conducting the explosions while having itself, in honesty, to pass a self-denying ordinance.

All the evidence that my Government has--from its own sources and as the result of its own investigations--is to the effect that

<Pg-197>

atomic, nuclear and thermo-nuclear explosions, under proper arrangements, are detectable. While I have no authority to disclose the source of this information, it is now well established by European investigation that it is possible to construct reliable stationary instruments for convenience in location and recording of very low radiation levels with an accuracy permitting changes of a few per cent to be detected.

Such an instrument, constructed for gamma radiation by the institute of radio physics in a particular country, consists of a fllashlight device giving one flash per micro-roentgen--that is, about one flash per five minutes-- in the case of normal background radiation. The records are made on a circular core, which has to be changed either weekly or monthly, etc. A world-wide system of control by means of battery-driven, hermetically enclosed apparatus, sealed by some kind of, international organisation, seems not to involve any serious technical difficulties.

Therefore, not only from such investigation as we have made ourselves and from such advice as is given us, but also from the experiments that are made in countries in Europe where atomic science is considerably advanced, although they are not making the bombs, we have every reason to think that there is the possibility of detection. No one can say that it would be 100 per cent detection, but the evasion of detection today is almost impossible. That is why we have suggested that, instead of one side saying that the bombs can be secretly exploded and the other side saying that they cannot, there being so many doubts, it should be possible for those who have differing views to provide scientific and technical experts to go into this question and establish the kind of machinery against evasion that is required and put it forward.

I am sorry to say that the answer to that from the representative of France is, to me, very confusing. He says that he does not agree to this tripartite division of the world, and I quote him as follows:

It would be difficult for me to agree to the tripartite formula of India: first of all, because I cannot resign myself to the present three-way division of humanity, nor to its being given legal existence in the United Nations; furthermore, because a committee thus set up could not supplant the powers primarily concerned, nor could it impose upon them any line of conduct.

I want to make it perfectly clear that any submission we have made is not intended in any way--and this has been very carefully and fully pointed out without any ambiguity--to supersede the Disarmament Commission or its Sub-Committee. What we propose is purely a machinery for assisting the decisions which the Commission wants to reach or which it could have reached. Therefore, there is no question of supplanting the Powers primarily concerned. And, if I may say so with respect, if we could end these explosions effectively and satisfactorily to all I am sure the powers would not mind what may appear like supplanting them in this way.

Then comes the statement by Mr. Moch: "I cannot resign myself to the present three-way division of humanity in any way, but it so happens that the world today is largely divided between two power blocs and other people who want to keep out of it"--not keep out of it by saying, a plague upon both your houses but keep out in the hope that by their non-commitment they may make more or, less a contribution to a peace area in the world, and that the friction as between the others themselves might not be as sharp as otherwise.

Therefore, there is no suggestion that there should be a tripartite division of the world. In fact the very idea of the introduction of a tripartite element to the extent of preventing a head-on collision between two points of view--an idea which Mr. Jules Moch himself has referred to, saying that there could not be any synthesis but that there must be support of a majority view--is to remove that danger, and it was put forward in the hope that this could be done.

Now this is purely an academic exercise, and as such has very little value. But I would like to ask the Committee, and particularly the delegation of the United States of America, to look into the history of the Atomic Energy Agency. When first the proposal was brought here that body was to be an exclusive

< Pg-198 >

club of eight countries, selected by whomever was to select them, and no one was to enter it unless they themselves agreed. In the first session the exclusion was given up, thanks largely to the wisdom of the initiators of the proposal; but that is not the most important point. When the twelve or fourteen countries which formed the preparatory commission for this purpose sat week after week, and month after month, to produce the Statute of the Atomic Energy Agency, it was found that it was the lack of that body's division--in the way in which, unfortunately, the Sub-Committee has found itself divided--into a majority and a minority view that enabled the overcoming of a large number of problems from day to day. Though the difficulties were serious, they were surmounted.

There the question was not whether a country was large or small. Sometimes a small country is able to function in a way in which a large country cannot. India was a member of the Preparatory Commission of the Atomic Energy Agency, the experience of which has been one where this introduction of what may be called a more representative element of consultation, and of giving and taking in

this way, has led to results.

This, in this particular suggestion we have submitted, on the one hand there is no attempt to supersede either the Security Council. the Disarmament Commission or the Disarmament Sub-Committee. There is no attempt to suggest to the great powers, "you do not know what you are doing; we will find you a way". That is not at all its meaning. It simply means that there is a deadlock, and the experience of the Commission for a long time has been that of presenting two points of view and the difficulty of resolving them. Sometimes they are resolved after a long period of argument. I do not say that it cannot be done in that way. But, as I say, there is no attempt here as far as we are concerned to disregard the authority of the Security Council or the Disarmament Commission, or in any way to suggest that any body of people but the great Powers--notably the United States and the Soviet Union--can really bring about disarmament. We therefore regret that there should be any suggestion that this is likely to lead to any further division of world opinion. Its purpose is altogether to the contrary.

I have dealt with this matter again briefly, and have not used all the material that is at hand with regard to the considerable harmful effects and the fact that the suspension of these tests is not open to the objection that there is non-detectability and, therefore, a handicapping in someone's favour. On the other hand, I have produced scientific evidence to point out that the suspension of tests would lead to prevention of the development of weapons which might be more formidable than those which exist today, and which might be more dangerous. Particularly to the powers which suspect the others—that is, for surprise attack and things of that character. I have also drawn attention to the great danger of large numbers of countries, in the exercise of their sovereign rights, engaging in such manufacture. After all, the manufacture of arms has been part of the industry in the world for a long time, and it may spread with disastrous results.

Finally, I have pointed out that, while we do not regard the suspension of nuclear tests as disarmament itself, we think it is a first step towards disarmament. It creates a climate of opinion: it creates that hope and confidence in the world to which Mr. Moch has referred and which he says it is the function of this Assembly to transmit. It makes public opinion of the world think that at least something is moving not in an illusory way. And what it more, when there is the process of inspection and the functioning of the machinery of detection, and consultations in regard to all these matters are carried on from day to day, we will have created something like a pilot plant in the way of working together on this matter. So, even from that point of view, the suspension of tests has a political value and a very serious contribution to disarmament.

My delegation has not suggested that we should just suspend these explosions and sit back and do nothing. The question of the suspension of explosions--in the same way, for example, as the submission of military budgets of countries--was regarded. as an item

which could be brought about more easily than the others. We have never at any time suggested that it is a substitute either for the abandonment of fresh manufacture or for the dismantling of existing bombs or for the cut-off of use--that is to say, the eventual elimination of the nuclear and thermo-

< Pg-199 >

nuclear weapons, which is the declared policy of the United Nations.

The main objection to this is that the only thing that is concretely asked for is the suspension -- that a commitment on suspension is asked for while, with regard to all the others, there is merely an expression of sentiment. To a certain extent, if this is a characteristic, it also appears in regard to the main proposals that are before us -- that is, there is no suggestion that the cut-off date in regard to further production should be effective before the suspension of explosions. Mr. Lodge, speaking on behalf of his country, said they were prepared to agree to suspension provided that there was agreement in principle -- or words to, that effect -- in regard to the other. I submit that the proposal we have placed before the Committee -- that in the same way, by having some other views added, they should work for cut-off dates in regard to fresh production, in regard to dismantling of bombs, and also toward finding a cut-off of the use, of this thing altogether, because that is in consonance with the declared policy of the United Nations from the time we began dealing with this question.

The main objection to this has been that we are asked to rely on faith. "How can you trust somebody else if he is not to be trusted"? -- that is the question. Well, that is a very logical question to ask. If you know that the other person is bound to break his promise, then it would be very foolish to trust him. There is no doubt about that. But, if those are the premises on which we are arguing, then the whole of the disarmament question, including the 24-power resolution is out of court. Every proposal that is made, however large or small, does rely on contract, does rely on commitment. Therefore, if it is possible to accept a commitment -- if it is possible, as the representative of the United States himself pointed out, to get areas of agreement in some ways -- and the other side can do the same in some fields, there is no reason why it should not be extended to another.

This is not to suggest that a mere element of blind faith is sufficient. As the representative of France rightly points out, the establishment of control and the machinery of inspection cultivate this faith. That is why we have suggested that, instead of merely saying that there must be inspection and there must be control, we must, as in the case of the Preparatory Commission of the Atomic Energy Agency, try to work out these details in this way.

Therefore, it is not as though the suspension resolution hangs in the air by itself and the rest of disarmament is forgotten. All that is

sought to be done is that the fact that we do not have comprehensive disarmament should not prevent us from doing anything at all. There is every reason to believe that, once some progress is made in this way, then it is possible that further progress may follow.

We fully believe the position taken up by the representative of Ireland: that, despite all procedural methods that you might try, unless there is a lowering of world tension, it is not possible to get to disarmament. I do not think that anybody can quarrel with that proposition. But it is possible that, if there were agreement in one sphere, as we said two years ago, there might be agreement in another. That is possible. It is quite true that there must be a change of heart, a change of approach, a willingness to negotiate, and that one must remove those elements which, in the mind of the representative of France, have created this great disastrous disillusionment. We therefore appeal particularly to the two most powerful countries, the United States and the Soviet Union, that in this particular matter the time has come to give the world a lead where a beginning is being made. We do not ask that any proposition that is put forward by either of them has to be rescinded here. We believe that the marshalling of the force of the Assembly behind an agreed proposition is likely to jam the machine more than anything else. This is not in any way a surrender to a minority view or a triumph of a majority view. It is sheer commonsense that, if a matter has been discussed fully, the members of the Sub-Committee, the Powers concerned, know quite well what is the majority opinion in the world. The registering of a decision would not in itself do anything but create a kind of restriction upon ourselves.

Therefore, it is our submission that, while these resolutions do not represent and cannot represent an agreed view, and are not an attempt towards that, they should not be

<Pg-200>

INDIA USA CANADA FRANCE UNITED KINGDOM SWITZERLAND CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC BELGIUM RUSSIA NORWAY SWEDEN JAPAN MEXICO PERU IRELAND

Date: Oct 30, 1957

November

Volume No

CONTENTS

Foreign Affairs Record	
VOL. III	No. 11 1957 November
CONTENTS	
COLOMBO PLAN Training Facilities	205
INDIA IN THE UNITED NATIO Shri Krishna Menon's Speech or	
Shri Krishna Menon's Speech or	n Korea 209
INDIA AND THE UNITED STA' Education Exchange Programme	
INTERNATIONAL COURT OF . India's Preliminary Objections to Complaint The Judgment	o Portugal's
JAPAN Supply of Iron Ore	218
PAKISTAN Canal Water Dispute	218
PORTUGAL Indian Passengers Barred from Portuguese Port Compulsory Flag Salutation	219 219
SOUTH VIET NAM President Diem's Visit President Diem's Speech Nehru-Diem Joint Communique	221
UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST	

MINISTRY OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS: EXTERNAL PUBLICITY DIVISION GOVERNMENT OF INDIA

SRI LANKA INDIA KOREA USA PORTUGAL JAPAN PAKISTAN CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC RUSSIA AUSTRALIA FRANCE MARSHALL ISLANDS

Date: Nov 01, 1957

Volume No

1995

COLOMBO PLAN

Training Facilities

The Deputy Minister for Finance, Shri B. R. Bhagat, laid a statement on the table of the Rajya Sabha at Delhi on Sep 25, 1957 on the extent of training facilities provided by India and received by India under the Colombo Plan in 1956-57.

According to the statement, 109 candidates were provided training facilities by India from 1 July 1956 to 30 June 1957. The candidates came from Burma, Ceylon, Japan, Nepal, New Zealand, Pakistan, Philippines, Singapore and Thailand. The training facilities were provided in the fields of civil,mechanical and electrical engineering, medicine, surveys, civil aviation, communications, statistics, agriculture, forestry, cooperation, fisheries, police and community development projects. 219 candidates from India received training facilities during the same period. The facilities were obtained in the fields of education, medical and health services, power and fuel, industry, transport, communications, crop protection techniques, coal mining, trade union services, cooperatives, marine engineering and dam construction etc.

SRI LANKA INDIA BURMA JAPAN NEPAL NEW ZEALAND PAKISTAN PHILIPPINES REPUBLIC OF SINGAPORE THAILAND USA

Date : Sep 25, 1957

Volume No

1995

INDIA IN THE UNITED NATIONS

INDIA

Date : Sep 25, 1957

Volume No

1995

INDIA IN THE UNITED NATIONS

(West New Guinea)

Shri V. K. Krishna Menon, leader of the Indian Delegation to the United Nations, made the following statement on the debate on the question of West Irian at the Twelfth Session of the Political Committee of the United Nations on Nov 26, 1957:

The Assembly has been debating the question of West Irian for the last three years and now it appears on our agenda for the fourth time. As the representative of the Netherlands pointed out, nearly 200 speakers have taken part in those debates and the legal issues, the issues relating to the Charter of the Transfer of Sovereignty. all these matters have been discussed threadbare. So far as we are concerned, we regard this problem as merely the completion of the independence of Indonesia. Indonesia was a colonial territory, formerly called the Dutch East Indies; and by the efforts of the Indonesian people, assisted of course by the circumstances, that arose during the war which caused a relaxation of the hold of imperial Powers on their Eastern territories, the political power of Indonesia was established. And Indonesia did not establish its political power and the right to be independent in regard to 2,999 islands or 3,001 islands it was for the whole of the territory over Which the Netherlands had had hegemony. It is rather late in the day for us, therefore to speak in terms of the abrogation of the charter or the maintenance of the charter. If we had the time to argue its legal niceties, whether the charter stands or whether it is abrogated, in either case the sovereignty of Indonesia would stand. If the charter was abrogated, it would be only article 2 that was abrogated, and it is well known in international law that what is executed, is executed, and if what is executory is not performed, it is not performed that is, it has sovereignty over the whole of Indonesia.

On the other hand, if it is held that because part of the charter has

not been performed, we must not talk about the charter any more. In that case, then the fact of the establishment of Indonesian independence, for which the United Nations bears great responsibility, is a political fact to which my colleague from Iraq referred a while ago. Therefore the problem before us-and here I differ, with great respect, from my colleague

<Pg-205>

from Brazil--is really a problem of the completion of the liberation of Indonesia from colonial rule.

It is guite understandable that in the United Nations, and particularly among the countries of Latin America, any argument to which the world "self-determination" can be tagged always arouses as a favourable response. It almost looks as though one's left pocket will have self-determination in a different way from the right pocket. There Cannot be self-determination in regard to a territory that is already sovereign. If that were so, many countries--and I shall not mention them--around this table would suffer disintegration today; that is to say, if we are to take sovereign powers and say that the peoples must have self-determination, the unity of those territories may well be decided by some local squabble, by some momentary issue, by the desires of some political adventurers, or a neighbouring country, or anything of that kind. Therefore, the issue of self-determination as such does not enter into this matter. The Indonesians did not win their independence by cries of selfdetermination but on the basis of their right as a nation to be free; and they established it to a very considerable extent--although Australia and other countries came in and on their initiative the Security Council intervened to give final shape to it--by dint of their own efforts.

If it were unfortunately true that Indonesia was still the Dutch East Indies, a colonial territory, then they would be entitled today to demand sovereignty over the whole territory. In our submission, the sovereignty of a country is not justiciable. You can have disputed territories, but if each country were to go to court and say: am I sovereign, or am I not sovereign? There would be no countries in the world.

The representative of Brazil whom we have just heard and therefore his speech is especially in my mind--referred to the material submitted, very accurately and well planned--as is customary with the Dutch--to the Committee on Information from Non-Self Governing Territories. If this information is valid in regard to, shall we say, one year, it must be regarded as equally valid for the previous year; and in our submission in order to establish what was Indonesia--and that is the problem that has been raised--there were not two Indonesias; there was not in that part of the Pacific a Dutch East Indies and a West Irian; there was only one territory. Of course, one cannot speak in constitutional terms about the sovereignty of that territory because the sovereignty really rested with the Queen of the

Netherlands because it was her colony. But there was only one entity. And on 24 August 1948, before Indonesia became free, the Dutch Government submitted information and that information is factual; it does not contain any political argument and it is simply in regard to what Indonesia is. It says in the report submitted to the United Nations:

The Netherlands Indies (Indonesia) consists of a series of Island groups in the region of the equator, extending from the mainland of Asia to Australia. The principal groups are the Greater Sunda, Islands (Java, Madura, Sumatra, Borneo and Celebes, with their adjoining smaller islands), the lesser Sunda Islands (Bali, Lombok, Sumbawa, Flores, Timor, ... and New Guinea west of 141 degrees E. longitude--this is the important part.

It goes on to say that from the East to the West the island area extends for 5,000 kilometres and from North to South 2,000 kilometres, and then it gives the population and so on.

This longitude of 141 degrees E. includes West Irian; it is on the other side of West Irian. So there was no separate West Irian territory. West Irian was a residency, it was not even a province of the Dutch East Indies. So whether this charter is valid today or not is immaterial--the struggle for independence of the Indonesian people was for their homeland, which is described here by the then rulers, at a time when this struggle was not anticipated. So West Irian is merely part of Indonesia, that theatre in which independence and self-government has to appear--the unfinished part of the process of liberation from colonialism.

That is what the struggle is about. It is quite true that the majority of the countries of South-East Asia, and particularly those which have had their problems brought before the United Nations in the years of nascent idealism, often enter into the exploratory

<Pg-206>

discussions, often accept methods whereby the completion of that process can be peacefully accomplished. And that is where this charter comes in. Article 2 of this charter makes no reference to sovereignty; it simply talks about the political status of New Guinea, as it was then called--now West New Guinea or West Irian. Article 2 is bounded by article 1 which says:

"The Kingdom of the Netherlands unconditionally and irrevocably transfers complete sovereignty over Indonesia"--why did they not say over Indonesia subject to article 2--"to the Republic of the United States of Indonesia....".

It will be recognized that the United States of Indonesia at that time had not in its political arrangements completed the unification of its various parts, which is all part of history, but that Government in its wisdom--and I repeat, in its wisdom--though rather belated and under the pressure of liberal opinion in the Netherlands itself, transferred to the United States of Indonesia "unconditionally and irrevocably" complete sovereignty over Indonesia. There is no difficulty about understanding the words "unconditionally and irrevocably transfers complete sovereignty.' No; the difficulty is over "Indonesia." Now the Dutch themselves explained what Indonesia was. Therefore, in our opinion, what is before us today is not all these problems but how in terms of a peaceful approach we may proceed to resolve the situation, and that is the only purpose of the resolution that is before the Assembly.

I note that Indonesia sponsored this draft resolution and if I may say so--not because its representative is sitting next to me or be cause he is an old friend--it does show a great deal of generosity and a spirit of conciliation, because it says that, despite their unquestioned sovereignty over these areas, please come and negotiate-negotiate, probably, with regard to the political status, with regard to time, with regard to joint arrangements, with regard, probably, to getting the DItch to invest their considerable surplus money in the country and so, therefore, to their mutual advantage. All those things can be negotiated. What does the draft resolution say?

"Realizing that a peaceful solution of this problem should be obtained without further delay,"--there is very little preamble in this--

"Invites both parties to pursue their endeavours to find a solution in conformity with the principles of the United Nations Charter.

Looking over Mr. Schurmann's statement on behalf of the Netherlands, the first point he makes, and quite rightly, is that the Kingdom of the Netherlands has obligations under the Charter which must be performed. We may differ as to what the contents of those obligations are but we all agree that all of us have obligations under the Charter, and since this resolution says "Invites both parties ... to find a solution ... in conformity with the principles of the United Nations Charter," the argument about what they are can come as the negotiations progress. They cannot be pleaded as a bar to negotiations.

During these three years, different positions have been taken. The Indonesians, if my memory serves me right, took up a position on the basis of the round table conference and the charter and so on in the beginning, and they stated it. All that was required was that it should be known that their best endeavours had failed and it asked the General Assembly to call on the Netherlands to complete the contract.

The position of the Netherlands, subject to correction, and as far as can be judged from the documents and the law in this case, is that the sovereignty over West Irian was in dispute or that the transference of sovereignty and all that goes with it was in dispute.

The Indonesians had never said, to the best of my recollection, either in Indonesia, or here, or anywhere else, that sovereignty was in dispute. But the position taken up by the Netherlands today is that they will not negotiate because the Charter is abrogated, it is their sovereign territory, you are asking us to negotiate about the sovereign territory of the Netherlands, which is not the position because it was transferred as part of the executed contract. Therefore, I submit that if the Assembly would be good enough to address itself to the limited task before it, it does not call upon particularly some of the Latin American States to pronounce themselves on these questions at the present time, but asks the parties to negotiate. We ourselves

<Pg-207>

would not dare to tell the Indonesians, publicly at any rate, to negotiate unless they had taken the initiative. I say, therefore, that Indonesia's sponsoring of the resolution is an indication of generosity which often is misplaced in public discussion. Very often it has been our experience that any willingness to explore a tentative proposition is pinned upon you as a commitment afterwards and the basic fundamentals are forgotten. But here, Indonesia is willing to negotiate, wants to negotiate, and, what is more, negotiate in conformity with the principles of the United Nations Charter. Well, how can that proposition be objected to? It can only be objected to if the Netherlands Government now goes back on the facts of the case, namely, the establishment of Indonesian independence which is the same as the establishment of American independence by the revolt of the thirteen colonies against the Britain of that day, unless they go back against those facts, or unless they go back against what was intended and what is shown in article I which is part of the executed contract, that is, the transfer of sovereignty, and article 2 only deals with the political question--"the question of the political status of New Guinea be determined through negotiations" and so forth. And that is what is suggested, not necessarily in terms of the article but in terms of the resolution. And since it is bounded by the principles of the United Nations Charter, I submit that everyone can feel reassured that such obstacles as there may be are further away and there need be no oposition.

What is more, in paragraph 2 of this resolution it does not ask for self-determination. It again asks for conciliation; it asks the Secretary-General, an organ of the United Nations, to assist the parties concerned, as he considers it best--it is not laid down by the sonsors of the resolution; it does not say that only to this extent is assistance welcome --as he deems appropriate in the implementation of this resolution, in other words, in the implementation of negotiations. This resolution is merely a recommendation by the Assembly to both sides to come together in conference, in terms of the Charter. This would be valid; it would be in place whether there was a round-table agreement, whether there was a charter or anything else. Assuming, for argument's sake, that there

was no West Irian problem but that another problem arose concerning mineral rights, royalties, waterways etc. in the former Dutch East Indies over which the Kingdom of the Netherlands has rights. Well, that would call for negotiation. That is the position as we see it.

Finally, I have no desire to go into the various extraneous matters which have been brought into the discussion, particularly in regard to a joint communique because it concerns one of our very close friends with whom we have not had the opportunity of consultation. For the present time we shall therefore say nothing about it. There is, however, one matter to which my delegation should like to make reference. First of all, metropolitan countries are very loud about self-determination when nationalism asserts itself. If self-determination is such an article of faith, why are there any colonies in the world? Why do not they all have self-determination?

In the Trusteeship Council, for instance, we cannot even get a timetable: it is either a part of metropolitan territory or some other excuse. But, it has already been said here that these populations-the populations of West Irian--are a different people; they are of different racial origins. No one has suggested that they are of Teutonic or Viking origin. But they are of different origin-- they are Papuans--and therefore that may be what is misleading people into thinking that this is a case of two rival colonial claims: one by Indonesia--does its representative look like a colonialist?--that is, between the colonialists in Indonesia and the colonialists in the Netherlands. That is not the position. Here again I fall back upon the extremely accurate presentation, of information by the Kingdom of the Netherlands in 1946. Information is more likely to be accurate when there is no heat of debate. At that time there was none. This question therefore of the population being different seems to be the special pleading of the moment. This is what the Netherlands said about the people, not of West Irian, but of Indonesia as a whole, which is described in the paragraph I read to you.

The indigenous inhabitants of Indonesia consist of many widely divergent groups. That itself rules out the problem that you have got to be homogeneous. What would happen to the United States of America, for example, if there must be a homogeneous

<Pg-208>

race, language, national background in order for there to be a nation? What would happen to a country like mine? We do not even know where we came from. The indigenous inhabitants of Indonesia consist of many widely divergent groups, the largest being that of the Javanese who, in 1930 totalled 27,808,623 people. The population of Java rose from nine million in 1845 to forty-eight million. All that may be irrelevant.

Now we come to the racial composition. As asserted by the Kingdom of the Netherlands, "racially the indigenous people"--not of West Irian but of the whole of Indonesia--"may be divided int Malays in the west Papuans in the east. These races have to a considerable extent intermixed; they are not separated by clearly defined boundaries." This is not a statement by Indonesia at the present moment. It is a fact established by the then-administrators. As these races have to a considerable extent intermixed they are not separated by clearly defined boundaries. "The religious heritage of the indigenous peoples consists largely of a foundation of animism, on which was superimposed, first, Hinduism, and second, Islam. Christianity among Indonesians etc." We can go on in this way. Therefore, any argument that here is a separate ethnic, language group--all the discussions of an anthropological, ethnological and philogical character are entirely irrelevant. There is no evidence in history that a common language necessarily unites people; very often it divides people. Look at all the frontier wars that have been fought by people. Look at all the frontier wars that have been fought by people speaking the same language. Any suggestions, therefore, that in West Irian there is a separate nation is not supported by evidence submitted to the United Nations, that is, by the information submitted to the Committee on Non-Self-Government Territories contained in document A/571/Add.1 24 August 1948.

We therefore submit that the simple problem before the Assembly at the present time is merely to take the first step in regard to a situation. Even if we have reservations on the question of sovereignty, or whatever it is, they will come in the negotiations; if the negotiations are sterile, then we may take other steps. On the other hand, if the negotiations are fruitful, then we will have done something that is useful.

My delegation has purposely--and, I hope, with good reason--tried to refrain from going into the details of this problem which have been dealt with in past years. We are anxious to confine ourselves at the present time to the national unity of Indonesia, the independence it has established through its own efforts, very largely, which have been crowned by its admission to the United Nations, mainly on the initiative of Australia and other countries, and to this resolution. We say, therefore, that charter or no chatter, you cannot argue a country out of its independence. You can take it by force; people do, for some time. But there are no logical no ethical, no philosophical, no international law arguments that would ever argue a people out of their national independence.

INDIA GUINEA THE NETHERLANDS USA INDONESIA IRAQ BRAZIL AUSTRALIA TOTO

Date: Nov 26, 1957

Volume No

INDIA IN THE UNITED NATIONS

Shri Krishna Menon's Speech on Korea

Shri V. K. Krishna Menon, Leader of the Indian Delegation to the United Nations made the following statement in the debate on the Report of the United Nations Commission on the unification and rehabilitation of Korea in the Twelfth Session of the Political Committee of the United Nations on Nov 15, 1957:

The present debate arises from the presentation of document A/3672 and the resolution on this subject which was before the Assembly last year. One cannot say that either this item or the aproach to it made from any side or the debate provides any hope for the establishment of what are called United Nations objectives, either in North or South Korea.

My delegation has no intention whatsoever of reintroducing into this debate any further element of acrimony.

We are not discussing Korea; the Korean people do not come into this, it is a cold war debate. This has nothing to do with Korea and it has been so for years.

Before I deal with the main political aspect of it, there are two matters which I have

<Pg-209>

to refer to so that they may be read into the record. One relates to the remaining prisoners in India. There are perhaps some five prisoners who have not settled down in India. With regard to these we are negotiating with the Governments of Mexico and Argentina. I have no doubt that that problem will be resolved. That is why, unlike our procedures of previous years, we have not introduced an item on prisoners. After all, there are only five men. But five men can make quite a lot of difficulty. They are Korean prisoners, but we think that direct negotiations through the usual channels, through the Governments of Argentina and Mexico, will resolve this problem. At the same time, I think that this Assembly owes a debt of gratitude to the Government of Brazil for taking a certain number of these men--a small number it is true--which has reduced the problem to a very small size. Argentina has also taken some of these prisoners. Therefore, there is no lack of desire on the part of the countries concerned--either Brazil, Argentina or Mexico--to assist in this not necessarily political aspect of this problem. So this is rather difficult. I am happy to say that some Korean prisoners opted for Indian nationality subject to any future decisions. They, according to the custom of our country, have to work for a living and they are all engaged in engineering occupations for which they were trained by the Indian army during the last three years while they were there. But when I say the Indian army, I mean the non-combatant part of the

Indian army. These men are being employed in the telephone industry and in related industries. We have made no use of them for military or para-military purposes. From the Western point of view their emoluments, and probably even their conditions of life, may not be as good as some of you would like, but we are a poor country. I think they are doing better than our own people from that point of view; I do not say from the point of view of work, so there will be no difficulty with them. There are [a small number--I think it is four or five, I am not quite sure-which have to be disposed of. I have no doubt that before we discuss this matter again next year, which I am sure we will do because it is almost endemic with the United Nations that we start with seventy-two basic items, we hope, thanks to the very kind concern of the Governments of Argentina and Mexico, and perhaps in other ways, this matter will be settled.]

Now we come to the political aspects of the situation which is the purpose of the draft resolution and the debate. I request the Committee to give its attention to paragraph 5 of this report which states:

There has been no change in the basic prospects for realizing the fundamental objective of the United Nations in Korea, namely, to bring about the establishment of a unified, independent and democratic government for the whole Korean peninsula. (A/3672).

Thus after six or seven years, our own Commission has to confess that the United Nations objective has not been established. It is possible to allocate blame and praise, but the fact does remain that even in a problem that is comparatively small compared, shall we say, with disarmament or other things which we have been dealing with, we have not been able to get anywhere near it.

Today we have a draft resolution before us which is a reaffirmation of the resolution passed in 1954, which was reaffirmed in 1955 and 1956. We are asked to reaffirm it for the fourth time, and I am afraid that this will not take us any nearer Solution.

I do not think that my colleague from Ceylon ever said that we ought to depart from principles. So far as I could hear him pretty well, as I believe all members of the Committee could--what he said was that there are various ways of implementing a principle, and that, one particular method which some people regard, quite rightly, as suitable is not necessarily a principle. My delegation has no desire to elaborate on this subject except to say that the unification of Korea and the establishment of Korean nationality, if the majority of Koreans wish it, is not only desirable but necessary from the point of view of the stability of the Far East and as opening the way to the solution of other questions. I have no doubt that once some of the other cold war propositions are out of the way this proposition of Korea, which appears so tough and so incapable of, solution, will, however much to our surprise, be solved overnight.

There will be difficulties, but not with the Koreans. The

representatives of some of them are here. And, incidentally, talking about some of them, there is always a tendency

<Pg-210>

for our statistics to be unrelated to facts. Sometimes those who are the victims of aggression are 30,000. The next year they have become 100,000. A year later they are 3 million, and in yet another year 15 million. I have never heard that the population of North Korea was 3 million, or that that of South Korea was 20 million. Maybe this is so, but we must find out.

However, it is possible to get a unification of Korea on the basis of the principles which we all uphold. I do not say that every country here can claim--and we cannot claim--to be observing the Charter 100 per cent. There are many countries here whose Governments are not based upon the will of the people. The United Nations is founded on that basis, without reference to the internal characteristics of governments. But it is possible to bring the North and the South Koreans together. The country has been divided at the 38th parallel, not because the Koreans wanted to divide it but because the Russians and the Americans wanted to, so that it has nothing to do with the Koreans. Thus it is possible to bring about the unification of Korea on the basis of understanding between the two sides, on the basis of free elections, if necessary on the basis of a constituent assembly, on the basis of continually working together or on the basis of a confederation or of any kind of solution if the Koreans are left to themselves. But in view of the position we have taken, my Government is in support of international elections.

My colleague from Ceylon was right in saying that the United Nations has a special responsibility in this area because the United Nations declared North Korea as aggressor. It waged war on this account, and we supported it. Therefore, my Government is in favour of elections under international supervision. But I would ask at what time during the difficult days was United Nations supervision exercised over the whole of Korea? Never. The armistice was not brought about under United Nations supervision. The United Nations is one of the parties, represented by the United Nations Command, represented by the United States.

I feel sure that the genius of the American people, the desire of the North Koreans to unite--all this will bring about a solution pretty soon. But it can only be brought about if there is a recognition, which fortunately there is, that the North Koreans are a minority taken as a whole. I do not say that all South Koreans have the same views, but if they could elect their own parliament--or whatever their assembly is called,--and not have to rely on outside assistance for maintaining the separation on either side, then we would get unity. We do not want to go into a great deal of detail about it, because really the theme of this draft resolution does not appeal to anyone who is not familiar with the subject from the very beginning. It is the recalling of the resolutions of Geneva. We passed this two

years ago. My delegation moved amendments to it because we felt that it would not help a solution.

It is not possible in the present circumstances to obtain a solution-if solution is desired by everybody concerned--of the division of Korea into North and South except in terms of the two sides nominating their own representatives and finding, either on the basis of the armistice agreement or on the basis of the Neutral Nations Repatriation Commission, the third element that is necessary. This is how the whole Korean business has proceeded. That is how the Korean war was brought to an end. This is not in any way to disparage the position of the United Nations. The United Nations has two functions in this matter. First, it is one of the combattants. Second, it is the custodian of the Charter in the way of harmonizing interests.

Is it more important to unite Korea? Is it more important that that unity should come about on a basis where even a minority, but a considerable minority, on either side will not only acquiesce but agree. Are there any valid objections to seeking an election of this character which can be discussed as among the leaders of the two sides? I have no doubt that all the public statements made by the North Koreans and, for that matter, by the South Koreans will be of a character that does not give us much hope. But the Koreans are a patriotic people. They want to see the unification of their country. They have, as the result of a great war, been able to liberate themselves from Japanese imperialism. They had hopes of being a country, and I am sure that modern Japan will assist them to rehabilitate themselves. Post-war Japan will do so--that is our expectation.

<Pg-211>

Therefore, while nothing can be done this year in view of the positions that are held, we hope we will get to the kernel of this proposition-that is, international elections. "International elections" does not necessarily mean only one type; there are several types of international elections. Any of them may be effective so long as the international element is maintained, and, so long as impartiality and integrity are maintained. We have tried that in the Korean issue. It enabled the war to be terminated after three years of the bloodiest slaughter on both sides. And three million Koreans died; that is what we have to bear in mind. Three million Koreans, whether from the north or the south, are human beings. They were killed in the war. It is quite true that a great many nations of other countries were killed too, but nothing like that number. Both sides of the country have been devastated, more particularly the north.

My delegation naturally expresses its own views, but we are not so proud as not to be able to quote other authorities on this question. The Foreign Minister of France, in 1954, when the climate was much more torrid than it is now, said at Geneva:

For the moment, in the same conciliatory spirit of which it has already given ample proof in the course of the parallel negotiations over Indo-China, the French Delegation lends its support in principle to the ideas Already expressed here by one of our Chairman and which can be summarized as follows: (a) Korea should be unified within its historical frontiers, as a free, independent and democratic State; (b) for this purpose elections should be held throughout the whole Korean territory to set up a single and truly representative government for the whole of Korea; (c) the elections should be carried out in conditions of genuine freedom under international supervision

The French are extremely logical and they are very, very constructive when their colonial interests are not concerned.

(d) the settlement of the Korean question should provide for the withdrawal of foreign troops";--

the twenty-one divisions, or whatever it is, on one side, and what the representative of the Philippines referred to just now, the mounting of arms which he alleges on the other side--you do not get free elections unless, of course, those arms are for the purpose of the security of the country

"(e) once unification is achieved under proper conditions, the United Nations should be called on to give their approval to the settlement thus reached."

Is this not a practical proposition? No one wants to elbow the United Nations out. What the Fench Foreign Minister submitted in 1954 was: Let there be elections under international supervision, and bring about unification; both before that and after that the United Nations can be called to give its sanction and its ratification. That appears to us the approach to Korea that is possible.

There is another aspect of this question which should not be forgotten. The South Korean Government is not a party to the Armistice Agreement. The Armistice Agreement was signed by the United Nations Command. Some representatives may recall that there were repudiations of this at that time. But, however, that may be, it is not necessary to rake all that up. But, if Korean unifications is really required, then I think that, at least as a challenge, a fair international machinery for elections, as suggested by the Foreign Minister of France in 1954, should be offered to both sides. That is our view. We do not think that view will gain the majority of votes in this Assembly as it is at present constituted.

We are thankful that there is no war taking place and, unless someone provokes it, neither the North Koreans nor the South Koreans are capable of bringing about a war which will shake the world.

Therefore, our view is that we would have hoped that, another year having passed, a new type of resolution would come up. We entered

into no negotiations about this matter, no discussions about it, because we thought the time was not ripe.

The resolution will, no doubt, pass. We cannot support it for the simple reason that the solution is not in keeping with the Armistice Agreement. The Armistice Agreement was not dictated by the United Nations Command.

<Pg-212>

The United Nations Command represents the United Nations. It is one of the two parties--one of the fifty-fifty parties in the stability that obtains. Now, how can it be that, when it comes to a settlement, that can be forgotten, but at the same time the substance of it can be obtained?

There are countries which are outside the United Nations, There are countries within the United Nations which are not deeply involved in the cold war. There is enough in the whole negotiations after December 1952 which warrants the belief that the United States has not only the capacity but the willingness, if it so desires, to find a solution to this matter. But I do not think that we assist a solution by any recrimination of any kind.

We have no comments to make on the report of UNCURK, except this one, and that is the only part that is important: I think that, when United Nations relief and rehabilitation can reach only half of the country, that in itself is a commentary on the whole situation, whoever is at fault. I think that from now on we ought to address ourselves to the proposition--and I hope that by the time we meet next year the world may have improved and it may be possible to establish the objectives of the United Nations, namely, the unification of Korea within its national frontiers on a representative basis, under elections conducted democratically and under international auspices, where there is no question of the elections not being straight. It is no reflection upon anybody to say that there have been charges made in the American Press and everywhere else, that we know of first hand, about the elections not being so straight. The real point, then, is that the supervision must be international, and, the United Nations Charter being so flexible, having taken into account the precedents in this matter that are involved, the circumstances of the present situation, that would be the approach that has to be made.

My delegation will therefore take no part in voting on this resolution, because we have no desire to aggravate this situation. We think it is not a resolution that does a lot of credit to the United Nations. That is our view. We may be wrong, probably we are--because who are we to say, when all of you agree we are wrong? But, after all, people have a right to be foolish if they want to be. Therefore, we shall take no part in voting on this resolution.

I wish to refer to only one other matter. The Government of India

wishes to reserve its right to discuss the report of the Neutral Nations Repatriation Commission. This report has been submitted to the Secretary General, but it has never been discussed because it has been generally agreed that such a discussion would involve a great deal of bitterness and acrimony. We must not forget that there has been considerable "monkey business' on both sides on various occassions. It has been generally agreed that a discussion of the report would raise problems which, although they are political problems, have no direct relations to this issue, technically speaking.

The report of the Neutral Nations Repatriation Commission could be discussed under the present item. We desire, however, to suspend the discussion of the report, and have not introduced an item in this regard, as our small contribution towards maintaining an atmosphere in which there is a lack of disharmony. For the record, however, we must reserve our right to discuss the report at this session, or next year, or in 20 years.

INDIA KOREA USA ARGENTINA MEXICO BRAZIL NORTH KOREA RUSSIA SWITZERLAND JAPAN FRANCE PERU CHINA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC PHILIPPINES

Date: Nov 15, 1957

Volume No

1995

INDIA AND THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Education Exchange Programme

In a statement laid on the table of the Rajya Sabha on Nov 27, 1957 New Delhi, Dr. K. L. Shrimali, the Minister of State in the Ministry of Education and Scientific Research, gave information about the quantum and nature of assistance received under Indian Wheat Loan Educational Exchange Programme during the years 1955-56 and 1956-57 and the institutions which had received equipment under the programme.

<Pg-213>

The statement said that during 1955-56 and 1956-57, books for Indian institutions of the value of \$487,700 and \$325,000 respectively and equipment for Indian institutions of the value of \$516,000 and \$375,000 respectively were received. Besides 11 Indian librarians and 21 scientists were invited for study tours in U.S.A. and the services of two U.S. scientists were made available to India during 1955-56, and 24 Indian teachers, one scientist, one administrator and one

librarian were invited for study tours during 1956-57 and the services of nine general educational experts were made available during 1956-57.

Among the universities which have received equipment under the programme are Aligarh, Agra, Allahabad, Andhra, Annamalai, Banaras, Baroda, Bihar, Bombay, Calcutta, Delhi, Gauhati, Gujarat, Jammu and Kashmir, Karnatak, Lucknow, Madras, Nagpur, Osmania, Patna, Poona, Punjab, Roorkee, Saugor, Travancore and Utkal. Besides, nine institutions in Bombay, Calcutta, Delhi, Madras, Agra and Coonoor also received the equipment.

INDIA USA MALI

Date: Nov 27, 1957

Volume No

1995

INTERNATIONAL COURT OF JUSTICE

India's Preliminary Objections to Portugal's Complaint

The International Court of Justice at Hague gave judgement on Nov 26, 1957 on India's preliminary objections to Portugal's complaint demanding right of passage between its territory of Daman and its enclaves Dadra and Nagar Aveli. The following is a communique issued by the International Court of Justice on the subject:--

Today, November 26th, 1957, the International Court of Justice gave its Judgment in the case concerning Right of Passage over Indian Territory (Preliminary Objections) between Portugal and India.

The case was submitted by Application of the Portuguese Government requesting the Court to recognize and declare that Portugal is the holder or beneficiary of a right of passage between its territory of Damao (littoral Damao) and its enclaves of Dadra and Nagar-Aveli and between each of the latter and that this right comprises the faculty of transit for persons and goods, including armed forces, without restrictions or difficulties and in the manner and to the extent required by the effective exercise of Portuguese sovereignty in the said territories, that India has prevented and continues to prevent the exercise of the right in question, thus committing an offence to the detriment of Portuguese Sovereignty over the enclaves and violating its international obligation and to adjudge that India should put an immediate end to this situation by allowing Portugal to exercise the right of passage thus claimed. The Application expressly referred to Artical 36, paragraph 2, of the Statute and to the

Declarations by which Portugal and India have accepted the compulsory jurisdiction of the Court.

The Government of India for its part raised six Preliminary Objections to the jurisdiction of the Court which were based on the following grounds:

The First Preliminary Objection was to the effect that a condition in the Portuguese Declaration of 19 December 1955, accepting the jurisdiction of the Court reserved for that Government "the right to exclude from the scope of the present Declaration at any time during its validity any given category or categories of disputes by notifying the Secretary-General of the United Nations and with effect from the moment of such notification" and was incompatible with the object and purpose of the Optional Clause, with the result that the Declaration of Acceptance was invalid.

The Second Preliminary Objection was based on the allegation that the Portuguese Application of 22 December 1955, was filed before a copy of the Declaration of Portugal accepting the compulsory jurisdiction of the Court could be transmitted to other Parties to the Statute by the Secretary-General in compliance with Article 36, paragraph 4, of the Statute. The filing of the Application had thus violated the equality, mutuality and reciprocity to which India was entitled under

$$<$$
Pg-214>

the Optional Clause and under the express condition of reciprocity contained in its Declaration of 28 February 1940 accepting the compulsory jurisdiction of the Court.

The Third Preliminary Objection was based on the absence, prior to the filing of the Application, of diplomatic negotiations which would have made it possible to define the subject matter of the claim.

The Fourth Preliminary Objection requested the Court to declare that since India had been ignorant of the Portuguese Declaration before the Application was filed, India had been unable to avail itself on the basis of reciprocity of the condition in the Portuguese Declaration enabling it to exclude from the jurisdiction of the Court the dispute which was the subject matter of the Application.

The Fifth Preliminary Objection was based on the reservation in the Indian Declaration of Acceptance which excludes from the jurisdiction of the Court disputes in regard to question which by international law fall exclusively within the jurisdiction of the Government of India. That Government asserted that the facts and legal considerations adduced before the Court did not permit the conclusion that there was a reasonably arguable case for the contention that the subject matter of the dispute was outside its domestic jurisdiction.

Finally, in The Sixth Preliminary Objection, the Government of India contended that the Court was without jurisdiction on the ground that

India's Declaration of Acceptance was limited to 'dispute arising after 5 February 1930 with regard to situations or facts subsequent to the same date." The Government of India argued: First, that the dispute submitted to the Court by Portugal did not arise after 5 February 1930 and, secondly that in any case, it was a dispute with regard to situations and facts prior to that date.

The Government of Portugal had added to its submissions a statement requesting the Court to recall to the Parties the universally admitted principle that they should facilitate the accomplishment of the task of the Court by abstaining from any measure capable of exercising a prejudicial effect in regard to the execution of its decision or which might bring about either an aggravation or an extension of the dispute. The Court did not consider that in the circumstances of the present case it should comply with this request of the Government of Portugal.

In its Judgment, the Court rejected the First and the Second Preliminary Objections by fourteen votes to three, the Third by sixteen votes to one and the Fourth by fifteen votes to two. By thirteen votes to four it Joined the Fifth Objection to the merits and by fifteen votes to two joined the Sixth Objection to the merits. Finally, it declared that the proceedings on the merits were resumed and fixed as follows the time-limits for the rest of the proceedings:

For the filing of the Counter-Memorial of India, 25 February 1958; for the filing of the Portuguese Reply, 25 May 1958; for the filing of the Indian Rejoinder, 25 July 1958.

Judge Kojevnikov stated that he could not concur either in the operative clause or in the reasoning of the Judgment because, in his opinion, the Court should at the present stage of the proceedings, have sustained one or indeed more of the Preliminary Objections.

Vice-President Badawi and Judge Klaestad appended to the Judgment statements of their dissenting opinions. M. Fernandes, Judge ad hoc, concurred in the dissenting opinion of Judge Klaestad and Mr. Chagla, a Judge ad hoc, appended to the Judgment a statement of his dissenting opinion.

USA INDIA PORTUGAL

Date: Nov 26, 1957

Volume No

1995

The Judgement

With regard to the First Preliminary Objection to the effect that the Portuguese Declaration was invalid for the reason that the condition enaling Portugal to exclude at any time from scope of that Declaration any given categories of disputes by mere notification to the Secretary-General, the Court said that the words used in the condition, construed in their ordinary sense, meant simply that a notification under that condition applied only to disputes brought before the Court after the date of the notification. No retroactive effect could thus be imputed to such a notification. In this connection the

<Pg-215>

Court referred to the principle which it had laid down in the Nottebohm case in the following words: "An extrinsic fact such as the lapse of the Declaration by reason of the expiry of the period or of denunciation cannot deprive the Court of the jurisdiction already established." The Court added that this principle applied both to total denunciation, and to partial denunciation as contemplated in the impugned condition of the Portuguese Declaration.

India having contended that this condition had introduced into the Declaration a degree of uncertainty as to reciprocal rights and obligations which deprived the Acceptance of the compulsory jurisdiction of the Court of all practical value, the Court held that as Declarations and their alterations made under Article 36 of the Statute had to be deposited with the Secretary-General it followed that, when a case was submitted to the Court, it was Always possible to ascertain what were, at that moment, the reciprocal obligations of the Parties in accordance with their respective Declarations. Although it was true that during the interval between the date of the notification to the Secretary-General and its receipt by the Parties to the Statute, there might exist some element of uncertainty, such uncertainty was inherent in the operation of the system of the Optional Clause and did not affect the validity of the condition contained in the Portuguese Declaration. The Court noted that with regard to any degree of uncertainty resulting from the right of Portugal to avail itself at any time of the Condition in its Acceptance, the position was substantially the same as that created by the right claimed by many Signatories of the Optional Clause, including India, to terminate their Declarations of Acceptance by simple notification without notice. It recalled that India had done so on 7 January 1956, when it notified the Secretary-General of the denunciation of its Declaration of 28 February 1940, (relied upon by Portugal in its Application), for which it simultaneously substituted a new Declaration incorporating reservations which were absent from its previous Declaration. By doing so, India achieved in substance the object of the condition in Portugal's Declaration.

Moreover, in the view of the Court, there was no essential difference with regard to the degree of uncertanity between a situatation

resulting from right of total denunciation and that resulting from the condition in the Portuguese Declaration which left open the possibilty of a partial denunciation. The Court further held that it was not possible to admit as a relevant differentiating factor that while in the case of total denunciation the denouncing State could no longer invoke any rights accruing under its Declaration, in the case of a partial denunciation under the terms of the Portuguese Declaration, Portugal could otherwise continue to claim the benefits of its Acceptance. The principle of reciprocity made it possible for other State including India to invoke against Portugal all the rights which it might thus continue to claim.

A third reason for the alleged invalidity of the Portuguese Condition was that it offended against the basic principle of reciprocity underlying the Optional Clause, inasmuch as it claimed for Portugal a right which in effect was denied to other Signatories whose Declarations did not contain a similar condition. The Court was unable to accept this contention. It held that if the position of the Parties as regards the exercise of their rights was in, any way affected by the unavoidable interval between the receipt by the Secretary-General of the appropriate notification and its receipt or by, the other Signatories, that delay operated equally in favour of or against all Signatories of the Optional Clause.

The Court also refused to accept the view that the Condition in the Portuguese Declaration was inconsistent with the principle of reciprocity in as much as it rendered inoperative that part of paragraph 2 of Article 36 which refer to the acceptance of the Optional Clause in relation to States accepting "The same obligation". It was not necessary that "the same obligation" should be irrevocably defined at the time of acceptance for the entire period of its duration; that expression simply meant no more than that, as between the States adhering to the Optional Clause, each and all of them were bound by such identical obligations as might exist at any time during which the acceptance was mutually binding.

As the Court found that the condition in the Portuguese Declaration was not inconsistent

<Pg-216>

with the Statute, it was not necessary for it to consider the position whether, if it were invalid, its invalidity would affect the Declaration as a whole.

The Court then dealt with the Second Objection based on the allegation that as the Application was filed before Portugal's acceptance of the Court's jurisdiction could be notified by the Secretary-General to the other Signatories, the filing of the Application violated the equality, mutuality and reciprocity to which India was entitled under the Optional Clause and under the express condition contained in its Declaration. The Court noted that two questions had to be considered: first, in filing its Application on

the day following the deposit of its Declaration of Acceptance, did Portugal act in a manner contrary to the Statute; second, if not, did it thereby violate any right of India under the Statute or under its Declaration.

India maintained that before filing its Application Portugal ought to have allowed such period to elapse as would reasonably have permitted other Signatories of the Optional Clause to receive from the Secretary-General notification of the Portuguese Declaration.

The Court was unable to accept that contention. The contractual relation between the Parties and the compulsory jurisdiction of the Court resulting therefrom are established "ipso facto and without special agreement" by the act of the making of the Declaration. A state accepting the jurisdiction of the Court must expect that an Application may be filed against it before the Court by a new declarant State on the same day on which that State deposits its Acceptance with the Secretary-General.

India had contended that acceptance of the Court's jurisdiction became effective only when the Secretary-General had transmitted a copy thereof to the Parties. The Court held that the declarant State was concerned only with the deposit of its Declaration with the Secretary-General and was not concerned with the duty of the Secretary-General or the manner of its fulfilment. The Court could not read into the Optional Clause the requirement that an interval should elapse subsequent to the deposit of the Declaration. Any such requirement would introduce an element of uncertainty into the operation of the Optional Clause system.

As India had not specified what actual right which she derived from the Statute and the Declaration had been adversely affected by the manner of the filing of the Application, the Court was unable to discover what right had in fact thus been violated.

Having arrived at the conclusion that the Application was filed in a manner which was neither contrary to the Statute nor in violation of any right of India, the Court dismissed the Second Preliminary Objection.

The Court then dealt with the Fourth Preliminary Objection which was also concerned with the manner in which the Application was filed.

India contended that having regard to the manner in which the Application was filed, it had been unable to avail itself on the basis of reciprocity of the condition in the Portuguese Declaration and to exclude from the jurisdiction of the Court the dispute which was the subjectmatter of the Application. The Court merely recalled what it had said in dealing with the Second Objection, in particular that the Statute did not prescribe any interval between the deposit of a Declaration of Acceptance and the filing of an Application.

On the Third Preliminary Objection which invoked the absence of

diplomatic negotiations prior to the filing of the Application, the Court held that a substantial part of the exchanges of views between the Parties prior to the filing of the Application was devoted to the question of access to the enclaves, that the correspondence and notes laid before the Court revealed the repeated complaints of Portugal on account of denial of transit facilities, and that the correspondence showed that negotiations had reached a deadlock. Assuming that Article 36, paragraph 2 of the Statute by referring to legal disputes, did require a definition of the dispute through negotiations, the condition had been complied with.

In its Fifth Objection, India relied on a reservation in its own Declaration of Acceptance which excludes from the jurisdiction of the Court disputes with regard to questions

<Pg-217>

which by international law fall exclusively within the jurisdiction of the Government of India, and asserted that the facts and the legal considerations adduced before the Court did not permit the conclusion that there was a reasonably arguable case for the contention that the subjectmatter of the dispute was outside the exclusive domestic jurisdiction of India.

The Court noted that the facts on which the Subimissions of India were based were not admitted by Portugal and that elucidation of those facts and their legal consequences would involve an examination of the practice of the British, Indian and Portugese authorities in the matter of the right of passage, in particular to determine whether this practice showed that the Parties had envisaged this right as a question which according to international law was exclusively within the jurisdiction of the territorial sovereign. All these and similar questions could not be examined at this preliminary stage without prejudging the merits. Accordingly, the Court decided to join the Fifth Objection to the merits.

Finally, in dealing with the Sixth Objection based on the reservation ratione temporis in the Indian Declaration limiting the Declaration to disputes arising after 5 February, 1930, with regard to situations or facts subsequent to that date, the Court noted that to ascertain the date on which the dispute had arisen it was necessary to examine whether or not the dispute was only a continuation of a dispute on the right of passage which had arisen before 1930. The Court having heard conflicting arguments regarding the nature of the passage formerly exercised was not in a position to determine these two questions at this stage.

Nor did the Court have at present sufficient evidence to enable it to pronounce on the question whether the dispute concerned situations or facts prior to 1930. Accordingly, it joined the Sixth Preliminary Objection to the merits.

Date: Nov 26, 1957

Volume No

1995

JAPAN

Supply of Iron Ore

The Minister for Commerce and Industry, Shri Morarji Desai, in reply to a question in the Rajya Sabha in Delhi on Nov 21, 1957 said that discussions had taken place between the Japanese Preliminary Survey Mission and the representatives of the Government of India on projects for collaboration for the development of iron ore mines in India and for supply of iron ore to Japan on a long term basis.

It had been agreed, added Shri Desai, that the project for the supply of iron ore from the Rourkela area through the port of Vizagapatnam would be given priority of consideration. The main Japanese Team was expected in India in December and further discussions would take place then.

JAPAN USA INDIA

Date: Nov 21, 1957

Volume No

1995

PAKISTAN

Canal Water Dispute

Shri Jaisukhlal Hathi, Deputy Minister of Irrigation and Power, told the Lok Sabha at New Delhi on Nov 25, 1957 that the World Bank had invited the Governments of India and Pakistan to express their views on certain heads of agreement for the formation of an International Water Treaty. Both Governments had communicated their views to the Bank who had forwarded the views of each Government to the other for comments. India's comments on the views expressed by Pakistan would be communicated to the Bank shortly. Meanwhile, the

co-operative work, through the good offices of the World Bank,

<Pg-218>

which was to terminate on 30 September 1957, had been extended until 31 December 1957.

The Deputy Minister added that three representatives of the Bank had recently visited Pakistan and were now in New Delhi trying to help negotiate a new ad hoc transitional agreement between the Governments of India and Pakistan.

Shri Hathi gave this information in reply to a question.

In a reply to another question the Deputy Minister stated that a reply from the Government of Pakistan in regard to the payment of 'disputed' charges was still awaited. As regards 'undisputed', charges, these had been paid, almost in full, up to the quarter ending September 30, 1957. The Government of Pakistan had been reminded.

Shri S. K. Patil, Minister of Irrigation and power, in reply to a question in the Rajya Sabha at New Delhi on 19 November 1957 stated that according to the reports appearing in the Pakistan Press, the Pakistan President, in a speech delivered on 7 October 1957 was reported to have said that any action by India calculated to cut off waters flowing to Pakistan would be considered as an act of aggression and that Pakistan would meet aggression by aggression.

He added that in order to maintain a favourable atmosphere for the negotiations which were now going on between the two countries through the good offices of the World Bank, the Government of India did not propose to take any notice of the speech, at this stage.

In reply to another question Shri Patil said the Government of India were not aware of any decision by the World Bank to send another mission to settle the Indo-Pakistan Canal Water Dispute.

PAKISTAN LATVIA UNITED KINGDOM INDIA

Date: Nov 25, 1957

Volume No

1995

PORTUGAL

Indian Passengers Bar red from Portuguese Port

In reply to a question in the Rajya Sabha at New Delhi on Nov 21, 1957 whether it was a fact that on or about October 1,1957, theIndian passengers who were coming to Bombay from Durban by the liner Karanjia, and the Indian elmployees of the said liner were not allowed to go out at the Portuguese port, Laurence Marques, by Portuguese Officers, and if so, what were the details of the incident, Shrimati Lakshmi N. Menon, Deputy Minister of External Affairs, told the Rajya Sabha:

On 6 September 1957 the ship Karanjia arrived at Lourence Marques. The Commander was told by the Portuguese authorities that no Indian crew and passengers would be allowed to get down or visit the town. The order was strictly enforced; no exception was made. Even the Supervisor was not allowed to go down and work in the shed. The ship left on the next day.

Asked whether Government had taken any action in the matter, the Deputy Minister said:

No, as protests with Portuguese authorities do not produce any results.

PORTUGAL INDIA

Date: Nov 21, 1957

Volume No

1995

Compulsory Flag Salutation

In reply to a question in the Lok Sabha at New Delhi on Nov 22, 1957 1957 whether Government were aware that the Portuguese authorities in Goa had recently arranged a special flag (Portuguese Flag) salutation ceremony in Aguada Fort and the satyagrahi prisoners of the Fort were ordered to line up for saluting that flag, the Prime Minister said in the Lok Sabha:

Government has seen press reports indicating that the Portuguese jail authorities held a flag salutation ceremony in Aguada Jail on 10th June 1957--the Portuguese National

<Pg-219>

Day. According to the reports, the satyagrahi prisoners were asked to

line up and salute the flag, but they refused to do so. This enraged the jail authorities and many of the prisoners were severely beaten and later kept in solitary confinement for several days. Government have no information to show if the prisoners involved in this incident included any Indians or not. It is also not known whether any satyagrahis, lying ill in the jail, were asked to stand up salute the flag.

INDIA USA

Date: Nov 22, 1957

Volume No

1995

SOUTH VIET NAM

President Diem's Visit

On the invitation of the Government of India, His Excellency Mr. NgoDinh Diem, President of the Republic of Viet Nam, visited India

during November 1957. His Excellency arrived in Delhi on 4 November and on 5 November President Prasad held a State Banquet in honour of President Diem. Speaking on the occasion, President Prasad said:

It is with great pleasure that I rise tonight to welcome in our midst His Excellency Mr. Ngo Dinh Diem, President of the Republic of Viet Nam. We welcome him as the Head of a State which, like us, has emerged as a free nation only recently after a long spell of foreign domination. If we look back, we can discover many a tie of friendship and mutual give and take in our past histories. The visit of the President of the Republic of Viet Nam to this country is, therefore, a welcome reminder of the cordial relations subsisting between our two peoples in the past, and perhaps more than that, an indication of the great resurgence that has been taking place in Asia since the end of the last world war.

In the modern age when the advance of science has all but annihilated distance, no two countries can be too far apart from each other; but in case of Viet Nam and India situated as they are in South-East Asia, the feeling of proximity is hightened by their common aspirations and a considerable similarity of the problems that both have to face. The Republic of Viet Nam is striving for the economic development of the country with a view to raising the level of production and the standard of living of its people. Like India, Viet Nam is also predominantly an agricultural country, the bulk of its people depending on land for sustenance. Again, like us, I believe, it is faced with the task of adjusting its age-old economy to the

country's industrial requirements and the needs of modern times. We in this country have been making strenuous efforts to raise our agricultural production and do all that is possible to develop it industrially. I am glad Your Excellency will be able to visit at least one of our River-Valley projects and some of our research institutes.

In our approach to world problems and international relations we are animated by the desire to maintain friendly relations with other countries on the basis of the principle of co-existence or Panch Sheel. When the common object is maintenance of peace in the world and the welfare of humanity, which naturally depends on the development of backward countries, we believe neither wisdom nor expediency would dictate a different course of action.

Recently we have been associated with the International Commission for Supervision of the Truce in Viet Nam in terms of the Geneva Agreement. In that connection a good many of our personnel are working on the Commission for maintenance of peace in Viet Nam. I need hardly say that we have nothing but goodwill and a feeling of friendship towards the people of Viet Nam, and it was because of our desire to assist the warravaged people of Viet Nam in the maintenance of peace that we, along with other nations, agreed to be on that Commission.

I feel certain that Your Excellency's visit to this country will further strengthen the bonds of friendship and fellow-feeling already subsisting between our peoples. While thanking Your Excellency once again for having accepted our invitation and while extending you a hearty welcome to India, I wish and hope that Your Excellency's stay in this country will be happy and comfortable.

<Pg-220>

INDIA USA SWITZERLAND

Date: Nov 22, 1957

Volume No

1995

SOUTH VIET NAM

President Diem's Speech

Your invitation has given me the opportunity to come at long last on a pilgrimage to your great country, the cradle of one of the oldest and most wondrous civilizations of history, whose present development is the focus of attention of the world, especially for Asian peoples.

I am grateful to you for having given me that opportunity. I am also grateful for the cordial reception which the Indian Government and people and you yourself, Mr. President, have so kindly extended to me since I came to this country which is so rich in spirituality and so full of great and peaceful works of construction.

I feel great satisfaction in meeting again Vice-President Radhakrishnan who is well remembered in Viet Nam, after his recent and rather short visit. I am also happy to meet again Prime Minister Nehru whom we had the privilege and pleasure of welcoming to Saigon three years age.

The visits of these high Indian dignitaries, and the participation of India in the recent Colombo Conference in Saigon gave us great comfort and provided opportunities for fruitful contacts.

Indeed, relations between India and Viet Nam are not of recent date.

If in the past it was not possible for our countries to establish official relations, our peoples have nevertheless maintained close contact for a very long time.

In fact, Viet Nam is situated at the far end of that vast area of Eastern Asia which, for 15 centuries, Buddhist and Brahminic India helped to awaken to art, thought, and especially to the appreciation of moral and spiritual values.

More recently, the struggle for independence has brought our two peoples nearer each other. The proclamation of Indian independence in 1946 filled our hearts with joy and hope. For this date not only signalled beyond doubt the awakening of Asian nationalism, but also marked a new era of positive contribution by Asia to world civilisation

In this connection you would not be surprised if I told you that Mahatma Gandhi was venerated as much in Vietnam as in India. In our eyes he was not only an Indian patriot, but also an Asian leader who had dared to translate his theories into action. He has conceived revolution in continuity, and while he advocated non-violence he was uncompromising on questions of principles.

Since then, thanks to the wisdom of its leaders and to the sense of public duty and sacrifice of its sons, India has surmounted immense obstacles to achieve a Prominent place among the leading world powers.

However, as Vice-President Radhakrishnan has recently said in Saigon, greatness and material prosperity is not everything: it is not an end but a means which, if properly utilised, would permit the liberation of man from economic subjection.

I shall add that it must under no circumstance serve as a pretext to infringe upon the essential freedom of man, for the end does not justify the means, still more the means will generally determine the end in the last analysis. If we wish to be faithful to the teachings of Mahatma Gandhi, here is a principle on which we must be firm and uncompromising.

It is in this spirit that I invite you, Your Excellencies, Ladies and Gentlemen, to raise your glasses to the health of President Rajendra Prasad, to the prosperity of India and to Indo-Vietnamese friendship.

USA INDIA SRI LANKA VIETNAM

Date: Nov 22, 1957

Volume No

1995

SOUTH VIET NAM

Nehru-Diem Joint Communique

After talks in New Delhi Prime Minister Nehru and President Diem issued a joint communique on Nov 09, 1957. The following is the text of, the joint communique.

On the invitation of the Government of India, His Excellency Mr. Ngo Dinh Diem, President of the Republic of Vietnam, visited India from 4 November to 9 November 1957. During his brief stay in India, the President saw the work of reconstruction and of economic development accomplished by India,

<Pg-221>

especially in the field of community development and the establishment of hydro-electric works. He saw also the interest displayed by the people in India in the progress and welfare of the Vietnamese people.

A party of 30 Government experts and technicians accompanying the President have availed of this occasion to visit a number of industrial and agricultural projects in India. They have also had important discussion with the Planning Commission on the objectives and techniques of planning adopted in India.

The President of the Republic of Vietnam met the President of the Republic of India and took the opportunity of this visit for a friendly and informal exchange of views with the Prime Minister of India on matters of mutual interest to their countries. The President of the Republic of Vietnam and the Prime Minister of India are agreed that, with the terrible advances in the development of weapons of mass destruction, the most urgent problem before the people of the world is the maintenance of peace in the world which is vital for their survival.

To both their countries, as well as to the other countries in South East Asia, maintenance of peace is a primary need to enable them to devote their energies wholeheartedly to the social and economic, advancement of their peoples. The essential task is to give, while maintaining spiritual values, economic and social content to their freedom and independence.

The President and the Prime Minister noted the important contribution made by India in the International Commission in maintaining peace in Vietnam. They hope that the problems of Vietnam will be solved peacefully and in the best interests of the people of Vietnam.

The President and the Prime Minister have decided to continue and increase the cooperation between their two countries in the pursuit of their common goal of economic and social advancement of their people. They are resolved to continue to work, in their respective spheres, for the maintenance of peace in the world and understanding between nations

INDIA VIETNAM USA

Date: Nov 09, 1957

Volume No

1995

UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS

Credit for Industrial Enterprises

The Government of India and the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics concluded an agreement on Nov 09, 1957 in New Delhi on the establishment in India of certain Industrial Enterprises and the credit arrangements of 500 million roubles. A Press Note issued by the Government of India stated:

An Agreement between the Government of the U.S.S.R. and the Government of India on establishment in India of certain Industrial Enterprises and the credit arrangements of 500 million roubles was concluded in New Delhi on 9 November 1957.

The negotiations were carried on in a friendly atmosphere and in a spirit of mutual understanding.

This credit will be used in establishing in India a Heavy Machine Building Plant, a Coal Mining Machinery Plant, an Optical Glass Factory, a Thermal Power Station (250,000KW) and enterprises for the mining and treating of coal. The Soviet Organisation will prepare the detailed project reports and supply equipment, machinery and materials, technical skill and assistance for all these undertakings.

The Agreement provides for necessary training facilities in the U.S.S.R., for Indian technical personnel required for these projects.

The credit, bearing an annual interest of 2-1/2% is to be repaid in 12 equal yearly instalments beginning from one year after the completion of delivery from the U.S.S.R. of machinery and equipment in respect of each enterprise.

<Pg-222>

Credit will be used to finance the purchase of the equipment, machinery and materials to be supplied from the Soviet Union for the above mentioned enterprises as well as the technical assistance to be rendered by the Soviet Organisations. Credit covers all requirements of foreign exchange for these Enterprises. Provision has also been made for further credit if the amount now agreed upon for the above mentioned purposes does not eventually prove adequate for the establishment of these Enterprises.

Mr. N. A. Smelov signed the agreement on behalf of the U.S.S.R. and Shri M. K. Vellodi, Secretary to the Cabinet, for India.

The signing of this agreement will considerably assist the Government of India to conserve foreign exchange in the immediate future and will stimulate progress of the current Five Year Plan. The establishment of these large scale uptodate enterprises will enable India to organise for the first time the indigenous production of heavy machinery and equipment necessary for the further development of its key industries in accordance with the targets of the Second Five Year Plan.

This Agreement will be a step towards strengthening the friendly relations and is a further example of co-operation in the economic field between the two countries.

<Pg-223>

USA INDIA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC

Date: Nov 09, 1957

December

Volume No

1995 **CONTENTS** Foreign Affairs Record 1957 December VOL. III No. 12 **CONTENTS** ATOMIC ENERGY Reorganisation of Atomic Energy Department 225 **CEYLON** Indo-Ceylon Trade 225 COMMONWEALTH PARLIAMENTARY CONFERENCE Prime Minister's Address on "International Affairs and Defence" 225 EUROPEAN COMMON MARKET India's Stand FOREIGN ASSISTANCE GIVEN BY INDIA Aid to Colombo Plan and Other Countries FOREIGN AID Industrial Equipment from U.S.A. and U.S.S.R. 234 GERMAN DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC Trade with India 234 INDIA IN THE UNITED NATIONS

India's Contribution to UN Technical Assistance Programme .. 235

.. 240

Indian Protest against Map......235Shri Krishna Menon's Speech on Algeria......235Shri Krishna Menon's Speech on Cyprus......237

Shri Krishna Menon's Speech on Peaceful

Coexistence of States

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS Prime Minister's Speech in Lok Sabha 246 Prime Minister's Speech in Rajya Sabha 253
JAPAN Trade and other Privileges Extended 260
NORWAY Trade Agreement Extended 261
(Continued overleaf)
<pg-i></pg-i>
PAKISTAN Canal Water Talks 262 Pakistan President's Statement on Kashmir 262 Review of Indo-Pakistan Trade Agreement 262 Smuggling on Indo-Pakistan Border 263
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA Aid for Malaria Eradication
UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS Credit to Indian Industries 264
YUGOSLAVIA Rupee Payments for Imports
<pg-ii></pg-ii>

INDIA SRI LANKA USA ALGERIA CYPRUS JAPAN NORWAY PAKISTAN YUGOSLAVIA

Date: Dec 01, 1957

Volume No

1995

ATOMIC ENERGY

Reorganisation of Atomic Energy Department

Government have under consideration certain proposals for the reorganisation of the Department of Atomic Energy. This information was given by the Prime Minister in reply to a question by Shri Shivananjappa in the Lok Sabha in New Delhi on Dec 02, 1957.

He added:

This has been necessitated by the important and rapid strides made by the Department in the research into and development of atomic energy for peaceful purposes and by the greatly expanded programme that is envisaged for the future. The central idea is to create an organization with full authority to plan and implement the various measures on sound technical and economic principles and free from all non-essential restrictions or needlessly inelastic rules. In devising such an organization, the special requirements of atomic energy, the newness of the field, the strategic nature of its activities and its international and political significance will also be borne in mind. No details can be given as the matter is still under consideration.

INDIA USA

Date: Dec 02, 1957

Volume No

1995

CEYLON

Indo-Ceylon Trade

Replying to a question on Dec 05, 1957, in the Lok Sabha in New Delhi, the Deputy Minister for Commerce and Industry, Shri Satish Chandra, said that a new Indo Ceylon Tobacco Agreement had not yet been finalised.

The Delegation from Ceylon had visited India and discussed mainly the question of renewal of the Indo-Ceylon Tobacco Agreement. The Delegation had also discussed the possibility of releasing for export to Ceylon small quantities of pulses and other things. Shri Satish Chandra informed the House that a quota of 5,000 tons of pulses had been released for export to Ceylon.

USA INDIA

Date: Dec 05, 1957

Volume No

1995

COMMONWEALTH PARLIAMENTARY CONFERENCE

Prime Minister's Address on "International Affairs and Defence"

Prime Minister, Nehru, participating the Seminar on "International. Affairs and Defence" held by the Commonwealth Parliamentary Conference in New Delhi on Dec 11, 1957, said:

Mr. Chairman and fellow-delegates, may I say that I feel it a great honour and privilege to address this very distinguished audience? I must also express my regret at not having been present here yesterday when this debate was opened in a very able speech by Mr. Gaitskell. I have tried to make up for that by reading the transcript of what he in said and what some other speakers said, though it has been a little difficult to read all that was said yesterday.

The first thing which I would like to mention right at the beginning is that this subject is so vast and so difficult that I feel a little, diffident in saying anything. about it with, absolute assurance and certainty. We talk, of course, often with a great deal of assurance before the public and even in our Parliaments, but the fact, at least so far as I am concerned, is that it is a little difficult for anyone to say that this is the right way

and everything else is the wrong way. So what I shall venture to place before you today are various ideas, various approaches, to this problem for your consideration.

How does a country approach this question of international affairs? It was mentioned by several speakers who said yesterday that they are naturally governed by their backgrounds, by geography, by history, by culture and by so many other things. Naturally, plus also, inevitably, by what that country thinks its national interests are. No country, whether democratic or other, can forget its own national interests in considering this problem. It tries, or ought to try, to reconcile its national interests with the wider causes that it espouses. That is true. But every country thinks of its national interests also.

Now, one of the most powerful factors is geography. Even physically, the world looks rather different from various standpoints. I suppose if you look at the world from the North Pole, it would be different from looking at it from the Equator. From Washington, it will have one look, from Tokyo another, from London a third, from Moscow a fourth and from Peking a fifth. It naturally follows, quite apart from any theory or anything else, that the outlook on the world is different, and depends to some extent on where you are standing, physically standing, and, secondly, mentally standing, if I may say so, that is to say, your mind has been conditioned by past events. It is an important factor because people seem to think that everyone in

the world looks at the picture of the world as they see it. It is not so. It is obviously different; physically, it is different. If a Country like Switzerland considers about foreign or international affairs, it does so in the context of its being in the centre of Europe, the past history of Europe and all kinds of factors, balance of power and other matters. It is a mountainous country. If another country somewhere else does it, it has to consider other factors, apart from its past history.

Now, broadly speaking, one may say that the consideration of international affairs in the last 200 years, ever since an organised way of considering it has begun, has been based on the European view of the world, for the simple reason that Europe in the last two or three hundred years has been the centre of international and world politics. It was obvious, therefore, that the view of world or international affairs must be governed by the fact that Europe was the centre of international politics dominating the earth's surface and controlling world affairs to a large extent. Therefore, it was the European view which was considered the view of international politics. Within Europe, there may be conflicts, as there were between the great countries, of Europe, in regard to the world view, conflicts leading to war even. But the fact remains that it was a common background, which was the European background, that was applied to the understanding of world affairs!

Later, of course, the United States of America came in a very big way. But with all deference to the United States, which is a very great country, if I may say so, even that began as a projection of the European It was very different; even now, the view is different, but it was really an extension of Europe, a projection of Europe plus of course, much more added to it.

So that whenever this question is discussed in various world assemblages, somehow it is taken for granted that what might be called the American and European view is the basis from which we start considering this problem. Now, that may not be correct. It was correct in the past two or three centuries in the sense that Europe dominated the world. Therefore, it was correct in that sense only, not that it represented the viewpoint of Asia or Africa or any other part of the world. How far that is correct today becomes doubtful, because conditions have changed. But anyhow, I want this fact to be remembered. Take even historical events; I am not going into history, even recent history, because then you will get lost in it; I would rather deal with the present state of affairs. But take historical incidents. I wonder how many of those present here, let us say, would agree about the true significance of the Crusades. There would probably be Very marked differences of opinion about the Crusades, and so about many other factors.

Therefore, the first point I would beg of this gathering to remember is that there are various approaches to problems conditioned

by all kinds of factors, by geography, above all, by past history, experience, culture, environment and all that.

So far as we are concerned in India, we have been conditioned by all these factors and we have been conditioned, more especially in recent years, in recent decades, by Mr. Gandhi and his movement. Here, may I say quite clearly, that we do not stand, our Government or the great majority of our people, to my knowledge, are not pacifists. Let there be no mistake about that. It is true that in some sense of the word Mr. Gandhi might be called a pacifist. He was, but he was so much more that to call him a pacifist is to narrow him down and is not to understand him in the sense the word 'pacifism' is normally used in Europe and elsewhere. Undoubtedly, he was a person absolutely committed in his way of thinking to what he called the non-violent approach in life and in everything.

We have been powerfully influenced by him but in international affairs or, for the matter of that, in national affairs, it would be quite untrue to say that we have been able to adopt, or we have deliberately adopted fully, his line of action. I say so with regret because the fact that we have not been able to follow it is our weakness, not individual weakness but national weakness, or individual, if you like.

It has been said many times in the course of yesterday's debate, about our not being visionaries or idealists, about our not losing sight of the reality. I entirely accept that proposition and that approach. I would beg you all to remember that Mr. Gandhi was far more than a visionary. He was one of the most practical men that I have ever come across and the test of that is the success he achieved in his methods. He did not fail. He succeeded in it.

Now, not discussing the past or even the recent past, but coming to the present, we see that the old European viewpoint of the world affairs, conditioned and augmented as it were by the United States of America, has obviously changed. The reality behind it has changed.

Unless the appreciation also changes and keeps in step with reality, it will be difficult for a full understanding to take place or for policies to be pursued which would yield results.

We here all of us, I take it, represent what is called parliamentary democracy. We represent the freedom of the individual and all that goes with it. It is true however, that large parts of the earth's surface--I am not merely referring to the communist parts but large parts of the earth's surface even apart from communism--have no parliamentary democracy or any kind of democracy nor do they respect very much the freedom of the individual. That is a fact; an unfortunate fact, but a fact. That fact was rather overladen and covered by the other fact that all these parts were not taking any important, part in world affairs. So, it could be ignored in discussing these matters. Gradually, they begin to play some kind of

part and we realise that the world is constituted very differently from what we thought. Broadly speaking, you may say that even today there is the communist part of the world, there is the democratic part of the world, that is with parliamentary democracy, but there is also a large part of the world which is neither but which is vaguely groping this way or that way. I am not thinking in terms of war or peace or alliances now but merely the way the countries look.

All these things can be rather covered by the other factors. For instance, many countries allied to, let us say, the United States or the Western Powers, allied for reasons which they consider adequate cannot by any stretch of imagination be called democratic or parliamentary. Some of them are absolutely feudal but for various reasons which may be adequate the ally themselves. So the line cannot be drawn quite clearly between parliamentary democracy or the rights of individuals and something which suppresses both.

So, the outlook becomes confused. When we talk about these matters, we slur over these difficulties. Mr. Gaitskell, while speaking a great deal about the state of affairs in Europe said that when the western countries were progressively, endangered by their having disarmed and by the Soviet power keeping up its armies were then compelled in sheer self-defence to set up the NATO. Well for my part, I can say very little about

<Pg-227>

that. I certainly am not in a position to criticise that. A position had arisen then which led the European powers to take measures for their self-defence and I cannot say, if I had been responsible, what I would have done in the circumstances.

I am more concerned with the present day and with certain subsequent developments. Now, Mr. Gaitskell was good enough to say that even though he pleaded for these collective arrangements in defence of the common danger, for these various military alliances and pacts, he did say that it did not apply all over the world. In fact, he was good enough to say, I believe, that he quite understood India's policy of non-alignment in military blocs in the circumstances in which India was situated. By saying that, Mr. Gaitskell rather weakened his broad argument.

As I say, it may be said with great justification that certain conditions automatically led to the formation of the NATO. I would not argue that. I am not competent to argue it. But what has happened since? Any number of other treaties have come into existence-military alliances. In fact, only two days ago I was reading an article by the Editor of the New York Times in which he described the recent period and the present tendency as 'pactomania'--people relying more and more on pacts as if they are going to solve their problems; they say: let us have another pact here.

I am not for the moment talking about the NATO but the subsequent

developments of this doctrine of pacts or pactomania. As far as I can see, they have not to my understanding produced any adequate results. They have produced certainly unfortunate results by adding to tensions and producing the results which they were actually meant to avoid. Now, then, if that is so, there is something wrong in our approach. I shall examine this matter a little more a little later.

Mr. Gaitskell referred to the U.N. and spoke about its great virtue; inspite of the many failings in the present structure of the U.N. and its processes. He laid special stress on his Charter. I entirely agree with him, and I agree with, him that inspite of every failing that we have noticed there it is by far the only thing which gives us hope for the future.

At the same time, how was the United Nations constituted twelve years ago? Surely, the United Nations was constituted having the then position in view on the basis of co-existence of countries which were opposed to each other ideologically or otherwise. That is the whole basis if the United Nations. It was not the United Nations of a group of countries which agreed with each other ideologically or in other ways. The Soviet Union which was obviously very different in its political and economic policy was included and given a very important place in it and shared with some other countries the right of vetoing.

Take the right of veto. Nobody likes that. I certainly do not like it. And, yet, I do not quite know at the time of the founding of the United Nations what other different way could have been found, because when you included 50 or 60 countries of various sizes, various strengths, various capacities, it was very difficult for great countries like the United States, or the United Kingdom, or the Soviet Union merely to say that we shall abide by any decision of the majority of this new group. So, recognising the practical aspect they introduced the veto principle. Whether the veto principle has been misused or not is another matter. Unless it was introduced I rather doubt if they could have got on with the United Nations at that time and I rather doubt even now, things being what they are, whether you can make much progress unless something like this is there. We should like it removed, but before that is removed many other things may have to be removed also. I mean to say, all this tension, distrust and all that; otherwise the United Nations may well cease to be what it was meant to be.

Then look at it again. The United Nations was meant to be a representative of all independent nations regardless of their ideological affiliations. Now, it is obvious that the United Nations has not got some countries, notably China, in it. And, looking at it purely, strictly, from the practical point of view, that impairs the United Nations; that weakens it; its authority does not spread over a vast number of people and over a great area of the earth's surface. What-ever

it may consider will have a gap in it. Take the question of disarmament. Are you going to have disarmament with, let us say, the United States, United Kingdom, Soviet Union, France and some other countries agreeing and leave out China? Manifestly, there will be a big gap. It has to come in to the picture. Let us even take it that they are discussing this new atomic energy agency. You leave out not only a big area but a vital area and 600 million people. Does this not appear absolutely unrealistic? I do not understand it. It is not a question of likes or dislikes. It is not a question of ideology. It is just utter lack of realism. It is the absolute opposite of a practical approach to a practical problem. That is what I submit. viz. that the approach which is called so practical has lost all touch with reality, and I would venture to say with great humility that this approach to military pacts has lost all touch with reality, with the modern weapons of today and with the other factors that are influencing international affairs today.

But one thing that is dead clear is this, that there can be no settlement on any problem in the Far East without China being brought into the picture. There can be no settlement in the Middle East without Russia being brought into the picture. These can geographical factors; it is not a question of ideology. There is the huge giant of Russia sitting there, and there is the huge giant of China sitting there. How can it be ignored? Apart from its power aspect, if you want to ignore it, the result is that you are ignoring an essential factor in a settlement of reality which will have to come into the picture of the problem.

And again, in considering these matters, I was just thinking whether what Mr. Gaitskell said could have been said with equal effect ten years ago.

Has these ten years made no difference to his speech or to the other events which have happened in this world? A tremendous deal has happened. But we go on repeating the same arguments, expressing the same fears and the same dangers. Well, the world has changed. It may have changed not to our liking, possibly. let us try to change it ,to our liking; but it has changed and it is changing all the time. And, this projection of a certain view-point which have fitted possibly a number of years ago to the conditions of today makes us out of touch with the subject that we are dealing with.

Take this question of military pacts. I am no soldier and I do not know anything about it. But I am told by those who know that the whole character of modern warfare has changed utterly since the last great World War. And, therefore, this question has, to be considered from an entirely different viewpoint and approach. May I venture to say that that should apply to the political realm also? Even as the character of modern war has changed completely, so our consideration of political and international affairs must also change if we are to be realistic.

In fact, the title of this discussion which you are having since yesterday is 'International Affairs and Defence'. They are intimately allied. If the problems of defence have completely changed by the advent of atomic energy and various atomic weapons, so also has the political approach to these problems necessarily changed.

Apart from other factors we know of, of course, the major factor of the world today, is that two enormously powerful countries the United States of America and the Soviet Union, having at their disposal these mighty weapons of warfare, dominate the world in a military sense, from a military power sense. There are also other great countries which are powerful but not quite so powerful. That is one factor. There is another factor--I am repeating what I said a little while ago in another context--that is, many new countries have come into existence, have become free rather, in the last decade or so-whether it is India, Pakistan, Burma, Ceylon, Indonesia or a number of other countries. Regardless of what in any particular matter their views may be--they may vary, they need not have all the same view--the fact is, the mere existence of all these large number of newly independent countries makes a difference, and a very big difference, to the consideration of all these international problems.

Take Africa. Africa from that point of view has much leeway to make. It has begun and we are very happy about it. But the fact remains that all over Africa, whether

free or unfree, there is a tremendous movement afoot which moves people's minds, which make them behave and sometimes misbehave. All that shows powerful forces are at work in the minds of millions of people in Africa as in. Asia. All these are new things, new factors which cannot be ignored and which might well make a difference. Anyhow, you cannot understand the world scene by simply sitting in Moscow, London or Washington and laying down the law from there; that is my submission. The opinion of great countries like the United States and the United Kingdom is worthy of great respect, but the fact remains that being great in military power does not necessarily mean that they may always be right; it does not follow. At any rate, the outlook of these eastern countries is to examine these matters themselves. Even accepting the basic approach of parliamentary democracy and the freedom of the individual, how are we to attain that? How are we to gain our ends? They try to think about it and to come to their own conclusion; they try to discuss it with others. It does not, I repeat, it does not follow naturally that the possession of armed might also means the possession of the right view of things. I submit it need not; it may be so of course.

Those countries which were recently under foreign rule and which have become independent now are troubled over this. They may be doubtful about this; they may not have clear ideas. But they do think and they rather tend to resist the idea of accepting ready-made solutions, more especially when all their logic, all their reasoning faculty,

tells them that the so-called ready-made solutions have led them nowhere and are leading nowhere. I do not know; I am not a communist and I react very strongly, more particularly to the suppression of individual freedom. One of the delegates, I think from the United Kingdom, referred yesterday to Marx-Leninism as having developed a rather old-fashioned look. I entirely agree with him, but I would add that many others have developed an even more old-fashioned look. Many of the arguments that they go on repeating are so old-fashioned as to have lost all force. In this new world, we have to think anew. In this world of atomic energy and space travel and all that, our conceptions of politics, especially international politics, has to change. What after all is the objective of any policy? Policy is not merely a projection of our wishes; partly it is but just wishful thinking does not help us. We like many things. We like the world to be completely free; we like democratic institutions. We like individuals to grow. We like poverty to be abolished; we like racialism to be abolished. We like free travel with no passport and all that. But we are compelled and limited by circumstances in a variety of ways.

What, then, are we aiming at the present moment? Well, security, I suppose; peace, certainly; the development of the under-developed areas also. They are all connected in a sense, because this great poverty that exists in a great part of the world is a danger from every point of view; for the individual, of course, it is terrible; for a group of nations, it is terrible; from the international point of view, it is a dangerous element. Also, if you talk about democracy, and if you think in terms of democracy being limited, or rather, democracy and the welfare being limited to a few countries. obviously that is not a conception which other countries are going to accept at all. They want democracy; they want welfare too naturally and it becomes almost a question as within a nation, so in the world no democratic country can for long keep the good things of life for a selected few, for a minority, or for a section of the community. They cannot; democracy will object to it. So, looked at from the larger world point of view, world democracy does not accept for long the fact that some countries should have all the good things of life and the others not

They can understand, of course, that this process of change takes time; you cannot do these things by magic. You can argue and you can tell them it takes a little time. That is true. Therefore, let us work to that end and changes will come. But any argument which ignores the fact that these great differences should be removed, whether within a nation or within the international sphere, cannot possibly appeal to vast sections of humanity.

As I was saying, what exactly are we aiming at. Peace, certainly, and it is said that we want to preserve peace by having these tremendous deterrents, the atomic and hydrogen bomb or the military pacts and the rest. All that can be said is another world war has

not broken out, but short of that, everything has happened. If that is a comfort, well, I do not feel very happy about it. What exactly is the aim? We want democracy. Are you out by force of arms to impose democracy? Obviously not. It is a rhetorical question.

First of all, democracy cannot be imposed. It has to grow. You can create conditions for democracy to grow; you cannot impose it. But you may say that in order to create conditions for democracy to grow, we have to remove the obstacles to democracy. The obstacle may be, let us say, an authoritarian government. Then, are we out to remove the authoritarian governments of the world or any particular place? Obviously that involves, as things are, a war, and we do not want war. Therefore, we cannot think in terms of changing other countries, their political or economic structure, even though we do not like them at all, through military effort. If you rule that out, what else is there? Through some kind of peaceful persuasion or just allowing things to develop and allowing opportunities for these peaceful reactions to take place. Of course, that may well happen. Indeed, it is happening to some extent.

One hon. Member here spoke about looking forward to this gradual change taking place, a huge gulf that separates the two major blocs of countries being gradually bridged. If I may say so, that is the only hope of mankind; there is no other, because an attempt by one bloc to crush and destroy the other is doomed to failure in the sense that it destroys the other, of course, but it destroys itself and destroys the world. So, that is not the way out. The only way, therefore, is to allow these peaceful processes to be encouraged, normalisation to come in. certainly throwing your weight against any evil development, but always trying to move away from this atmosphere of war, whether hot war or cold war. I submit that the atmosphere of war is the atmosphere absolutely opposed to the temper and climate of democracy. Democracy goes by the board when war comes; much of it does. Civil liberties go; a great deal of them go when war comes. If war does not come. we have cold war and in some measure democracy suffers; civil liberties. By that I mean that our minds become so wrapped up by that powerful idea of the cold war that we cease to have that capacity for calm thinking, which statesmen should have, however bad the situation might be. The cold war is the very opposite. It creates an atmosphere the very opposite of the democratic temper and climate. And further it inhibits the development of those very forces which may ultimately bridge that gulf and bring those who are opposed to you nearer to you and especially those who are compelled, who are being coerced, to bring some relief to them. Take the question of Hungary. A terrible tragedy occurred last year, a continuing one in many ways. Now, apart from expressing opinions strongly, what exactly can any country do? And, oddly enough, the stronger the expression of opinion, the worse it is, because it becomes just a part of this tremendous cold war, apart from the physical possibilities, that is, the idea that if a change occurs it may give a advantage to the other side and all kinds of considerations come in and the poor people do not count at all. How

do we help by this cold war technique? How have we been helped anywhere by the cold war technique, whether in Hungary or elsewhere? Previous to Hungary many things happened in the year or two before in Europe and elsewhere which were indicative of a lessening of tensionwhether it was Austria, whether it was Finland or a good number of other countries. And you will remember that rather remarkable meeting that took place, called the summit meeting, at Geneva when President Eisenhower and the Prime Ministers of the United Kingdom, France and the Soviet Union met. That summit meeting did not do much. It came to no definite practical results. And yet the mere meeting of those four heads of governments created, as if almost by a magic, a new atmosphere in the world. It did not last long. I agree; but it did create it, because the world hungers for that atmosphere-the people of the world in every country-and a weight was lifted off their shoulders. Unfortunately other things happened, but that does not matter. That was the approach, not the cold war approach, but the other approach, the opposite of the cold war, which yielded results or tended to yield results. Then, we reverted to the cold war and I am not going into it as to whose fault it is. But the fact remains that whoever may be guilty of it, it leads you nowhere. It can lead you nowhere. The only justification for a cold war would

<Pg-231>

be if one really wanted a hot war. There is no other justification. If you do not want it, and if you want to achieve results, then it is no good not having the thing like a hot war, ruling that out, and yet preventing yourself from doing something else by having a cold war. You cannot help anyone by it. You can neither adopt the one method nor the other and you hang in mid air and this tension continues, troubles continue. At a time when great countries have this vast power in their hands, these new weapons, apart from the governments which might be presumed to exercise a great deal of restraint, there is always the possibility of a mad General or some mad airmen doing something which might simply upset the apple cart and create terrible fears and a war may be launched without any government having really decided to do so. Through sheer fear something may happen. So, living in this way, on this terrible brink of a precipice, does seem a very odd way of giving security or peace. There is no security today, of the type that should exist. There can be no security while the cold war lasts. The two terms are self-contradictory and always there is that danger of war.

Now, many of you here are possibly aware of what we call the 'Panchsheel', the five priciples. There is nothing remarkable about them. They are very simple.

I have yet to find anyone who disagrees with them. What are they? Recognition of national sovereignty and independence; non-aggression; non-interference, that is, non-internal interference, including ideological interference, mutual respect-and I forget the exact language, something like that-and mutual benefit; and peaceful coexistence. Now, I am quite sure that no one can disagree with any of

these and I am also equally sure that if countries honestly adopted them-I do not say it will create an ideal world, of course, not-it would remove to a very large extent tensions and fears and apprehensions. Why they do not adopt it I do not know. I think more from the fear that behind this something may lurk which is not obvious. Also they think "what is the good of our accepting this when we cannot rely upon the word of the other party?" Now, that is a legitimate thing to do. We cannot always rely upon others. But it is not so much a question of relying upon others. To some extent, of course, it is. But by taking the right step one creates an atmosphere which makes it more difficult for the other party to misbehave. Also, no one suggests that having done this you should-to put it crudelylay down your arms expecting everyone to live in brotherly love with each other. No country expects it. That will take a long time. All that we can do now is to go step by step towards that stage. I do not suggest that any country should suddenly disarm itself relying on the other. I do suggest and very strongly that the time has come for disarmament and if disarmament does not come soon, the dangers threatening the world will be infinitely greater than they are today because of this nuclear weapon. Today the nuclear weapons are in the hands of two or three countries. I have no doubt that in a year or two they will be in the hands of more countries. In about ten years or fifteen years or twenty years they will be in the hands of more countries, and I think it would be practically impossible then. In fact, they may well be in the hands of not countries only but enterprising groups and I shudder to think of what the position will be when a number of enterprising groups carry hydrogen bombs or can produce them. A very distinguished scientist-I think he came from Australia-told me that the time would come when people will produce the hydrogen bomb in their kitchen gardens, a terrible thought. Well, he exaggerated, of course. But what he meant was that it would become simpler and simpler to make it, unless you control the situation now. What are you going to do then? You will be at the mercy of any mad man or any criminal in the world. Therefore, the time for disarmament is here and now. I do not think, obviously and one cannot expect a full-blooded disarmament suddenly, but surely steps can be taken, so that each step taken can prepare the ground for the next step. For my part, I feel that a suspension of atomic explosions is a valid first step. It is a dramatic step. It will not change the power of any country-the suspension of it for two years. It won't change the power of any country, while it gives a tremendous lead, and a tremendous effect is produced all over the world. I have not the shadow of a doubt that if this was done a sigh of relief will go out from hundreds of millions all over the world, and much greater than may be justified. I am certain

<Pg-232>

we will immediately enter into a new phase, when step by step you can disarm more, always taking care. I am not suggesting unilateral disarmament, but one should approach this with good intensions to disarm and not merely argue about it without limit. So I do think that with the coming of these tremendous developments in science

which are being applied for military uses, there is no choice left but to forget the old approaches, and the old cold war approach is the worst of all, the most unpractical of all, with no justification, logic or reason, far less ethics or morality. No ethics or morality are going to be based on hatred. I am not preaching. I am a poor specimen of a human-being. I think it is obvious that you are not going to convert the world by the approach of hatred, and that is not a democratic apporach. I am not saying that you should go unarmed and disarm yourself. Not at all. Take all the steps you like, but your mental approach should be different, and if your mental approach is different, you undermine your adversary and gradually prepare the ground for all kinds of changes in the present international set-up.

So, I venture to say that this 'pactomania' that we have had is not good enough. It may have been good so far as NATO is concerned, I do not criticise it, but I have completely failed to understand how SEATO or the Baghdad Pact has done any good to anybody or towards peace. I would say very precisely and definitely that the Baghdad Pact has been a cause of trouble, continuous trouble and conflict in the Middle East region. It has brought no peace to anybody. It has split up the Arab world. And then exactly what it was meant to avoid it has brought in there, the Soviet Union. It is extraordinary how wrong steps lead to unexpected results. It may be of course that the Soviet Union might have come there otherwise too. It is there next door; it cannot be ignored. But its advent was hastened certainly by the Baghdad Pact. I do not see how any approach, whether that of the Pact or of military alliances, can push out the Soviet Union from that area. The only approach again will be some understanding that this area should not be used as a pawn in world politics. That is a possible approach. Whether you will be successful or not I do not know. I do not criticise it from an ethical point of view, or moral point of view but strictly from the practical point of view. We have to change our approaches to these problems and not continue to think and to repeat arguments which, in a slightly different context, our friend from the United Kingdom said had become rather old-fashioned.

INDIA USA RUSSIA JAPAN UNITED KINGDOM SWITZERLAND OMAN CHINA FRANCE BURMA INDONESIA PAKISTAN MALI PERU HUNGARY AUSTRIA FINLAND CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC AUSTRALIA IRAQ

Date: Dec 11, 1957

Volume No

1995

EUROPEAN COMMON MARKET

India's Stand

The Minister for Commerce, Shri Nityanand Kanungo, stated in the Lok Sabha in New Delhi on Dec 05, 1957 that the European Common Market Scheme was being considered in the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT) and it was hoped that the Scheme would be supplemented by arrangements which might be considered satisfactory to all the contracting parties.

Shri Kanungo was replying to a question. He said, the Common Market Scheme had been studied on the basis of material available with Government. In this connection he invited the attention of the Members to the reply given by the Finance Minister to a question in the Lok Sabha on 2 August 1957.

Shri Kanungo said, the Scheme had not yet come into operation and it would be premature to assess its likely effect on India's trade. The association of the overseas territories (of the signatories to the Common Market Treaty), however, would amount to the creation of a new preferential bloc which might have some adverse effects on India's export trade.

<Pg-233>

INDIA USA

Date: Dec 05, 1957

Volume No

1995

FOREIGN ASSISTANCE GIVEN BY INDIA

Aid to Colombo Plan and Other Countries

A statement showing the foreign assistance given by the Government on India to other countries under treaty/agreement or the Colombo Plan during 1956-57 and 1957-58 was laid on the table of Lok Sabha on Dec 20, 1957 in New Delhi by the Deputy Minister of Finance, Shri B. R. Bhagat. He was replying to a question.

In 1956-57, a sum of Rs. 10 lakhs was given to the Government of Nepal under the Annual Treaty payment. A similar amount was given during 1957-58, under the same Head.

An expenditure under the Colombo Plan of approximately Rs. 15 lakhs was incurred for the provision of training facilities and services of experts to member countries of Colombo Plan. Also under the Colombo Plan, technical and economic assistance of the value of approximately

Rs. 1.08 crores was given to Nepal for implementing its 5-year Plan. Both these amounts were given for the year 1956-57. For 1957-58, a sum of approximately Rs. 9, lakhs was given upto November 30, 1957 and a sum of approximately Rs. 32 lakhs was given upto the end of September, 1957. Both these figures relate to assistance to Nepal under the Colombo Plan.

A loan of Rs. 20 crores had been advanced to the Government of Burma for the economic development of that country. Another loan of Rs. 4.93 lakhs had been given to the Government of Indonesia for training Indonesian airforce personnel. This sum had been given out of an agreed loan of upto Rs. 50 lakhs.

INDIA SRI LANKA NEPAL BURMA INDONESIA

Date: Dec 20, 1957

Volume No

1995

FOREIGN AID

Industrial Equipment from U.S.A. and U.S.S.R.

Equipment worth Rs. 21.7 lakhs has so far been received under the Point Four Technical Assistance Programme of the U.S.A. and supplied to various industrial training centres and institutes in the country. The equipment is being utilised to provide training to craftsmen trainees. The total amount sanctioned for equipment to be obtained under the Point Four Programme is about Rs. 30.87 lakhs.

This was stated by the Union Deputy Minister for Labour, Shri Abid Ali, in reply to a question in Lok Sabha in New Delhi on Dec 05, 1957.

Shri Abid Ali also said that equipment from the U.S.S.R. under the U.N. Technical Assistance Administration was yet to arrive in the country. The actual amount sanctioned under this programme was Rs. 20 lakhs.

USA INDIA

Date: Dec 05, 1957

Volume No

1995

GERMAN DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC

Trade with India

Indian exports to the German Democratic Republic during 1956-57 were worth Rs. 46 lakhs and imports worth Rs. 47.24 lakhs stated Shri Nityanand Kanungo, Minister for Commerce, in the Rajya Sabha in New Delhi on Dec 23, 1957.

Shri Kanungo, who was replying to a question said that East Germany had offered to supply to India industrial plants and certain other goods against purchase of Indian goods to the same extent. A contract had already been signed by the State Trading

<Pg-234>

Corporation with a State Trading Organisation in East Germany, for the import of textiles machinery to the value of Rs. 1.2 crores. Other deals on the same lines were under negotiation.

Shri Kanungo said that implementation of the East German offer would assist in the import of essential plant and machinery required by India and help to increase exports of Indian goods to that country. This would diversify India's export markets.

INDIA GERMANY USA

Date: Dec 23, 1957

Volume No

1995

INDIA IN THE UNITED NATIONS

India's Contribution to U.N. Technical Assistance Programme

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari, Minister of Finance stated in Lok Sabha in New Delhi on Dec 12, 1957 that the Government of India had increased its contribution towards the U.N. Technical Assistance Programme for 1958 to the Rupee equivalent of \$525,000; for 1957 the same was \$500,000.

He was giving a reply to a question.

INDIA

Date: Dec 12, 1957

Volume No

1995

INDIA IN THE UNITED NATIONS

Indian Protest Against Map

In a written reply to a question whether it was a fact that the U.N. Department of Information had brought out a world map for distribution among members in which Kashmir alone was singled out as disputed territory whereas other disputed territories like West New Guinea and Anja were left out, and if so, whether any protest had been lodged by the Government of India, the Prime Minister, Shri Jawaharlal Nehru, said in the Lok Sabha in New Delhi on Dec 10, 1957:

Yes, Sir. The map was published with the comment that the final status of Jammu & Kashmir has not yet been determined. It also bore a general observation that "the boundaries shown on this map do not imply official endorsement or acceptance by the United Nations."

Our Permanent Representative with the U.N. has protested to U.N. Secretariat in suitable terms.

Asked about the reaction of the U.N. Secretariat to such a protest, he said:

Some explanation has just been received and it is being examined.

INDIA GUINEA USA

Date: Dec 10, 1957

Volume No

1995

INDIA IN THE UNITED NATIONS

Shri Krishna Menon's Speech on Algeria

Shri V. K. Krishna Menon, Leader of the Indian Delegation to the United Nations made the following statement during the debate on the Algerian Question in the Twelfth Session of the Political Committee on Dec 04, 1957:

Mr. Chairman, I understand that it is your desire to have the general debate close this evening. The desire of the general pressures and Assembly time compel my delegation to intervene in this debate at this stage. It is not my intention, however, at this late hour to go into any detail about the merits of this problem, merits which have been discussed and debated in the Assembly for several days by so many speakers.

We are considering this matter now for the third time. Last year the Assembly passed a unanimous resolution. It would not be right to regard that resolution as not making a recommendation. The phraseology of the Assembly is always such that it cannot give a mandate to any country, but the nations assembled here expressed the hope that there would be a peaceful solution. This hope has unfortunately not been fructified, and in this part of North Africa war still rages, and both the French people and the Algerian people continue to suffer. It is impossible to estimate the figures or the extent of the casualties or debts and other hardships arising from the war. One sometimes sees phenomenal figures. But whatever these

<Pg-235>

may be, there is little doubt that this war has dragged on too long for the conscience of the world to remain unconcerned about it.

I do not think there is much point at this late hour to discuss Article 2(7). Article 2(7) has been discussed in the Assembly threadbare for the last ten years in connexion with different problems. My delegation would like to say that while the discussion has so far not led in the direction of any conclusions, progress has been made in the last two years in regard to this problem. Two years ago, when the question of Algeria was first brought here, the issue was not whether there would be a settlement but whether we should discuss it at all. The Assembly decided to discuss it. Unfortunately, we were not able to carry the Government of France at the time and it led to certain incidents, but latterly there has been more cooperation.

My Government has considered the statements made by the Foreign Minister of France. I do not propose at present to go into details about it. We stand foursquare on the principle of national independence. We regard independence as territorial. We do not regard national independence as limited by the bounds of race, religion or creed. If we were to say that each racial group should have its own national independence, then in a country like this, the United States of America, there would be very many national States. It would not be quite practicable; it would be running all over the country.

The main reason for my intervention in this debate is to express the hope that between now and the time of the resolution stage it will be possible for us to come to a unanimous decision as we did last year, which I must frankly confess will not solve the Algerian question at this Assembly; nobody expects it to do so. But at any rate it would not aggravate the situation. It would lead to the furtherance of negotiations. It is essential, if we are to do that, that there must be a certain amount of give and take. There can be no give on the side of the people who want independence and as far as the principle of national independence is concerned. But there can be and there will be the desire to achieve that by methods of discussion, or whatever word is used for it.

My delegation is of the view that no contribution can be made towards an Assembly solution of this problem if, in considering that discussion we were at this late stage of the Assembly to go into the question of what should be discussed. That is a matter to be considered for discussion. There must obviously be a cease-fire; there must be political settlements; there must be the protection of minorities and majorities; there must be economic and other questions that must be considered.

These are all matters which those concerned would have to take into account when discussions take place. Therefore, our attempts should be to aim at a solution of the problem rather than to pick one of these, even if it is the cessation of hostilities, and put it in front so that it becomes a "red herring" across the path of any solution

I am purposely refraining from entering into details, except to make it quite clear that our people and Government will at no time make any compromises in regard to the independence of colonial peoples. And neither any definition of the Charter nor any legal interpretations can argue people into dependence. We also think, in the background of our experience, that once that independence is gained, co-operation between former rulers and former colonials, on a basis of equality and mutual respect, is possible. But it is possible only if that co-operation comes by free will from both sides. Co-operation that is compelled still spells domination.

We have a great deal of trust in the wisdom of France and also in the good sense of the peoples of Algeria and their friends to hope that given a little time, even in regard to the Assembly solution, shall we say by tomorrow, it may be possible for us to work out an Assembly solution which would enable the discussions between the French Government and those who can deliver the goods in Algeria to continue.

I stated on behalf of my Government last year that Algeria means the whole of Algeria, and we cannot escape the issue of Algerian nationalism, the rights that arise from that, the aspirations that are there, by evading it by various phrases. It would be impossible to think, as regards Algeria-as, I am sorry to say appears in the

<Pg-236>

Minister of France-that certain solutions may lead to the partition of Algeria. When a country is partitioned, those who belong to the country will try to unite it, unless it is a partition by agreement, as happened in our case.

We do not try to undo the partition. But in other places partitions have come in other ways. Thirty and 40 years have left the aftermath of it. Therefore, it is the hope of my delegation that if at this stage it were possible for the Assembly to come to a decision that there should be a recommendation for the continuation of discussions, with a view to finding a solution-and such solution, naturally in the modern world would have to be in the context of democratic conditions-that would be the best way out.

We have no desire to lengthen this debate. There have been serious difficultures in regard to the former French colonial empire in the last few years, and it is thought that at the present moment the only place where serious fighting is going on in the world is in Algeria. On 11 August 1954, when the French Government, in its wisdom, made certain agreements, or subscribed to certain arrangements, the guns of war were silenced after 25 years. And though it is not strictly relevant to this proposition, I think it is only right to pay tribute to a great British Prime Minister who made outstanding and conclusive contributions towards bringing this state of affairs to an end, which three months before that appeared almost insuperable. It is also to be said that the Prime Minister of China, in the same way, made a similar contribution at Geneva in 1954.

When the conversations began in regard to this particular problem, a number of difficulties--I would not say arguments--that now faced this problem were evident. They stood in the way. Some people probably dismissed it as obstructionism by one side or the other; but obstructionism or otherwise, they had to be overcome, and gradually they were overcome. But even after the agreement, for three years, the working out of it presented considerable difficulties. But in the last week or two, we find steps towards progress which are satisfactory.

My delegation therefore wants to be of assistance in enabling you, Mr. Chairman, to conclude the general debate. We reserve our position in regard to the various matters, which we are entitled under the rules of procedure to take up at the resolution stage and we express the hope that the private talks that are going on and have been going on intensively for the last forty-eight hours outside this room, between various parties, will result in the continuation of discussions without it being vitiated by insistences that are not necessary at present. All negotiations, all discussions are for a solution. What should go into that solution is to be decided at the discussions. If we start arguing the items that should go into that

solution in this particular problem and at this stage, I am afraid we shall get nowhere.

I have done my best to make this statement as short as possible and say as little as possible, in the hope that the Foreign Minister of France, in whose wisdom we have reason to place some confidence, and the generosity and forebearance of others concerned, will help us, we have faith, to find a solution in a very short time.

INDIA ALGERIA USA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC FRANCE CHINA SWITZERLAND

Date: Dec 04, 1957

Volume No

1995

INDIA IN THE UNITED NATIONS

Shri Krishna Menon's Speech on Cyprus

Shri V. K. Krishna Menon, leader of the Indian Delegation to the United Nations made the following statement during the debate on the Cyprus Question at the Twelfth Session of the Political Committee on Dec 12, 1957:

My delegation has abstained from participating in the debate and in the voting on this question because after the laborious efforts made by ourselves and by various other delegations, it became clear that any decision taken here at the present time which did not command the overwhelming majority support of the United Nations, not necessarily unanimity, was not likely to fulfil the purposes of the Charter.

I would like to say that in the attempts we have made, we have had the co-operation of both the Greek and the United Kingdom delegations in the discussions; and it is not as though there was an attitude of absolute intolerance but rather an attempt to reach some point on which we could come before the Assembly, as last year--or someone else

<Pg-237>

could--and obtain agreement. But that was still prevented by the existing gaps.

Any question that is brought before the General Assembly, in the context that this question is brought forward, can be effectively decided only if there is co-operation in the sense that we have mentioned. The Government of India is neither unconcerned nor

insensitive to this matter, and I am asked to state its position. Our position is the same as was stated last year: that this is a colonial question. We stand four square by the independence of the Cypriot people and their right to be a sovereign State entitled to membership of the United Nations.

Cyprus has a long though chequered history, and going back 2,000 or 3,000 years this country, which has remained an entity, has been ruled by the Egyptians, by the Persians, by the Romans and the Byzantians, and afterwards it passed to the dictators, was conquered by the King of England and passed on to Knights Templars because he could not administer it, and then it was passed on to the Republics of Genoa and Venice, and finally came under Turkish rule for 300 years. Turkish interests were such that in 1878 it passed on that, administration to Britain. Then came the First World War, in which Turkey was on the side of the Central Powers, and Britain annexed Cyprus.

I will come at a later state to our view with regard to the interest of other parties. It has been argued that this is not a straightforward colonial question. I would not like to be cynical and say that colonial questions are never straightforward because colonialism is not straightforward. But there are no colonial questions which do not have complications. Cyprus is part, under the British Constitution and the Proclamation of 1951 of Her Majesty's other realms, the realms beyond the seas. The legal sovereignty of Cyprus rests in the United Kingdom. The political sovereignty of Cyprus rests in the Cypriot people. And when the legal sovereignty, which was obtained by annexation, is removed, then the Cypriot, people-irrespective of their nationality, whether they were of Greek ancestry of Byzantine ancestry or of Armenian ancestry or Turkish ancestry--will be members of what would be the Cypriot State when they become an independent nation.

Therefore, Cyprus, under all the published documents of the United Kingdom, is one of the realms of Her Britannic Majesty in the United Kingdom and is a Crown Colony. There is one thing further, which probably is somewhat esoteric to other people. It is not possible even for a parliament or a government easily to change the status of this just by a speech, because the status of Cyprus was conferred by letters patent in 1925. Letters patent are beyond the jurisdiction of parliament. It is possible for parliament to reduce the salary of judges, but it cannot reduce their statuses because they are covered by letters patent.

Therefore, we hold the view that Cyprus is a Crown Colony the same way as Ceylon was before it became independent, and then in other places as well. Our view about non-self-governing territories or colonies is that they are entitled to and must have independence so that they can take their place in the comity of nations.

There is not a denial of whatever right to self-will or self-election there may be. But there must be a self first. A subject people cannot

choose, and therefore their independence has to be established.

My delegation stated here on the last occasion that we do not consider that this land and its people should be the subject of a controversy as to who should have them, the British, the Greeks or the Turks. I think it is time that the Cyprus people, after all these years of subjection, came into their own nationhood. Therefore, we stand fully by their independence. We hope that the United Kingdom, in the pursuit of its liberal policy in Governments which has now become part of the general thinking of the British people, will find its way in the speediest possible time to resolve this question in a manner which is not now before the Assembly, namely, by enabling the people of Cyprus through peaceful means, as we would like to see it, to attain and to maintain their independence and for their country to take its place around this table as an independent nation.

My neighbour comes from Iceland. When I last spoke, the population of Iceland was somewhere around 155,000. I am now told it is 166,000. Cyprus has a population of half

a million. If Iceland can be a member and make effective contributions, there is no reason why any other country should not.

As an independent country situated in the Mediterranean with all the considerations that have been spoken about, in which we are not particularly interested, Cyprus would be safer because it would be in the interests of the great Powers not to interfere with it.

Therefore, we look to the day when the Cypriot people, evoking their great sense of nationalism, their industry and their particular position in the world, will be able by their efforts and aided by the sympathy of the Greeks and, I have no doubt, of the Turks and of the rest of the world as shown by this debate and by the liberal attitude in regard to former colonial territories that now exists in the metropolitan country, will be able to attain their independence.

It is necessary for us, however, to deal with what is called the tripartite claim. I hope that neither my colleague from Greece nor my colleague from Turkey will take exception to this, because it is my duty to state our position.

Reference has been made to the Treaty of Lausanne. The reliance is that there is some equilibrium established by the Treaty of Lausanne which confers upon Turkey certain rights. I looked through this Treaty. I found that article 16 states:

"Turkey hereby renounces all rights and title whatsoever over or respecting the territories situated outside the frontiers laid down in the present Treaty." This is not only with regard to Cyprus, but with regard to everything else. But when it comes more specifically to Cyprus, article 20 states:

"Turkey hereby recognizes the annexation of Cyprus proclaimed by the British Government on 5 November, 1914." It is not even as though Turkey ceded it. The act had already taken place and Turkey, by the solemn Treaty of which she was one of the high contracting parties, agreed to the annexation, recognized the sovereignty of His Britannic Majesty, as he was then, and Cyprus became part of the British Empire.

We go from there to article 21, which concludes this chapter. Article 21 states: "Turkish nationals ordinarily resident in Cyprus on 5 November, 1914, will acquire British nationality." So it is not only as though the territory was taken. Nobody was interested in keeping them Turkish. They acquired British nationality and so forth. Then it goes on to say that if any Turkish national still remained a Turk, he had to go back to Turkey. We will not go into how many went to Turkey. That is a different question. But they could not remain in Cyprus. If they did, they became under the law British subjects and they became Cypriots. So much as far as that is concerned.

In the same way, in order to maintain our objective position, it is necessary for me to state that the parties to this Treaty are the British Empire, France, Italy, Japan, Greece and Romania. Consequently Greece also, by these texts, became a party to the annexation and the establishment of this separate entity. We, therefore, think that while there may be many considerations-I think we are all concerned about every part of the world and every part of the world is concerned about us-these may be taken into account.

Our position is that the main parties in this matter are the peoples of Cyprus who are entitled to their freedom and the British Government which at present holds possession and authority over this island.

Finally, I am asked by the Government of India to state that while we were a sizable part of the British Empire, the mightiest we have known in modern times, our independence was established by means which denounced acts of violence on either side. We therefore do not subscribe to methods which go beyond the necessities of the ordinary maintenance of law and order or which exercise force in any way over subject peoples or to methods of terrorism which will never establish the independence of a people. For 50 years in our own country there were groups of people who thought that there was a short cut to freedom. There is no short cut except in the organization of the masses behind the idea of national independence.

Our abstention was not due to any support of colonial rule or any desire to see a state of subjection. It was, first of all, due to this consideration: that in the whole of

<Pg-239>

this debate, we have heard so much about the interests of Britain, of Greece and of Turkey. So far as we are concerned, the Greeks have

come here, as they have said, more or less representing the rights of the people of Cyprus in the same way as my Government has brought before the United Nations the question of people of Indian and Pakistani origin in South Africa. We have at no time said that these people are Indian nationals. They are not our nationals, and we do not accept them. We want them to remain in South Africa. They are South Africans. We come here partly because of cultural, racial or other affinities, partly because of our allegiance to the Charter, partly because of the violation of human rights and because we think it is a problem which may lead to very serious international complications in the future and racial conflicts. We regard the fact that Greece has inscribed the item merely in that aspect, and not as a territorial claim by Greece to Cyprus.

What the Cypriot people will do when they are independent is not for us or for the United Nations to decide. Because it is the essence of independence that people must make even their mistakes. If they do not make mistakes, often they do not make anything at all. So what happens in the future is not for us to decide. But any decision that has the odor, the colour or anything of that kind of conditioning their alignment in a future way would be inconsistent with the whole conception of national independence.

It is not easy for a delegation like ours to refrain from participating in a debate on a colonial question. But the greater part of it had been wrenched out of this context on account of past history. Last year, it was rehabilitated to its position of a colonial liberation. We think that this liberation, apart from all these theories, can only be established successfully and speedily in modern conditions by the peaceful process of negotiation. It is our view, therefore, that if negotiation has to go on--and whether one party is completely right or the other is completely wrong--it will be necessary to carry both of them with us.

We share the hopes of the delegation of Mexico that it may be possible in the next day or two to find some method by which the United Nations will be able to speed this process of negotiation, not for the purpose of putting off the day of Cypriot independence but so that Cypriot national independence may become an actual reality. Cyprus then will be able to take its place, even as other countries have done in recent times, round these tables as a free and equal member of the comity of nations.

INDIA CYPRUS USA EGYPT OMAN TURKEY ARMENIA ICELAND GREECE FRANCE ITALY JAPAN ROMANIA PAKISTAN SOUTH AFRICA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC MEXICO

Date: Dec 12, 1957

Volume No

INDIA IN THE UNITED NATIONS

Shri Krishna Menon's Speech On Peaceful Co-existence of States

Shri V. K. Krishna Menon, Leader of the Indian Delegation to the United Nations made the following statement in the debate on the declaration concerning the peaceful co-existence of States in the Twelfth Session of the Political Committee on Dec 13, 1957:--

The General Committee, after consideration of this question and in its wisdom, recommended that the item that we are now discussing should be considered by the General Assembly. I do not suppose that anyone, least of all my delegation, expected that this unanimous recommendation represented a unanimous or uniform approach to this problem. It is in the very nature of the subject that we are now discussing that the approach by different sovereign nations, with different forms of government, with different historical backgrounds, with different hopes, fears and suspicions, should be different. While some of us might have expected more or less acrimony, more or less hate, more or less insistence upon one aspect or the other, none of us would have hoped, none of us could have expected that a debate on the item that we are now considering could not but provoke and bring into relief the divergences of views that exist in the Assembly. From the point of view of my delegation, the expression of these divergences, so long as there is in the background of it the desire to work towards the ideals of the Charter and of the principles to which references have been made, do not very much matter.

Each year in this Assembly we consider large numbers of items. Some of them are in a sense specialities. In one Committee it is colonial problems and in another Committee

<Pg-240>

it may be economic problems in which either the whole of the Assembly or sections of it get rather exercised or more interested than others. There are items like disarmament which we discussed over a long time which concern all of us in equal measure, irrespective of approaches to them. We think that while our passionate or deep-felt approach to any of these problems, like the one that we were discussing yesterday are inevitable, an integrated approach to world problems are inevitable, an integrated approach to world problems become essential.

The United Nations is primarily concerned with the problem of world peace. In intervening in the disarmament debate, my delegation expressed the view that in present conditions we are really not discussing programmes, but we are really discussing the survival of

human civilization and indeed perhaps of a greater part of the human race.

The subject we are now considering is another aspect of the same problem. Disarmament is taking away, reversing the processes which have been put in motion because of either the fears or the suspicions or other factors that exist which operate against peaceful relations and tolerant attitudes of States between each other. I have no desire--it would not be appropriate for me--to reenter or to try to digress into the problem of disarmament which we have discussed and which, for the purpose of this Assembly, we have disposed of. But the problem that we are now considering is another and more positive aspect of it because even if a measure of disarmament were achieved, that in itself would not take the world towards peace unless members of the human society now organized in sovereign States decided to live together in conditions which are set out in the resolution that is before us, of tolerance and mutual respect, respect for each other's sovereignty, etc.

In introducing the subject, the representative of the Soviet Union yesterday made a speech which I am happy to think differs to a very considerable extent from the tone of the memorandum which introduced the subject to the General Committee. The view of my delegation is that once an item is admitted-by the General Committee, then it becomes the property of the Assembly. While we have taken no initiative in this matter, both in the course of the General debate in the Assembly and in the course of the debate of this item here, reference has been made to the policy of my country and to what are now called the five principles and to various other matters in which we are deeply and profoundly interested. In fact, they form the basis of our approach to our relations with other countries in the world and to international problems generally.

At the same time, I should like to say that the Government of India attaches no importance either to the numeral "five" or to any particular formulations of it; the content is more important than anything else. That we live together in this world, either as individuals or as nations, has no particular merit because there is no escape from this planet so, in one form or another, so long as we are surviving we shall be existing. That is not sufficient. It is necessary for human beings in our civilized communities to live together in mutual tolerance, and I would submit to this Committee that while it may not so appear now, what we are actually discussing is merely the extension of that to the international field. In civilized communities individuals and groups, people of different races and backgrounds, of different opinions and different political parties, have to find ways of adjusting and tolerating each other, sometimes of suffering each other. And, therefore, what we are now discussing is the extension of that democratic principle into the field of international affairs.

I said a short time ago that we appreciated the statement of the Soviet representative, which contained far fewer controversial points

than are usually found in such speeches. In our view, the Soviet representative made an approach to this problem which is more in keeping with the nature of the subject. We are equally appreciative, indeed, we are in debt, to the delegation of the United States for the very forthright statement made by the United States representative this morning in regard to the proposals we have placed before this Committee. Since we are nearing the end of the General Assembly, I suppose that the rigid rule about the division between the general debate stage and the draft resolution stage will be waived to a certain extent. In any case, the representative of the United States did us the

<Pg-241>

honour of introducing our draft resolution this morning, so that at some stage in the course of my observations I shall, on behalf of the sponsors of the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/L.198, formally introduce that draft resolution.

I said a while ago that we did not claim any particular sanctity either for the numeral "five" for or for the label of "Principles" or even for the phraseology contained in them. Indeed, in the various statements of the Government of India and of other countries of the East, West, North and South there have been variations of phraseology. There were also variations of phraseology at the Bandung Conference. We go further and say that neither the present generation of Indians nor our country has a prescriptive right in this matter. I will not go so far back as the edict issued 2,500 years ago, which is only of historical interest but, of sentimental interest to us, but we are near enough to the Western world, and I have found in the well documented publication, the Department of State Bulletin of the United States, that as far back as 26 November 1941 the United States proposed the adoption of a draft mutual declaration of policy. This contains the fundamental principles upon which their relations with each other and with other countries were to be based, and the phraseology was practically the same as that adopted by India and others. The principles were: firstly, the principle of the inviolability of the territorial integrity and the sovereignty of all nations, secondly the principle of non-interference in the internal affairs of other countries; thirdly, the principle of equality, including the equality of commercial opportunity and treatment; and, fourthly, the principle of reliance upon international co-operation and conciliation for the prevention and pacific settlement of controversies and for the improvement of international conditions by peaceful methods. Those principles were formulated before the conclusion of the war, and perhaps if this resolution had not remained in draft, the course of past history might have been different, but that is by the way.

From his statement this afternoon, the representative of Peru seemed to have some difficulties, because he thought that this might be some attempt to rewrite the Charter or at a derogation of it, or something of that kind. I should like to make two observations on this. First

of all, if the representative of Peru has taken the view that something is contained in the Charter and, therefore, we need not discuss it, then we would not have to come here at all because everything is in the Charter. It is true, as they say, that there is nothing new under the sun. But we can look closer to Peru, and look at the Charter of the American States which was signed at Bogota on 30 April 1948. I would invite the attention of those who are interested to certain articles in this Charter of the Organisation of American States. Here again we have the same ideas of territorial integrity, of sovereignty, independence, of non-aggression by one State against another, of economic co-operation, of non-intervention in the affairs of other people, and various other matters of that kind.

In the course of the debate, reference has been made to the current history of those so-called "five principles," and so far as my country is concerned, in one form or another they have been agreed to and subscribed to, either directly or indirectly, by a large number of States on all continents. There are 20 to 21 countries, I hope I have not left anyone out, in Asia, in Africa, if Europe and on the American continent which are direct signatories of these principles. The countries in Europe include the Federal Republic of Germany; in America, they include Chile.

There is another significant factor to which I should draw the attention of the Committee. That is that at the end of the visit of Bulganin and Khrushchev to London, a statement was issued on the discussions, and it contained the following:

The two countries in their relations with each other and also in their relations with other countries will be guided by the principles of the United Nations. They are convinced that the basis of friendly co-operation and peaceful co-existence of countries, irrespective of their social systems, irrespective of national independence and sovereignty, territorial integrity and non-interference in the internal affairs of others

That was not a statement made by the Government of India. It was a statement made by the United Kingdom and the Soviet Union. So far as Western Europe is concerned, the

<Pg-242>

Prime Minister of the United Kingdom, during his visit to India, expressed himself in favour of those principles and of our policy based upon it.

The United States Ambassador to India, speaking to us on 27 September 1955, explained that the United States did not consider strength the ultimate answer to world peace. He adhered to the five principles "in words and in purposes"--those are his words. He stated that these, which India had enunciated, were but another expression of what had already been expressed in many treaties since the last war and in the

United Nations Charter.

About the same time, in October, the Secretary of State for Commonwealth Relations, Earl Home, said:

This brings me to the point where I believe it is possible to state with truth that the objectives of foreign policy of the United Kingdom and India and other Commonwealth countries are identical. Mr. Nehru has himself named principles of living together in world society to which we have all subscribed.

I am not trying to make this a testimony meeting. Our country claims no prescriptive rights, no rights of originality and no monopoly with regard to these ideas. In fact, it does not come to us either as a revelation or as something we inherited from some unknown source. It is purely a pragmatic approach to a problem.

In the United Nations more populous countries and less populous countries have all expressed these opinions. Mr. Thors of Iceland, speaking at San Francisco, on the 10th anniversary of the United Nations, said on behalf of Iceland:

The world has two roads to choose between, and this has already been said here and will be said over and over again. One is the road of disputes, disagreements, discord and conflicts. This is bound, sooner or later, to lead to war, to ruins and to the extinction of civilization. The other road leads to peaceful co-existence and co-operation between all nations under the dome of the United Nations. There is practically no; limit to the prosperity and the well-being that-can be given to humanity if the leaders of our world will agree to live in peace and understanding.

We are appreciative of the reference to this in the speech made by Mr. Gromyko in the General Assembly, which now appears as a draft resolution before this Committee. The Committee well knows that my delegation and my country have no particular feelings about who sponsors a resolution, but rightly or wrongly--and I think rightly--our co-sponsors and we came to the conclusion that this Committee was more likely to accept and appreciate a formulation which was more in keeping with the approach made in some other speeches. That is reflected in the draft resolution which the Committee has before it.

The approach of India in this matter is, as the representative of Finland said yesterday, that we do not claim to prescribe what is good for other countries. We simply say that this is the kind of approach we like to make, and we hope that if it were acceptable to the others it would lead to better relations. In pursuance of this policy we have tried to establish, and In a very considerable measure have succeeded in establishing, close friendships with countries of entirely different persuasions. This applies not merely to visits of cultural delegations, and things of that kind.

For instance, in our very considerable economic development, such

countries with divergent systems as the United States, the Soviet Union, Czechoslovakia and Germany have all come to our assistance, and our relations are based upon mutual respect.

During the visit of my Prime Minister to Moscow, when a joint statement was made, the question obviously was discussed in regard to ideologies, and I think there is no use disguising the fact that there has been apprehension--and to a certain extent it prevails in the non-communist world--that there may still be the practice of imposing ideologies upon friendly nations. So the original draft of the so-called five principles was changed in Moscow in its article 3, which reads:

No interference in each other's internal affairs for any reason of an economic, political or ideological character.

<Pg-243>

So that by adherence to these ideas we do not in any way abandon our principles or our approach. We are not surprised although we may sometimes be distressed at the degree of heat that is introduced into the controversy.

Soon after my Prime Minister returned from Moscow, Mr. Mohammed Ali, who was then Prime Minister of Pakistan, said in an interview in Calcutta on 24 June 1955 that the addition of this third clause--that is, the one I read out just now--was more comprehensive and was a great improvement on previous statements, and he agreed with it. Thus, whether it be on the European continent, in great parts of America or in Asia, there has been, irrespective of the differences that exist, a desire to implement the purposes of the United Nations Charter in these more concrete terms.

I need hardly say that it would be a mistake to look upon this formulation as in any way limiting the purposes of the Charter, because if representatives look at the draft resolution which is before them, but which I do not propose to deal with in detail at the present moment, they will see that the second paragraph says, "Recalling that among the fundamental objectives of the Charter" and so on. No one says that this exhausts the objectives of the Charter. I would ask the Committee to accept the view that those who sponsor this draft resolution, and certainly the Government of India, have no desire either to rewrite the Charter or to question its adequacy. This is under the umbrella of the United Nations.

We think, at this stage of the Assembly, especially in view of the developments that have taken place, that if we could all come together--not merely to cover a crack in granite with a piece of tissue paper, but with some desire for a common agreement of this character--that might assist to a small extent in the further attempts towards the lowering of tensions or in finding ways out of other unresolved problems.

Mr. Cabot Lodge said this morning that declarations are not enough; that tones are not enough; that deeds a necessary. No one would challenge that statement. But we, think that even deeds are not adequate, because if a deed is to be understood or done in the right way by the doer himself it requires a correctness of approach, and therefore even an approach which is called a tone has its value.

In the attempt we are now making we are not in any way questioning the doubts and apprehensions that exist in the minds of various countries, but we think that if the General Assembly were to approve the declaration unanimously it would serve to rally the forces of world opinion and the minds of people to its main purposes—not that the Charter is not adequate, but as a constant reminder.

As I said at the beginning I do not, for various reasons, want to go into any great detail about this matter. I reserve my right, if necessary, to speak on the draft resolution later. We have, in our own experience, good reason to be satisfied that this approach is the correct one. Our position and our relationship to what is called the Commonwealth, particularly the United Kingdom, is based upon this approach. In the economic field, in the Colombo Plan and various other schemes, it is the same kind of mutual respect for the consideration of one's own interests that dominates our consideration.

The Committee need hardly be reminded that in the last few years, whether it be on the European continent, in the case of Austria and Trieste, or in other parts of the world, in connexion with the halting of the war in Korea, the war in Indo-China, and various other instances of that kind--whether within the strict formal bounds of the United Nations or otherwise--wherever progress has been made, it has been on the basis of negotiation or conciliation or of recognizing the differences and still trying to aim at an objective.

Our first partner in this matter was China--the China that we recognize. And I should like to say here--it would be wrong of me not to say it--that we have 3,000 miles of frontier with China and, in the 4,000 or 5,000 years of our recorded relations, there has been no aggression against our territory by China, and we do not anticipate or apprehend anything of that kind.

The relations with countries that are far away from us--because our nationhood is so

<Pg-244>

new and our contact with the outside world before our independence was naturally circumscribed through the then policies. I am not making a reflection upon them. But this approach has brought about not only closeness, but understanding, and, if I may be allowed in modesty to say this, it even helped us to a certain extent to enable us to react to others who may hold different views, in accordance with the facts as we see them.

So it is not only in regard to our own country, but in our functioning in the international field--in the United Nations, for example-the approach that we make, is, that there are differences and they must be recognized.

We agree with the United States and with the Soviet Union--not only do we agree but we would like to proclaim--that deeds are necessary. But we say that, even with deeds, an approach, the reiteration of an approach, a proclamation of it, has its value. It certainly has its value in the larger field of world public opinion.

In view of the Chairman's desire to save time, my delegation does not wish to elaborate on this very much more.

Questions have been asked--as why the word "coexistence" does not appear in it. As usual with our delegation, we do not shirk any of these questions. We think what we have said here--"realizing the need to promote these objectives and to develop peaceful and tolerant relations among States"--goes very much further, even in content, than the mere concept of existing side by side. As the representative of Peru has said, it is necessary to do more than simply to co-exist. It is what in some parts of the world has been called a positive approach to this problem.

At any rate, I do not propose to argue the resolution at the moment. But in view, of the opinions expressed, and while there has been no opposition to the resolution that we and our co-sponsors have submitted, some opposition has been expressed to the other--and, since the so-called five principles are the main kernel of this matter, the Government of India desires me to say that we cannot subscribe to any resolution that discriminates, by way of judgment, on the performance of one country or another. We cannot say that one country has behaved better than the other countries, and we could not subscribe to any discriminatory clause of that kind.

We are grateful that the reference to the five principles appears in the Soviet resolution. My country has expressed more than once its appreciation of the fact that they subscribe to it, and, what is more, introduced the amendment that I referred to in regard to part three of it. Our relations are based upon this--whether it be the economic or any other field--and, since the desire of all of us is to obtain the maximum degree of agreement on this matter, I hope that the U.S.S.R. will not take it amiss if we say that if, as a result of the debate, it is revealed that there is a considerable volume of opinion which is likely to give the proposal that we have submitted the kind of support that would be useful in the world, we would have to ask the Chairman for leave to move for priority for this. It is not in any way to displace the previous proposal. My delegation is not normally in the habit of asking for priorities, and we do not think that priorities should be asked for merely because one can get the votes. But we think that in this particular case it is far more important for the subject we are discussing, it is important for

creating confidence in the world, for giving some hope to those who may feel rather disappointed in regard to some of the decisions we may or may not have been able to reach, that we are going out with at least an attempt at a new approach.

We do not say for one moment that the passing of this resolution, any more than the United Nations Charter, would solve all the problems. If it is argued that the declaration or a resolution will not solve the problems and therefore is unnecessary, we might equally say that the Charter has not solved all the problems and has created a lot of difficulties at times. That is why people try to amend- it. We do not say that those problems will not be there. In fact, it is the existence of these problems that makes an approach necessary. If there were no differences, there would be no necessity to ask for attempts to resolve them.

Therefore, I hope that the position of my Government will not be misunderstood if, on the one hand, we ask for priority for this,

$$<$$
Pg-245>

and, the other, appeal to this Committee to give our resolution its unanimous support and not regard it as an attempt on the part of ourselves or our co-sponsors to foist on the Assembly something that is foreign to it.

I want to reiterate the fact that it is not only within the four corners of the Charter. It is in implementation of the Charter. It says that it is not the whole of the Charter, and it is our firm belief that, particularly in the present state of the world, divided as it is into two great armed camps, each side trying with equal earnestness to see a way out and not able to find one because of the prevalence of suspicion, of fear, of past history and of disillusionment—we think that the present is a very opportune moment.

I would like to conclude by reiterating what the representative of Finland said yesterday. There is one thing that we cannot be impatient with, and that is the creating of confidence. You cannot create confidence in the way that the president of an American university appears to have said once--that "this tradition will start the day after tomorrow." You just cannot do that. It takes time. The only way to create confidence is to take some risks of peace. If we are prepared to take the risks of war, we are equally entitled to take the risks of peace.

The resolution that will be submitted, the proposals we are discussing, the whole of this subject, is something which, so far as our people are concerned, has entered deep into their hearts and minds, and the support that the Assembly gives will be a great inspiration, particularly to the people who have recently come into freedom--undeveloped economically, having great faith in the United Nations, and looking forward to a world which will not be rent by

war. But, in spite of all their differences. and there are many ways in which we ourselves fall by the wayside in regard to these principles--we do not try to conceal that fact--but it sets a line, a direction, and for that reason we ask for unanimous support and we hope we will get it.

INDIA USA INDONESIA PERU COLOMBIA GERMANY CHILE UNITED KINGDOM ICELAND FINLAND NORWAY SLOVAKIA RUSSIA PAKISTAN SRI LANKA AUSTRIA CHINA KOREA

Date: Dec 13, 1957

Volume No

1995

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

Prime Minister's Speech in Lok Sabha

Initiating a debate on Dec 17, 1957 in the Lok Sabha on the present international situation the Prime Minister said: Sir, I beg to move: "That the present international situation and the policy of the Government of India relation thereto be taken into consideration."

Normally on such occasions, this House is interested in the problems which directly affect India, problems of our neighbouring areas such as Pakistan, Goa and, to some extent, Ceylon, as well as other problems. No doubt, we are interested in those problems. But if you will permit me, I shall not refer to them much or at all at this stage. If necessity arises, I shall say a few words about them in the course of my reply, that is, if honourable members opposite draw my attention to any particular aspect of them which needs reply.

In opening this debate on international affairs, I have both an advantage and a disadvantage. The advantage is that I believe that in so far as the Government of India's foreign policy is concerned, there is such a very wide measure of agreement all over the country and in this House that, to some extent, it becomes for me a question of shadwo-boxing--so far as our country and this House is concerned. Because the Members not only on my side of the House but those on the other side have been good enough, in spite of occasional criticism, in spite of laying. some emphasis on some matter which, according to them, deserves greater emphasis than has been given. But, by and large, they have accepted and approved all the broad policies that we pursue in the international sphere. Indeed, so far as our Government is concerned and so far as I am concerned, I have become more and more convinced of the rightness of that broad international policy after all the experience of the last few years.

<Pg-246>

matters which are not in the context of this major international policy but which deserve attention and which ofcourse cause much concern. One is in regard to the situation in Indonesia. The House knows our views about this controversy that has gone on now for many years in regard to West Irian. We have held that both on larger consideration and even, I would say, in regard to the interpretation of the agreements arrived at between the parties, West Irian should become part of Indonesia.

We have also held in regard to that, as in regard to other matters wherever they occur that it is always better, it is always desirable, to settle these matters peacefully by negotiation, even though that might take some time. Therefore, we viewed with concern these recent developments there which followed--I should like the House to remember--the failure of a resolution put forward in the United Nations. That resolution, which I thought, and many of us thought, was a very moderate and statesman-like resolution, unfortunately, though not defeated exactly, because it got a majority of votes, failed to get the two-thirds majority which is necessary in such cases. As a matter of fact, it got 41 votes in favour to 29 against, a considerable number abstaining.

The defeat of that resolution was unfortunate because it was a moderate, conciliatory approach to the problem, so that the problem might be discussed further by the countries concerned. But because it did not get the two-thirds majority, it failed, according to the rules of the United Nations. I am afraid this failure had a very strong reaction in Indonesia, and many things happened there which have tended to make the situation even more difficult than it was.

Recently, I believe, the situation has improved to some extent, in the sense that it is fairly well under control of the Indonesian Government, and it is hoped that the improvement will continue. I can only repeat that this question can only be solved satisfactorily by the two Governments concerned, that is, the Indonesian Government and the Government of the Netherlands, taking it up and discussing and considering it, because it is obvious that unless it is solved, this kind of sore will continue, poisoning not only their relations but, to some extent, the relations of Asia and Europe!

One basic fact has to be remembered, regardless of the particular problems that exist in parts of Asia, that in the new Asia that has arisen, it is very difficult for that Asia to stomach or to digest any foreign occupation anywhere. That is regardless of the justification of any particular problem; it just goes against the spirit of the times, the spirit of Asia as it is. Such foreign occupation may continue for sometime, a short time or a long time, but it will always be resented; it will always create difficulties

and undoubtedly will ultimately have to be given up.

If that is so, then surely it is the path of wisdom to do that in a friendly co-operative way now rather than later when passions have been roused much more intensely and feelings are much more bitter. So I earnestly hope that this problem of Indonesia will, instead of both those countries getting more and more involved, angry with each other, whatever the occasion for the anger may be, should be dealt with directly by them discussing it, by negotiation. In fact, that was the resolution which was put forward before the United Nations which, unfortunately, did not get the concurrence of the majority.

There is another country very near to us, very close to us viz. Nepal, where the King has recently made a statement about elections. We welcome any statement which indicates that elections will be held there, for we feel that the holding of elections, although that may offer some difficulties, is the only proper course to bring about some kind of a Government responsible to a legislature. We hope, therefore, that the recent difficulties which the Government and the people in Nepal had to face will now end for the time being, and all their energies will be directed towards the preparation for these elections and the other schemes that they have to improve the condition of the people of Nepal.

Now, coming to the big and broad issue, the major issue in the world which today dominates everything else, the issue of war and peace--I do not mean to say that war is round the corner and suddenly might appear and yet it is, in another sense, not round the corner but almost above our heads all the time now--although we have referred to this matter many times here in this House

$$<$$
Pg-247>

and elsewhere, I do speak about this in terms of greater urgency today than I have ever done before.

The other day, I ventured to make an appeal which was addressed to the other great countries and more especially to the United States of America and the Soviet Union because, after all, it is in the hands of those who hold the reins of authority in these two countries that the question of peace and war depends. I ventured to address an appeal to them and I have had replies from both, the heads of both those countries. They have appeared in the public Press and so I need not refer to them in any detail. I am very grateful for the trouble Mr. Bulganin and President Eisenhower have taken to reply at considerable length.

I should like Hon. Members to consider those replies because, while there appear to be some differences in approach, some criticism of each other, basically, it will be noticed how strong the desire for peace and for some arrangements to ensure peace is evident from both those replies. It may be that some people may lay stress on the differences; but, I think it would be right for us here as it would

be right anywhere else for us, rather to lay stress on the similarities, on the common urges, on the common desires and the common objectives than on the differences. There are differences, of course; otherwise, there would be no question of this crisis having arisen. I think the time has come when this issue has ceased to be completely a theoretical issue and is an issue of the highest practical importance.

It is an issue which does not merely demand a moral an ethical approach. I hope the moral and ethical approach is always there; but, sometimes the purely moral and ethical approach is called an impractical one. There appears to be some strange presumption that everything practical should be immoral and unethical. However, today, I would certainly lay stress on the moral and ethical approach because morality and ethics are involved when there is a question of extermination of the human species in a general way, when there is the question of war weapons being used for mass slaughter. There can be no doubt that from any approach moral and ethical questions are involved. But, there is something much more perhaps which may be appreciated by many people and that is a very definite, practical and, if you like, the opportunist approach to this problem. And, all the arguments in the world, blaming one party or the other will not help us or will not save us or humanity unless there is some solution of this problem. The time has gone by, I submit, when any of these great countries, opposed to each other in military alliances and blocs can morally justify their attitude, or their policy by criticising the other party even though that criticism might be justified and might be right. It will not help at all because what the world seeks to achieve is not some self justification of one's action but survival, to freedom from the daily fear that oppresses humanity today.

In Europe, and maybe elsewhere, aircraft fly about with hydrogen bombs on them all the time. Why? Because they must be ever ready to, they say, defend themselves. What an extraordinary state of affairs! Every country does the most aggressive things in the name of defence. But, even if that was necessary in the name of defence, it is obvious that even a very slight accident might let loose all the horrors of war to prevent which all this is being done.

Now, a little while ago, there were some resolutions put forward in the United Nations; and I should like to refer to them because they represent an approach which though it may not be considered very satisfactory by Hon. Members here--many of them--nevertheless is the only reasonable approach left today to deal with the highly controversial problems. One was the resolution on Algeria and the other was the resolution which, unfortunately, did not succeed; and that was the Indonesia resolution which I referred to. If it was accepted nothing much would have happened except that it would have opened the door to talk, for a consideration of the problem without finally committing anybody to anything. Naturally, the time will have to come sometime however early or late. However, that did not get the two-thirds majority.

Now, Algeria has been a terribly frustrated problem, frustrating to everybody, to Algerians, to the French and the others. There has been a horrible war going on and the accounts we read of that war and of the

<Pg-248>

large-scale killing of people are very bad. How is one to deal with that problem? Our reaction, the reaction of this House, is obviously that Algeria should be independent. True; we agree. How are we to help Algeria to become independent? By passing a resolution in this House? Perhaps, this is an expression of the will of this Parliament but that does not go far. In the United Nations also the same difficulty comes.

Therefore, the attitude we have endeavoured to take up there in such problems where our views are completely well-known is nevertheless not merely to be the protoganists of one set of views, loudly proclaiming them and condemning those who oppose us; but rather we have always endeavoured to try to bring about a method of conciliation. It may fail; it may not succeed; but even an attempt to do that is helpful.

In this Algerian affair a resolution was passed; it did not go terribly far. But it is a remarkable thing that where such passions are involved, the resolution was passed almost unanimously in the U.N. It is a remarkable thing. Only France did not vote for it. Even France did not oppose it. That itself shows that the resolution did not go very far. True. But it helped

We have to deal with tremendously difficult problems, which apart from the difficulties involved in them, are on the verge of other major problems of the world, the hydrogen bomb and other ballistic weapons and the like are there to warn you of what would be the fate of the world if a false step is taken. Today, the United States of America and the Soviet Union are the big powers with the biggest, longest and the most dangerous weapons. The United Kingdom has also joined with the Hyrogen Bomb Club though presumably comparatively it is weaker than those two. I have no doubt that within a relatively short time, France will also be experimenting with its test hydrogen bomb explosions.

So, you see how the world drifts on and I have no doubt that other countries will do so in another year or six months. It will go on and it will become absolutely impossible to control this deterioration and decline. Therefore, we are today at a rather critical moment in history--not only in our country but the world. If we fail to take advantage of this moment, the results may be very bad.

Recently, only two or three clays ago, a resolution was passed, also unanimously, by the U.N.--a resolution sponsored by India, Yugoslavia and Sweden, three countries which are not aligned with any bloc of

nations. Although they have different ways, they have this in common that they are not in military alliances with any bloc of nations, This resolution was on peaceful co-existence. The resolution referred in actual terms to the so-called five principles which are well-known and which were originally drafted and placed before the public in a document signed by India and China. Since then, these principles have been adopted by a number of countries. It is, I think, a great gain that even in the form they have been put up, before the United Nations they should have been accepted unanimously.

I do not attach too much importance to this fact. But, I do wish to point out that all these efforts in which India has played a considerable part together with other countries who are equally motivated with a desire for peace, do not suddenly take us out of the danger zone. They are all intended to help to create an atmosphere where one can consider the problems of today in a very objective way without this terrible oppression of fear.

There was a resolution proposed by the Soviet Delegation on peaceful co-existence in the Political Committee of the U.N. So far as the resolution went, it was undoubtedly one with which we agreed. None-the-less, it was not a resolution which, as worded, was acceptable to some other countries. Then, with some other countries, notably Yugoslavia and Sweden as well as others, India conferred and placed a different draft which embodied the substance of the other resolutions but-tried to avoid anything said in it which might just possibly irritate any country. Fortunately, we were successful in this. This resolution obtained the approval of the great countries. The U.S.A. supported it warmly. The Soviet Delegation were not only good enough to support this, but withdrew their own resolution so that it might not come in the way. I am very grateful to them for this because in effect they have priority for their resolution. But, they withdrew it.

<Pg-249>

This may mean little but it means a lot too because it shows that once the approach of mutual recrimination and mutual criticism goes, it is much easier for countries to come together because in the final analysis, there is a tremendous deal in common between these apparently rival great powers. Above all, there is the common desire to survive.

I believe in the speech that President Eisenhower delivered at the NATO Conference yesterday--it appears in this morning's papers--he says that the time has gone when there can be any victory of one side over another. I do not remember his exact words. I am giving the sense. `The time has come when any right solution can only be a victory for all,' he has said.

Those are pregnant words; they are very right indeed. If that is true, it is not only in the case of war. This is applied presumably to the possibility of war; there could be no victory any one. The

only real victory for everybody is to put an end to this fear of war.

If that is so, that approach also applies and should apply to the cold war. I cannot understand how people talk about peace and the necessity for avoidance of war, but at the same time indulge in cold war, which precipitates or adds or increases our passions and brings about a situation which progressively is more dangerous and may burst at any moment.

I would again beg the Hon. Members to read carefully what Premier Bulganin and President Eisenhower have said in their replies to me and to observe how much there is in common in the approach although they criticise each other. If I may say so, with a great deal of respect, it has become the habit to criticise the other party, although criticism may be needed occasionally. Let us at least lay greater stress on the common bonds than on the points of difference.

Now, it is often said that all this is done for the sake of security, to, ensure security. It is a strange way to ensure security, to add to every conceivable danger. But, anyhow, it is in the name of security that all these various steps are justified. In the name of security atomic tests should go on, in the name of security hydrogen bombs should be flown all over the place, in the name of security all kinds of tremendous weapons should be evolved, and in the name of security each party slangs the, other and thereby creates an atmosphere where danger becomes more acute. I do not myself find it easy to follow, these arguments. Of course; I must and everyone must recognise the argument for security. No country and no government can risk the future of itself, or can accept a position when another country can impose its will upon it. I accept that. But, in order to attain security if measures are to be taken which really endanger it still further, then you fail in getting that security.

I do not propose to discuss the various subjects that have come up in disarmament conferences and in the United Nations in regard to disarmament, because it is a complicated subject. But it did seem to us some months ago, last summer, that for the first time an agreement became conceivable, that means an agreement principally between two, three or four great powers. We may vote and we may pass a resolution about it, but it is a little difficult when the people who possess hydrogen bombs do not agree not to use them. Therefore, last summer, five or six months ago, there was some hope of this agreement, but a little later various things happened which somehow almost put disarmament into the shade, it hardly remained a live issue, it was put aside, there was a complete dead pause and that continues still. It is very unfortunate and very dangerous. The Soviet Government withdraw from the conference--not permanently, of course, I hope, but, nevertheless, for the time being withdrew--and, therefore, at the present moment there are not even talks going on on that subject, and that is a dangerous position.

So, it is not for me here, and especially for us here, to argue the details of disarmament. It is a fact that the differences at one time

were very limited, but something else happened which widened them. That 'something else' is the mental approach to the problem, the approach of fear, the approach of anger, the approach of not being made to appear that one is weak. It is the approach which uses the words: "Let us have a tough policy, let us speak from strength".

<Pg-250>

We have been hearing these words of "speaking from strength" for many years now. The result is: not the accretion of strength to one side; when one side grows a little stronger the other side grows stronger also, so that merely any reference of strength induces the other party to build up its strength as rapidly as possible, and you are where you were, perhaps in a worse condition.

It is extraordinary how old slogans, old phrases and old pious platitudes go on being repeated without any real attempt being made to grapple and wrestle with this problem and put an end to it, because the time is gone-by for resolutions, the time is gone by for just wishful thinking, and we have to, and these great powers have to come to grips with the actual reality that any slip not even on the part of their governments but of individual gentlemen or commanders or somebody might precipitate a world war. Surely, the first thing necessary for the sake of security is to prevent this odd slip which might occur on the part of tens of thousands of persons who are in command here and there, whereby a war will be precipitated.

I should, just to refresh your memory, like to read to you this resolution on co-existence, that was passed by the United Nations a few days ago, which represents an approach, an outlook, which does not solve any problem. I was beginning to feel more and more that the basic difficulty that we have is this mental approach, that is so wrong. I do not say that a change of mental approach will solve the problems of the world. Of course, not. But it will change the nature of those problems, it will make them easier of solution, and it will certainly give some security and peace to the minds of men and women. This was the resolution on co-existence:

The General Assembly considering the urgency and the importance of strengthening international peace and of developing peaceful and neighbourly relations among States irrespective of their divergences or the relative stages and nature of their political economic and social development.

Recalling that among the fundamental objectives of the Charter are the maintenance of international peace and security and friendly cooperation among States. Realising the need to promote these objectives and to develop peaceful and tolerant relations among States in conformity with the Charter, based on mutual respect and benefit, non aggression, respect for each other's sovereignty, equality and territorial integrity and non-intervention in one another's internal affairs, and to fulfil the purposes and principles of the Charter. Recognising the need to broaden international

cooperation, to reduce tensions, and to settle differences and disputes among State by peaceful means.

Calls upon all States to make, every effort to strengthen international peace, and to develop friendly and co-operative relations and settle disputes by peaceful means as enjoined in the Charter and as set forth in this Resolution"

If the spirit underlying this resolution actuated the Governments concerned, well, a very great deal of progress would be made.

People seem to think today, some people, that the conflict, the differences that separate nations are almost unbridgeable; that either war comes with whatever it may bring, or else rival and armed camps continue glaring at each other, at the most with some kind of uneasy co-existence. Only 11 years ago--or is it 12 now?--when the last Great War ended, and if Hon. Members can take back their minds to the date of the war, when the war was occurring they will remember the bitter passions and hatred that were aroused between the enemies, and now we see those countries that were enemies today are closely allied; they are allies today in military alliances and also ideological and other alliances. And, we see those countries that were allies, today poles apart, afraid of each other, threatening each other. Is that not extra-ordinary? But is it not still more extra-ordinary that people should think that the present bitter differences should continue for ever? All history shows us that friends and allies sometimes become enemies and enemies become friends, and even the history of the last ten years has shown us this. Why then persist in a policy which perpetuates these enmities? Even a bitter and a bloody war comes to an end and there is peace at the end of it, after a terrible slaughter and killing

<Pg-251>

and destruction. Why wait for a war before you seek peace?

Surely it should be wiser to have peace before a war comes or to work for it and not to allow yourselves to be driven into a war. That of course would be so at any time, but now, when we have reached the age of these tremendous ballistic weapons, hydrogen bombs and space travel, we have reached an age where all old conceptions do not apply. Nobody knows what the future might be. It is said by people who know something about military and defence matters that in a war that may come things will be completely different, that all the tactics and the strategy learnt previously, even in the last great war, would not apply, because conditions are completely different. That is so.

May I suggest that conditions of thinking, of political and international thinking, are also completely different now? And merely repeating old slogans, old phrases and the old mental approaches does not help today. The problems are different. The way the problems have arisen, the way these big, enormous weapons have come into being--

great forces are being released--require entirely a different order of thinking.

I would add, with great humility and great respect, that they also demand some consideration on a different plane than the purely military plane; some consideration which I cannot describe properly perhaps, say, some consideration on an ethical plane; but quite apart from that, even on the strictest material, defence and military plane, which is so alike, on a political plane, because international affairs and defence are closely allied to each other. In defence thinking has got to be on a very, very different line, then surely political thinking on the international plane must also be equally different, and it is not good enough to think in the same old way.

And the full realisation must come--if I may repeat President Eisenhower's statement--that there can be no settlement and no real peace unless it is a victory for all. If any group or country thinks that it is going to score in the cold war, it is mistaken. In either hot war or cold war you can go on till you destroy each other.

Therefore, the only way is to approach it differently and realise that war can no longer solve these problems, cold or hot, and also realise, which is a fact, that the people of every country, barring none, passionately desire peace. There is no doubt about it; whether it is the people of the United States or the Soviet Union or any country, they passionately desire peace. Why not then allow this tremendous urge for peace to have full play and to help in reaching agreements between these countries which ensure their peace?

I would like just to mention one matter. Today, the NATO council is meeting in Paris. It is not for me to advise them, because, as I have indicated previously, we are not very much in favour of these military alliances today; and we do not think they create that atmosphere which will lead to a settlement. As I said previously, it is not for me to say, and I am only talking about the position today. Every step of this kind is met by counter-step on the other side; there you are where you were. Anyhow they are meeting and they consist of great powers and I do earnestly hope that their deliberations will lead to a peaceful approach and not to this attempt at continued rivalry.

No one knows--I do not at any rate--which power today is stronger. Today, in the realm of these new types of weapons, maybe in some the United States may be stronger and in some other matters the Soviet Union might be stronger. But the point is that both are strong enough to destroy the other and the world. So, it matters very little who is a little stronger than the other. If that is so, then this rivalry in weapons ceases to have much meaning, because, even if you get some slightly better weapon, you will be destroyed nevertheless.

One thing more, just to clarify a matter which sometimes people may not be sure of. It is about Kashmir and the recent resolution in the Security Council and the fact that Dr. Graham, has been invited in that resolution to visit India and Pakistan. Our position has been stated with such clarity and force by our representative, Shri Krishna Menon, that it is not necessary for me to say anything about it except to say that what our representative has said there is precisely

<Pg-252>

our position. Let there he no mistake about it. He has stated our position and the whole history of this Kashmir case with great lucidity.

This problem of Kashmir, according to us, cannot be solved till the whole approach is not a different one, till the whole approach is not one of the vacation of aggression which Pakistan has committed. If that is admitted then other things flow from it. If that is not admitted, then no step forward can be taken about this. Dr. Graham has been invited by the Security Council to visit here. Dr. Graham is ofcourse welcome here. He is an esteemable gentleman as many of us know. The other people also, if they wish to come, can come here. But we have made clear, our representative in the Security Council made it perfectly clear, that we are not prepared to consider this visit of Dr. Graham as some kind of continuation of his previous visits or a continuation of the previous talks which he had with us. Conditions have changed completely and we are not prepared to continue those talks in that context. Otherwise, he is welcome as all others are welcome.

INDIA USA PAKISTAN INDONESIA THE NETHERLANDS NEPAL TUNISIA ALGERIA FRANCE YUGOSLAVIA SWEDEN CHINA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC

Date: Dec 17, 1957

Volume No

1995

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

Prime Minister's Speech in Rajya Sabha

Initiating a debate on international affairs in Rajya Sabha, in New Delhi on Dec 12, 1957 the Prime Minister said:

Normally speaking, in a debate on foreign policy specific issues of interest, of topical interest, are considered, and I shall no doubt refer to them, which are of peculiar interest to India. Yet all these specific issues, important as they are, are very secondary in importance to the major issue in the world today, of the drift

towards war or the approach towards peace, because that will govern all the other issues. And there is no doubt that the situation in the world today, while it is not without some hope, is nevertheless a very serious one, and a very grave one, and many thinkers in the world are very much perturbed at this trend of events. I should like this House to pay some attention to these broad aspects and not confine itself to some narrow issue which may temporarily be of interest to us. It is our good fortune or misfortune to live at a time of great change, of tremendous developments which may bring good or evil to humanity. Living at this exciting period of human history, I would suggest to this House that we should take a view, in some perspective, of what has happened, what the position is today and what is likely to happen, and not confine itself to narrow issues. Then perhaps we might understand this tremendous theme.

Now, before I say much about this broader aspect, I shall refer to some of the special issues that will no doubt interest this House. Again, I should like to say that in considering any issue, we have to decide what method of approach we should adopt. It is easy for any Honourable Member of this House or for me to express our opinions boldly about any issue if we do not care for the consequences. It is very easy to lay down high principles, but the difficulty comes in the application of those high principles as we know because, human beings are not governed by rigid rules and each human being is different from the other, and to lay down certain rigid principles and expect everybody to follow them is perhaps not very wise. Now, the point is, what are we aiming at in the debate, in the speech that I deliver, or any Honourable Member does. Is it merely the repetition of those high principles which we pretend that we stand for or is it something which is meant to lead to something else, whether it is peace, whether it is a lessening of passions, whether it is a solution of a problem or whether it is a step in the right direction? It is important because we must know whether we are actively trying to achieve some result however small it may be or just trying to lighten our minds, by giving expression in strong or moderate language to our views about the world in general. Now, surely, a Government which is responsible or considers itself so or a body like this House which obviously is responsible, has to consider these matters from this very practical point of view of trying to achieve results. I do not say that even this House or our Parliament can achieve major results in world policy because nobody can pretend that our influence is such as to mould world opinion or world actions but all of us count for a little and in all humility we try to influence it to that little extent in certain directions. Now, why I am emphasizing this matter is because some of the amendments

<Pg-253>

show, and others too, that we are criticised sometimes for not taking up a bold and a gallant attitude in regard to some matters in jumping into the field and so on and so forth. Well, that may be a very gallant thing but it has no relation to reality. That period of Rajput chivalry does not apply to modern politics, brilliant as it

may be, The other alternative, of course, is being drawn into the controversy of the cold-war that is to say, casting all the blame on the other party for the lack of success of efforts made towards peace. Now, the argument may be perfectly justified or not I am not going into that but if you seek to get an agreement with the other party, if you seek to win over the other party, it is not the best way to approach it, to make a facet of it to begin with and to criticize it. That way, you will make it more difficult to get on with. I am not dealing with the merits of any question, but with the other thing, making an approach to the broad problems of the world. We are either making an approach with the intention of lessening the gaps, bringing these gaps together, winning over the other party if not completely at least to some extent, or we are merely wanting to declare something that we have in mind loudly, because we believe in it regardless of how it affects the main issue.

Now I do submit that there has been too much of this, what I venture to call, the "cold-war mentality approach" which, of course, is much more than what I have said because it is normally based on fear and apprehension, passion and prejudices as well as a desire not to appear to be cowed down by what the other party says, and a strange amalgam is produced out of all this, which makes even relatively easy problems, very difficult of solution. We have to deal here really not only with political, economic, military and like problems which are there practically, but we have to deal with something intangible in the minds of men, which comes in the way, of fear and anger and dislike and all that, which is a dangerous thing in this background of hatred. Now, obviously, one cannot get over that major difficulty merely by going on criticizing the other party, even though that criticism might appear to be justified. You do not get over it; you may satisfy yourselves but I do submit that by pursuing that policy we will not help ourselves or anyone else. I do not pretend to say that this Parliament or our country is superior in the sense that we are above passion, prejudice, hatred and fury.

As things are, there are a certain number of factors which help us. One factor is that we are geographically so situated that we are not drawn into this controversy with that passionate fury that other countries not so favourably situated may be. That is a major fact of geography, not of our goodness or of badness. The other thing is that the past years, not only since Independence, but previously too, have, under the inspiration of the Father of the Nation, trained us to some extent to think in a certain way and not to lose ourselves in a policy based merely on fear and passion. We might be swept away occasionally by fear or by passion, but we have tried to pull ourselves up. Therefore, because of these geographical and other factors we sometimes are in a position to help a little, not because of any special virtue on our part. I want to make that very clear because some people imagine that we consider ourselves very virtuous. I do not, and I speak in all honesty, consider my country more virtuous than the other countries. Some of our friends in our country appear to lay great stress on our high virtue, and our spirituality in dealing with problems. Well, nobody can deny our great

inheritance, but that great inheritance of ours and the, spiritually and other things are often shrouded up in something which is the very reverse of spirituality, and the gentlemen who generally repeat about this spirituality possess the least of it.

So, situated as we are, we have endeavoured, wherever we may function, whether it is the United Nations or bilaterally with other countries, to place our viewpoint as fairly and as clearly as possible, but always in a context of emphasising the common points and not emphasising the differences. Differences have to be pointed out of course, wherever they are but it does make a difference as to what you emphasise. The other party knows what our viewpoints are, and by emphasising the common points, you produce a certain favourable reaction in the other party and it is easier to discuss matters even though you may disagree. Recently, within the last few days, we have had a Conference here, the Commonwealth Parliamentary Conference, and there were discussions

<Pg-254>

on various subjects including foreign affairs. Now it is obvious that there was a great deal of difference in the viewpoint represented by the Delegations to that Conference. If I may mention, take the Delegation from South Africa. The House knows how we differ completely and how our policy is different from that of the South African Government, but the South African Delegation came here and we welcomed it as individuals, as our guests, regardless of our differences. So also in other cases. Here is this Conference consisting of a strange variety of people. The newest arrivals in it are from Ghana and Malaya. There were representatives from Nigeria from the West Indies ark so on. There was this great variety representing an equal variety of nations and approaches and yet we met, discussed matters and expressed our viewpoints with some force, differed with each other and yet kept our tempo spoke in a restrained way trying to appreciate what the other has said and trying to make the other understand what we feel. I do submit that if there is no other virtue in our meeting than that we had met and spoken and discussed these matters in that calm and relatively objective way, this kind of thing is a great purpose. I wish that this particular temper of approach to problems and to differences could be applied in many other places also.

I should like to place before the House some other instances of how we endeavour to function. We do not always succeed, we do not function by ourselves, naturally. Recently a resolution was passed in the United Nations on Algeria. Now Algeria has become one of the major problems of the day. A terrible war has been going on there. The House knows that we in India, all of us naturally and inevitably, are in favour of the freedom and independence of Algeria, of the Algerian people. We have always said at the same time that this question should be settled by peaceful methods. Unfortunately war has gone on there and terrible things have happened, and continue to happen. Now passions have been excited, and it is not an easy matter

for any approach to be made to the Algerian problem which would bring people nearer to each other. The United Nations, constituted as it is, can help but cannot force down any kind of solution. It has often failed

Take the South African issue, and India and Pakistan. The advice of the United Nations has not gone very far, and yet it would be wrong to say that the advice or the resolutions of the United Nations have failed. They have made a difference not only to world opinion but I am sure even in South Africa--may be not among the Government, but among the people.

However, here is this question of Algeria, a most difficult question. Yet, in co-operation with some other countries, India prepared a resolution which was passed unanimously by the Assembly. An extraordinary thing. Now the resolution itself may not go very very far. It is a simple resolution, but it is an extraordinary thing that over an issue which has roused so much passion as Algeria, a simple resolution should be passed. The only country that did not vote was France. It did not vote against it, I mean; it abstained from voting and all the others voted. Now the wording of the resolution may or may not be important. But the passing of a resolution of that type itself created or was meant to create a temper which leads to peaceful negotiations leads to lessening of tension, leads to an attempt to appreciate the reality of the problem, and so forth.

I gave this example of Algeria where very recently this step was taken by the United Nations, as showing how we feel about these matters.

Now, we are entangled in other problems. There is the problem of Goa. Then there is a different type entirely, the question of Ceylon, the people of Indian descent in Ceylon, a problem affecting many hundreds of the thousands of persons in Ceylon, esssentially a problem for the Ceylon Government and for the people of Indian descent there, but we are naturally interested in it and we should like to help in solving it. We treat it as a human problem not as a political one, and in spite of the fact that much progress has not been made towards a solution, it is an advantage that we discuss it with Ceylon in the friendliest manner, and if we do not solve it today, there is hope of solving it tomorrow. At present I confess we are nowhere near solving it, and things remain where they are. I had a very friendly talk with the Prime Minister of Ceylon who was here; we had long discussions and we understood each other, I think, fairly thoroughly each other's difficulties, each other's problems.

<Pg-255>

In Ceylon there are of course Indian nationals. There is no great problem about them, except that we should like Indian nationals to be treated as other foreign nationals with the same privileges, and not to be pushed out suddenly and in large numbers. But that is not the problem. The problem is of a large number of people of Indian descent

who have lived in Ceylon, many of whom have been born in Ceylon, most of whom work in the plantations there, and who according to us should be Ceylon nationals--unless any of them choose Indian nationality-and about whom the Ceylon Government has not been very encouraging in making them its own nationals. There are these many hundreds of thousands of persons who in a sense are stateless, although they are in Ceylon. They are not Indian Nationals, and the Ceylon Government has not made them yet its own nationals, and they remain in that fluid state. A few have become Indian nationals; a few, relatively few, I forgot what the total number is, have been registered as Ceylon nationals, but most of the applications for registration as Cevlon nationals have been rejected by the Cevlon Government. So. they remain in that fluid state. As I said, it is not really our problem except sentimentally, it is a problem of our people living there. It is up to the Ceylon Government and those people to adjust and solve it, we can help in that. If any of those want to become Indian nationals and satisfy the qualifications for being Indian nationals laid down in our Constitution, of course we shall accept them. But we do not accept any persons who came under compulsion, who are compelled. We object to that. If they decide freely without any compulsion, we take them.

Then there is the question of Goa again--a subject which has caused all of us much trouble, many headaches and may cause us many headaches in the future, because of the extraordinary attitude of the Portuguese Government which, as I have said earlier, live so apart from the modern world and modern thinking that it is difficult even to talk to them. Now, of course, we do not talk because our contacts have been cut off. But when we did try to talk to them, it was like talking to somebody in the middle ages. However ancient India may be, India thinks in the modern age and acts in the modern age. However. as some of the questions of today indicated, Portugal had discovered some kind of a pen friend in the President of Pakistan who has recently been visiting it and they are supporting each other in various matters. So, in spite of all this, in spite of the amazing anachronism of Goa being still a colonial possession, Goa is not something separate, but is right in the middle of India. The House knows how we have patiently tried to find a way to a solution and found great difficulties. The difficulties are still there, but we refused to talk of forcible or military methods. Many members in this House have thought -- and may still so think -- that we have been acting weakly and that we must be much more positive and aggressive. Well, I will not go into that matter, but at the present moment, what I am pointing out is that we have to follow a policy which we consider to be an integrated one. W cannot do something which, in fact, goes against our policy somewhere else. We will spoil our policy in both places when we venture to say in the United Nations and elsewhere, that all problems should be solved peacefully. We cannot at the same time talk of military measures because it happens to be to our interest to do so. Everyone knows that, from a military point of view. Goa is not a problem and as the President of Portugal has said, of course, India can take Goa in a day or two, but we have not.

Then, Portugal went, on a slightly allied issue, to the International Court of Justice at the Hague. This is about Nagar Haveli and Portugal is asking for a right of passage through India, to cross the Indian territory, to those enclaves which used to be in the Portuguese possession, but which liberated themselves about three years ago and which are now, well, more or less independent. They are not parts of the Union of India. No doubt, they want to be parts of the Union of India, but we have not accepted them because we want them to come through some normal processes, through some agreement and the like.

I said, there is no difficulty about our agreeing with the people of Nagar Haveli. I said that I did not wish to isolate this problem from the problem of the other Portuguese territories in India. When that problem is settled, then we can take normal steps about Nagar Haveli. We do not wish to take a step because that step should apply not to Nagar Haveli separately, but to Goa

$$<$$
Pg-256>

and other places also. When the time comes, it will comprise all of them. Meanwhile, we carry on. There is no difficulty about Nagar Haveli

But, this matter about the right of passage, as the House knows, was taken by the Portuguese Government to the International Court of Justice and we are contesting their claim there. We put forward six preliminary objections to the hearing of the Portuguese claim in the International Court of Justice. About a week or ten days ago, the, International Court of Justice gave their decision in regard to four of these preliminary objections, rejecting them and decided that, in regard to two of the Preliminary objections, they would consider them further at the time of the final hearing of this case, which will probably take place some time next year. Well, naturally, we cannot-and I do not wish to discuss the judgment of the International Court of Justice. There it is and we shall proceed to take other steps with regard to it.

In regard to Pondicherry, I should like to tell the House -- we have been told, in fact--that in the course of a few weeks--may be a month or two -- the French Parliament will presumably take the final legal steps. Practically, of course, steps where taken long ago. We have been expecting them for a considerable time past. But I do not think the delay has been due really to any basic objection there, but to the French Parliaments and the French Government's being entangled in their own internal affairs and controversies. In this connection, I should like to repeat what we said long ago about these French enclaves. The House may remember that, when this Treaty with France was signed and even before that, we had laid a great stress and made it clear that we would not change the status of Pondicherry without consulting its people. We declared this and I want to repeat that, lest some people may think that we are going to impose any change on

them. There are other various matters included in that Treaty. We are preserving the French language there. We have also preserved many things, because we do not want to change them which Pondicherry and like enclaves, inherited in the past without their consenting to it and having the chance. So far as the French language is concerned, we welcome it; we welcome the idea of having a centre in India where French will not only be taught as a foreign language but something in a better and deeper way, and which could be claimed to be a centre of French culture.

Recently the Kashmir issue has been before the Security Council and our position was stated there with fullness and clarity by the Leader of our Delegation, Shri Krishna Menon. His exposition of our case was a fine one and I should like to pay a tribute to him. But a resolution was brought forward by a number of countries represented there which we thought was very wrong and which ignored and bypassed what we considered the main issue in the case. We made our position perfectly clear in regard to this matter.

So, after that, a resolution was put forward and we expressed ourselves clearly that we could not accept it. Thereupon the Soviet Union made it known that they would, if this was put to the vote, vote against it, which meant that they vetoed it. Thereafter the sponsors of that resolution decided not to put it to the vote and after some further consideration brought forward a very different type of resolution, which ultimately was passed. So far as we are concerned, we do not accept even this resolution although I must say that it does not contain most of the objectionable features of the first one. This resolution invites or requests Dr. Graham to come to India. Well, Dr. Graham, of course, can always come to India. He is welcome to India as he was previously, and he is welcome now also. But we have made it clear that this visit should not be considered as some kind of continuation of talks on the old lines with Dr. Graham as regards demilitarisation etc. So that is the position.

One matter that is causing us a great deal of concern is the development, recent developments, in Indonesia. The House knows that we have been of opinion and we have expressed it clearly in the United Nations and elsewhere that the claim of Indonesia to West Irian is a right one, is a legitimate one and it flows from the circumstances of the case and even from the various treaties made by Indonesia and the Government of the Netherlands, and I am not going into the legalities of it. That is our view. The Netherlands Government has a different interpretation of those treaties. So, I am not going into the legalities but apart from strict

<Pg-257>

law, the fact remains that all over Asia and elsewhere too, there is no approval left of foreign colonial possession. The time is long past when these conditions could be tolerated and from that standpoint alone, it is clear that such a continuation of colonial authority would only be an irritant and would continue to be an

irritant, and we hope that this matter would be settled peacefully between the Government of the Netherlands and the Indonesian Government. Many efforts have been made thus far without success. Only a short while ago a resolution was moved in the U.N. -- I think it was about a fortnight ago. The resolution was a very simple one:

The General Assembly having considered the question of West Irian and West New Guinea, viewing with deep concern that prolongation of this political dispute is likely to endanger the peaceful development of that area, realising that peaceful solution of this problem should be obtained without further delay:

Invites those parties to pursue their endeavour to find a solution of the disputes in conformity with the principles of the United Nations Charter:

Requests the Secretary General to assist the parties concerned as he deems to be proper in the implementation of this resolution and submit a report of the progress to the 13th Session of the General Assembly.

The House will notice that this resolution is very carefully worded, avoiding any offence to anybody. Purposefully it was so worded. Yet, it was nevertheless opposed by the Netherlands Government and by some other governments. Voting on it was ultimately 41 in favour, 29 against and 11 abstensions that is to say, many more voted in favour of it than against. But it had to be passed by a two-third majority and because it did not get a two-third majority, it failed.

Now this was a great blow to the Indonesian Government and their people, that even this very moderate approach, which had been supported by so many countries -- so far as I remember the USA abstained on this resolution, they did not oppose it in spite of their great friendship for the Netherland but abstained from voting which, if I may say so, meant half approval of the case, if not more--did not succeed. However, it was so. Now this has led to certain happenings in Indonesia which it is a little difficult for us to understand or to appreciate. We hear about the happenings, we read in the newspapers and we also get some other accounts and all this has caused us great concern. Well, our sympathy is with the Government of Indonesia and the people of Indonesia in this matter, but we do hope earnestly that these matters will not be allowed to drift in such a way that a peaceful settlement is ruled out, that is in accordance with our own approach to these questions anywhere, and apart from that if conflicts occur no one knows where they would stop. There as elsewhere the attempted approach was one of conciliation, but unfortunately it has failed thus far.

Now I should like to say a few words about this particular problem to which I referred, the old problem of war and peace. Now in considering the world problem we come up against this business of cold war which has become now, whatever virtue it might have had in the past, completely illogical and leading nowhere. This business of

people talking that we must be tough and we must speak from strength becomes rather unmeaning, when strength is matched by strength and toughness can be matched by toughness, and when the ultimate recourse to put an end to one toughness by war is ruled out, because everybody proceeds on the assumption that we must have no war? Why? Because war will not only destroy your adversary, but it will destroy yourself and the rest of the world. Now that was the position even before certain recent advances were made in weapons like these ballistic weapons, and although this Sputnik and others are not weapons, they open out a prospect of other weapons of the most dangerous kind coming up. Obviously no one country is going to have a monopoly. At the present moment the Soviet Union has not got. No doubt the Soviet Union will get them and develop them. The Soviet Union has got the Sputnik and something else which the United States has thus far not got. No doubt the United States will have it in a month or two or in three months. It is always a question of delay, of a little time between the scientists and others of one country and the other. And

<Pg-258>

what is more, not only the United States of America and the Soviet Union, but gradually other countries will also possess these weapons as they are beginning to possess them. The United Kingdom has the hydrogen bomb. So whether one country is a little ahead of the other or not, the fact is that either of these giants has got enough material and bombs to destroy the other completely. And, therefore, any attempt by any one power, howsoever powerful it is to coerce the other through military means, involves destruction of both. Having arrived at that conclusion the natural result is that only a mad man will indulge in such an act. How then are you to solve these problems? If you rule out coercion by war or threat of war, how do you solve these problems? Well, cold war is not a method of conciliation. That is obvious, and you are ruling out war. So you hang between the two with no possibility of finding a way out of that deadlock. So it becomes more and more obvious that these policies of toughness and threats and brandishing of the sword do not lead anywhere.

The other day, Sir, a very eminent American expert on Soviet and Russian matters -- I think his name is Mr. George Kennan -- delivered a series of lectures in sonic university in which he made certain suggestions. The suggestions are not novel. They have been made by others also. But the point was that this very considerable expert in these matters had arrived at these conclusions. He said, as many people now say and as was said here in the Commonwealth Parliamentary Conference by Mr. Gaitskell, that an attempt should be made at "disengagement". This grappling together all the time like two wrestlers is not good enough. So gradually one must disengage. What the method of disengagement may be is a different matter. Mr. Kennan suggested as a first step towards disengagement that the various foreign armies in Europe should gradually be withdrawn. That is to say, the Soviet armies from other countries where they are stationed should be withdrawn, and in other armies of the Western countries

from Germany and wherever else they may be should be withdrawn. That is to say, both should simultaneously agree to withdraw. Now in our own small way we have often suggested that the keeping of foreign forces in other countries is bad, and whatever virtue it might have had in the past, in the present day it does not help at all. So it was suggested that they should be withdrawn, whether they are the Soviet forces or the forces of the Western allies. It is interesting therefore that a very eminent American expert has come to that view and has advocated it. But it is not only Mr. Kennan. This realisation is coming more and more to people's minds, even though many of them may not say so because they have a feeling that "If we say this, we might perhaps be weakening our country's policy and making the other country think that we are weakening." This is an inhibiting factor. But the fact remains that the people are driven inevitably to the conclusion that there is no hope in pursuing the policies at present pursued. This constant wrestling, cold war, piling up of armaments and this frantic search for a more powerful weapon, the ultimate weapon and so on -- as one ultimate weapon comes, it is succeeded by another which is more ultimate still -- where does it all lead to? Obviously it does not lead anywhere except ultimately to destruction. So when I said in the beginning that there were some elements of hope, I was referring to this gradual opening out of people's minds to these basic facts of the situation. But apart from this, the situation is bad enough. There is no doubt about it, and it has not been made easier by these latest discoveries like the Sputnik and others. Not that the Sputnik can do much. It has no military value. But as I said, it opens out the possibilities of greater and more destructive weapons which can destroy even the whole world. It was these thoughts which weighed with me and which made me issue a respectful appeal to the leaders of the United States and the Soviet Union and I was not presumptuous enough to think that I could advise them in this very difficult situation, because it is not good thinking that it is an easy situation to deal with; that we have only to lay down a principle or repeat a slogan and the problem will be solved. It is a very difficult situation. Nevertheless, the burden on my mind was so great that I had the presumption to issue this appeal to them. It was not any particular thing in the appeal that counted so much as the basic fact that a new approach should be made to these problems, and a new approach can only be made by people coming together, and I do hope that it will take place.

Now, war, today, it is said and rightly said, is likely to be completely different from

<Pg-259>

even the last World War. The weapons are different. Any general who thinks in the terms of the last World War and prepares for the next war on that basis, well, he is not at all good and he will have the surprise of his life when the next war comes. In other words, a General has to think on different lines. I do submit that in international affairs which are so intimately connected with defence and war potentials and the like -- in international affairs also --

we have to think on different lines and get out of our old rut. Nothing preserves that rut so much as the cold war mentality. In fact, the cold war mentality is no mentality at all. It is cold war. Thinking does not come in so much, because it is suppressed by passion and anger, and therefore the most dangerous part of the situation is this mentality befogging people's minds and filling them with dislike and hatred and thereby possibly leading to some kind of incident which even Governments may not know -- any odd General may do something in a fit of madness, in a fit of excitement, in a fit of loss of nerves, and that may bring all this catastrophe without even the knowledge of the Government concerned, because once somebody lets loose these terrible weapons, the others will follow step by step.

Therefore, our approach in this matter is not that we do not like this country or like the other country and so we run it down and say it is at fault and others are not at fault, even though some of our arguments may be occasionally justified. It is a bad approach. The new approach that can help is the approach of not laying stress on differences but rather laying stress on similarities, on common points and on common dangers. That is the approach of reconciliation, and I do hope that progressively people in other countries will adopt that approach. The people in every country, I believe, do think in that way, but the leaders who have to shoulder these heavy responsibilities naturally have to consider every aspect of the question, and it is very easy for us, sitting or standing at a distance to criticise them without realising all the difficulties they have to face. So, I issued that appeal and the day before yesterday, I received a reply from Mr. Bulganin, Prime Minister of the Soviet Union. The reply, I believe, is in today's press. I do not know whether the whole of it is there, but at least most of it is there, and naturally it deserves the fullest consideration. I am grateful to Mr. Bulganin for dealing with this matter at such length and suggesting that this kind of atomic tests should be suspended. That is what we have been saying for a long time. It is not so much the actual suspension of the tests that is good and will help in clearing the atmosphere, but the avoidance of the spirit of the atomic tests being applied to people's mental processes, Governments' mental processes i.e. the approach to each other in anger and trying to run each other down which is coming in the way more than the atom bomb today. I earnestly hope that this new approach will be made by the great leaders. We are small fry; in this matter we have no presumption that we can play an important part, but we do wish to play an independent part, because that is the only way we can serve our country and the rest of the world.

INDIA USA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC SOUTH AFRICA GHANA NIGER NIGERIA ALGERIA PAKISTAN FRANCE PORTUGAL INDONESIA THE NETHERLANDS GUINEA RUSSIA GERMANY

Date: Dec 12, 1957

Volume No

1995

JAPAN

Trade and Other Privileges Extended

An agreement to extend for a further period of three months the existing privileges to the nationals, trade, shipping, navigation and air traffic of Japan and India under the Indo-Japanese treaty of 1952 was signed in New Delhi on Dec 30, 1957 by His Excellency the Ambassador of Japan to India, Dr. Shiroshi Nasu, and a representative of the Government of India. A Press Note issued on the occasion stated:

The Indo-Japanese Peace Treaty, which was concluded in 1952, provided that pending the conclusion of treaties or agreements to place their trading and other commercial relations on stable and friendly basis, the two countries would accord, on a reciprocal basis, for a period of four years, certain privileges

<Pg-260>

to their nationals, trade, shipping, navigation, air traffic, etc.

This provisional period ended on 27 April 1956 and was last extended up to 31 December 1957, by exchange of letters.

As a result of the discussions held in New Delhi between the representatives of the two Governments, letters were exchanged in New Delhi on 30 December 1957 between Shri K. B. Lall, Joint Secretary, Ministry of Commerce and Industry, on behalf of the Government of India, and His Excellency Dr. Shiroshi Nasu, Ambassador of Japan, on behalf of the Japanese Government, by which the two Governments have agreed to continue to accord the same privileges up to 31 March 1958.

During this extended period, the two Governments hope to complete discussion for the conclusion of a Trade Agreement.

JAPAN INDIA USA

Date: Dec 30, 1957

Volume No

Trade Agreement Extended

The validity of the Trade Agreement between Norway and India were extended in New Delhi on Dec 17, 1957. A Press Note issued by the Government of India on the subject stated:

Letters were exchanged in New Delhi on 17 December 1957, between Shri K. B. Lall, Joint Secretary, Ministry of Commerce and Industry, and H.E. Mr. Knut Lykke, Ambassador of Norway to India, extending the validity of the Trade Agreement between the two countries up to 31 December 1958.

Some of the important commodities which will be available for export from India to Norway are tea, coffee, tobacco, jute goods, coir products, hydrogenated oils, shellac, mica, iron and manganese ores, woollen carpets, tanned hides and skins, cotton and woollen textiles, light engineering goods, plastic manufactures, hardware, including cutlery, and sports goods.

Among the commodities available for export from Norway to India are mechanical and chemical pulp, newsprint, aluminium manufactures, including aluminium boats, galvanised and black steel pipes, testing machines, welding equipment, marine type diesel engines, machine tools, fishing vessels, calcium carbide, urea formaldehyde and miscellaneous machinery.

The Government of Norway have agreed to include vegetable oils, manufactures of leather, including saddlery and other harness, equipment, floor coverings including carpets, mats, etc., and oilseed cake and meal in the free lists for imports from India into Norway, when the balance of payments position makes it possible for the Norwegian authorities to do so. Meanwhile, the Government of Norway will give due consideration to applications for the grant of quotas to the new importers, who may wish to import goods from non-traditional sources of supply.

The total value of imports into, India from Norway during 1956-57 amounted to Rs. 3.37 crores. The dominating item in the list of imports into India from Norway during this period was paper of all kinds, the value of which alone stood at Rs. 1.3 crores. Other important items imported during this period was metals, pulp of wood, staple fibres (raw), art silk yarn, machinery, calcium carbide, aluminium and canned fish.

The value of India's exports to Norway during 1956-57 amounted to Rs. 51 lakhs only. The main commodities exported to Norway from India were jute goods, coir and coir products, cotton waste, spices, manganese ore and cotton textiles.

It is hoped that as a result of the Agreement and better contacts between exporters and importers, it will be possible for trade between the two countries to be developed on the basis of a better balance.

<Pg-261>

NORWAY INDIA USA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC RUSSIA

Date: Dec 17, 1957

Volume No

1995

PAKISTAN

Canal Water Talks

In reply to a short-notice question in the Rajya Sabha on Dec 24, 1957, whether it as a fact that talks with Pakistan on canal waters had failed, Shri S. K. Patil, Minister of Irrigation and Power, said that the question probably referred to the talks recently held in New Delh i

representatives of the Governments of India and Pakistan in connection with an agreement for ad hoc transitional arrangements for a further period.

The Minister added that no such agreement had yet been reached. The failure of the talks did not present a new situation. The last transitional agreement between the Government of India and the Government of Pakistan expired on 31 March 1957. Since then river supplies had been distributed in accordance with the principles of the Indo-Pakistan Agreement of 4 May 1948, and the principles proposed by the Bank for such transitional arrangements.

The new crop season would begin on 1 April 1958, when the Government of India would take a fresh decision in the light of all the circumstances at that time.

In reply to another short-notice question, the Minister of Irrigation and Power, Shri S. K. Patil, said in the Lok Sabha in New Delhi on 20 December 1957 that talks were recently held in Delhi between the World Bank representatives and the representatives of India and Pakistan on agreement relating to ad hoc transitional arrangements for a further period.

As a result of prolonged discussions with the parties, the Bank representatives had informed themselves fully of the views and requirements of both sides in connection with the proposed agreement for ad hoc transitional arrangements for a further period. No agreement had yet been reached. It was believed that the Bank would continue its efforts to secure agreement.

PAKISTAN LATVIA INDIA USA

Date: Dec 24, 1957

Volume No

1995

PAKISTAN

Pakistan President's Statement on Kashmir

In reply to a question whether the attention of Government had been drawn to the statement made by the President of Pakistan, Major-General Iskandar Mirza, on Oct 02, 1957 that "if all means of an amicable settlement desired by them failed some other means shall have to be devised to cut the Gordian knot regarding Kashmir question", and if so, what action Government proposed to take to meet the threat, Shrimati Lakshmi N. Menon, Deputy Minister of External Affairs, said in the Rajya Sabha in New Delhi on 4 December 1957:

Yes. The Government of India have been reports to this effect in the Pakistan Press.

The Government of India has not known what other means the President of Pakistan has in mind. Nor can they say whether any threat is intended. Government of India are fully aware of their responsibility for the defence of Indian Union territory and will continue to take all measures necessary for efficient discharge of this responsibility.

PAKISTAN INDIA

Date: Oct 02, 1957

Volume No

1995

PAKISTAN

Review of Indo-Pakistan Trade Agreement

A Press Note issued by the Government of India on the subject of review of Indo- Pakistan Trade Agreement stated as follows:

Discussions were held in Karachi from 19 December to Dec 22, 1957, between the Indian and Pakistan Delegations on the review of the Indo-Pakistan Trade Agreement and the arrangements of Ziratia tenants and improvement of transit facilities to Tripura. The Indian Delegation was led by Shri B. N. Banerji, Joint Secretary, Ministry of Finance, Government of India. Osman Ali, Joint Secretary, Ministry of Commerce, Government of Pakistan, led the Pakistan Delegation.

The review, which was held in a cordial atmosphere, covered the main items under the Agreement such as coal, hard-wood, soft-

<Pg-262>

wood, stone boulders, stones (pakur), cement cinema films, sulphuric acids, books periodicals and newspapers. The working of the arrangements on border trade was also reviewed. Difficulties faced by the Ziratia tenants on either side of the border and the question of improvement in transit facilities through East Pakistan into Tripura were also discussed. The discussions were directed towards facilitating a greater flow of trade between the two countries to their mutual advantage, and to remove such difficulties in the working of the arrangements as has been experienced. Certain decisions were taken.

PAKISTAN INDIA USA **Date**: Dec 22, 1957

Volume No

1995

PAKISTAN

Smuggling on Indo-Pakistan Border

The Deputy Minister of Finance, Shri B. R. Bhagat, replied in the affirmative to a question in Rajya Sabha on Dec 19, 1957 in New Delhi whether it was a fact that Pakistani smugglers opened fire on the Indian border police near Mahawa village on the West Pakistan border on the 20 September 1957.

Giving details, the Deputy Minister added that four Pakistani smugglers opened fire on the Punjab Armed Police Party at Mahawa on the Western Border of India on the 20 September, 1957. The P.A.P. returned the fire which resulted in the death of two Pakistani smugglers while the remaining two escaped.

PAKISTAN INDIA

Date: Dec 19, 1957

Volume No

1995

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Aid for Malaria Eradication

An agreement was signed in New Delhi on Dec 05, 1957 by the Government of India and the United States Technical Co-operation Mission by which the full amount of the foreign exchange requirements for the malaria eradication campaign in India during the Second Five Year Plan period, estimated at 38 million dollars, will be made available as grant from T.C.M. funds. A Press Note issued by the Government of India stated:

The Indo-American Agreement on the malaria eradication programme was signed in New Delhi on 5 December 1957 by Shri N. C. Sen Gupta, Joint Secretary, Ministry of Finance, on behalf of the Government of India and Mr. Howard H. Houston, Director, U.S. Technical Cooperation Mission in India, on behalf of the T.C.M. The agreement will facilitate the broadening of the National Malaria Control programme into one of eradication.

Speaking after the signing of the Agreement, Shri D. P. Karmarkar, Union Minister of Health, said:

The National Malaria Control Programme started in April 1953 with the welcome assistance of the International Cooperation Administration, U.S.A., and other international agencies like the W.H.O., the UNICEF, and the Rockefeller Foundation, has fully justified itself and brought immense relief and immunity to large tracts of our country where the incidence of malaria has all along been high.

I am happy that today's agreement between the Government of India and the International Cooperation Administration will enable us to take the bigger stride towards the complete eradication of this foul disease. With this background, India is switching over from the control programme to eradication. I am happy to note that in this

great venture the International Cooperation Administration of the U.S. Government are making substantial contribution. I have great pleasure in expressing our deep appreciation of the great importance of the step we are taking. I am sure that it will not only achieve the immediate objective of the eradication of this disease which used to result in great human and economic suffering, but also bring our two countries closer than ever before. I wish this effort all success.

Replying to the Union Minister of Health, Mr. Howard H. Houston, Director of

<Pg-263>

the T.C.M. in India, said:

The agreement with the Government of India which I have just signed on behalf of the United States Technical Cooperation Mission is, indeed, one of tremendous significance.

It means, thanks to the diligence and zeal of the guardians of public health in the Centre and State Governments, that the malaria control programme will be broadened into one of eradication.

Malaria is an ancient scourge in India, as we all know. It would be impossible to give a valid estimate of the toll it has taken in human lives, destruction of health and loss of production.

We do know that one of the most-recent estimates was that there are 75,000,000 cases of malaria per year in India. The death toll from malaria, by this same estimate, is 800,000 per year, with another 800,000 deaths per year attributed indirectly to malaria.

As well as saving lives and increasing production, eradication will result in a savings in expenditures for the Central and State Governments. Under the National Malaria Control programme, which is less intensive than will be a programme of eradication, expenditure for spraying of DDT and other insecticides would go on indefinitely. But under the new programme eradication should be reached in three to six years, after which expenditures will be reduced tremendously.

The United States Technical Cooperation Mission in India is proud to be a partner in this project.

USA INDIA

Date: Dec 05, 1957

Volume No

1995

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Indo-U.S. Trade

The Deputy Minister for Commerce and Industry, Shri Satish Chandra, said in the Lok Sabha Dec 18, 1957 that there had been no decrease in India's over-all exports to the United States of America.

Shri Satish Chandra, who was replying to a question said that total exports to the United States in 1956-57 were worth Rs. 90.73 crores. Exports in 1955-56 were worth Rs. 87.12 crores and Rs. 89.00 crores in 1954-55.

The imports from that country totalled Rs. 105.26 crores in 1956-57, Rs. 89.3 crores in 1955-56 and Rs. 82.22 in 1954-55.

USA INDIA

Date: Dec 18, 1957

Volume No

1995

UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS

Credit to Indian Industries

Five agreements, subsidiary to the 500 million roubles credit agreement between the Governments of Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and India for cooperation in the establishment of industrial enterprises in India were executed in New Delhi on Dec 14, 1957. A Press Note issued by the Government of India stated thus:

Five agreements, subsidiary to the 500 million roubles credit agreement between the Governments of U.S.S.R. and India for cooperation in the establishment of industrial enterprises in India were executed, in New Delhi on 14 December 1957.

The agreements were signed by Messrs. P. Sergeev and P. Solodov on behalf of the "Technoexport", an All Union Export Import Corporation of Moscow and M/s. S. R. Kaiwar and R. S. Krishnaswamy on behalf of the Neyveli Lignite Corporation and National Coal Development Corporation, respectively.

Under the agreement with the Neyveli Lignite Corporation, the "Technoexport" will prepare a detailed project report of the Neyveli Thermal Power Station.

The remaining four agreements with the National Coal Development Corporation provide

<Pg-264>

for detailed project reports on an open cast mine in the Korba Coal-fields, two or three coal mines in the area of Korba Coal- fields, the central work shop for repair and maintenance of the equipment of the coal enterprises and the coal washing and dressing plant in these fields.

The agreement for the project report for the coal washing and dressing plant, however, provides that laboratory and pilot plant tests on the washability of coals from the Korba should be carried out with the help of Soviet specialists before deciding the establishment of the enterprise.

INDIA USA RUSSIA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC

Date: Dec 14, 1957

Volume No

1995

YUGOSLAVIA

Rupee Payments for Imports

An agreement was concluded in New Delhi on Dec 14, 1957 between the State Trading Corporation (Private Limited) and Intertrade, Yugoslavia, A Press Note issued by the Government of India on the subject stated as follows:

An agreement has been concluded between concluded between the State Trading Corporation of India (Private) Ltd., and Intertrade, Yugoslavia, Shri D. Sandilya, Managing Director, signed the agreement on behalf of the State Trading Corporation and Mr. Janez Rojnik, Commercial-Director, on behalf of Intertrade, Yugoslavia.

The object of the agreement is to promote trade between India and Yugoslavia.

Under the agreement, payments for the imports into India from

Yugoslavia will be made in Indian rupees and the money credited to a special account of Intertrade with the State Bank of India, New Delhi. The money in the special account will be utilised by Intertrade for the purchase of specified Indian goods.

<Pg-265>

YUGOSLAVIA INDIA **Date**: Dec 14, 1957